

Jill:

Welcome back to #SistersInLaw with Barb McQuade, Joyce Vance, and me, Jill Wine-Banks. We're missing Kim this week, but she'll be back with us next week. As you all know by now, we are going on tour in May: Portland on May 12th, New York City on May 19th, and DC on May 21. Go to politicon.com/tour to get your tickets. They are selling fast, so hurry up. New York is almost gone.

Let's get on with the show. Today, we'll be discussing so many exciting topics, all the things involving the Trump investigations and subpoenas and depositions and the Georgia Grand juror who's talking to the media. Then we'll move on to Brnovich and what he did that was right in Arizona and what he did that is really wrong. Then we'll talk about the Communications Decency Act and the Anti-terrorism Act. And as always, we'll be answering your questions. It's a part of the show we really look forward to.

Before we get to all that excitement, I want to just talk about... We're recording early today, and so it made me reflect on what my morning routine is and how I could shorten it so that I would be ready in less time. I want to know what tips you have for getting ready fast. It usually takes me, honestly, two hours including if I have to wash my hair and dry it. That's a lot of time to spend every few days, but it takes me at least an hour and a half even without washing my hair. So I need some ways to cut back on what it takes. Any suggestions?

Joyce:

Well, here's mine. Get a chicken coop. I'm not a morning person, but every morning I bounce out of bed really early, throw on some jeans and a T-shirt, make coffee really fast, and then I go down and I hang out with the chickens for that first hour of the day where I'm otherwise, my husband says, not even human, unapproachable grouchy, and I get it out of my system. Jill, it's amazing. I'm pretty low maintenance. I get dressed in about 10 or 15 minutes. So once I'm wide awake and have had a chance to have the chickens help me sort out whatever issues I've had, I find that they give very good advice, I'm really efficient at getting everything else in the works.

Barb:

Since I've been writing this book, my routine is to wake up at 6:00 a.m. and to go straight for coffee and then straight to the computer and work until 9:00 o'clock and then put it away for the rest of the day. So that's been helpful. I'm, as Joyce would say, barely human. I don't talk to anybody else. I just focus on my computer during that time. But over the course of those three hours, I wake up and then get ready to start my day. I teach... My first classes at 10:20 a.m., so about 9:00 o'clock, I start getting ready. I can get ready in less than an hour though, Jill, but I don't look nearly as good as you.

Jill:

I got to say-

Joyce:

Well, that's true, right?

Jill:

... I share with all of you this business of, when I wake up, I'm not really awake, and I think the reason it takes me so long is because I'm not awake. If I go to get dressed at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon, I can do it in 15 minutes. But in the morning, it takes me so long because I'm not energetic. I wake up-

Barb:

I'm groggy.

Jill:

... later in the day. That's my problem. I'm going to try running downstairs and letting Brisbie kiss me. That might wake me up faster. So maybe that's the answer. I don't have chickens, but I do have Brisbie, so maybe there's how I can speed up my morning routine.

Joyce:

Well, you always look good, Jill. Something that I appreciate is the fact that you actually do that because I typically don't wear makeup if I'm not going on TV, and I've sort of mastered the five to ten-minute makeup face. I just put a bunch of hairspray in my hair. So I think I need to be more like you. Maybe we should all meet in the middle.

Jill:

Well, I almost missed a performance of the ballet on Sunday because I was working and I totally lost track of time. I suddenly looked and it was like 10 to 1:00, and the ballet started downtown at 2:00. I got ready in less than 15 minutes-

Barb:

There you go.

Jill:

... from pajamas, everything, out the door, and we made the ballet on time. So I know I can do it, but that was at 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon when I'm awake.

Barb:

Joyce, tell me what you've done lately to save a tree.

Joyce:

Well, we are all about saving the trees here. My husband is a big recycler, and we try to be very environmentally conscious. Something that we can all do, and, Barb, I know that this is one of your favorite topics, but we can think about the toilet paper we're using. We can stop cutting down trees to make toilet paper. It's true that humans are cutting down tens of thousands every day just to supply our need for toilet paper. The worst part is that when we use trees for toilet paper, it's one-

Barb:

Are you saying toilet paper as often as possible just to taunt me?

Joyce:

I am.

Barb:

Because I'm going to say my part without saying the phrase "toilet paper."

Joyce:

I'm clearly taunting you here. I'm seeing how many times I can say toilet paper before I make you erupt like you just did. It's working. Joking aside, we all know Barb doesn't like talking about toilet paper. It is a one-and-done use for trees. It can't be recycled or reused, Barb, as you well know, so it just goes straight into our water system. That's why in our house we've made the switch to Reel Paper. Reel is 100% bamboo, something that grows really fast. It's a regenerating resource, and it doesn't impact entire forest ecosystems. It's the best kind of eco-friendly product because it doesn't feel like you're sacrificing something to help the Earth. In fact, you'll probably like it just as much as, if not better, than what you're using now. We love how it's always shipped for free to our doors in plastic-free packaging, and you can schedule it on a subscription so that it comes right to your door without the need to say toilet paper over and over again.

Jill:

I love the two of you. You sound like little children fighting. You must be basically sisters at heart. Oh, yeah, you are, SistersInLaw. But I agree, Joyce, with everything that you say. I've even planted some bamboo, which, amazingly, there is a type that will survive in Chicago. It is amazing to watch it regrow year after year after year. Reel is now partnered with One Tree Planted so that with every box of Reel you buy, they are funding reforestation efforts across the country. So unlike the other toilet paper that cuts down trees, Reel is helping to actively plant them. Cutting costs and increasing growth, that's always a win, especially when it's a big step we can all take to reduce our footprint and do our part to keep the planet green and clean.

Barb:

Reel Paper is available in easy, hassle-free subscriptions or for one-time purchases on their website. All orders are conveniently delivered to your door with free shipping in 100% recyclable plastic-free packaging. If you head to reelpaper.com/sisters and sign up for a subscription using our code Sisters at checkout, you'll automatically get 30% off your first order and free shipping. That's R-E-E-L-P-A-P-E-R.com/sisters or enter promo code Sisters to get 30% off your first order plus free shipping. So let's make a change for good this year and switch to Reel Paper. Reel Paper is for the planet. Look for the link in the show notes. See, I told you guys I could get through that without saying toilet paper.

Joyce:

No, do it just one time... Oh, you just said it. You just said it.

Jill:

There is so much news related to investigations of Trump that I'm going to cover some of it. Joyce will do another part of it. I want to start in Georgia with, what I have to say, is one of the oddest news-maker stories of the Trump investigation, and that's Emily Kohrs. Joyce, who is she, and why is she in the news, and what were key takeaways from what she's saying? Finally, why is she being called a witch?

