

Barb: Fuel up for your fall routine with Factor's no prep, no mess, fresh, never frozen meals that are ready in just two minutes. Get 50% off your first box, plus 20% off your next month with code SIL50 at factormeals.com/sil50. You can also find the link in the show notes.

Kim: Welcome back to #SistersInLaw with Joyce Vance, Jill Wine-Banks, Barb McQuade, and me Kimberly Atkins Stohr. Okay, we have some plugs, people. #SistersInLaw will be doing a live show. That's right. We will be getting together again live at the 92nd Street Y in New York City on September 20th. You can get your tickets at politicon.com/tour, and we cannot wait to see you there in the big city, the Big Apple, all the names that people who actually live in New York don't call it, but we can't wait to see you there. There's a new T-shirt in the merch store. It's the perfect color for summer or fall as we're transitioning into. Just go to politicon.com/merch, and check it out. I know you'll love it.

You may not have heard, but I have just launched a new podcast called Justice by Design, because justice doesn't happen on its own. It happens by people actually rolling up their sleeves and thinking outside of the box, and finding the solutions to the problems we have in our society. So, I see it as a companion for #SistersInLaw where we break down so many legal issues. I take some of those and also some non-legal issues, and try to dive into solutions with the people who are making those solutions happen. So, you can also follow that wherever you get your pods. It's called Justice by Design. Please like it, tell your friends about it.

I want to make it grow, and I appreciate having you along. Tell me what you think. I want your honest opinions. So, you can find the links to that in our show notes, but we have our own podcast to do right now. Enough about that. We will be talking about the issue of abortion, which is the unfortunate gift that keeps on giving. We will also be talking about a new bill to tackle the perils of AI before they happen. How's that going to work? Of course, we're going to break down a new part of Project 2025, because we are here to do that for you, so you can make an informed decision in November. But before we get to that, I promised on Threads that podcasts would tackle a little news item that came up about how a certain vice presidential candidate, what he thinks about the role of women at various ages, including once they have stopped menstruating.

This is, of course, referring to J.D. Vance who seem to agree in a past interview that the whole role of a post-menopausal female, and we will get to the use of the word female in a minute, is to be a good grandma, and take care of those grand babies. So, I was just wondering what my sisters-in-law think about this issue. I have a clue, Joyce, of what you think about it, because you wrote a little piece. Let us have it.

Joyce: I did. I wrote with Jennifer Weiss-Wolf, who's the executive director of the Birnbaum Women's Leadership Center at NYU Law, and an expert in the law involving menopause and menstruation. But, we wrote less about the law specifically, and more to use J.D. Vance's utter stupidity as an opportunity for women to talk about the lack of equity for menopausal women, and the need to do better studies and more funding for medical care, but really most importantly, this notion that women who've been affected by menopause should be mocked or be minimized. That's something that's so outdated, outmoded, and so very MAGA. So, instead of lumping women together, we argue that women should be treated by society with respect. That seems to be pretty obvious to everyone except for J.D. Vance.

Kim: That is really crazy. I just want to amplify a point that you're making about healthcare for everyone, how it should be prioritized for women of all ages, but including women who get older. I literally had to stop seeing my doctor once I became a certain age, and find a new one with the help of Jill Wine-Banks, by the way. I thank you for that, for making a referral to me.

Jill: That's what sisters are for.

Kim: Thank you, but it was really hard, a, to find a gynecologist who is focused on perimenopausal, menopausal, and postmenopausal women. I felt like my previous doctor once she realized. She always used to ask me, "Are you sure you don't want kids? Because there's stuff we can do. We can do... We can freeze your egg." I'm like, "Nope, you don't have to freeze anything. I'm good." Then once she realized that, she stopped spending as much time with me. She had... Her interests were in birthing, and it wasn't in anything else. I had to find a new doctor, and he's telling me things about studies that were done about effective care for black women of perimenopausal and menopausal age that just have not reached the mainstream, and that do such wonderful things for their overall health.

He was furious that it wasn't common knowledge, and I am too. It's so important to focus on that, but women get erased, and when it comes to medicine, and now they're trying to be erased in terms of their role in society. Jill, tell us more about what you think about the post-menopausal female.

Jill: Well, as one who's been there for a long time, I can tell you a lot about it, but something you said just reminded me that a very dear friend of mine is the leading guru on postmenopausal women, and her name is Dr. Lauren Stryker. She has a podcast, and I think everyone who's interested in this should actually tune in to listen to her. But, I'm so offended by J.D. Vance for oh so many reasons, not just this, and by the use of the word female. This is something that's been going on for a very long time. You can only imagine when I started in the profession of law, what it was like when only 4% of all lawyers were women. The condesation that I got from...

I mean, I was so talked down to, and words were used that would never be used in connection with a man. The newspapers would report on what I wore, not just what I said or did in court. I think it's time that we stop that, which is why today, I'm wearing ERA pins, and going to a premiere of a movie about the Equal Rights Amendment, because it's time to stop this. We need to get to be treated equally. Vice President Harris needs to be referred to as either the vice president or as Harris in her campaign, not as Kamala or Kemala as she is called by the-

Kim: I agree. Kamala.

Jill: She's Kamala. I'm sorry, I'm not wearing my Kama plus the la t-shirt.

Kim: But you are wearing brat green so-

Jill: I am wearing brat green, yes, with my green ERA pins.

Kim: Yes.

Jill: I mean, I think there are so many things that we could be talking about here in terms of what is hidden sexism everywhere you turn. When I was being identified, I would be called by my two names, which weren't hyphenated on the first reference, and then I'd be Mrs. just one name. So, I hyphenated my name so that I would be Wine-Banks in all references. I shouldn't have to do that for people. I noticed, Kim, that you don't hyphenate, but you do get called Atkins Stohr, and that's a big improvement, but I think there's a lot going on.

