

Kim:

Just a little note before we get started. We recorded the podcast before a jury in New York handed down an \$83 million verdict against Donald Trump in the E. Jean Carroll defamation case, \$65 million of which is for punitive damages. Clearly, this jury wanted to send a strong message to Donald Trump, but that came down after we wrapped up our recording. But everything else we said still remains as fresh as the morning dew.

Welcome back to #SistersInLaw with Jill Wine-Banks, Barb McQuade and me, Kimberly Atkins Stohr. Joyce is away this week and we miss her already. There's no better time to get your Sisters In Law merch than right now. The weather's been a little wacky, but depending on where you are, if it's very warm, like it is in DC today, you can get a T-shirt. If it's a little colder, if you're in another part of the world, you can get a hoodie. We got what you need. If you're tired, you can get a mug to hold your coffee. Just go to [politicon.com/merch](https://politicon.com/merch) and it's something for you, we guarantee. Just click the link in our show notes today.

Now onto the show. It's a big one. We will be discussing the latest on Trump's legal woes. We'll also be talking about Texas's defiance of the US Supreme Court when it comes to border barriers, and political discord. We'll be taking on the topics of swatting and deepfakes in political discourse. But before we get to all that, you guys, I saw on threads the other day, you know how you have the answer back thing, they ask you to post something, and one of them is post five jobs that you've had. I was looking through people's jobs that they've had, and I was thinking about the jobs that I've had. It made me want to ask you guys what's the worst job that you've ever had? Barb, I want to start with you. I've had some not great ones, but I want to start with you first.

Barb:

Yeah, I've been thinking about this, Kim, and I'm not sure I've ever had a bad job. I have loved every job I've ever had.

Kim:

What?

Barb:

I think I've been very fortunate, but even receptionist and other kinds of things, there's certainly tasks that I haven't loved to do, but even that was a great job, because I got to meet interesting people. I wasn't always good at it, because someone comes in the door and they say, "Hello, my name is such and such, and I'm here to see so-and-so," and I'd start chatting with them, and then by the time I picked up the phone to tell Mr. so-and-so that Mr. such-and-such was there, I'd forgotten their name. I either had to embarrassingly say, "I'm sorry, what was your name again?", or say, "Your two o'clock appointment is here," and hope that they don't ask you, "Who is it?" "I don't know. I'd be so embarrassing to ask them again, we've been chitchatting." I've had jobs I haven't been as good at as others, but I can't really say I've had one that was a bad job.

Kim:

Huh. Well, Jill has had every job, so I'm sure it was tough to try to pick the worst. But Jill give it a shot.

Jill:

Actually I'm aligned with Barbara, and every job I've had-

Kim:

Wait, all of your jobs were good?

Jill:

Well, I tried really thinking about ones that were bad and I learned something at every job, whether it was that it's a job I didn't want to do for a long time or forever. But to get a really bad job, I had to go back to high school summer jobs, and one maybe or two, were things that I learned I could never do, and that was pay attention to details. That was something that just wasn't... like recording numbers in a column. That just wasn't for me.

But basically, maybe the worst was while I was waiting for my security clearance at Justice, I took a job as a substitute teacher in Montgomery County High Schools. I really was afraid of the kids, and I didn't like the idea of teaching. I was in a school that had classes divided by intellectual levels, and the ones that were the lowest level would greet you with, "Ah, we're the bad kids, we're going to cause you trouble." They sort of did. I had to learn that I would teach whatever I knew, not what the teacher wanted me to teach, because I could engage them that way. But yeah, I found something good in all my jobs.

Kim:

Wow, okay.

Jill:

Although timekeeping maybe, at a law firm, was a really... talk about a detail oriented thing that I didn't want to do.

Kim:

Yeah.

Jill:

It was those six minute segments.

Kim:

Yeah, I hated that six minute time clock too. That's one of the things I do not miss about practicing law, but my worst job was not being a lawyer. Actually, that job was great in many ways, including the people that I work with, who I'm still friends with. But my worst job easily, it was a high school job. It was a high school job that I had. It was the very first paying job I ever had in my entire life. I was a grocery store demonstrator. Do you know what I'm talking about?

Barb:

Oh, I love the person who-

Jill:

I did it too.

Kim:

You liked serving the samples? Oh my God.

Jill:

Yes. Oh my God.

Kim:

Oh my God.

Jill:

I loved it. I loved it.

Kim:

Oh my God, I hated it. For people who have not seen these, you go to a grocery store, and you see somebody in the corner, they're either handing out coupons, or most often they're handing out little samples of something that is sold in the grocery store, and you can try it.

Jill:

Yeah, the free samples. Love the free samples.

Kim:

Yes, and then you also give them a coupon, and you encourage them to buy. There are a lot of reasons why I hated this job. But the top one is that, especially when I was giving out samples, you had to stand next to wherever the item was, and it was often a refrigerated item, like hot dogs, or yogurt, or something. You had to stand in the refrigerated part of the grocery store, but you also had to wear a uniform. You couldn't put a coat over the uniform. I would wear long johns, or sweats under the uniform. I looked like the Stay Puft Marshmallow Man, because it was so cold. Then I had to deal with people coming, and trying to make up their lunch out of the samples. Even when I would-

Jill:

I've been that person. I've been there.

Kim:

... politely ask them not to do that, or I'd have to get a manager to say, "Hey, scram, this is a sample. Don't abuse." They would ship us the product beforehand, so I had to lug it in my car and take, and it paid almost nothing. It was a very thankless job. I don't like being cold, and oh my gosh, I hated that job so much.

Barb:

That sounds pretty rough.

Kim:

It's funny that I've had the same job as Jill Wine-Banks. My experience is different.

Barb:

I've been Salvation Army bell Ringer. That's a great job.

Jill:

Really?

Barb:

Have you done that? Yes. I mean, volunteer at the holiday time. That's lovely. People are really nice to you. Some don't want to give you money and they avoid eye contact, but that's okay. I'm not aggressive about it. But it restored my faith in humanity. Many people gave.

Kim:

Oh, that's great. Yeah, many people took from me, so it was the opposite.

Jill:

In my grocery store era, I helped to introduce Imperial Margarine. Of course, in the mid-

Barb:

Did you wear a little crown?

Jill:

I actually cut out the Imperial sign and pinned it onto me, so remember I was always into pins, and it was just fun to introduce a whole new product. Then I also worked at trade fairs, and one of the products was Latoja Spa Aftershave, which was really expensive, because it had a gold nugget in it.