Joyce:

Emily Kohrs was the foreperson for the Georgia investigative grand jury in Fulton County that investigated what we all know DA Fani Willis is looking into, Trump's role in the 2020 election. It's been a fascinating, and I have to say for me as a former prosecutor, a very cringey situation. You don't like seeing members of grand juries speak out in public. But Georgia has this weird procedural quirk where

they use an investigative grand jury for long-term investigations. She's not the foreperson of the grand jury that will end up indicting the case. So she's come forward, as the judge apparently instructed them they could, to share her impressions.

Interesting question, Jill, why is she being called a witch? You didn't have to be a rocket scientist to see the minute she opened her mouth in public that Trump and Trump's allies would come after her. Interestingly, they found some stuff on her Pinterest boards where she had pinned some stuff that made it look like maybe she was interested in Wicca or in witchcraft. So of course, Trump pundits fell all over themselves saying, "Putting the witch back in witch hunt." Of course, this is silly stuff. This is just a flash in the pan.

Jill:

I know, but I loved reading that. It was so much fun. Barb, more importantly, did she violate any rules? Even if she didn't seem to, will she hurt the prosecution?

Barb:

I watched some of those interviews with her. I think Emily Kohrs is a very earnest person who fully accepted her responsibility to serve on a grand jury, and for that, she deserves our thanks. I don't think she should be mocked. It appears that she did follow the letter of the law in Georgia. Like Joyce, I'm used to practicing in the federal system where a grand juror is not supposed to discuss any, quote, matter occurring before the grand jury, so you don't talk about who came in, who the witnesses were, anything about their demeanor, nothing.

In Georgia, the Grand Juror's Handbook says simply that grand jurors should not disclose their deliberations. So she seemed to interpret that, whether this was because the judge explained it to them this way or this was her own interpretation, as long as she didn't say what their decision was, who they decided to recommend indictments, then that was good enough because she was asked a couple times that, and she said, "Nope, can't say that." But she did say that they were recommending more than a dozen indictments, which seems perhaps to have crossed that line.

I think it's unlikely that she violated any laws. The one that concerned me the most, frankly, wasn't so much about her conversations about what happened in the grand jury, but revealing some of the things behind the scenes. There was one thing where she said she swore in a witness while holding a Ninja Turtle Popsicle in her hand. That alone isn't bad enough, but she said that she got the popsicle at an ice cream party thrown by the DA's office. What on earth is she doing at an ice cream party thrown by the DA's office? I actually researched this a little bit. Because I remember when I was a prosecutor, we were always told, "Don't socialize with the grand jury. You must maintain independence and a professional distance."

I looked this up. There was a case where there was some socializing between members of the grand jury and a prosecutor, and it did not result in the dismissal of the case. It just resulted in a reprimand of the prosecutors for failing to maintain the independence and appearance of independence of a grand jury. But Joyce, you tell me that in the South, that's a thing. I know once I've had grand jurors offer me donuts. After a while they get to know each other and they bring in donuts. I had a grand juror a time or two say, "Oh, would you like a donut?" I would always say, "No, thanks. Those are for you," and just move on with my case. But you told me then in the South that southern hospitality prevails, huh?

Joyce:

Well, I think that there's a big difference between federal grand juries and state grand juries in this regard. What I was mentioning was that shortly after I had joined our office, so a million years ago, 1991, we decided as an office that we could no longer put out tables of food for grand jurors for exactly the reasons that you talk about. But in the state system, I think that's still by and large the practice.

It's not just a Southern thing. I think as human beings, we associate food with making people feel comfortable. Grand jurors come in to do something that's brand new for them. Like you Barb, I have a lot of empathy for this woman. I think, with someone who has no legal context, doesn't understand the kind of issues that we might discuss about whether what she's done will impact prosecutions, she was just really genuinely wrapped up in her opportunity to serve and the experience that she had. Those are the kind of people that prosecutors want to put at their ease by feeding them. At least it's what I do, the Jewish mama in me. I feed people when I want them to feel comfortable and happy.

So in state grand juries, certainly across the Deep South, there's nothing unusual or even untoward about this. It's just this horrible image we all now have of her saying, "I was standing there swearing in the grand jury with the Teenage Mutant Ninja Popsicle that I got from the DA's office in my hand." You just want to beat your head into the brick wall, because how many lucky breaks can Donald Trump get in one lifetime? He certainly seems to get more than his fair share, [inaudible 00:14:47].

Barb:

I think if I'm Fani Willis, I think they can cleanse this taint, if there is any, because this grand jury only recommended charges. She now has to go before a new grand jury to actually get approval for any charges. So I think any taint that might exist on this can be cured with the presentation before that grand jury. But I'll tell you, if I'm Fani Willis, I'm saying, "No parties, no ice cream parties, Prosecutors, and no food for the grand jurors."

Joyce:

This would be a good time for her to adopt the "no more fraternizing with our grand juries" rule. That's a rule all prosecutors should adopt.

Jill:

While that might be, I do think that this is not going to be a legal impediment. I do not think that Donald Trump's defense or any other person who's indicted's defense is going to be able to use it. There was a law professor from Georgia State who said that it's a downside that it makes it look unseemly, but there was nothing illegal. The judge gave permission for the grand jurors, not just her, but for all of them to say anything they wanted as long as they didn't talk about their deliberations. So I think she definitely tried to stay within it, and we'll have to see what comes forward.

Let's move on to another exciting development, which was 41,000 hours of January 6th tapes were given exclusively to Tucker Carlson by Speaker McCarthy. Barb, let me start with you and say, the January 6th Committee had released many, many hours, not anywhere near 41,000 hours, of this very footage, but not all of it. Of course, no one would want to sit and watch 41,000 hours. But there was a security risk that stopped the prior release of all of it to the public and the media. So before we talk about whether, if you're going to release it, it goes just to Fox News, talk about what the security risk was.

Barb:

Well, it's incredibly irresponsible to release all of this footage to Fox News, especially Tucker Carlson. This is no longer speculation. We know from testimony that Fox News is very much a part of the Trump propaganda machine. So exposing this may present a one-sided cherry-picking presentation of the facts, but more dangerously, as you suggest, Jill, it's a security risk. The committee refrained from showing certain things. When the Secret Service is escorting the vice president around the Capitol, I'm sure there are routes they take him and hold rooms they put him in to make sure that he is safe from the public. If those things are disclosed to the public, they've lost the ability to do that going forward. The same with the Speaker of the House, same with where they evacuate members. If those all become publicly known, then that playbook has been compromised and everybody in that building will no longer be safe. So it's incredibly irresponsible to give it up.