Kim: Sometimes. I still have to... But you know what, I just do what you did. I remind people, "My last name starts with an A, by the way, not an S." Barb, what do you think?

Barb: Well, one thing, I'm a real stickler, as you know, for disinformation. I think it's really easy to spread things out of context, but I think it's really important to think about the context of what happened here. It was not J.D. Vance himself who said these words, but a host who was interviewing him who said, and I quote, "The primary purpose for postmenopausal females is to raise children." I think it's important to note that those were not the words of J.D. Vance, but he did not correct them. I don't know about all of you, but when I am being interviewed anywhere, television, radio, audience, and someone says something I disagree with, I will push back and say, "I disagree with your premise. Well, let's hold on a minute there. I don't have that view, but I will tell you what I do think."

I know that all of you do that. So, you want to correct the record if you think someone said something that's offensive, and he didn't. J.D. Vance went along with that. So, I think that's important. The other thing that I've heard many of you say is that you object to the word females. I don't don't know if you agree with me, but when you use the word female, it suggests that it is about being a species. It is about being part of the animal kingdom. It's not viewing you as a woman and a person and someone who contributes to society, but this is your animal properties, and this is your utility.

Kim: Yes.

Barb: We're utilizing you first either for sex or making babies. Then once you are obsolete in either of those things, then we will allow you to take care of the children. That's really about all we care about. So, that to me is why this episode is so offensive. There are so many women at every stage of life who are incredible contributors to society in so many different ways. Having children is but one facet of how we contribute to the world. So, I found it incredibly insulting.

Kim: It is important to the law, because we cannot live in a world where Dobbs was advanced without this kind of thinking, without reducing women in society to a certain place. Justice Alito even did that in the Dobbs opinion, right? There were parts of it that read as if women were walking incubators. I remember one footnote where he was talking. I think he thought he was trying to be helpful to black people and saying how many black women have abortions in the country, and somehow he's saving black babies. I don't know what it was. It was such nonsense, but he didn't even refer to the women.

He only talked about black fetuses, and totally just removed the fact that there are human beings in the world that were be forced to carry these pregnancies, but didn't even refer to them, just dehumanized them. That's what this is about. J.D. Vance, and to your point, Barb, yes, we want to be accurate, but when you put this with every other statement J.D. Vance has made about women and reproduction, it's of a piece. If it walks like a duck, it cracks like a duck.

Jill: I want to add something to what Barb said, because not only did he not push back or disclaim this ridiculous statement, but he talked about his mother-in-Law who is a PhD and who took off a year in order to come and take care of her daughter's baby so that her daughter could pursue her career. Now, of course, if you're post-menopausal, you're not taking care of your own children. You're post-menopausal. You're taking care of your grandchildren if you have them. So, to put this highly accomplished working woman in this category of, "Well, that's what my post-menopausal mother-in-law did was she took off to take care of the baby." That is, to me, confirming what was said, not just not pushing back on it.

Kim: The way my mother would have cussed my husband out if he did something like that, but luckily, he never would.

All right. Y'all know I love clothes, but ironically, I hate laundry. I usually hate everything about laundry. One of the worst things used to be for me buying laundry detergent, because they came in these big, bulky containers. So, either you had to carry that home. I'm usually a pedestrian, or you have to get it delivered, and it's cumbersome. That's one of the many reasons I love Blueland, because they make doing laundry easy and non-burdensome. Laundry detergent pods are almost always wrapped in plastic film, and it's ending up in our oceans, rivers, our soil, and even our body, microplastics people. It's up to us to take action. So, Blueland has given us a great way to do our part for the environment and also have it be really easy.

Blueland is on a mission to eliminate single-use plastic by reinventing cleaning essentials to be better for you and the planet at the same time. Their packaging is the perfect fit for my home, because I don't have to carry big, heavy things. You can get reusable pods, and they come right to your door. It's easy-peasy, and there's no plastic in it at all. That's the same for their tablets, whether it's for the dishwasher or the little tablets that you put in for hand soap and their beautiful reusable containers. It cuts down on shipping. It cuts down on CO emissions, and it's really great, and their packaging on top of it all is fully compostable.

Barb: Kim, I'm not one for fluff and glitz, but you know what I do love about Blueland? I love the scents because I find-

Kim: It smells so good.

Barb: Yes, smells can really put you in a mood. So, we're excited to share that Blueland just launched a now available first of its kind fragrance, laundry detergent tablet with the scent of spring bloom. It's a good one. After two years of extensive research and development, Blueland successfully created a fragranced tablet that maintains the company's commitment to powerful plastic-free efficacy, and delivers a delightful scent that customers have been requesting for years. The Spring Bloom fragrance is a

captivating blend of sun-ripened citrus, fresh wildflowers, and golden amber. It smells lovely. Their amazing laundry tablets are proven to lift the toughest stains from grass to food. We've tried it, and it smells fantastic. Especially with a family full of dirty people, we never use anything else.

Jill: I hope no one's listening from your family.

Barb: They know. They know who they are.

Joyce: So, I'm going to speak for all of my sisters, and say we are never going back. Also, we are never going back to expensive, wasteful plastic-coated brands. Plus, you can get more savings with Blueland by buying refills in bulk or setting up a subscription. It's such a time and money saver. Their subscriptions are customizable and convenient, so you never run out of your most used products. Everything is effective and affordable. You'll want to try it all.