Kim:

Oh my God.

Jill:

I mean, it was really weird and fun.

Kim:

You know what, Jill? I really made the best tacos that I've ever made in my life. A real crowd pleaser, and guess how I did it?

Jill:

I bet I know the answer, and it was HelloFresh, wasn't it?

Kim:

It certainly was.

Jill:

My favorite meal is always whichever was the last one I prepared, because they are all fantastic. This week I had three real doozies. I did Shepherd's Pie, which was so delicious, and I did some ethnic

cooking. It was really, really good. That's because with HelloFresh you get Farm fresh pre-proportioned ingredients, really high quality ingredients, and seasonal recipes, delivered right to your door. There's no trips to the grocery store, no wasted ingredients, and no menu planning, or grocery lists. Count on HelloFresh to make home cooking easy, fun, and affordable. That's why it's America's number one meal kit.

Barb:

Yeah, I find that my daughter is now coming over and wanting to seize my HelloFresh boxes. She said, "Are you going to cook that? That looks delicious. I want to make that salmon. Oh, I love salmon." Don't give in to recipe boredom. HelloFresh has more options than ever before. Dig into their biggest menu yet with over 45 dinner options to choose from weekly, and even more market add-on items that suit any lifestyle. I love those add-ons. Have you guys tried those? They're soups, and breads, and breakfast items.

Jill:

I have. I just tried their chicken wings. Phenomenal.

Barb:

Oh really?

Jill:

The best I've ever had. Absolutely. Although it's listed as just an add-on, it's big enough to be multiple meals. I only cooked half of what they sent, and it was a full meal, and so I saved the other half, froze it, and it's going to be fantastic the next time I try it.

Barb:

Well, there you go. This time of year revamp your eating habits. Enjoy great savings on HelloFresh's wholesome, healthy options, with more than 30 calorie smart, and protein smart recipes, each week.

Kim:

HelloFresh works with your schedule. Their plans are flexible, and you can change your meal preferences, update your delivery day, and change your address with a few taps on the HelloFresh app. Imagine getting fresh quality produce, from the farm to your kitchen, in less than a week, so you can enjoy the flavors of the season right at home. Go to [hellofresh.com/sistersfree](https://hellofresh.com/sistersfree) and use code sisters free, for free breakfast for life. That's one breakfast item per box, while the subscription is active. That's free breakfast for life at [hellofresh.com/sistersfree](https://hellofresh.com/sistersfree), with code sisters free. You know where you can find the link to America's number one meal kit, HelloFresh? In our show notes.

Barb:

Kim, how much does that breakfast cost?

Kim:

It's free.

Barb:

What? I missed it. Free?

Kim:

It's free. Let's begin the podcast with the moment we were all waiting for, Donald Trump taking the stand in his own defense, and it happened in the E. Jean Carroll defamation damages case. But wait, he was only on the stand for a few minutes. Jill, what do you think Donald Trump accomplished in those three minutes?

Jill:

Well, I think he may have accomplished some self-control. He was limited to three questions, and he was cut off after he answered yes or no. The Judge said to the jury, "Ignore that response. That isn't at issue here." That was maybe a good thing. The shortness of the questioning, somewhere between three and four minutes, has been the butt of a number of jokes that I will not repeat here, but I encourage people to go online, and find out what those jokes are. I don't think he accomplished much, in terms of changing the outcome of this trial. He tried to say that he believed it was true, what he said, but that's already been determined that it was a lie, and that he was guilty of defamation. I don't know that he accomplished anything at all. I think it was a waste of time, but luckily it was only three minutes.

Kim:

Yeah, you know, it's funny, because he has been saying for so long, "You just wait until I show you my evidence," him and Rudy, right?

Jill:

Right.

Kim:

"I would love to take the stand." Then he took the stand and yeah, it was... remember Marvin the Martian? It's like, "Where's the kaboom? There was supposed to be an earth-shattering kaboom." There was no kaboom. Barb, we've talked about the tightrope that judges, in Trump's legal cases, have been walking. They want to keep order in their courtrooms, but they also don't want to feed into Donald Trump's false narratives, especially the one that he's some sort of victim being attacked, with all of these legal issues, that he really created themselves. How do you think Judge Kaplan, in the E. Jean Carroll case, has fared, in this tight rope walking?

Barb:

I think mostly well, better than most, but I think even he let Trump get away with a little more than he probably should have, when he took the stand. Judge Kaplan a no nonsense, experienced judge, made it clear that there has already been a decision on liability, in this case. Donald Trump, a jury has found did indeed sexually assault E. Jean Carroll, and he defamed her, and those issues will not be re-litigating. The only issue in this case is damages. That was very helpful, to make it clear what was going to be at issue, and what wasn't, and has mostly reined him in. But even when Donald Trump took the stand, even after saying, here's what you can talk about, here's what you can't talk about, the very first question was, "Do you stand by everything in your deposition?" "Yes, I do." That opens the door a little bit, because there's a lot of stuff in there now.

Now, he probably thought that's just a preliminary question. Then Trump jumps in and says things like... the question is, "Why did you say what you said?" "I had to. I had to defend myself and the Presidency." Then the Judge like, "Okay, I see where this is going. Strike all of it. Strike all that testimony." That ,put an end to it. But I do think it gave his lawyer just enough material to argue in closing argument, what's in that deposition, about his denial, that he denies it. I think he just wanted to be on the record saying that he denied doing this, even though the Judge has already ruled it happened, and you can't deny it. I think it gives Trump the ability to go out and say, "I testified, on my own terms, and I got on the record that I denied it." I think it's all about showing that he can't be controlled, no one's going to be the boss of him, and tell him what to do.

Kim:

Right.

Barb:

I think that's all part of this lawlessness game.

Jill:

I agree with Barb completely. I think that Judge Kaplan allowed phraseology of the three questions that was maybe a little bit broad enough, or broader than it should have been, and so he jumped into that, and that was unfortunate. But I don't think it matters. The jury knows that he is guilty as charged, and that it's just a question of what are the damages.

Barb:

The law... be careful with our language there, Jill. I know you said you don't like attention to detail, so allow me to correct you though, he's not guilty, because it's not a criminal case.

Kim:

He's liable.

Jill:

Right. Right, right.

Barb:

But he's liable civilly.

Jill:

Thank you very much. Yes.

Barb:

Yep.