Assume he's acting in good faith, which may be a bit of a stretch here, but assume he were, what he could do is form a committee or assign it to a committee to examine all of it and see if there was anything about that presentation by the January 6th Committee that was misleading in any way. "They showed you Josh Hawley running through the Capitol, but what they didn't show you is..." whatever. That's fine, and on a case-by-case basis if they want to show it. But showing everything means that even those very sensitive pieces of video are going to get out in the public domain. So it's just incredibly irresponsible. It is, once again, an example of somebody putting their political interests ahead of the best interest of the country.

Jill:

It fits right in with your book and the security risks involved. Joyce, Barb said it was irresponsible, and I think we would all agree to that. But did he have a legal right to do this? If the tapes belong to the public, which is what he said, that McCarthy said, they belong to the public, then shouldn't all media get it, not just Fox's Tucker? As Barb said, he has a predetermined narrative. What do you think about that?

Joyce:

Well, Jill, if you're the Speaker, the only people that matter to you are Tucker Carlson's viewers, so you only have to give stuff over to them. I think it's worth saying, I hate that sort of tone of edgy sarcasm that gets into my voice, but like Barb says, this is yet another example of someone who's putting party over country. It's unseemly when it's the Speaker, someone who should be setting a tone for the rest of the Republican Party. Here's the tone that he's setting. So as a practical matter, the Speaker can do whatever he wants to do here. Could somebody legally challenge it? Maybe, but you can't let the horse back into the barn once it's already out.

I think that maybe the more important challenge here is, given that he's done it, are others entitled to it as well? That certainly will start with polite requests, but may well escalate. The problem though is the one that Barb identifies. Some of this footage is stuff that should not be released. We read, for instance, that Capitol Police learned it was being released when they read it in the news. Democratic leaders learned about it the same way. It is unconscionable to create this level of security risk. Yet, that's where we are, 2023.

Jill:

You mentioned that, again, it should go to everybody if it's going to anybody, and it should be restricted as to what goes. But has anybody else sued for access, a Freedom of Information Act request, or does the Department of Justice have it all?

Barb:

I think Mike Lindell has filed a lawsuit. I just saw that headline today. Does he have a media company?

Jill:

I don't [inaudible 00:20:53].

Joyce:

It's a pillow company.

Barb:

[inaudible 00:20:53] My Pillow CEO.

Joyce:

Is it the same thing?

Jill:

Yeah, kind of.

Barb:

No, he wants it. He wants it too. He said that it violates the First Amendment to give it only to Fox and not to other outlets.

Jill:

Oh, interesting.

Joyce:

Well, that's how he reads the First Amendment.

Jill:

So how do you see Fox using these tapes? Will more need to be released to set the record straight after he puts his spin on it? How is he going to misuse these? Barb, what do you think?

Barb:

I don't know, but you could speculate, like "This is a Fox News special report." They'll have to have a name for it. Like, how it's like the Twitter Files and the Pentagon Papers and the Panama Papers, it'll have to be the Capitol Films or something like that. "The Capitol Films reveal that this was all a false flag. Here's a police officer who is allowing protestors to pass him by rather than die or something." So I could imagine you could find little bits to cherry pick, to promote some sort of false narrative, that this was all staged. There's been some rumor or conspiracy theory that this was all put on by the FBI. So whatever narrative you want to frame, I'm sure you can find tidbits.

It's sort of like that 2000 Mules film that purports to show how ballots were harvested for the 2020 election. It turns out nothing of the sort, but grabbing a little bit of shadowy video over a narrative can look like, "Look, there's video proof." So that's the kind of thing I'm worried about. Will more video need to be released to correct the record? Maybe so. I don't think anybody who is responsible would want to

release anything that shows sensitive places within the Capitol, but it is possible. Sometimes the best way to respond to false claims is to share true claims.

Jill:

Here's a third subject within Trump world. Ivanka and Jared have been subpoenaed by the Jack Smith group. What are they going to be asked, Barb?

Barb:

I would think that, with regard to Ivanka Trump, we have heard that she was with the president on January 6th and was urging him to call off the mob at the Capitol, and he sat there for three hours and let it all continue. I would want to ask questions about that. I would also want to ask her questions about any knowledge she had that Trump knew he had lost the election, because that is an important factor to demonstrate fraud. I guess, the same with regard to Jared Kushner. Did either of them ever discuss with him the fact that he had lost the election? I think that would be an important fact. Some of that did come up in the January 6th hearings. There was also some reporting that she was in the room when Trump was talking to Pence on the phone, either on January 6th or just before January 6th, and pressuring him to overturn the vote. So I would imagine those things.

One of the important things is sometimes people say, "Why would you ever question somebody who's so closely aligned with the target of the investigation? They're just going to say things that are helpful to the target." If that's true, that's okay, but it's important to lock in that testimony now so that there are no surprises later. What is she going to say? She's going to say what she's going to say. So let's get her under oath, hear what she's going to say. That prevents someone from fabricating testimony down the line. So a year from now, the case goes to trial and Trump has some new cockamamie theory about what happened, it would prevent someone like Ivanka or Trump or Jared Kushner from testifying and say, "Oh, yeah, everything he says is true. Absolutely. No one ever asked me before, but here's the way it all played out."

Jill:

Joyce, what do you think it means about where in the investigation Jack Smith is? Obviously, this is moving up the chain to people who are really close to Donald Trump. Does that mean we're getting close to the end of his investigation?

Joyce:

I think that there are two possibilities here, and I can't evaluate which one is correct. One possibility is the one that you suggest, late stage in the investigation where you're finally very close to Donald Trump. You're talking to the people closest to him, doing what Barb suggests. I think it seems pretty clear from what we know publicly that there is good evidence to show that Trump knew he had lost and continued with this anyhow, which is essential to proving this claim that he obstructed a congressional proceeding. What you've got to know is what might they come shooting with you at trial that you don't already know. So you have to ask very specific questions to elicit every last bit of that testimony so that there's no wiggle room.

That could mean that we are very close, but it could also mean that Jack Smith is savvy. He's watched what's happened in the past. He knows that there will be a lot of fights before people comply with these subpoenas, privilege issues that have to be determined, like the Mike Pence issue about Speech or Debate Clause immunity. So he's going ahead and bringing these subpoenas to people now so that he

can set up those court battles and they will be finished by the time he's ready for their testimony. Two possibilities, can't really get a read on which one is accurate, but I'd love to know what y'all think.

Barb:

I think either is possible, Joyce. I don't know. Talking with people who have handled some of these high-profile cases, it sounds like your second theory may be true, which is they're savvy enough to know that there are going to be some fights here, so time to serve these subpoenas now so that we can build it, a little time to litigate it knowing that it may be a month or two before we actually get their testimony.

