

Barb: Make your day delicious. From breakfast to dessert, Factor lets you stay fueled with easy nutritious options, all ready in just two minutes. Get 50% off your first box plus 20% off your next month with code SIL50 at [factormeals.com/SIL50](https://factormeals.com/SIL50). You can also find the link in the show notes.

Joyce: Welcome back to #SistersInLaw with Kimberly Atkins Stohr, Jill Wine-Banks, Barb McQuade, and me Joyce Vance. #SistersInLaw will be doing a live show at the 92nd Street Y in New York City on September 20th. There are only a handful of tickets left so if you want to join us, slide on over to [politicon.com/tour](https://politicon.com/tour) to get your tickets today. We can't wait to be there, we hope we'll see you there too.

In other news, we have a new T-shirt, it's at the merch store. Go check it out at [politicon.com/merch](https://politicon.com/merch), just in time for the change in the seasons.

And in other news, Kim recently launched a new Politicon podcast called Justice by Design. If you haven't listened to it yet, you'll want to. Both Jill and Barb have been on it. Justice doesn't happen on its own, and Kim is there to introduce you to the people applying it to the most challenging issues facing our country. You can find Justice by Design wherever you get your podcasts, or watch it on the Justice By Design YouTube channel. Find all of those links in our show notes.

Kim: And Joyce, your time is coming, your time is coming, don't you worry. I'm going to have you on the podcast.

Joyce: Oh girl, I'm so there, all you need to do is ask.

Kim: Your time is coming.

Joyce: I'm addicted, it is really a good podcast. I don't listen to tons of podcasts, I love it and I'm addicted.

Kim: Thank you, thank you, you're not going to get away from me.

Joyce: Yeah, so look, we are going to get onto the show, we have a lot to discuss. This was a week where just out of the blue legal news exploded. So we'll be talking about the latest with Donald Trump, especially that hearing in front of Judge Chutkan that means that the presidential election interference case is back underway. We'll talk about DOJ's new election interference cases and what's going on with Russia. It was always Russia, we told you that here on SistersInLaw, it was always Russia. And following a horrific shooting in Georgia that left four people dead, the 14-year-old school shooter is being prosecuted as an adult. His father has been indicted as well, and we'll talk about those charges.

But y'all, before we get to the show, I am curious about what your plans are for Tuesday, because Tuesday of course is when Kamala Harris debates Donald Trump. Ooh, I am looking forward to this so much. Barb, what are your plans for watching the debate and what are you looking for?

Barb: Well, I'm not going to do what I've done in the past, go to a watch party, which can be a lot of fun. Every time Al Gore says lockbox, somebody has to drink. You can have a good time at some of these things. I'll just be watching at home on my own, but you know what I'll be watching for is just for Kamala Harris to just avoid any trip up. Thinking back to the first debate between Trump and Biden in 2020, and remember Trump was just all over the place, talking all the time. Now they've agreed, I think, to shut off the microphones to avoid that sort of thing. But it seemed to me at that time Trump was just trying to do whatever he could to be disruptive and take Biden off his game.

I kind of expect to see that Trump, trying to trip up Kamala Harris, to insult her, to get her to take the bait, but she's a prosecutor at heart. Elie Honig wrote about this in a column I saw today, and I totally agree with him. Prosecutors are used to this stuff, that's what defense attorneys do, they try to disrupt, they try to put you on trial, they try to accuse you of all different kinds of things, and I think prosecutors are trained to not take the bait, focus on what's in front of you. And so I think if she doesn't make headlines it's a good night.

Joyce: What do you think, Jill? What are you looking for?

Jill: So unlike Barbara I'm doing the very first watch party I've ever done. I've been invited to lead a discussion following the broadcast, and I'm assuming therefore that everyone will be quiet and will really pay serious attention. It's a serious group that's very interested in the outcome. So I'm looking forward to watching the reaction of other people, because I know I always react as a lawyer, and I'm interested in seeing how other people react to the same things I'm hearing and being able to judge what impact it will have on viewers around the country.