Kim:

Yes, yes. Trump's still going to be Trump. At one point he stormed out of the courtroom, during closing arguments on the other side, like a petulant child, and in front of the jury. That's the thing too, even

though Judge Kaplan told him, okay, said, "Strike the parts that he said, that's non-responsive," the jury still hears it. Right? We never love that during a trial, because that's very Perry Mason. Perry Mason will say something shocking, and then the DA says, "I object." He goes, "I withdraw the question," and just walks away, knowing that the jury heard it anyway. Right?

Barb:

Yeah. Right.

Kim:

Speaking of the closing argument, Jill, how do you think they went?

Jill:

I thought it was really interesting for a number of reasons. I think that Carroll's argument, during which Trump walked out, it was an outrageous behavior on his part, and the jury knew it. First of all, it's him and Secret Service leave. But in addition, the Judge said, "Let the record reflect that he has left the room," as is his right. He doesn't have to be there. But he did it in a dramatic way, returning only when his own lawyer started the closing. But I think that E. Jean Carroll's lawyers made some very good points, and made a dramatic presentation saying, "Just picture Carroll alone in her apartment, and she's getting these horrible letters, and just imagine having been assaulted by Donald Trump," because at the time he was not... hadn't been elected, it was many years ago, "and then getting threats, and she loses her reputation, and she's unable to hold a job." It was a really dramatic, emotional picture, which is what led to the big damages in the Shaye Moss and Ruby Freeman case.

Kim:

Right.

Jill:

I thought that was very good. Donald Trump of course, didn't help himself, at all. I thought their argument, which included chastising Alina Habba multiple times by the Judge, because of her exceeding what the proper rules are. Again, I don't know whether that was a Perry Mason dramatic attempt at getting the jury to hear something that was improper, or whether it was just she doesn't know what she's doing in a courtroom. But I thought the slap downs would hurt the perception of the jury. I think that there was nothing in it that would show the jury something that would make them like Trump, or let them think that he should be not held liable, and not held liable for very big damages.

That was one of the big points in E. Jean Carroll's argument was how rich he says he is. That means that in order for you to make him stop doing what he has been doing, ever since this trial started... and she pointed out numerous attempts to... numerous times that he had done that, you have to give him many more punitive damages than he has ever had, in order to stop him. For someone who has \$10 billion, according to his own testimony, that's going to take a lot of money to make a dent. I thought the argument of E. Jean Carroll's lawyers was very good, and that Alina Habba's was not effective. The jury, it's been announced, that if they hadn't reached a verdict by 4:30 Eastern time, that they would be sent home for the night. When I look back at how fast Ruby Freeman and Shaye Moss's verdict was, it could be before they go home, and we'll have to wait and see, and maybe it'll happen before we end this podcast. If not, then we'll know it all right after it happens.



Kim:

Speaking of people who like to play the victim card, this week, Trump's former White House advisor Peter Navarro, was sentenced to four months in prison, I believe also fined several thousand dollars on Thursday, for criminal contempt of Congress. Barb, what do you think of this sentence that Navarro got, for refusing to cooperate with the House Special Committee on January 6th?

Barb:

Yeah, so he got four months in prison, and I guess it's pretty good. The maximum in this case is 12 months, so it's less than half though. It is the same sentence that Steve Bannon got. When you are judge imposing sentence, you have to think about a lot of things. I want to deter this person from committing this crime again in the future, so maybe some jail time is necessary. I want to deter other people from flouting subpoenas from Congress and know that, "Oh, if you don't show up, you might go to prison for four months." It's there to promote respect for the rule of law. There's also an idea that you want to be relatively uniform, so people who commit the crime in similar ways, should get similar sentences. I think four months, in light of the fact that Bannon got four months, was probably about right. But I don't know when you think that it goes up to 12 months, and how serious this matter was, and how blatant their disregard for it was, I thought it was a little soft, for me personally. I would [inaudible 00:21:20] seen more.

I think the thing that's most offensive to me, is that Steve Bannon has not yet begun serving his sentence, while his case is on appeal. That is not the normal course. Most defendants, when they have an appeal, they go and begin serving their sentence anyway. I suppose in this case, the Judge thought it's a novel issue that could be reversed on appeal, and by the time the case gets decided, four months will have come and gone, and I don't want the person to have to serve in prison, if it turns out their conviction gets reversed on appeal. But you know, guess what? Many defendants see that happen to them every day.

Kim:

Yeah.

Barb:

They don't get this treatment that Steve Bannon's getting.

Kim:

Yep, special treatment. Jill, what do you think? Do you think the sentence is going to be a deterrent for people who, in Trump world or elsewhere, who have been treating congressional subpoenas like they're optional?

Jill:

I would say, for people in the Trump world, there's no stopping them. They will do whatever they think will help him. I don't know. In terms of fairness, Barb is right, in terms of it being proportional to a similar sentence for Bannon. The federal prosecutors only asked for six months, so four is not that far off, but they did ask for a \$200,000 fine, and he was only fined \$9,500. I'm a little disappointed in that, because I often think that in cases, like white collar offenses, and for MAGA people, that the financial penalty might be more effective. But honestly, think about people who are not hardened criminals going to jail for even three or four months is a real penalty. I think it's not a bad outcome.

You know, I used to use all drugstore brands, really cheap skincare stuff, and lately I have discovered a wonderful new one that I get online called OneSkin. Barb, have you tried it?

Barb:

I have tried OneSkin and it's fantastic. In fact, support for today's episode Jill, comes from OneSkin. Now that the holiday buzz is behind us, it's a great time to focus on self-care, and that means taking care of your skin's appearance, and its health. OneSkin makes it easy with their science-backed approach to healthier skin.

Jill:

Their products are powered by a scientifically proven peptide called OS-01. It targets fine lines and wrinkles, right where they start, your cells. This isn't just another skincare routine, it's a real science breakthrough. In fact, OS-01 is the first of its kind to actually turn back the clock, instead of just masking the signs of aging. At my age, I need to turn back the signs of aging, and turn back the clock. They now give us their full line of face care, eye, body, sun, and travel size products. OneSkin doesn't only promise healthier skin, they prove it.

Kim:

Jill, you look beautiful all the time, and you know, it's because of OneSkin, and we are all in. Now for a limited time, our listeners will get an exclusive 15% off OneSkin products, using the code sisters, when you go to your checkout at OneSkin.co. Start 2024 off right and give your skin the scientifically proven love it deserves with OneSkin. I have to tell you, the Travel Bundle is such a great companion. I travel a lot, and it's so great to know you can just grab it, and whenever you're traveling, and you have everything that you need right there, you don't have to think about it. The formulas feel amazing to apply, especially when you use it on... I personally really like the products on my face. My face gets very dry, especially this time of year, when the weather changes a lot, and it really makes a difference. I will never go anywhere without OneSkin, and we know that you'll love it too.