Jill:

Of course, I agree, either could be true. Maybe it's my Pollyanna part, maybe it's my past experience, I really do think that he's moving up the chain and that that means he's getting closer and closer to taking some action. Maybe it's just my wishful thinking.

Let's go to the last part of what I want to ask about in terms of January 6th, and that is a case involving access to Representative Scott Perry's cell phone. It was taken from him, and a case was argued in the Circuit Court for the District of Columbia. Part of it was in open court, part of the argument, and part was in secret. Barb, what is this case about, and why is part of it sealed?

Barb:

Well, this is part of the Department of Justice's investigation into January 6th. You may recall that Scott Perry was a person who helped install Jeffrey Clark and wanted to have him elevated to the acting attorney general right after the election when the deputy after William Barr resigned, Jeff Rosen, made it clear he wasn't going to play ball, that they were not going to perpetuate this false claim of fraud. So Scott Perry said, "I've got a guy who'll do it for you, Jeff Clark. He'll help you out." So DOJ seized his phone, which requires a search warrant. They, no doubt, got a search warrant, got the phone. So they've seized it, but they have not yet searched it because Scott Perry has asserted privilege under the Speech or Debate Clause, the same one that Mike Pence has asserted to challenge a subpoena, and has said, "They should not be able to look at my phone because it contains information about my efforts regarding legislation, and therefore it is protected."

As to why it's sealed, Jill, I can only imagine that because it's a search warrant matter, if you're litigating a search warrant before a case is filed, it would seem that the prosecutors would file anything and a motion should be filed under seal. What's interesting to me is the fact that the DC Circuit Court argument was so public, whereas the District Court judge's review of all of this was done in secret. So I thought that was kind of interesting.

But what's at stake is whether DOJ gets to see the contents. There could very well be some very incriminating messages on this cell phone where he says, "I've got a guy who's corrupt. Put Jeff Clark in charge, and he'll help you steal the election," or something maybe a little more guarded, but words to that effect. But what he says is, "Anything that's on my phone might involve informal fact gathering, questioning to inform my own views about how I might vote on legislation." The Speech or Debate Clause talks about not questioning or charging anybody for things that are said in the chamber. They can't be questioned in any other place for things they say about legislation in the chamber. It has been extended to things outside, and it's been extended to aides and other kinds of things. But as DOJ argued, it can't be everything they talk about. If it's about ordering a pizza, that can't be part of their legislative fact finding. So the question is, where does that line get drawn?

Jill:

Joyce, the Speaker and Hakeem Jeffries, the minority leader, both have supported secret amicus briefs about the Speech and Debate privilege. Were they both defending Perry's opposition to access his phone, or do we really know what their position was because their brief was sealed?

Joyce:

Right. I think we don't know because of the sealed nature of the proceedings. I don't think it should come as any surprise to us that members of Congress would jealously guard this Speech or Debate privilege. They want to see it be as broad as possible. But I'm in Barb's camp on this one. I think that if Congressman Perry and Jeffrey Bossert Clark, the DOJ official who he brought to Trump's attention and suggested as an acting attorney general because he was willing to perpetrate the big lie, if those two are text messaging back and forth and I'm a prosecutor, I want access to those text messages and there is no way that a legitimate legislative purpose is involved there, they're entitled to get it.

Jill:

Don't you think it falls within the same kind of exemption that the executive privilege decision recognized in US v. Nixon, when you're involved in committing a crime, those are not executive privileged conversations, and they're not legislatively protective under Speech and Debate either? That's what I would argue is that it just can't.

Joyce:

I would go even broader. I think it's become popular to say, "Well, there's a privilege," and to stop the analysis there. It's great that there's a privilege and it's great that you're talking about a person who's covered by that privilege or adjacent to it, but that doesn't mean that everything that they do is covered by it. So to your point, Jill, there's what we would call if it was attorney-client, a crime fraud exception. Not everything that people do is privileged. It's not enough for Pence, for instance, just to say Speech or Debate. He has to show that it really was part of his function as president of the Senate, not a criminal conspiracy to interfere with the certification of the vote.

Jill, I know a little bit about some of the things that you do. I know that you play Wordle every day. I know that you're a late night denizen of Twitter. But you seem to always be really calm. You seem to roll with the punches. Do you have a secret that the rest of us don't have?

Jill:

I do, but I think some of you also share this with me. It is something called Calm, which is an amazing, amazing app. It's the best thing for those late nights when you are just so stressed you can't fall asleep. It's also great when you wake up on the wrong side of the bed, or you have a long day at work and there's still more to do. Maybe you've been feeling like you just can't catch a break. We never know what type of day we'll have, but Calm can help you handle whatever comes your way. Calm helps you stress less, sleep more, and live a happier, healthy life. Their guided meditations, Sleep Stories, relaxing music tracks, and daily movement sessions are all designed to give you the tools to improve the way you feel.

Barb:

Right now, more than 100 million people around the world are using Calm. Even if you've never meditated before, you'll get the support you need to reduce stress, improve focus, and uplift your

mood. We love how their Sleep Stories help you drift off quickly to recharge your brain. They're also great for getting kids to calm their minds at night so you can rest assured they're getting the sleep they need. If you go to calm.com/sisters, you'll get a special offer of 40% off a Calm Premium subscription, and new content is added every week. So relax, Calm's got everything you need for a happier and healthier you.

Joyce:

Sometimes it's hard to turn your brain off when it's time to go to sleep, but thanks to Calm's amazing content and narrators, I'm able to find deep relaxation and be ready to take on the challenges ahead. For listeners of the show, Calm is offering an exclusive offer of 40% off a Calm Premium subscription at calm.com/sisters. Go to C-A-L-M.com/sisters for 40% off unlimited access to Calm's entire library. That's calm.com/sisters. You can also find the link in our show notes.

Barb:

Joyce, I think you should be a Calm reader. I like your voice. The Southern lilt, it's very calming.

Joyce:

Do you ever notice there's sometimes really interesting accents, too, when you're listening to some of the different programming they have, so maybe they do need a Southerner.

Barb:

There you go.

Joyce:

Well, Barb, this week, former Arizona Attorney General Mark Brnovich was back in the news. He is a name that may be familiar to folks. He was the named plaintiff in some of the voting rights... some of what I would call the bad law that came out of the Supreme Court in 2021 further restricting the use of the Voting Rights Act to protect voters. But that's not why his name is back in the headlines. What's going on, Barb?

Barb:

Well, first, as you pointed out, Joyce, Mark Brnovich has a very unfortunate spell check variation on his name. You type in what Brnovich comes back as. He-

Joyce:

Not even when you type it in. When I'm voice to text and I'm texting the Siri, if I don't check carefully, you guys know it's always "burn a bitch."