Jill: I see what you did there with, "We're not going back," and I love it, but I love also that this is a product that works and that's good for the environment. They're trusted in over 1 million homes, including ours. So, we're happy that Blueland has a special offer for our listeners right now. You can get 15% off your first order by going to blueland.com/sisters. You won't want to miss this, blueland.com/sisters for 15% off. Again, that's blueland.com/sisters to get 15% off, or you can find the link in our show notes.

Following right along with that topic, abortion is back in the news. Oh, maybe it's never been gone, but we're seeing horrendous consequences from the Supreme Court's EMTALA non-decision. We talked about that decision, although it was just saying they wouldn't decide it in a previous episode, but now we have to deal with the recent decision in Arizona, and the pending case there as well. Both are very upsetting. Then we're going to move to something that's a little more positive, which is a case in Montana. But let's start with the awful horrendous consequences of leaving doctors unsure of what they can and cannot do without being jailed and losing their medical licenses and being fined hundreds of thousands of dollars. Joyce, tell us what's happening.

Joyce: Right, so the case that you're referring to where the Supreme Court punted, that's a case from last term called Moyle. The Supreme Court was supposed to decide whether Idaho could deny women in emergency rooms, emergency life-saving treatment, including abortions in defiance of a federal law called EMTALA. EMTALA requires that women and all patients' conditions be stabilized before they're released from the emergency room. Where the problem was happening was particularly acute for women with ectopic pregnancies. Non-viable pregnancy is dangerous to the woman's life and to her ability to have children in the future. Hospitals in Idaho were saying, "Sorry, we can't treat you because of state law," and the Supreme Court said, "We shouldn't have taken this case. We are not going to decide it."

That non-decision means that in some states, women are still being denied emergency care. Ironically, it's not the case in Idaho, because when the Supreme Court punted, they put back into effect a lower court decision that said doctors in Idaho did have to provide care, not the case in a number of other states, including, surprise, Texas. So, two women in Texas filed complaints this week, administrative complaints after they were not given

care in emergency rooms persistently in the case of one woman. Over a period of days, she kept going back with heavy bleeding, and their attitude was, "Sorry, can't treat you."

Both of those women have asked the Department of Health and Human Services to look into whether or not those hospitals violated the law. Perhaps most importantly, Solicitor General Elizabeth Prelogar is trying to get the issue back in front of the Supreme Court this time with a case out of Texas, where she's asking the court for once and for all to say that emergency rooms are required to save women's lives.

Jill: So, as if that isn't depressing enough, let's look at a bad decision from Arizona about the wording of the pamphlet explaining the pending abortion ballot measure. The court ruled that the informational pamphlet can say unborn human being instead of fetus as the petition actually says, and as the measure that's going to the voters should say. In addition, there's a case trying to challenge all the signatures on the petition, because the petition did use the word fetus. A legislative council changed the word fetus to unborn human being in the description of the ballot initiative as they are required to do. Obviously, using that word makes a big difference. So, Kim, tell us what the Arizona Supreme Court said this week about the wording of the pamphlet, and what that means for the referendum going forward.

Kim: Well, I mean, the court said that the pamphlet can say unborn human being. That's what it said. The problem is, a, that is just inaccurate. It's a fetus. That's the technical... That's the factual description of what we're talking about here. We're talking about pre-viability, the availability to have abortion up until the point where the fetus is viable outside of the womb. It's like a row standard essentially. So, I mean, to refer to a fetus at week eight or whatever as a human being is just inaccurate, but it's some done for a reason. It's part of the push for personhood bills, for personhood recognition, which has been going on in many states, particularly in the south, but elsewhere as well in order to try to push the agenda even further.

We saw what happened in Alabama, which is when they put in a fetal personhood language, and then everybody suddenly... People who were trying to use in-vitro fertilization to expand their families, and they had frozen embryos suddenly had scramble, because that completely changed the legal landscape surrounding this. It put a lot of people who were trying to use reproductive technologies to expand their families in a lot of trouble, and suddenly, Alabama legislatures, even they realize, "Oh shoot, we got to fix this," but this is part of that same thing. You may think, "Okay, it's just a pamphlet. What does it matter? What does it care?"

Well, the people who pushed this know that support for the measure dropped when you use that language as opposed to using different language. They know that words matter. So, this is a very disappointing decision, and it is consequential, even if it doesn't change the language of what appears on the ballot itself.

Jill: So Barb, as I said, there's an even bigger issue still pending in court. Arizonans still are awaiting a decision on a lawsuit brought by a group of right to lifers, which would invalidate all the signatures. They had an overwhelming number of signatures because the petition said fetus, and they claim that is misleading to anyone who signed the petition, although as Kim just said, of course, fetus is a much more accurate word than unborn human being. I can't see how they could argue otherwise. But anyway, they want

all the signatures thrown out, and want Arizona Supreme Court to overturn the trial judge's decision, and block the measure from going to the voters this November. What's that about, and what do you think the chances are?

Barb: Well, I think what's really going on here is a Hail Mary pass to try to get this issue off the ballot. This is a big issue for the ballot. I mean, number one, it could lengthen the period for abortion rights in the state of Arizona, so it's a significant win for reproductive rights. But, it's also a really interesting issue to have on the ballot, because it will bring out Democratic Party voters who in turn will vote up and down the ballot for Democratic candidates, I think, gives the Democrats a real edge in the presidential race and Senate races and other kinds of things. So, I think Republicans very much want to get this issue completely off the ballot.