Barb:

OneSkin is the world's first skin longevity company. By focusing on the cellular aspects of aging, OneSkin keeps your skin looking and acting younger, for longer. Get started today with 15% off using code sisters at OneSkin.co. That's 15% off OneSkin.co with code sisters. After you purchase, they'll ask you where you heard about them. Please support our show, and tell them we sent you. A new year, healthier skin, that's OneSkin. Look for the link in our show notes.

Jill:

It's usually Kim who we have to talk off the ledge. This week, it's maybe me. Is Governor Abbott's response to the Supreme Court decision, allowing the federal government to remove razor wire he had installed along the Texas border with Mexico, the prelude to Texas seceding from the Union, or starting a 21st century civil war? What are the consequences of Representative Chip Roy advising Abbott to ignore the Supreme Court's ruling, and to tell them to go to hell? I can't believe that I'm actually asking these questions, and maybe we need to have just a very quick overview of how we got there.

But first Abbott put up a barrier in the river, and then he was ordered to take that away. Then he put the razor wire along his own land border, and he prevented any federal officials from going there to remove it, when it is already been conceded, in some ways by the federal government, that they have

superiority in terms of immigration and border control, so that's how we got here. Kim, am I overreacting when he writes a statement that says what it said? Do they have the powers that he said he was going to ignore SCOTUS, and he's asking other states to join him, including states that aren't even border states?

Kim:

Yeah, so the legal term I would use for this is bananas, the position that Texas is taking here. I mean it really... I suppose if the state secedes, they could become their own sovereign, and take care of themselves, and give up all the protections that the federal government gives them, and benefits. But until then, the answer is no, you cannot. I mean, we have talked about this so many times before. One of the simplest concepts in the Constitution to grasp is federalism, and it's that the federal government is in charge of certain areas, and states cannot come in and write rules that are contrary to those federal rules. You just can't.

The federal rules and laws reign supreme over state rules and laws. Texas cannot act like its own country when it wants to, and then accept the protection of federalism on the other hand. No, this is just bonkers. I think they know good and well, in the end of this, they're going to lose legally, but in the meantime they are just politicizing this, and that's really horrible. As we mentioned before, people have died from that horrific razor wire. The fact that they are digging in this much, and defying the highest court in the land, as if they have the ability to do that, is absolutely bananas.

Jill:

Kim, you are completely correct. When it comes to immigration and foreign relations, it has always been accepted that our relations with other nations are handled at the federal level. The President has the power to receive ambassadors, et cetera. Stopping at the border is where we have to go. Barb, Abbott claims a constitutional right to do what he is claiming, under Article 1 and Article 4, Section 4. Is he correct?

Barb:

Man, he is so incorrect. As Kim said, I don't think this is even in good faith. This is an effort to wave around the Constitution and say, "I am upholding the Constitution, and what President Biden is doing is unconstitutional." If anybody would actually read the language of the Constitution, they would see what a bunch of hogwash this is. The provisions that he cites says that the federal government should protect states from invasion. Invasion. It says that if a state gets permission from Congress, then it may engage in war to protect its borders, but it may not do so without permission of Congress. No permission has been received by Texas to put up razor wire, or do anything they're doing. Also, this idea of thinking of migrants as invaders, as invasion. Invasion means a military conflict, that a state has sent-

Kim:

Pearl Harbor.

Barb:

Yeah, it's military, it's soldiers, it's sailors onto your shores. That's not what this is. This is a humanitarian crisis. There are people coming in, and I'm sure they need help, and we need a real solution on our border. But the idea that this is an invasion is... it's not only incorrect, there is a former government official at the Department of Homeland Security who says, "This is the language of white supremacy, to

talk about refugees, and migrants, as part of an invasion." The idea that we would engage in military exercises to suppress this, is really contrary to the way we think of immigration. This is a political stunt, but it's such a dangerous political stunt, because it really causes people to be confused. It is a form of disinformation, by leading people to believe that it is the President that is in violation of the Constitution, especially when the Supreme Court has already held that it is the President's prerogative to decide how to enforce immigration law. It is not the state. They lost in court, and it's their job to obey the orders of the Supreme Court.

Jill:

Let me just say that you've raised an interesting issue, and I think people don't know the language. I'm going to put in our show notes, the language of both Article 1 and Article 4, so that people can see for themselves, and there is an additional factual thing where... specifically in terms of what they can't do without Congressional okay, is enter into an agreement or compact with another state. This idea that other states are going to join in his efforts is really terrifying to me. But Kim-

Kim:

He's talking about civil war.

Jill:

Well, yes.

Kim:

That's basically what he's intimating. It's crazy.

Jill:

I say goodbye and farewell. But in addition to his constitutional claims, Abbott claims a factual basis, which is that President Trump has refused to enforce those laws, and has even violated them. The result is, according to Abbott, that Biden has smashed records for illegal immigration. Kim, tell us what the facts really are, since those are not correct.

Kim:

Yeah, that's a lot of malarkey, to use the President's words. That isn't the case. I think a lot of people would be surprised to see that actually the most deportations that have happened have been under democratic administrations. That's in part, because the last Republican administration was during the pandemic, when it was a lot more difficult. But despite all of Donald Trump's big talk about being tough on immigration, and bringing in all these new policies, actually Obama and Biden... they used to call Obama, the Deporter in Chief, and Biden as well, have in their policies really been robust, when it comes to removal proceedings for people who do not have authorization to be here. Now, of course there are in excess of 11 million people who are not authorized being in the United States. You Can't get rid of them all.

Also, there has been a very difficult time. The problem with the border is due largely to Congress, and congressional inaction. Again, as we record this, there was a stopgap border deal that was reached in theory, bipartisan. Donald Trump said, "No, no. I want to run against Joe Biden on the issue of immigration." Now Republicans in Congress are like, "Yeah, no. We don't want that deal anymore. Trump told us not to do it, so that we can blame Biden." I mean really, this is Joe Biden doing this,

Governor Abbott? It's absolute nonsense. Again, it's a very cynical, politically driven, and cruel approach to this, and it is totally factually incorrect.