Barb:

Well, he is in the news because of some positions he took when he was attorney general in Arizona. At the election time, he was one of the first people to say that Joe Biden won the election in Arizona. But that was a state where there were all of these claims about election fraud. Then when he got the ambition to run for Senate in Arizona as a Republican, suddenly he started talking more and more about fraud. In fact, he undertook a massive investigation. His staff spent more than 10,000 hours investigating claims about fraud and determined that there was no fraud. But while he's campaigning, rather than

disclose that, he first issues an interim report in April of '22 that says, "Well, we're not done yet, but we're finding some very suspicious things." His staff has written, like, "No, we're not. None of this is true." Then they complete their work in September of 2022.

He loses his election, but before he does, he goes on things like Steve Bannon's podcast and says things like, "Well, we all know what happened in 2020." So he is going along with the con, again, to advance his own political agenda. In September when his team finishes their final report, he just buries it, and he leaves office without ever disclosing that they found that there was no fraud in Arizona. We only know about this now because his successor, who is a Democrat, has shared it with the media, said, "Hey folks, look at this. His report concluded that there was no fraud in the election." Just once again, shame on someone who is putting their own political fortunes ahead of their duty as a public servant.

Jill:

I have a question, Barb. How did he think he was going to keep its secret? The document was in the office, a Democrat was taking over, was going to see it. What kind of idiot hides it like that?

Barb:

Yeah, I don't know. Now he's all back on board. "Oh, I said all along that they were a bunch of clowns, anybody who denied the election was a bunch of clowns and that it was all horse bleep." I don't know how these people live with themselves with this double speak, but he's the ultimate flip flopper.

Joyce:

It's so patronizing to their voters. It's like saying in a way, "We don't expect you to be able to detect our lies." If I was a Republican voter, I would be so offended by Mark Brnovich. Jill, I think it's worth going back and talking a little bit more. Barb mentioned that Brnovich did acknowledge that Trump lost Arizona, but he was sort of alone on the Republican side of the aisle in doing that. We all remember that Arizona was one of the states that Trump tried to put into play as part of the big lie scheme. What were the allegations in Arizona, and how far did other Republicans, apart from Brnovich, go in trying to pretend Trump had won?

Jill:

Well, of course you can't skip the Cyber Ninjas who were hired at great expense and with no qualifying credentials to get the job who investigated. Even though their sole purpose was to find more votes for President Candidate Trump than for the winner, President Biden, they failed to do that. They had to admit that there wasn't. But the allegations included, of course, dead voters were voting, that aerial objects were flipping votes, that election workers were scrubbing the hard drives, that the Italian military had satellites that penetrated the vote counting machines, so there were a number of Looney Tune accusations.

There was never any evidence of any of them at any point in any lawsuit, in any Cyber Ninja findings, or in this later-started investigation that Barb's been talking about which was started a year after the election ended and that was kept secret until just now being released by his successor. So the allegations were really silly. They challenged early voting. They challenged how signatures were being validated and verified. They said that drop boxes were misused. They were all unfounded. It's a very good representation of what happened in every challenged state where there was no evidence ever to prove any of these and that every legitimate investigation, and even the illegitimate ones like the Cyber Ninjas, proved that there was nothing there.

Joyce:

Go figure, a group called Cyber Ninjas wasn't a legitimate investigative unit. In fact, I think when they were hired in Arizona, they had no experience with-

Jill:

That's right.

Joyce:

... contested election races. It's utterly astonishing that they got that far. But, Barb, you point out something important here, which is that Brnovich's mind seemed to change about the 2020 election about the time he needed some voters from Trump's base to help him win the Republican Senate primary in Arizona. But he lost. He didn't win that race. He's now a former AG in Arizona. Does any of this matter? It's sort of a sad, sorted tale of hypocrisy, but is there more to this? What do you think, Barb?

Barb:

Boy, I think it does matter that you've got somebody who's a public official... Now he's on one of those William Barr-like rehabilitation tours where he's saying, "I knew all along that it was horse bleep." But I think that every time a public official, this is a position of great respect and trust, says things to undermine public trust in our elections, it does damage. There are people who will listen to that and believe it. There are people who will never hear that he's come around and seen the light. They'll only see the report about his statements about the false claims.

Those false claims erode our democracy every single time. They chip away. It was those kinds of false claims of election fraud that led to the attack on the US Capitol, and people died there. We've also seen these kinds of false claims leading to threats and harassment against election workers, which has been a significant issue in Arizona. So this kind of selfishness harms public safety, and I fear that it will discourage good people from serving as election workers. So it absolutely matters.

Joyce:

Jill, what do you think?

Jill:

I agree completely. Yeah, Barb is completely correct on this. But in terms of what can we learn from this, I think maybe we can learn about how important government transparency is. I'm on the board of the Better Government Association. One of our major activities is to foster government transparency. Maybe there has to be a law that says anytime, any amount over 10,000, 20,000, 100,000, I don't know, depending on the size of the state, if there's a contract, it must be made public and any reports must be made public. That would've meant that he couldn't have concealed and kept repeating the big lie knowing that his staff and that this special consultant had shown the lie to that.

In terms of what we'll learn, the people who believe in the big lie will still believe in the big lie. They're going to just not get the flip flop that he did, back and forth and back and forth. So I don't know. It's very discouraging that the attorney general, the chief law enforcement officer of the state of Arizona, did this and did it for what seems blatantly political reasons. It had to do with his primary race and getting the right number of people, and then, "Well, if I lost to a bigger election denier, then we're going to go with that." It's an awful situation.

Joyce:

I think all of us, we are hardwired as lawyers to look at things from all sides and to try to treat everybody fairly. So often it's easy to fall into this, "Well, Democrats do it and Republicans do it." Increasingly, that feels like a little bit of a sloppy answer to situations like this. This is just one too many Republican in a trajectory of Republicans who've advanced their own political career at the expense of the American people. Look, that's not to say that there aren't Democrats who do that. But this big, bright, marquee-level willingness to trash the integrity of our elections and to use that, I think, is very disturbing, and it's something that we see happening with regularity in the Republican Party. It continues. Kari Lake, or whatever her name is, still hasn't conceded that she lost that election. It's time for us to call this out wherever we see it and call it what it is.

Barb:

Jill, have you been Nooming lately?

Jill:

I have. I took a break, I have to admit. But I really missed it, and it showed in how I was performing in the scale department, so I have gone back to Noom. When we decide to get fit, it's usually not just about the number on the scale, and it wasn't for me either. But whatever your reason is for wanting to make a change, Noom Weight is ready to help. Noom Weight's psychology-based approach empowers you with the knowledge and support to build lasting results. The Noom app has helped over 4.6 million people like you improve their health. And it's super easy to use. Noom knows every journey is different, so your daily lessons are personalized to you, and you can control how much time you spend with each one of them. It's the perfect step in the right direction.