However, I think for the same reason, the Arizona Supreme Court decided the way it did about unborn person, I think that they will also reject this idea that the word fetus is misleading. Because remember, the court's job is not to be the super drafter. It is to decide whether something violates the Arizona constitution. So, just as they said that they thought the term unborn human was substantially accurate, I can't imagine that they would find that the word fetus, which is even more accurate, which is the actual medical term for it, is not substantially accurate. So, I like to presume goodwill by courts, and I think if the courts play this straight, then that will be the resolution.

One other thing to keep in mind to the extent people are concerned about the U.S. Supreme Court, and their demonstrated hostility to abortion rights, a state's Supreme Court is the final say in interpreting a state constitution. So, this will not go to the U.S. Supreme Court. This will be the final answer. I'm cautiously optimistic that they will say the word fetus is substantially accurate, and therefore it may stay on the ballot.

Jill: So, I want to end with something that is definitely more hopeful, and that is that not only have Vice President Harris and Governor Walz taken on the issue of abortion in a big way, it has energized voters as Barb has suggested, and it will bring out the vote. But there's also good news from Montana where its top courts struck down a parental consent law for minors seeking abortion, something that's been with us since 1976 when the Supreme Court first said that you could do that and require parental consent. So, what do you guys all think about what Montana's law was and what's going to end up happening when it gets appealed?

Joyce: Well, I'll jump in. I mean, I'll talk about the context here, right? In 1976, the Supreme Court decided a case called Planned Parent versus Danforth. They held that a state can't require spousal consent for an abortion. They also rejected laws that gave parents an absolute veto over a minor's abortion decision, but that didn't mean that minors could make up their own minds completely. It meant that they were subject to a lot of different laws, for instance, a Utah law that the court approved just a few years later that required parental notification at least 24 hours before a minor got an abortion. The rationale was, "Well, their parents can't tell them that they can't have one, but we're going to let the parents know first."

So, that was the state of the law after Danforth. It'll be interesting to see what the court makes of it when this case comes in. I think I say interesting to say we all know what this court is going to do.

Jill: How significant is this, and will it impact other states?

Barb: Again, the Montana Supreme Court is the final arbiter on what Montana's State Constitution says. So, if you want to send it to the states, this is what happens. You're going to end up with a patchwork. But in Montana, it seems that this is where they want to be, and what they interpret their Supreme Court... what their constitution to say. So, the U.S. Supreme Court is not going to be able to get into this.

Kim: But what it does do to Barb's point is continue this patchwork. I mean, it shows that Dobbs was a solution in search of a problem. There was certainty before the states knew what they could do and what they couldn't do. Now, there's so much uncertainty about what's going on, and this is of a piece. Your human rights should not depend on your zip code, and that's exactly what this is showing.

Jill: Well, the one thing it does show though is that when you get it down to the state level, people realize what they're losing. That's why all of these ballot referendums are passing to guarantee abortion rights, is that the people really want it. So, that is a hopeful place to end.

Joyce: It's great to be able to give yourself the perfect home manicure with Olive and June's salon grade tools. I really feel a lot more competent than I used to feel now that I'm using them. Olive and June's mani system has everything you need for a DIY salon quality manicure in one box. You can customize it with your choice of six polishes, and we love how their polish doesn't chip. You can expect it to last up for seven days or more according to their own directions. But in our experience, it really does often last closer to 10 days. That means you get fantastic savings because an all of in June manicure breaks down to just \$2 a pop.

Jill: You can count on the mani system for salon worthy nails. It's so convenient and relaxing to do a manicure at home. You definitely won't miss scheduling appointments or traveling to a pricey salon. It's great knowing you'll be looking your best while saving time and money. My friends, family, and sisters-in-Law all love it. Anyone who has seen the great colors is impressed. Once you try Olive and June, you'll never go back to using anything else. I just wish my sisters were in the same city so we could have Olive and June nights all the time.

Kim: Their quick dry polishes only take about a minute to dry, and you can feel confident knowing your mani will still last for five days or more. The colors are beautiful, and we love having 40 plus cruelty-free and vegan polishes to choose from. They even have amazing looking press-ons that go on really quickly if you're in a pinch and need your nails looking good fast. The press-ons come in every size you can imagine, so you know you're going to get the perfect fit. You can get a non-damaging mani in less than 10 minutes for only \$10 a set. It's no surprise that they're an Allure Best of Beauty winner.

Barb: Whenever I get Olive and June nail polish, it disappears instantly, because my daughter loves it so much. They have amazing products. You need to try them out for yourself. You can visit oliveandjune.com/sil for 20% off your first system. That's O-L-I-V-E-A-N-D-J-U-N-E.com/SIL for 20% off your first system. You can also find the link in our show notes.

Well, it seems that everywhere you turn these days, there's some story about the dark side of artificial intelligence. The robots are taking over. I like to push back on that and sometimes say, "AI actually has a lot of positive uses, medicine, climate science, transportation with autonomous vehicles." There are a lot of, I think, exciting possible developments with artificial intelligence, but of course, every new invention brings with it positive uses and then some negative aspects. To invent the airplane is also to invent the airplane crash. So, some people are trying to get ahead of AI by proposing laws to ensure it will be used for good instead of evil.

First, let's talk about some of the dangers of artificial intelligence we're already seeing. One, of course, is election interference and disinformation. Jill, I want to ask, have you seen this fake ad using artificial intelligence to replicate the voice of Kamala Harris? Maybe we can put a link to that in our show notes where it sounds pretty good. It sounds like her voice, but she says all these outrageous things like I'm the DEI candidate and all kinds of other things. Do you think that the First Amendment does or should permit political content that utilizes artificial intelligence like that?