And I'm very excited, because I do agree with Barb that Kamala is ready for this and will not fall for any of the stuff that, and let's not forget what he did to Hillary when he stalked her and roamed around behind her. I know that Kamala Harris, the Vice President of the United States, former senator, former State Attorney General, will not let him get away with that. And so I'm feeling like it's going to be a good and interesting debate and that she will have substance as well as character on display, and he will not.

Joyce: Kim, what you going to do?

Kim: Yeah, so I as a journalist will be on deadline when the debate is happening, because I and my colleagues at Globe Opinion are going to be writing our thoughts about what happens in this debate.

But as for what I hope to hear, I hope the moderators ask a question about the Supreme Court. I mean, I would love if they ask broadly about the federal judiciary, but the Supreme Court and the fact that Joe Biden now has backed reforms for it, this has been a big issue in the last campaign as well as this one, the stakes are high, Donald Trump seems to be trying to have his way and have his cake and eat it too on this issue, claiming that he's great for reproductive justice, but he touted the fact that Roe V. Wade was over. I would love to see the moderators ask clear questions of Kamala Harris about what reforms she backs and about Donald Trump, just asking him why shouldn't we believe that you are saddled to this court? Because a lot of the decisions that have changed the

lives of millions and millions and millions of Americans only happened because of his appointees.

Joyce: Yeah, nothing like being able to draw a sharp contrast between the two candidates, right? I think for once, I usually like to watch debates at home just with my family because I get a little bit nervous sometimes, but for this one, I don't think that there's a lot to be nervous about. I think she's well-prepared, surrounded by good people, has great instincts, and something that I really love about her is I think she trusts her instincts. She believes in herself, and you see that. So I was talking with one of my neighbors this morning, I think we'll get together with just a few close friends and enjoy the evening. Every once in a while politics delivers, and I'm sort of thinking that next Tuesday will be one of those nights.

Great sleep is critical to success, and there's nothing better for sleep than a Helix mattress. Join us and find your perfect mattress for the best sleep of your life when you take Helix's two-minute sleep quiz. You'll match with a mattress customized for your body type and preferences. When I took the Helix quiz, I matched with the Helix Midnight Mattress. I liked it so much that I got Helix mattresses for everyone in my family. They all love them as much as I do. Your sleep will be better than ever when you choose Helix.

Barb: It's the first quiz I've ever looked forward to, try it and upgrade to a mattress tailored just for the way you sleep with Helix. Their lineup offers 20 unique mattresses, including the award-winning Lux Collection, the newly released Helix Elite Collection, mattresses designed for big and tall sleepers, and even a mattress made just for kids. There's something for everyone. Helix designs cradle your body for essential support in any sleeping position, with enhanced cooling features to keep you from overheating. And if your spine needs some extra TLC, they've got you. Every Helix mattress has a hybrid design combining individually wrapped steel coils in the base with premium foam layers on top. It's the perfect combination of comfort and support.

Kim: Helix knows there's no better way to test out a new mattress than by sleeping on it in your own home. That's why they come with a 10 to 15 year warranty and offer a 100 night trial to try out your new Helix mattress. The setup is fast and easy and Helix mattresses get delivered in a box straight to your door for free.

Jill: Helix has been awarded the number one mattress by GQ and Wired Magazine. Leading chiropractors and doctors of sleep medicine use Helix as a go-to solution for improved sleep. And now Helix is offering 25% off all mattress orders and two free pillows for our listeners. Go to [HelixSleep.com/sisters](https://HelixSleep.com/sisters). That's [HelixSleep.com/sisters](https://HelixSleep.com/sisters). This is their best offer yet and it won't last long. With Helix, better sleep starts now. You can find the link in our show notes.

It seems like we have a Trump legal segment almost every week, and we never run out of material, and this week is no exception. Let's start with Judge Chutkan and the DC Federal January 6th election interference case. She just got the case back from SCOTUS with instructions to evaluate how their immunity decision impacts this case, and she handles it expeditiously with a scheduling hearing on Thursday, set a speedy schedule granting pretty much all of what the special prosecutor wanted and none of the delay that Trump wanted.