Joyce:

Noom helps you change your habits because Noom Weight shows you how to pursue goals that you set for yourself and get you to them. It's about progress and what you want and not someone else's idea of perfection. I say that as a woman who is sitting here with a milkshake and French fries in my hands, not something that I really ever eat, to be honest, but it's just one of those days. But with Noom, I can actually put that into my daily diary record and adjust the rest of what I do so that I can stay on track.

Noom teaches you about cravings and finding your balance to build better habits, plus the science behind it. You'll learn about your relationship to food and cognitive behavioral therapy that can help you take your changes to the next level. It's all about long-term progress, not what you do on any one day, so knowledge is the key to progress and success. Noom gives you that confidence, knowledge, and the plan you need to get there. Y'all know I was in New York last weekend with some girlfriends for a knitting thing. One of my friends actually joined Noom while we were there, and it was really fun talking with her about some of the important Noom concepts, like making sure that you're the rider not the elephant when it comes to your eating habits.

Barb:

Yeah, that's a good one. Although I was going to say, dang, Joyce, now you have me wanting a milkshake and fries. It looks really good.

Joyce:

It's really good.

Barb:

But that's the beauty of Noom, right? Nothing is off limits. You just have to take the long-term approach of eating healthy, more vegetables, more water, exercise, all of the things that are part of a healthy life. We all have a lot going on, but I love it that Noom Weight gives you the control to decide how much time you use it. You can choose anything from a five-minute check-in, which I've said before, I can do in about three and a half, to in-depth personal coaching if you want it. Active Noomers lose an average of 15 pounds in 16 weeks, I lost 40, and 95% of customers say Noom Weight is a good long-term solution, and I have kept it off. So get empowered and stay on track with Noom. You'll get nourishment, not restrictions.

Joyce:

The long-term point is so important. I feel like over the time since we started using Noom, I've become much healthier, much more aware, serving much better meals to my family. So stay focused on what's important to you with Noom's weight psychology-based approach. Sign up for your trial today at noom.com/sistersinlaw. That's N-O-O-M.com/sistersinlaw to sign up for your free trial today. Check out Noom's first-ever book, *The Noom Mindset*, a deep dive into the psychology of behavior change. Available to buy now wherever books are sold. Find the link in our notes.

Barb:

Well, the Supreme Court this week heard a couple of really interesting cases about the legal liability for social media platforms. The first was a case called *Gonzalez v. Google*, which involves Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996. First, Joyce, Section 230 is sometimes referred to as "the 26 words that created the internet." What is Section 230, and what was its purpose when it was enacted?

Joyce:

Section 230 was meant to limit the legal liability of what we now think of as web hosts or platforms or websites for the content that people put on them. The 26 words that you're referring to are these words, quote, "No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider," closed quote. That is a legal liability limiting provision. Without that, the internet as we know it today, could not have gotten off of the ground because anybody who hosted a website that other people commented on could have been subject to lawsuits for defamation or other court actions. Without Section 230, our world would look radically different than how it looks at this moment in time.

Barb:

If you look at the Statute 47 USC Section 230, it's almost quaint. This is written in 1996, which is now almost 30 years ago. It says, "The internet offers a forum for true diversity of political discourse, unique opportunities for cultural development, myriad avenues for intellectual activity. The internet has flourished to the benefit of all Americans with a minimum of government regulation." If only they could see the future. Jill, let me ask you about the first of these cases, *Gonzalez v. Google*. What was the challenge there for protection for Google?

Jill:

This is a challenge that... First of all, let's get the facts. The daughter of the Gonzalez family was a student in Paris and was killed in an attack in Paris by ISIS. The parents claimed that YouTube violated

the anti-terrorism statute by recommending ISIS videos through its own speech, as opposed to that it was just publishing these videos, that its algorithms had forced people to see them or had made them available to people. So they're arguing that under this Section 230, the liability from content may be protected but not the liability for YouTube, which is owned by Google, which is why it's against Google, for their own conduct in directing people to that. The argument against that is that they're publishing this information and they have to organize it in some way and that they do get the protection of 230 as a publisher of that information. So that's sort of as close as I can get. They're using 230 to protect them from liability.

Barb:

It's a super interesting idea. It isn't about the content that they've published, but they're pushing certain content to certain people. So if you indicate an interest in ISIS, they're going to shoot you all kinds of videos about, "Come join ISIS," and recruiting videos. So that's pretty interesting. Then Joyce, there's this companion case of sorts called *Taamneh v. Twitter*, similar kind of case. What was that case about?

Joyce:

The issue in *Taamneh* is whether social media platforms can be held liable for aiding and abetting terrorism, for failing to remove content and accounts that promote it. This case involves the family of a man who was killed in a 2017 terrorist attack on a Turkish nightclub. They sued Twitter and others. The family argued that Twitter and the other tech companies knew that their platforms played an important role in ISIS's terrorism efforts but still failed to keep the content that supported terroristic activities off of their platform.

Specifically when the court hears argument in this case on Wednesday, they were thinking about whether internet platforms should be able to be sued for aiding and abetting international terrorism by failing to remove videos supporting the Islamic States, that sort of narrow niche question. It's not about Section 230 like the other cases. It's about whether the family's theory of liability under the Anti-terrorism Act is viable. Despite that context and the fact that this is about terrorism, which is typically very interesting, the issues are legally intricate. Chief Justice Roberts said during the argument, "My-my, the discussion this morning has taken on a really academic tone," which it in fact had. The issues here come down to line-drawing exercises. I think it's more likely that the final decision is about how much liability platforms have and under what circumstances, rather than about a bright line questioning: Do they have liability or not? This will be a very academic exercise in where the line should be drawn.

Barb:

Jill, what do you think about that? In reading the tea leaves, the court, as Joyce said, did not seem particularly receptive really in either case. In fact, Justice Kagan said something like, "The nine of us are hardly experts in the internet, hahaha. Maybe Congress ought to do this." Do you think it's likely that the Supreme Court will either strike down parts of Section 230 or uphold it but find that this idea of pushing algorithms is unprotected?

Jill:

I do. I agree with Joyce that this is a line-drawing decision. The arguments or the questions from each of the justices in both cases may be some clues, and there were some very interesting comments from them, including the one you mentioned, which is, "Isn't this really up to Congress to decide what the liability is, not up to us who are not," as she said, "experts in technology or the internet?"

I think that when it comes to drawing a line, they may find that the original purpose of 230, which was to protect them from keeping off content that they didn't like as opposed to pushing content that might be offensive to some, and then you get back to the obscenity question, how do you know that it's offensive? What's offensive to me is not going to be what's offensive to MAGA supporters, for example, which is the one that gets left off as being offensive.