Jill:

It is absolutely correct to say that Trump had worse numbers than Biden does. As to your last point, I'm sure we all have heard Senator Romney's comments saying that it was shameful that Trump would try to kill this bipartisan bill. But Barbara, let me go back to you, because you mentioned that the Supreme Court had already ruled, and since 1803 in a famous case, Marbury v Madison, the Supreme Court got supreme authority to decide these kinds of issues. How does anything give Abbott the power to take on border control and ignore the Supreme Court? Is there anything?

Barb:

He really doesn't have authority. The closest parallel I can think of, Jill, is during the civil rights struggle of the 1960s, when the Supreme Court ruled that schools should be desegregated, following Brown versus the Board of Education, and there were leaders, governors in Alabama, and other states in the South... I can say that because Joyce isn't here, other states in the South where governors stood in the schoolhouse doorway and said, "We will not allow integration in our schools." The Presidents sent down the National Guard to escort these kids to school, to enforce the law. If it comes to that, that is what the federal government can do. They can send in, when it comes to the border, they can send in the National Guard, they can send in border patrol agents, and do what they did, go ahead and cut that razor wire. They have the authority to do that. I mean, if there should be some sort of military conflict, I hate to even imagine it, I mean, the President gets to decide what to do, and can call in the National Guard to put down what would be deemed an insurrection.

Jill:

He can nationalize the state guard. That's what happened in '57 under Eisenhower, and in '62 under Kennedy. I went to law school with James Meredith, who was the one who integrated and was escorted in by the Guard in Mississippi. It was Alabama I think, and Mississippi, and Governor [inaudible 00:36:54] stood at the door. I mean, it was a horrible situation, and there was tension whether guns would be drawn, and we'd be in a civil war. But Kim, the decision was 5-4, and Texas made all the arguments, and they were rejected. Is there anything more to be said about what does it being a 5-4 decision mean? There was no opinion from... no dissent written that said, "Here's why we're against this."

Kim:

Yeah, so just a couple of things. This was an order, not an opinion. Sometimes yes, it's 5-4, but it doesn't mean that the five who were on the side of telling Texas that they can't defy... that they have to take this border razor wire down, and the four who did not say that, would be on those sides, if this case was fully presented to the Court, argued, and a signed opinion was written. It's just saying that five of them said, "Yeah, you need to take it down," and four of them did not. It could be for procedural reasons. It could be... I mean, I'm trying to give an example. Somebody can... the court can grant an order, for example, staying a law from going into place, keeping a law from being enforced, until the case is finally heard. They can uphold the law, and then it goes into place, and the Justices can rule on opposite sides of that, at different times.

I just want to be clear, this was an order about just Texas taking that wall done. But at the same time, there are things to be gleaned from this, even though as you said, they didn't give reasons for it, and it's who was on either side. This is a case where the conservative block, the six Justices who make up the

conservative block, split. You had... and it split in an unusual way. When we talk about some conservatives being peeled off in some of these cases. We often talk about Chief Justice John Roberts, who was among those who voted to have Texas take it down. We usually talk about Brett Kavanaugh, who is like... he's conservative, but he wants people to like him, so sometimes he rules on the other side. You know what I mean? This time the other person who voted to make Texas take the fencing down was Amy Coney Barrett, which is unusual.

I think this is one of those circumstances where she has little-by-little, since she's been on the court, shown that she's not necessarily a rubber stamp, and voting exactly as the other conservatives do. Now often she is, most surprisingly to me, I mean I will never get over the fact that she joined the majority in Dobbs, and didn't even say anything, didn't even defend her herself. She just voted with Dobbs and like, "Yep, let's roll back Roe. I won't tell you why." That's crazy. I will always think that that's crazy. But she was the one in this case that voted to make Texas take that barrier down.

What does that tell you? I don't know. It's a data point. As we look at all of this, I'm sure that's something that Texas has taken note of, as they push forward with this battle. But again, I think at the end, I don't think the Court's going to uphold this. They're not going to completely... I can't believe that they would completely ignore the rules of federalism, and federal supremacy here. But it also tells you that there are four justices that would've been perfectly fine leaving with that razor wire staying up, despite the fact that it's been killing people, and their names are Justices, Kavanaugh, Gorsuch, Thomas, and Alito.

Jill:

Here's the bottom line question, the statement put out by Governor Abbott, which I will also add to the show notes, do you think that I should be scared that this is a prelude to secession, or writ large, if he gets his way? Is this the end of the United States? Remember President Obama often said, "We are not red states and blue states, we're the United States." What do you both think on that? Am I right to be really worried that, as Barb said, we nationalize the state guard, and we have troops fighting each other, to make sure that this happens?

Barb:

I think we're a ways from seeing this materialize, but I think you are wise to consider this issue important. I think you're wise to be on alert when a governor is making this kind of inflammatory statement, and when a member of Congress is saying that you should violate the Constitution, and do it anyway. I think that's the rhetoric that slowly erodes our Constitution, before our eyes. Suddenly the day comes and we say, "What happened?" I don't expect there to be some rebellion or civil war tomorrow, but I do think that you're responsible for leaders to speak this way, and I think we should demand that people speak in a way that is consistent with the Constitution.

Jill:

Kim?

Kim:

No, I agree with what Barbara says. I associate myself with the gentle woman from Michigan entirely, except I'm not sure it's as far away as she says it is. I worry that the threads of our union are getting weaker and weaker each day, and I think its stuff like this, that can really make it break apart.

Jill:

I certainly am worried, and I hope we don't get to the point where we have to nationalize and order troops to force their way to the border. I hope that doesn't happen, and that we can go about our business as a United States. But I'm particularly worried, because there are so many states, including non-border states, that have joined in saying they support Governor Abbott. Let's hope that Barbara's slight optimism prevails.

Kim:

Jill, I know the environment is so important to you. Isn't it?

Jill:

It really is, and every time I see a plastic bag going out of a grocery store, which I don't in Evanston, because we've barred them, and you have to pay for even a paper bag. But that's how we make a difference individually. What if all people, everyone, you and me, and everyone else, could change the world with a push of a button? Well, meet Lomi, it's the world's first kitchen appliance designed to turn your home into a climate solution, by transforming your food scraps into nutrient rich plant food. Lomi has changed the way you deal with your food waste. It is a truly big innovation in the modern day kitchen. It's a smart and simple solution to turn food scraps into plant food, in just four hours. Lomi transforms plant waste as well, into nutrient rich plant food, at the push of a button.