So Barb, let me start with you. Smith tried to help Judge Chutkan in answering the Supreme Court's instructions of sorting out what stays in, what charges go out, what evidence can be used, what can't be. He filed a superseding indictment with what he believes are only charges that are allowed by the court's decision regarding what falls into the categories of things that are official but rebuttable immune acts, and those that are totally political private acts that would have no immunity. So what charges are left in, what evidence did he argue in the hearing he could use, and what was the argument from Trump's team against that?

Barb: Yeah, so the big difference in this superseding indictment from the original indictment following the Supreme Court's immunity ruling was to remove the allegations that pertain to official acts. And so mostly that's the whole scheme, to abuse the Justice Department to investigate claims of fraud, to say they're investigating claims of fraud, to encourage states to submit new slates of electors. All of that the Supreme Court made clear was going to be considered official conduct, so that's all out. Some other allegations came out too about things that Trump heard, for example, from his advisors, some things that Trump said or did while in the office, the Oval Office, or in the White House. And most of what's left I think the parties will agree is unofficial conduct, things like false slates of electors, persuading state legislators to overturn the results of the election.

But the one big sticking point seems to be Donald Trump's interactions with Michael Pence, right? So Mike Pence was, as president of the Senate, had the duty of certifying the election, and Trump pressured him to avoid that. Some of that was done privately, but some of it was done publicly in official speeches, unofficial campaign speeches, and other things. And so that seemed to be the thing that they argued about the most. It is Jack Smith's position, I believe, that even though this is protected by a rebuttable presumption of immunity, Jack Smith believes he can rebut that presumption by casting Mike Pence as acting in his role as president of the Senate as opposed to in his role as vice president. So that's the position of the Special Counsel.

Here's what the defense attorney said, they said it's clear the Pence stuff is immune and is not protected, and the other thing about it that I found curious, and I'm interested in what you folks think, is the lawyer said repeatedly, this is John Lauro, he said repeatedly, "And once we win on the Pence issues, we win everything, the whole indictment will have to be dismissed because it was tainted by when the grand jury heard evidence about it in returning its indictment, the grand jury was tainted, therefore the whole thing has to be thrown out." I don't think that's right.

Jack Smith did go back to a new grand jury to present evidence that was untainted, he said, but I don't think that's necessary. A grand jury sometimes hears evidence that ultimately isn't admissible because it turns out there was a search warrant and they saw evidence that gets thrown out later by a judge who finds out that the search material was improperly obtained, and so I don't think that's right. Number one, I think the Pence stuff is probably going to stay in, but even if it doesn't, I think Lauro is just completely wrong, do any of you disagree with that? I mean, just because the grand jury heard it, what the Supreme Court says, it can't be presented to a trial jury. So I don't think that means the rest of the case goes. Do you guys disagree?

Joyce: I think he's just setting up a very speculative appellate argument where they will argue that immunity is different than other categories of inadmissible evidence, and if immunity

means anything, and the Supreme Court has sort of entertained this before, then it has to be a total exclusion. So they'll make this argument about, oh, the grand jury was tainted because they heard evidence about Pence, and that evidence is now out. I agree with you though, Barb, I think that evidence, or most of it, stays in, I don't think that this is a very good argument, I think it's what they're trying to set up, because one thing that we have learned about these folks is that they will not hesitate to make a frivolous or speculative argument, and their client is going to be desperate to stay out of prison, so why not try it?

Barb: Yeah, well, and the other thing I think they're trying to do, and Judge Chutkan, man, I read this transcript, she was so on it, she said right from the get go, "I think you're trying to delay this case as long as possible, if I didn't know better." But she also said, and this was the response of Jack Smith's lawyers, Thomas Windom, said, "We know this case is going to go back to the Supreme Court, but we're trying to make it go back only once." And if you look at what the defense wants to do, they want to take this one step at a time, they want to deal with the Pence issues first, get a decision on that, take that up to the Supreme Court, and then once that comes back, regardless of how it comes out, then take on the other issues. So Chutkan was having none of that, Jack Smith was having none of that, and so ultimately she agreed with the decision of Jack Smith.