Jill: So, I think this is in a category that's very different than possible good uses of AI, possible advantages. I can think of probably more disadvantages than advantages. But when it comes to these deep fake political ads, I see only bad. You and I and Kim and Joyce would look at that ad, and go, "It's a fake. It's a fake. It's not her. She didn't say that. She's not an idiot," but the people it's aimed at, look at it and go, "Yeah. Oh, yeah, she's an idiot, and this is terrible." So, it has significant danger. It is deliberately intended to provide disinformation. This isn't an accidental misinformation. It is deliberate disinformation, and I think we have to judge political deep fake ads on a different standard than we would any other use.

Saying that it is parody or satire does not get you out of the feeling that it isn't parody or satire, that it is a deliberate attempt to create disinformation that will lead voters to vote in a way that they might not otherwise have. So, while I'm very concerned about the First Amendment, and I'm looking at how can you restrict the use of AI deep fakes without infringing on free speech, and I know we're going to talk about later, what are some of the ways that we can solve this through labeling and other means? I do think that this has to be stopped, and that it is... It's not funny. I mean, I look at that, and I go, "That's not a funny ad. It is going to mislead a lot of voters." So, that's how I feel about it. It was a terrible thing.

Barb: I agree. I think it's going to be tricky though with First Amendment Rights. I suppose labeling might be a way to get around it, but they're not. I mean, Elon Musk himself retweeted it without any labeling that it was parody or satire. This kind of thing, Kim, creates this other dynamic, which is known as The Liar's Dividend. That of course allows people to claim that anything they don't like is fake news or disinformation. It's AI. It was created with AI. Do you think that unregulated AI fosters a risk that we might reach a point where we don't know the difference between what's real and what isn't real? As a journalist, how do you think about how AI might be used in the coming days?

Kim: Well, first, I have to say I loved learning about The Liar's Dividend, and I learned about it in a great book. What book was that? Oh, that was The Attack Within, thank you, by Barb McQuade.

Barb: You're welcome.

Kim: Yes, I think it's a big risk, and we're already seeing it, right? Donald Trump who has the thinnest skin on Earth, and you know for the last few weeks, there had been some people trolling him a bit for coming out of airplanes and waving. Then when you pull out on the shot, there was nobody there, and he wasn't waving at anyone. So then when Kamala Harris and Tim Walz come out of an airplane in Pennsylvania to this huge crowd at the airport, he starts saying, "Oh, nobody was there. It was AI. It was made up." So, you have presidential candidates out here lying about what people are seeing with their own eyes, and that's something that is one of my biggest fears.

It's not just creating false images, which is bad. I just don't like it. I didn't even like the Kamala... We talked about this, the album, the vinyl meme, because I got fooled by it temporarily, and this is too important to be looking at sources that I normally trust, and then getting fooled by something. But, the opposite side of it is that they are taking what things people see with their own eyes, accurate images, accurate statements, and saying, "Oh, that's just AI," so that people disbelieve the truth. They disbelieve facts, and that's a big problem too. I hope that we can get legislation that can also particularly for candidates. It's the First Amendment issue for doing this for everybody, but particular candidates for coming out and purposefully trying to make disinformation by casting disparaging on actual facts.

But, it's all... As a journalist, I think it's important to have facts that you can trust rely upon. But as a lawyer, I appreciate that this is all uncharted territory, and the First Amendment has and should have a lot to say about this. I think it'll be... We need lawmakers to at least try. I applaud the lawmakers in California. Try to pass this law. If it passed, it'll get challenged, and then the courts can work it out, like where the First Amendment stops, and where the ability to protect against this kind of disinformation starts, but it's not going to be easy. It's going to take some years and some litigation to work it all out.

Barb: I want to point out, Kim, that although I wasn't there at the Harris-Walz rally in Detroit, I know people who were who said-

Kim: Oh, that's right. It was Detroit, not Pennsylvania.

Barb: It was packed. It was 15,000 people. I had to wait five hours to get in. It was packed. So, the idea that there was no one there is absurd.

Kim: Yes.

Joyce: All the knitters that came to our podcast live show in Michigan then went to that rally, because I heard about how packed it was.

Barb: Well, Joyce, let me ask you about a different hazard of AI, and there's a whole bunch of them. One of them though is about fraud, and there are some fraud schemes that are starting to crop up utilizing artificial intelligence. Warn our listeners about some of those, and whether you think current laws might be adequate to address them.

Joyce: Yeah. I mean, it's interesting, right? Fraud is fraud is fraud, and what used to be fraud in banks and in person is now fraud on the internet. There are laws. For instance, there's a wire fraud law that's perfectly adequate to address the crime, but the fact that it's happening online adds real dimensions to it. For instance, can you find a defendant who's defrauded you on the internet? Can you identify? Can you find them? Can you put handcuffs on them, and bring them to trial? Those are the problems, right? In One New York Times report, a victim, by the time he understood that he was being defrauded, and elderly people are particularly victimized by these kinds of schemes, by the time he realized it was a scammer, not Elon Musk helping him make money, because that's what he thought it was, it was a deep fake video with Elon saying, "Send me all your money, and you will make a lot of money."

This particular gentleman gave away his entire life savings before he realized it was a problem. Lo and behold, by the time he went to the police, the website was down from the supposed company. The phone numbers, the email addresses, they were all gone. So, even though there were laws there that could have been used to prosecute criminals, you simply couldn't find the criminals. I think it's going to require aggressive public education to help people understand and to prevent. I'm just not sure that the criminal law is... I mean, it's a great vehicle when you identify the bad guys, and they're still around, and they still have money. Most important thing here is going to be prevention, and that's going to be tough.