So I think it's going to be a really tricky decision. There's also the possibility that they will say, "This is really not up to us." There was even a suggestion that this should go back to the lower court because there's been this neutral rule, which says as long as they treat everything equally. In other words, if you've expressed interest in guns and it refers you to gun commentary, but if you've expressed interest in cooking, then it sends you to cooking, that it's applied neutrally, it's okay. That was questioned as something that, well, it's really not in the law, and so it really needs to go back to the lower court for a hearing on that. So there's a lot of different ways out of this, I think.

Barb:

Let me ask you about some other cases that are looming over the horizon. Joyce, I think these could be really transformative if these new laws prevail. Texas and Florida both passed laws in the past year that prohibited social media platforms from taking down content on the grounds that they thought that any kind of content moderation tends to favor one political viewpoint over the other, and that conservative viewpoints are being suppressed. Can you tell us about those cases?

Joyce:

I think you're right, Barb. It's a pretty interesting development. Texas and Florida are animated by what they view as censorship of conservatives like Donald Trump on social media platforms. So they passed this pair of laws that would prohibit social media companies from removing posts that violate their standards. That's what got Trump banned. He violated Twitter's standards. They banned him after taking intermediate disciplinary steps.

The two laws aren't identical, but they target social media sites where people talk about politics, not entertainment or sportsy kind of sites. Ron DeSantis even said when he signed the Florida bill that he was doing it to stop censorship of conservative views, so no mistake about what's going on here. The laws have been challenged in court by two trade groups who've argued that the First Amendment prohibits government from telling private companies whether and how to disseminate speech. I think, legally, that's a pretty sound viewpoint. In May, a unanimous three-judge panel of the US Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit largely upheld a preliminary injunction that blocked Florida's law. It's worth noting that the opinion was written by a conservative Trump appointee from Alabama who very vigorously rejected the notion that the state of Florida could do what it had tried to do here.

Recently, the Supreme Court asked the Biden administration for its views on the issue, so that likely delays any sort of decision on whether these challenges will move forward. It'll take some time for the solicitor general to prepare the government's view, and so she'll have her work cut out for her there. Even though this isn't an issue that appears to be on a fast track, I think it's something important to keep an eye out for the future. It's hard to believe either one of these laws could pass the smell test.

Barb:

Jill, if these laws were to prevail though, and that is Twitter and YouTube, any of these, are prohibited from taking anything down, what do you think social media would look like? I'm imagine this hellscape that no one would want to go on, toxic. What do you think?

Jill:

I absolutely think that. Actually, I think Twitter is already becoming that because the moderation has declined so much. I will point out that both of these laws do allow a certain amount of censorship. It's interesting. They allow censorship of sexual child exploitation and incitement of crime and threats of violence. It's pretty interesting because, what is a threat of violence, and what is an incitement of a crime? The Donald Trump "Come to DC, it will be amazing," is that an incitement of a crime? Well, it certainly turned out to be. So at what point would it be allowed? I think you need to have some way to make sure that there are standards that prevail and that you don't violate those standards. It would be awful to be subjected to a barrage of what would otherwise be white nationalists, anti-Semitic, fact-free tweets, and other postings on other platforms.

Barb:

Well, we will see what the future brings in that regard. Looking 30 years ahead into what the internet may be, not as quaint as they thought 30 some years ago.

Jill:

I bought the ribs from HelloFresh. It comes vacuum packed, already barbecue sauced up.

Barb:

Oh.

Jill:

You just put it in the oven.

Barb:

How was it?

Jill:

It was wonderful.

Barb:

Oh.

Jill:

It was really good. It was very meaty, very good barbecue sauce.

Barb:

Oh, that's great.

Jill:

Also, last night I had the ravioli with mushroom stuffing, which was another Market purchase, absolutely delicious.

Barb:

I've been getting the chili on there, same thing, chili and garlic bread.

Jill:

We really love HelloFresh in our house. You get farm fresh, pre-proportioned ingredients, really high quality ingredients, and seasonal recipes delivered right to your doorstep. So skip trips to the grocery store and count on HelloFresh to make home cooking easy, fun, affordable. That's why it's America's number one meal kit. You don't have to look up recipes. You don't have to throw away all the extra ingredients you buy for recipes. It's all right there in one compact thing.

Barb:

HelloFresh now has 40 weekly recipes to choose from, so you can say goodbye to your recipe rut and treat yourself and your family to exciting new flavors every week. You can customize select meals by swapping proteins or sides or even adding protein to a veggie dish. Now you can even upgrade for organic chicken or organic ground beef. We know you'll love their easy-to-prepare meals as much as we do.

Joyce:

HelloFresh even works with your schedule. Their plans are flexible. You can change your meal preferences, update your delivery day, and change your address with just a few taps on the app. Imagine getting fresh quality produce from the farm to your door in less than a week allowing you to enjoy the flavors of the season right from home.

Jill:

And it makes you a real chef. You're doing the cooking. It's such a fun break from the other stresses of the day. Just go to hellofresh.com/sisters65 and use code Sisters65 for 65% off plus free shipping. Go to hellofresh.com/sisters65 and use code Sisters65 for 65% off plus free shipping. You can also look for the link to HelloFresh, America's number one meal kit, in our show notes.

It's now time for one of our very favorite parts of the show, which is answering your questions. We love that part because you send us really challenging questions that we debate, and then we pick just three. If you have a question for us, please email us at sistersinlaw@politicon.com or tweet using #SistersInLaw. If we don't get to your questions during the show, keep an eye on our Twitter feeds throughout the week where we'll answer as many of your questions as we can.

Today, I'm going to ask Joyce to answer the first question, which comes from Karen in San Diego. She asks, "If Pence is saying he can claim executive privilege at the January 6th Committee and at the same time claim legislative protections with the DOJ, is he basically arguing he is above the president somehow? The president can't claim Speech and Debate."

Joyce:

This is such a great question, Karen. I suspect you mean it a little bit playfully just to point out how ridiculous what's going on here is. First, I think it's important to say, there is a little bit of sound legal footing underneath what Pence is doing, not very much, but a little bit, and it's this. When he was in front of the January 6th Committee, he could not have claimed Speech or Debate privilege as president of the Senate because that privilege is very explicitly about being questioned by another body. So when he's in front of the House, that would never have applied, and he couldn't have been expected to raise it there. He used executive privilege. It worked for him more as a tactic of delay because it had been

legally sorted out. Now of course, he's in front of DOJ. That executive privilege question, we believe, has been sorted, and it wouldn't favor Mike Pence, so he's grasping at straws and using, what Judge Luttig called in an opinion piece in the New York Times this morning, sort of a Hail Mary of an argument to try to avoid testifying.