Jill: Yeah, I thought Chutkan was amazing in how she handled all this. One of the best things I've ever seen a judge do, she took none of their baloney and she really made short shrift of it. I agree with both of you that it's probably going to stay in because he is in a different role than a reporting role, it has nothing to do with the President's responsibilities, and so I think it will stay in so it won't matter, and there won't be any taint because it's admissible. But if there is some reason that it's put out, I agree with you, Barb, things go before the grand jury that eventually are not allowed in evidence, but also, so what's the worst that could happen? We'll have a third grand jury return another indictment minus Mike Pence.

Barb: Yep, that's right.

Jill: We saw so many ridiculous arguments made by the defense, I don't know if each of you has a different ridiculous one, but I thought they were saying the quiet part out loud where they basically admitted they're trying to delay this to keep the public from knowing anything until after they voted in November. And that's just so offensive to me that I can't believe it, and because of the fact that justice was left out, I know Barb, you feel the same way too, that that's such egregious behavior and was so clearly motivated as a political candidate, not as president, that it's just wrong not to be able to look at the motive for your conversations with your attorney general and subordinates. It should have been allowed to be in and I can't believe the Supreme Court ruled it out, but they did, so.

Joyce: Can we just say again though, Jill, because I think it's such an important point, the Supreme Court got it wrong. Because under this case, the president could go to the Attorney General and say, "Hey, let's plot a bank robbery together," or, "Hey, let's use SEAL Team Six to take out my political rivals." That just can't be how this country works. The Supreme Court got it wrong, a questionably motivated Supreme Court got it wrong, and I don't think we can ever let that be normalized.

Jill: Thank you, that is so true. And Joyce, let me ask you to continue on because we've already talked about how well Judge Chutkan did, and could you compare her handling of this hearing and how Judge Cannon has handled things in the past?

Joyce: Well, I'm going to try to be nice, my mama always told me not to talk unless you have something nice to say.

Barb: I love it when Joyce talk Southern.

Joyce: I really don't where Judge Cannon is concerned. Look, I mean the biggest difference, one is competent and the other isn't. Judge Cannon delayed and dithered. The most important job that a judge has, my husband was told this when he first went on the bench, the judge he replaced said, "Look, Bob, your job is to decide issues that matter to parties so that they can get kicked upstairs to the appellate court so those parties can get decisions and go on with their lives," and Judge Cannon just does not get that. She delayed, she didn't want to decide issues, she permitted people with no interest in the case amicus to come in and argue in front of her, she just couldn't do it. This case could have gone to trial in six or eight months, it was not that complicated, and she never got it there.

But Judge Chutkan yesterday, she was decisive. She got everything ratcheted up and ready to go, she issued an order hours after the hearing was over, and most importantly, she was respectful of both parties rights. She didn't have an ax to grind. For instance, the time for filing new motions is passed in this case, and Trump wants to file a new motion. He wants to file this motion, the same thing that Cannon used down in Florida to kick that case, this motion about the constitutionality of how the special counsel is appointed. Trump could have filed that in Washington in time in keeping with the original scheduling order and he didn't, and she could have told him, "Forget it, you're out of time," but she did not because she's interested in doing justice.

And so she gave him permission to seek leave to file that motion, there's sort of a technical hoop that has to be jumped through there because the law in the circuit has established constitutionality, so he'll have to ask for permission to file that motion. But she told the lawyer, "Sure, go ahead, you can do it." This is not a judge who is conflicted or who is self-interested, this is a judge who wants to do the right thing, Tanya Chutkan. And as a lawyer, as a DOJ lawyer looking at that, it just fills my heart with happiness to see the rule of law working.

Jill: Yeah, yeah, she was decisive, and she also was taking none of the baloney about things like, well, there's an election to consider in this, and she said, "No, I'm considering a four count indictment, and that's what we are going to talk about today." She really kept control. And she also, Kim, recognized the inevitable appeal of whatever she decides, and the delay that will come with that, and that there will be no trial before the election.