Barb: So, now, there's this bill that's been proposed in California. California, of course, is the home to a number of big tech companies. There is a goal with this bill to try to stop AI from careening out of control, and really allowing the robots to take over with some of the really scary things that could happen, like allowing ordinary people to figure out how to use biological weapons or autonomous drones that can do all kinds of things, and wreak all kinds of havoc. So Jill, can you just tell us briefly what this bill in California would do?

Jill: Sure. The California bill is really focused on two things. One is to stop what they call dangerous AI, and to require companies that are doing the development of these technologies to test them for safety before they go public. It also allows the Attorney General of California to sue companies if their technologies cause any serious harm to property or human casualties. So, it's hard to imagine, but it could. I mean, it could also include things like Tesla's crashing and using artificial intelligence to drive. So, that's what it's part. The opponents say that it's going to stop the development of AI.

It's going to drive development to other states or to China, and it's going to prevent helping worker productivity and improved healthcare and climate change improvements. Of course, the people who are against regulation used to say, the companies used to say, "Well, we should regulate ourselves." By the way, Bankman-Fried funded a huge amount to do exactly that, to stop the bad things that AI could do. I just think it's ironic that we're talking about scams and what can happen with AI. It was Samuel Bankman-Fried who was funding a lot of this research to stop it, but there's nothing that's going to stop AI from spreading disinformation.

I think that's something that needs to be dealt with more specifically in terms of what the California law would do. It's a good start, but it's not going to be enough.

Barb: I think you raised a good point there, Jill. I think it's like so many things. It's good to foster innovation and creativity, but the business of business is business. If left to their own devices, companies are going to do whatever it is, maximizes profits. It's why social media has become such a toxic wasteland. I don't want to put the handcuffs on these companies so that they can't be innovative, but I think AI has the potential to do some really powerfully damaging things, and without any regulation whatsoever. They say, "Oh, trust us to police ourselves." I just don't think we can trust them. So, I think we have to get that balance right. I don't know exactly where it is, but I think our lawmakers need to take responsibility here, and step up. So, I think this is a good start too.

Well, if you're like me and many of us are, you have had your identity stolen. I've had it more than once. I think three times that I can count. One time, I saw a bill that someone had spent thousands of dollars at a sunglass hut. You'd think I was looking pretty stylish in my shades, but none of them were mine. So, we are fighting back, which is why we're thrilled to partner with Aura. Aura is an all-in-one online safety solution that protects you by controlling what information about you and your family gets sold online without your consent. Data brokers are legally required to remove your personal information if you ask, but they make it extremely difficult. Aura automatically and regularly submits opt-out and take-down requests on your behalf, reducing robocalls, telemarketing, phishing, text messages, and junk mail.

Kim: They offer a suite of tools to protect you and your loved ones, including real-time alerts on suspicious activity, computer virus protection, a VPN, which you really need to use a VPN in whatever you do, just with all the breaches that are going on, a password manager and even parental controls. It's a comprehensive online safety solution that provides every tool you need in one place.

Jill: So, it's really true with all the hacks that are going on and the notices you get that you have been part of a breach of some big company, or all the bills you supposedly get in invoices on your email that are from made-up companies, it's really good to have some protection. In addition to all that, Aura also monitors identity theft, financial fraud, and other online threats before they happen. With Aura, you can rest easy knowing that someone is looking out for you. Aura even scans the dark web to look for your email address, passwords, social security numbers, and other sensitive information.

If anything is found, you'll receive a real-time alert. When you're a victim of ID theft, their experienced White Glove Fraud Resolution team helps you navigate credit bureaus, initiate credit freezes, and locks and works with you around the clock.

Joyce: We feel so much better knowing our families are protected, and you will too. For a limited time, Aura is offering our listeners a 14-day trial, plus a check of your data to see if your personal information has been leaked online. It's all for free when you visit aura.com/sisters. That's aura.com/sisters to sign up for a 14-day free trial, and start protecting you and your loved ones. That's A-U-R-A.com/sisters. Certain terms apply, so be sure to check the site for details, and you can find the link in our show notes.

Well, it would not be an episode of #SistersInLaw these days if we didn't talk about Project 2025, and we're going to dig a little bit more deeply this week too. Donald Trump may be claiming he doesn't know anything about Project 2025, but the people running the project sure are not acting like that's the case. If it's true, and of course, there's plenty of

evidence that suggests Trump is in the mix. The people manning Project 2025 are putting lots of time and resources into it in ways that suggest they believe it's going to be useful if Trump wins the election. That's why we need to know what's going on.

So in this week's deep dive, we look at reports that training videos for implementing Project 2025 have surfaced a great catch by Barb McQuade who picked up on some new reporting in ProPublica. Barb, what do you make of this reporting? I mean, how far along in a project are you? You've been a manager as was I in the Justice Department. When you're at the point where you're producing training videos, that's a pretty serious step in an endeavor. What's going on, and what are these videos about?

Barb: Yeah, it's so interesting. I think the Trump campaign wants to say they realize that Project 2025 with some very aggressive conservative policies is not politically popular, and have tried to say, "Oh, it's nothing. This is not us. This is..." In fact, meanwhile it's like, "Don't pay any attention. Over here, we've got all kinds of training videos going on, telling people exactly how to roll things out, what words to use, and what words to avoid." It's getting ready to roll this thing out to develop policies. As you say, at the Justice Department, when you're at the point of producing training videos, that means not only are the policy ideas done, you have written the plan.

You have figured out the execution, and this is how you want to roll it out, and how you want to make sure you have the broadest reach, and this thing's ready to go on day one. So, I think, the disclosure of these videos is a very big development, that these are not just idle ideas of brainstorming, "What if this? What if that?" This is like, "On January 20th, boom, this is how we execute the plan."