Kim:

You know, I totally have changed the way that I cook, right now. When I chop up a vegetable, and I have the shavings from the carrots, or other little bits or scraps, I immediately put them in the Lomi. I don't even think about putting them in the trash. It makes me feel really good about the way that I cook. With Lomi, you'll cut down on the time spent taking out the trash, and eliminate bugs, and bad odors in your kitchen. If that's not enough, there's a bonus. You get to feed your lawn and garden with all the natural fertilizer that you've created out of your food scraps. We definitely do that. It's really nice just tossing it out back. Really, one of my least favorite chores is taking out the trash, and doing that less is fantastic. Our outdoor plants are looking great, and your kitchen will look great too, and so will your lawn, thanks to Lomi's modern and sleek design, and how well it works. We love knowing that we're doing our part for the planet.

Barb:

Lomi's new app even lets you track your environmental impact, earn points for every cycle, and redeem for freebies from Lomi and other great brands. It's great to get rewarded for doing good. Whether you want to start making a positive environmental impact, or just grow a beautiful garden, Lomi is perfect for you. Head to [lomi.com/sil](https://lomi.com/sil) and use promo code SIL to get \$50 off your Lomi. That's \$50 off when you head to [lomi.com/sil](https://lomi.com/sil) and use promo code SIL at checkout. You can find the link in our show notes, and thank you Lomi for sponsoring this episode.

Well disinformation, and its effect on democracy, is in the news again. You know I am writing this book on disinformation, so I've always got my eye on these things. But there are a couple of big stories about this. First Kim, you wrote in your column, for the Boston Globe this week, about AI and deepfakes, which is the use of technology to make it appear that a prominent person said or did something, they didn't do, such as you talk about fake robocalls making it sound like President Biden was telling voters in New Hampshire to stay home, and not cast votes.

Kim:

Yeah.

Barb:

Man, such a scary and interesting thing. But Kim, you note that the FEC, the Federal Election Commission, has not taken any action to stop deepfakes in political campaigns. One of the most delicious lines in your column is where you say, "You can't spell feckless without FEC." That was my favorite line in your column. It was excellent.

Kim:

Yeah, sadly, it's true. Sadly, it's really true.

Barb:

But you highlight the challenge. You talk about the fact that we have not done anything, but you also highlight some proposed solutions out there. What are some solutions out there that we might be able to use to address these kinds of deepfakes in political campaigns?

Kim:

Yeah, so the issue with this, as is the issue with a lot of things involving technology, is that the law does not keep up with technology. Technology moves at lightning speed, and the law creeps along, and it's always too late. What is happening is people are exploiting that loophole, or that gap in the law, by using this deep fake technology, which has just spread at the speed of light. We've seen it in previous elections, usually with outsiders making things that are manipulated by AI, and then going viral online. Well, now you're seeing candidates and political parties using AI, including deepfakes, which make it look like a person is either saying or doing things, or something that he's not, or manipulating it, or there are stupid examples like Ron DeSantis in his presidential campaign lodge video.

He was standing outside, wherever the Governor stands in Florida, and fighter jets inexplicably flew over him, while he was making... and they were totally fake. It's like, "Why would fighter jets," again, federalism, "Why would fighter jets be flying over Florida to say, go Ron DeSantis?" That would never happen. There's one making the rounds where Trump re-truthed, or whatever you call it, an image of himself praying in church. He's got six fingers.

Barb:

Oh yeah, that's a great one.

Kim:

It's like, "What?"

Barb:

Well, has anyone ever counted? I don't know.

Kim:

But sometimes, sometimes they're super dangerous. I think the example of the audio manipulation to sound like Joe Biden telling people not to vote in New Hampshire, is a newfangled way. It's an old dirty



trick. We've seen leaflets and stuff telling people that their polling places are different, or that the election day is wrong. This is a high-tech version of that sort of shenanigans, and they can get worse. You can make candidates say things that they didn't say. Even worse, Donald Trump is now, when he says something out loud, like when he confused Nikki Haley for Nancy Pelosi, he's like, "Oh no, that's AI. I didn't really say that. That's an AI." He's blaming this as if everything's being manipulated, and at a time where people need to understand what is real, and what is not, and where misinformation and disinformation is as dangerous as you pointed out, Barb. This is a big problem.

One thing that I... states have been passing laws that give people a civil cause of action, if they don't disclose that something in a campaign ad is manipulated digitally. It's a disclosure law, just like when you see political ads and you say, "I'm Kimberly Atkins Stohr, and I approved of this message." It's that same concept. Those laws can be effective, because they are likely to pass and withstand a constitutional challenge. The problem with banning AI, or other stronger laws, or criminalizing its use, is that the First Amendment has really strong protections of things, including satire, including false statements. I'm not sure... and lawmakers trying to figure this out, aren't sure, that any of those laws would withstand that challenge. One thing that I looked at is, remember that charge we talked about, that Donald Trump is facing? The one from the reconstruction era, interference with people's right to engage in a constitutionally protected right, meaning the right to vote, with his attack on trying to stop the certification of the election.

Jill:

I remember.

Kim:

There has been at least one successful prosecution of someone who spread disinformation in the 2016 election, of being convicted under that. I think that's something that prosecutors should really look into, in the meantime, while we wait for the law to catch up, and trying to discourage and deter this kind of behavior.

Barb:

Yeah, that's a really interesting theory, right? Rather than ban it outright, you could say, "It's a crime, because you're interfering with voting rights, to try to fool people this way." Well, Jill, let me ask you, Kim raises this First Amendment issue, that there is an argument, that any regulation of deepfakes that would ban deepfakes, even in political campaigns, would violate the First Amendment. Do you think that's a legitimate position, or is there a way... ? Reasonable restrictions are permissible, as long as they're narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling governmental interest. Do you think there's some way to comply with the First Amendment, and still ban these deepfakes?

Jill:

You know, Barb, the First Amendment argument is not frivolous. It's certainly not as bananas as what Governor Abbott is arguing. But I think there are solutions, and of course, Kim brilliantly laid them out in her piece, and pretty much in her answer as well. But there are ways to say things are not within the First Amendment. We already know that you cannot defame someone. That's our first topic under the E. Jean Carroll case. If you're doing something that defames someone, there's also a crime of putting someone in a false light. If you portray someone doing something horrible, that might fall within that, and there might be a way to punish the person for doing that. I think that states and the federal government are going to have to be very creative in how they deal with this, and how they leave the

First Amendment, which I strongly believe in, intact, but prevent the fraud on the voters, and on misinformation being portrayed, in a way that makes it really hard to tell what is true and what is fiction.