Does Pence think he's got more protection than the former president of the United States? That's an interesting question for political pundits to debate. What's clear here is that Mike Pence does not believe he has a constitutional duty to tell the truth to the people who elected him, and that, I think, is a sad commentary on who Mike Pence is. He is going to lose this fight in court, by the way. Ultimately, he will be ordered to testify. There may be a few questions that are off limits. But he's being asked to talk, as we discussed earlier in the show, about a criminal conspiracy, and that is not the business of the Congress.

Jill:

Let's go to another really interesting question from Donna in Richmond, Virginia. She said, "I find it incredible that Fulton County's special grand jury drafted and produced a report by committee. My question is, who wrote it? Who chose the words and outline? Is the special grand jury given an attorney ghost writer? What is the process?" Barb, do you know the answer to that?

Barb:

I really don't. I've looked in the Georgia Grand Jury Handbook for answers to this. I have to believe they get assistance from an attorney just because you really can't expect to bring together lay people who just come in response to a summons and have the ability to do this. I base it on my own experience in federal grand jury work where members of the grand jury don't do any of the writing.

Prosecutors draft the subpoenas for them and report out to them who's being subpoenaed, but it is the prosecutor who decides who gets called to testify. Sometimes members of the grand jury will request a particular witness come in, but even that's pretty rare. Then indictments are drafted by the prosecutor and put forth to the grand jury for their approval. If they have a problem with it, sometimes they might even find a typo, you'll go back and correct it to make sure it conforms to their wishes. But the prosecutor writes every word of that. So the idea that they wrote their own report seems to be asking them to do something that would be well beyond the scope of their abilities. Now, maybe it's different in Georgia. We've already learned that people eat Ninja Popsicles in Georgia in a way that they tend not to-

Joyce:

Do y'all not have those-

Barb:

... in federal court.

Joyce:

... in Michigan?

Barb:

Not in the grand jury. So I don't know. Joyce, do you think it was written by one of the grand jurors? It seems unlikely to me.

Joyce:

I have a theory that's not much more than speculation, but I'll share it because I think we'll find out the answer to this at some point. In the grand jury in their report, they go to the trouble of saying, "We have no election law experts among us. We have no criminal lawyers." So immediately I'm thinking, "Well, what do you have? Do you maybe have a civil lawyer?" I think you're right, Barb, to say that the process in Georgia is weird and unlike what we're used to in federal court, this investigative grand jury that's expected to produce a report. I think it's not beyond the pale here that the civil lawyer, who, I'm guessing, was on this investigative grand jury, drafted the report. Maybe they had some input from the DA's office. We don't really know. But the grand jurors here seem to really be interested in playing the leading role in these proceedings, and I bet you a lot of the report was written in-house, as they say.

Barb:

I'll bet you a Ninja Turtle Popsicle.

Joyce:

No, I want some more of that good deli foods you guys have up in Detroit. I'll fly up and you can buy me brunch.

Jill:

What kind of good deli food in Detroit, guys? Chicago.

Barb:

Ann Arbor, Zingerman's, Zingerman's Deli.

Jill:

Oh, really?

Barb:

Oh, yeah.

Jill:

Okay, we do have to do a show there then so that we get to test that. For our last question, I'm going to take this from Leslie who said, "I was wondering if Fani Willis indicts Trump, how does she get him to Georgia? Would police in Florida have to arrest him?" That's a great question. I think the first thing is he's likely to not fight that. He would probably show up. It seems unlikely that he would want to be arrested. But there is a way that he could be extradited. There'd have to be extradition papers filed. The district attorney in Fulton County would ask for extradition to Fulton County of the Palm Beach County DA, and I believe that the Palm Beach County DA would cooperate in the extradition. There would be hearings on extraditing, but ultimately he would be extradited on those charges.

Thank you all for listening to #SistersInLaw with Barb McQuade, Joyce Vance, and me, Jill Wine-Banks. You can send in your questions by email to sistersinlaw@politicon.com or tweet them for next week's show using #SistersInLaw. Keep in mind, #SistersInLaw are going on the road. Come and join us as we record the podcast live on stage and discuss all of the legal topics of the day and answer your questions directly right there in front of you. We're starting off in Portland, Oregon, on May 12th, New York City

on May 19th, and Washington, DC, on May 21. There are still some tickets available but not many, so hurry to get them because they are going fast. Go to politicon.com/tour to get your tickets. Do it today. We can't wait to meet you.

Please support this week's sponsors, Reel Paper, Calm, Noom, and HelloFresh. You can find their links in the show notes. Please support them as they really help make this show happen. To keep up with us every week, follow #SistersInLaw on Apple Podcasts or wherever you listen, and please give us a five-star review to help others find the show. See you next week with another episode, #SistersInLaw. I want to have a Detroit hotdog. That's my big goal, so we need that.

Joyce:

Is this the deal here? The #SistersInLaw live tour, is this really just an excuse for us to go to fun cities and sample whatever the local food specialties are? I mean, is that where we're headed, y'all?

Barb:

I think so. It seems like a good enough reason to me.

Jill:

I hope so. Then we have to add Memphis to the list for some great barbecue.

Barb:

Barbecue.

Jill:

Absolutely.

Joyce:

What do we eat in Detroit? I love the deli food up there. Is there anything else?

Barb:

Well, I think if we have you in Ann Arbor, then we most certainly will go to Zingerman's Delicatessen. That is the place. President Obama went there twice during his presidency and ordered [inaudible 01:12:46].

Joyce:

Do you think he'll come eat deli sandwiches with #SistersInLaw if we invite him?

Barb:

Probably. Why not? I'm sure he would.

Joyce:

Call him up.

Barb:

This transcript was exported on Feb 25, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

He ordered the enormous Ruben sandwich that's like the size of your head. Looking at how thin he is, I can't imagine that he actually ate that. He got it and put it in the limo and then probably ate three almonds or something. [inaudible 01:13:05].

Joyce:

Jill, what do we eat in Chicago?

Jill:

Well, I guess you'd have to at least try a Chicago deep dish pizza from Uno's or Due's would be my recommendation if we're going to do something. We have such great food, and we have high-end Michelin-starred restaurants here as well. But when you think of Chicago, you think of Chicago pizza.

Joyce:

I don't know. I could eat more than one meal in Chicago.

Barb:

That's right.

Jill:

On the other hand, you have to have a Vienna hotdog. There's no question about that. We have to have hotdogs. We'll do a hotdog trade off, Detroit versus-

Barb:

Yeah, game on, game on. I do like a good Chicago hotdog, but I'll tell you, our Coneys stand up with anybody's.

Jill:

Okay, I look forward to it.