Joyce: Jill, there was new evidence this week of Trump's alignment with the project, right? I mean, there is a lot of evidence that Trump is in the know about Project 2025. What's this week's new tidbit?

Jill: It's so interesting, because it's been obvious, ever since we've heard about Project 2025, that the authors are all people who he knows, who he hired, who were in his White House, but now we have video evidence, two Brits pretending to be the children of son-in-law of a wealthy donor who was made up, who were going to fund part of one of the organizations that was sponsoring Project 2025 interviewed Russell Vought, who was, I will point out, Donald Trump's head of the Office of Management and Budget. He then, after the administration ended, created this new center for Renewing America, a very right-wing organization.

So, he was talking to these two supposed donors who were actually reporters for a British organization. I have to say, in Britain, it's much more common to have undercover reporters filming the interview than we do here. Yes, there have been some here. We had a liberal reporter get Alito on tape saying bad things, and Project Veritas uses that kind of technique often. But anyway, he was caught on tape talking about how deeply embedded Donald Trump was, and how much he approved of Project 2025. He, by the way, Russell Vought not only is the former head of OMB. He was a very chief author of Project 2025, and he also was one of the ones who drafted the agenda, the platform for this year's Republican Party.

So, you can't say that he isn't going to have an influence on the presidency should Donald Trump win re-election, and his views are really awful. He talks about Christian nationalism and eliminating all porn, eliminating all abortion, saying Posse Comitatus has to be eliminated, and the federal government can use the military in civilian law enforcement, which would be a horrible thing. So, that's just one more piece. We could put the link to the video of this interview in our show notes, because it's fascinating to watch how easily he talked about the involvement of Donald Trump. So, Donald Trump, stop denying what's obvious.

Joyce: It really is amazing. I mean, Vought at one point says that Trump has blessed his organization, and he's very supportive of what they do. It's just very clear language. So Kim, from your perch as a journalist, what do you make of all of this? I mean, how do you view the news that is seeping out about Project 2025 and Trump's connection to it as he denies that? Does he get away with that? How should journalists be handling this situation?

Kim: Well, I think for the most part, the news was slow to catch up with Project 2025, because if you remember, it was put out last year.

Joyce: I do. I started writing about it last November, and I felt like the lone voice out there.

Kim: It took them a while to catch up. But once they did, and certainly now on this particular issue, I think they've done a reasonably good job in just pointing out reading the document, first of all, shows that everybody who wrote in it, not everybody, but a lot of people are from Trump's administration. They're from his campaigns. They're his advisors or former advisors. I mean, it's just really nonsensical. It's silly to think that the Heritage Foundation is something that Trump is not aware of since they helped select his Supreme Court nominees. So, they've been pointing this out bit by bit.

I think if somebody doesn't realize that Trump is lying on this, they are not looking or they don't care anyway, and whatever the media writes doesn't do it. But I think in general, I have a lot of quabbles about the media and how they've been contextualizing this in terms of writing this and then also writing a story about Kamala not sitting for an interview. It's not the same thing, not the same thing, people. But on this, I will give them reasonably high scores.

Joyce: Well, I think that's reassuring, right? Because at the end of the day, we require that fourth branch of government to do its job. There've been questions about whether the media is adequate to take Trump on, but I'm with you on this one. I really see a difference in how they're handling Project 2025, and I think the reporting is hitting its mark now.

Jill: I'm really proud to say that this episode is proudly brought to you by LolaVie, an award-winning hair care line founded by the fabulous and iconic Jennifer Aniston. Frequent coloring, heat styling, and relentless summer sun and humidity put our hair through the wringer. Jen was fed up with the incessant damage and having to choose between products that worked or those that were genuinely healthy, natural, and beneficial for hair, so she created LolaVie.

Kim: She worked with industry leading chemists to develop a chia seed derived proprietary bond technology called BPro3, so the LolaVie lineup could deliver naturally-derived ingredients with high performance results. It constructs a new protective cuticle around the hair where damage begins to keep it healthy and looking its best for an all-around defense against signs of aging and damaged hair. I really love it. I recently took my braids out, and the first thing I reached for is the protective leave-in. So after I gave my hair a good conditioning, I put that protective leave-in. So now with that, I've gone back to using a blow-dryer. I know that my hair will still be as protected as it was in my protective style of braids.

Barb: Kim, I was going to say, even though your hair looks beautiful when it's in braids, and not as we were talking, it's like the sign of fall is coming. "No. No. Kim's braids are gone. Summer is slipping away."

Kim: The curls are back. The curls are back, and I reached for LolaVie. Now for a limited time, you can get an exclusive 15% off your entire order at lolavie.com with code SIL at check out. For haircare advice, listen to the woman who gave us the Rachel and me, the woman whose hair signals the arrival of fall, and, of course, all of our other sisters-in-Law.

Joyce: Unlike Kim, whose hair changes with the seasons, mine is always the same, thin and limp and straight. Some of you may have even seen the infamous Twitter post about the bob-off, where four guests on an MSNBC panel all had the same Bob haircut, something that I only learned about because my daughter pointed it out to me and said, "Mom, your hair looks really good." It's funny, that was right after I started using LolaVie, which I absolutely love. After spending the summer outdoors, your hair needs a rescue. Try the intensive repair treatment, whether your hair is like Kim's or like mine, because according to Jen, using it just once a week is an absolute game-changer.

The intensive repair process is clinically proven to repair and rebuild all three types of bonds found in hair for truly stronger hair from the inside-out. It's the ultimate hair savior for all seasons, especially summer. Outdoor chores in the sun used to leave my hair feeling dry and straw like, and I do a lot of those down at the chicken coop, but Jen was right. After using LolaVie, my hair feels softer, sleeker, and stronger.