That's harder, when you think you're hearing the voice of someone, and seeing their mouth move with those words, and their face be attached to it. I think that the law has to be carefully done, and that we're in the meantime going to have to rely on, as Kim said, this criminal Ku Klux Klan Act to punish people, and on defamation, or false light cases. We also have to look at who's going to be liable for these deepfakes? Is it going to be the platform? I mean, we have Section 230 that says it's not the platform. We also have the right of publicity, and the right of privacy, that could be enforced through civil lawsuits.

But I think we may also have to rely on the development of deepfake detection tools, which is one of the problems is you see something... and I bet we've all been fooled by watching something, thinking it was real, and then finding out that it was a total fake. This is beyond fair use, so that it's not just satire. It's something that's very different than satire. It's not intended to be funny. It's intended to deceive, and I think that's where we're going to have to come to some understanding, and make sure that it doesn't continue.

Kim:

People just have to... I mean, it's awful to put the onus on the receiver of this false information, but people have to be really smart, and skeptical, and question where things come from. I know my husband says to me, it's like, "I saw this really cute pet video with this dog, but I don't know whether to believe that it's real, or if it's AI." I'm like, "Well, it makes me sad that you can't just enjoy a nice puppy video, but I appreciate the fact that you are a discriminating consumer of information, and that you ask questions about it." People need to ask questions about what they see.

Barb:

Yeah, and this idea of I don't know what to believe anymore, whether it's true or it's not true, is something called the Liar's dividend, which is you can benefit from that. When Trump does see something that he doesn't like, he can say, "Oh, well, that was fake," and people don't know which to believe. It's one of the real challenges in this disinformation environment.

Well, also relating to disinformation and political violence is a piece I had in the New York Times this week about how disinformation about public officials, is inciting people to commit the crimes of swatting, and to make fake bomb threats. Swatting, of course, is when someone calls the police and falsely claims there's a barricaded gunman, or a hostage situation at a person's home, in an effort to draw a SWAT team out to respond. We've had victims who've been Democrats and victims who've been Republicans. I mean, Judge Tanya Chutkan had her home swatted. Representative Marjorie Taylor Greene had her home swatted. It is not just a harmless prank. It is a form of political violence. It's dangerous. In 2017 an unarmed man was shot by police when a SWAT team showed up at his house, thinking that they were dealing with an armed gunman situation. It also diverts law enforcement resources from real emergencies to these false claims.

I'm really concerned about this phenomenon, and I'm wondering if you have any thoughts about how we can stop this trend, and copycats, who see this and think it's funny, or it's fun to have that kind of power. I'm wondering what your thoughts are. Kim or Jill, what do you think?

Kim:

Yeah, I've been thinking about this. I mean, I think the answer, in a way is the same, or similar to the one before, which is in the meantime, unless or until we get specific laws that adds additional penalty, in the case of swatting, and to use existing law... I think about how hate crime legislation, it criminalizes things that are usually illegal in some other way, but it adds a bigger bonus. I think in cases where someone... if it's a misuse of official resources or something like that, you get an added bonus, if it's done purposely to harm someone else. But until that law catches up, I just think that prosecutors have to use every tool in their toolkit to prosecute this, and to talk publicly about it too.

I think you mentioned that in your piece, Barb, to say out loud, "We are not going to tolerate this. The penalties are going to be serious, and we are going to make examples of people that do this, because it puts citizens in danger. It puts law enforcement in danger." Data shows that these kinds of attacks, political attacks, are more likely to be done against women, and people of color, or other people in more marginalized communities, and make it clear that they're going to treat this with the utmost seriousness. But it's a big problem.

Barb:

How about you, Jill?

Jill:

Well, I first learned what swatting was on an episode of SWAT.

Kim:

Well, that's a good place.

Jill:

I couldn't believe that it really happened until I started seeing these things actually happening. Of course, it raises the danger level that someone will accidentally get shot, and it is therefore already illegal to falsely report something like this. Right now, I agree with Kim, that we need to raise the penalty when there's a political motive for doing this, or in some other way, to make sure that this stops. But in the meantime, I think we have to urge law enforcement to seriously investigate, find the culprit, and make sure they are prosecuted, to the full extent of existing laws. That should slow it down a little bit. Obviously, law enforcement also needs to be aware that when they show up to something like this, whose house it is, and whether that could be a fake report, so that no one gets hurt for no reason at all.

Barb:

Kim, this time of year, my face, my lips, every bit of my skin are starting to feel like sandpaper. What do I do?

Kim:

A full spectrum skincare routine is just what you need, Barb, because it's the secret to looking and feeling good. That's why we want to tell you about OSEA, especially their Undaria Algae Body Butter. It can help you have healthier glowing skin all year long. OSEA's clean, vegan, and sustainable body care is our go-to, and our new year self-care regimen, and we know you'll love it too. Their body butter, first of all, I can't even describe how good it smells. It smells really good. I actually have to keep Snickers away from me, because she thinks it's food and she will try to lick it off the minute that I put it on. But so I put it on, and then immediately put on socks, or something, so that she can't get to me. But it's really, really

great, and it's made with ceramides and Undaria seaweed, which are normally reserved for the face. But when you use it, you'll transform your dry crepey skin to smooth, soft, and supple skin, in no time. It's definitely not your typical body butter.

Jill:

I agree with you. But I want to add the new thing that I just tried, which is their Collagen Dream Night Cream. It is amazing, especially right now in the winter, where we've had below zero, it feels so good to soak up on your skin. But you're right, the Undaria Algae Body Butter keeps my skin hydrated, and I love how silky it makes my skin feel. Even when the heater's blasting, as we need right now in Chicago, it takes the shower experience to the next level too. When you use it after you dry off, but leave yourself a little wet so that it really absorbs, it feels like being transported to the beach for a luxury massage. OSEA has been making seaweed infused products, that are safe for your skin, and the planet, for over 27 years. Everything is clean, vegan, cruelty-free, and climate neutral certified. With OSEA, you never have to choose between your values and your best skin.

Barb:

Start the new year fresh with clean, vegan skincare, and body care, from OSEA. Right now we have a special discount, just for our listeners. Get 10% off your first order, site-wide, with code sisters at oseamalibu.com. You'll get free samples with every order, and free shipping on orders over \$60. Head to O-S-E-A malibu.com, and use code sisters for 10% off. Remember, you can also find the link to your perfect glow, in the show notes.

Kim:

Now we have reached what is really no joke, our favorite part of the podcast, and that is answering some questions from our listeners. If you have a question for us, please email us at sistersinlaw@politicon.com, or you can tag us on threads, or on X Twitter, or Twitter X, or whatever they call it, wherever you get your social media. If you can do a hashtag, hashtag sistersinlaw, and we will answer as many of your questions as we can. If we don't answer them on the show when we can, we often just answer them right in the social media feeds, so keep an eye out there as well.

First, we are going to go to a question from Arnoldo who asks, "Listening to your conversation and definitions of natural-born citizens make me wonder about US citizens born in Puerto Rico. Are they natural-born citizens? Generally, both parents are US citizens, but not born in a state. How does that apply to those born in Washington DC?" That's a good question. What do you think, Jill?

Jill:

I love the question, and I actually had to do some research so that I could answer it, even though my gut said, "Of course they're citizens." But the answer is that since 1952, there is a Nationality Act, and that declared that individuals born in Puerto Rico and Guam, I'll throw in, on or after 1941, are US citizens at birth. They would therefore qualify as a natural-born citizen. The reason we discussed this before, was in terms of what are the qualifications for running for president, or holding the office of president, and one of them is being a natural-born citizen, and DC is an absolute yes. If you're born in DC, it is a district, and districts and states are judged the same. Puerto Rico, DC, Guam, you are all US citizens, if you are born in those physical territories.

Kim:

I will add that I believe that is also true for the Mariana Islands and the US Virgin Islands, but it is not true for American Samoa. It is an interesting thing. But yes, thank you for that, Jill. Next we have a question from Juliette in Portland, Oregon, where we did a live show. We had a great time there. Juliette asks, "Is anyone lobbying President Biden to expand the Supreme Court? If not, why not?" Barb?

Barb:

Yes, it's such a great question. There was some conversation about this a while ago, that seems to have died down. One of the things that President Biden did was to appoint this blue ribbon panel of scholars, and practitioners, to get together to make recommendations about what should be done with the Supreme Court. I think people thought they might come back with some bold recommendations like expanding the number of justices on the Supreme Court, but they really didn't. The closest thing that came was to suggest that the terms be limited to 18 years instead of life, so that you'd have more turnover. It would take a while to get there, but eventually it would be harder for any one party to pack the court. I think the reason is thinking in the long-term... in the short-term, if President Biden could add three or six justices to the Court, he could switch the makeup of the Court, and perhaps get more favorable outcomes for his political party.

But the Court is concerned about legitimacy in the long-term. If justices are added now, for political reasons, then you could keep adding them, and the next president wants to add three more, and then six more, and three more. Before you know it, you have a Supreme Court with 49 justices, or something on it, due to the political whims. That's the argument. I do think though, that there is an argument to be made here, and I know Kim, I think you've raised it before. There's nothing magic about nine. Nine happens to be the current statutory number. There have been different numbers in our nation's history. As the nation has grown, it may make sense to have more justices on the court. It used to be nine, because that represented how many judicial circuits there were. Each circuit has a justice who handles matters arising from that circuit. Now that we have 13 circuits, maybe the time has come to have 13 justices? There are certainly arguments be made about expanding the court.

Kim:

Okay, and our next question comes from Amber, who asks, "Do you think that E. Jean Carroll will ever receive the money the jury has awarded her? What happens if he doesn't pay?" Oh, this is a really, really great question. As of the time that we are recording this, we're still waiting to see what happens in that case. But she's already been awarded \$5 million. There are also other civil cases that Trump is facing. Will she get that money? We don't know. A lot of things have to happen. First, there will likely be an appeal, and usually the post-trial appeal process plays out, including appeals about the amount of the judgment, particularly if the penalty... the punitive damages are really high, usually a judgment would not be paid, until that entire process is over. Also, there's this thing that Donald Trump loves to do, which is file bankruptcy.

Now, in the event that he files bankruptcy, most civil judgment sadly, can be discharged in bankruptcy, except for a certain category that includes fraud, civil judgments for fraud. When it comes to the New York case, it is unlikely that he can get out of whatever that is, if he files for bankruptcy. But unfortunately, it might be true, if he files for bankruptcy, for him to get out of it. He would have to prove that he literally does not... that he cannot pay for this, which I think will be very tough for Donald Trump to try to do, on a personal basis, since he is personally liable. It's easier to file for bankruptcy as a business, and not pay your contractors. It's harder to file for bankruptcy, as a person, because then you literally have to liquidate your assets, account for them all, open your books. I don't think Donald

Trump's going to want to do that, so I don't think that that's the out. I think he may just not pay, and then you get penalties for that, as well.

One of the things I hated most, as a civil attorney, is trying to actually get the money out of people. It can be dicey, it can take a long time. E. Jean Carroll is not going to get a big check, when this verdict comes down. It will be delayed, but hopefully in the end, they will be able to at least attach... you can get federal attachment... not federal, sorry. You can get legal attachment of property, to force a payment of judgment, if there's not a bankruptcy. I hope, if he doesn't pay her, she attaches some of his property, or something else that can be used and sold, in order to satisfy that judgment.

Well, thank you for listening to #SistersInLaw with Barb McQuade, Jill Wine-Banks, and me, Kimberly Atkins Stohr. Joyce will be back next week. Remember, you can send in your question for next week by sending them via email to [sistersinlaw@politicon.com](mailto:sistersinlaw@politicon.com), or tag us at #sistersinlaw on Threads, or Twitter or X. You can also remember to get some swag. We have great Sisters In Law mugs, t-shirts, hoodies, and more. Just go to [politicon.com/merch](http://politicon.com/merch). There's also a link in our show notes. Also, please show some love to this week's sponsors. We love being able to give this to you without you having to pay a penny for this podcast, and that's because of sponsors like the ones we have this week, HelloFresh, OneSkin, Lomi, and OSEA Malibu. You can find their links in the show notes, too. Please support them, because they support us. Please follow #SistersInLaw on Apple Podcasts, or wherever you listen. Give us a five star review, because you know what? It doesn't just make us feel good, it helps other people find the podcast, so it's like your way of recommending it to other people. See you next week with another episode #SistersInLaw.

Jill:

Yeah, and just to make it clear, immigration and foreign relations, which would include our relations... oh my God.

Kim:

Are you okay?

Jill:

My microphone just fell off.

Kim:

Oh.

Jill:

My microphone just fell off.

Kim:

Oh.

Jill:

Rather than trying to get it back on, I think-

Kim:

This transcript was exported on Jan 27, 2024 - view latest version [here](#).

That was so... the conversation was so hot.

Jill:

Oh my God.

Kim:

Jill... no. Jill-

Jill:

What?

Kim:

Jill literally dropped the mic-