Barb: Well, my hair looks fabulous, but you wouldn't know it because I usually wear it under a baseball cap, but it is. It's fantastic under the cap. You can check out all LolaVie products at your local Ulta beauty location to experience their luxurious scent for yourself. You know I'm all about the scent, or head directly to their website at lolavie.com. As our loyal listeners, you'll get an extra 15% off your entire order when you use code SIL at checkout. That's 15% off your order at L-O-L-A-V-I-E.com with promo code SIL. Please note that you can only use one promo code per order, and discounts cannot be combined. After you purchase, they'll ask you where you heard about them. Please support our show, and tell them we sent you. Your hair will thank you. Look for the link in our show notes.

Kim: We are now at the part of our show that is our favorite, and that is answering viewer questions. If you have a question, you can email them to us at sistersinlawatpoliticon.com, or post them on social, and we will try to answer as many as we can. If we don't answer them on the show, we'll try to answer them in our social feeds.

The first one is from Scott who asks, "How would Nixon have fared under the new immunity decision? Did the court address US v. Nixon?" Jill, you are our Watergate girl.

Jill: Well, the Supreme Court decision regarded civil liability before US v. Nixon. Then the Supreme Court in US v. Nixon addressed the responsibility of the sitting president to provide evidence in a criminal case that involved him, but that also involved others. So, it didn't really address this issue of his criminal immunity. So, under this decision, Nixon would have argued that what he was doing was within his official duties as the president, even though we can clearly see that it wasn't. It was all a scheme to cover up something that was a campaign activity. So, it was clearly an unofficial, and it was in his role as the candidate for president, not his role as the sitting president that he did these things.

So, it would be interesting to see, but I do believe that not just under the immunity decision, but in an environment that we have now with social media and a factory environment there, he would've gotten away with this, because people would've believed all the falsehoods that he told. When he said, "I'm not a crook," people would've believed him, and that would've been a bad thing.

Kim: Indeed. Our next question is from Jim in South Florida who asks, "Can we expect all the federal criminal cases against Trump to end up on appeal at the Supreme Court if he's convicted at trial?" Prosecutor Joyce, what do you think?

Joyce: This is a great question because appeals can get really confusing. In civil cases, the Supreme Court does not have to hear the argument. That's like the case that we were talking about earlier, the abortion case from the Fifth Circuit, where the Justice Department is trying to get the Supreme Court to hear it. The Supreme Court has discretion to take a case or not. That's not typically how it works in criminal cases, though. In most criminal cases, you will see the appeal go up. The court still has some say so. But in a case involving the former President of the United States, we are going to see all of these cases land in the United States Supreme Court for a decision one way or the other, either because the petition goes to the court and they say, "No, we're not going to hear this one. We're going to let the lower court's decision stand," which is of course the Supreme Court making a decision of sorts.

But far more likely, they will hear the case. They will brief the case. There will be oral argument, and we will get a full decision from the United States Supreme Court on each of these issues.

Kim: Our final question in this episode comes from Chris who asks, "Now that Judge Cannon has dismissed the documents' case against Donald Trump, instead of the special counsel appealing, can Merrick Garland bring charges against Trump himself?" Just eliminate the middle man, Barb. What do you think?

Barb: The answer is yes. Absolutely. 100%. Very astute. Now, Jack Smith has appealed, because I think what they really want is a definitive answer about whether the special counsel regulations are lawful and can go forward. So, they'll get an answer on that. But if the answer is ultimately no, that the special council regulations are unconstitutional, then absolutely. The whole purpose for naming a special council was to create this independence from the Department of Justice and the chain of command under Joe Biden, which could create this idea that they're somehow biased against Donald Trump.

So, it would've been easier just to start by having Merrick Garland bring this case, but they went through this whole structure of a special counsel to create this appearance of independence.

But if that should all go away, then there's nothing that would prevent Merrick Garland from himself bringing the case, or perhaps assigning it to the U.S. attorney in the Southern District of Florida, which I would love to see happen, because I find that U.S. attorneys' offices tend to move faster than DOJ components. Just too many layers in that building. Although I suppose if you're charging a former president, all the layers are going to be involved anyway, but short answer, yes.

Kim: Thank you all for listening to #SistersInLaw with Joyce Vance, Jill Wine-Banks, Barb McQuade, and me, Kim Atkins Stohr. Remember, mark your calendars, New York, because #SistersInLaw will be there at the 92nd Street Y on September 20th. You can get tickets at politicon.com/tour. We can't wait to see you there. Please show some love to this week's sponsors, Factor, Blueland, Olive and June, Aura, and LolaVie. Their links are in the show notes, and supporting them helps you support us. They really make this podcast possible. Follow #SistersInLaw on Apple Podcasts or wherever you give a listen to all of your pods, and please give us five stars, because it really makes a difference, particularly in helping others find the show.

Speaking of finding a show, you can also find anywhere you get your pods Justice By Design, my new podcast. This week, we talked about the path to overturning Dobbs. You don't want to miss that, so follow me there too. Give me five stars. It would just be nice. See you next week with another episode, #SistersInLaw.

Jill: His top aides, his White House counsel...

Kim: Is that free ride?

Jill: It's Dueling banjos.

Kim: Oh, Dueling Banjos.

Jill: From the great movie Deliverance, which I totally love. Great movie.

Kim: Oh, God, I can't.

Jill: God, my house phone rang and Brisbie didn't bark. I don't know. I hope he's okay.

Kim: I can't decide if that's better than Bad to the Bone or what. You just... You're the gift that keeps giving, Jill.

Jill: I keep trying.