So let's move on to another Trump legal case, and that's the one in New York where just before we went on air to record this, Judge Merchan ruled to delay sentencing from September until November 26th, and to delay the scheduled decision that he was going to issue on the impact of the SCOTUS immunity decision to after that. He, like Judge Chutkan, has tried to treat defendant Trump fairly, but no more fairly than any other criminal defendant. So Barb, is the delay the right amount of fairness? What considerations did he have to balance?



Barb: Yeah, I don't like it, because I think just as we just said with Judge Chutkan, she says, "I am not considering the election, this is a case any other, I am deciding the issues in front of me." It kind of feels like Judge Merchan caved to the pressure a little bit, but he did note a couple of things. One is the government did not object to an extension, so he said, "I see that as the government's consent to this request, so that certainly played a role in my decision."

But the other thing that he said that I think was important was that he was making his decision on the basis of public perception of the fairness of the system, he said that was very important, that we've got a jury who worked really hard, they rendered a verdict, and I want to give honor to that verdict without distraction or distortion, and so I think in light of the fact that we've got this historic situation where never before has a former president and candidate for President been convicted of a crime, I don't want to do anything that is going to taint that, and so I'm just going to move it past the election.

So I can see his decision, it isn't so much about doing a favor for Donald Trump, it is protecting the justice system's reputation and the public perception of it. But I think if it were me, I would've gone forward, just to make it clear that a former president and a candidate for office does not get any special treatment.

Joyce: So I have a slightly different take on this, and I wonder what you think. I mean, this is all just happening as we're taping the podcast on Friday afternoon, maybe I'm wrong, but in my view, if Judge Merchan had gone ahead, Trump's lawyers would've probably waited until a day or two before, and then they would've tried to file an emergency appeal with the US Supreme Court. I think that they probably would've skipped over the New York courts and we would've ended up with an administrative stay from the US Supreme Court, because that's how they do things. And who knows, there might've been five votes on that court to kill the sentencing, all sorts of crazy things could have happened.

I think Judge Merchan was dealt a bad hand here. I love the fact that he has maintained control of this case, he has scheduled it for sentencing the Tuesday before Thanksgiving. So gobble gobble Donald Trump, he won't have an argument for delay at that point. Either he'll have won or he'll have lost, but either way, there's no argument to delay sentencing.

Jill: So Joe Biden will be pardoning a turkey, and Judge Merchan will be sentencing one.

Barb: Oh, look at you.

Joyce: Yeah, we going to have to watch that sentencing, all of us together.

Kim: Oh my goodness. So I'm with Joyce on this, because a lot of things. First of all, the criminal justice system and the election system are totally different, they don't impact, but they do. I mean, in reality they do, right? And so having the sentencing before the election, especially given in this case, y'all remember, remember, this is not like the Chutkan case, I don't think he's going to get jail time. I don't even think it's going to be-

Barb: Well, I do too. That's a very good point.

Joyce: I think he might now, I think he might now.

Barb: No I think he would not. Kim, go ahead, finish your thought.

Kim: I don't think that he would, so why put all of this with the ensuing appeals and all of the kerfuffle, which could also, among other things, put people in that courthouse in danger with threats and all this other stuff before the election. Just set it aside a couple weeks, just put it off, and that way you avoid all of that smoke. If this was something that was constant... The people have already seen, by the way, that a unanimous jury convicted him on these charges. That's information voters have when they go to the polls, and some of them are already voting early. They have that information already, so that doesn't make the difference, the sentence is not going to be that severe, and I just think doing this sentence would, if anything else, give Trump what he wants. Again, I don't think that that should be a factor in the outcome, but it won't be a factor in the outcome if they just sentence him in November, I don't see a big deal with it.

Jill: There's nothing lost, the conviction stands, he can be sentenced in November. But honestly, I mean, you've mentioned something, Kim, that I really don't get, which is why is this so important that he gets sentenced or not sentenced in the sense of affecting the election? I don't see any impact. The crime was committed and he was convicted, that's before the voters. The only thing that might affect them is if the judge said, "I'm not sending you to jail, this isn't important enough." I mean, he's not going to say it in those words, but that's how it would be interpreted, and that that might diminish the impact of it. I don't know, so what do you think? Do you really think it was important?

Kim: I think it naturally has an impact, even though it's a completely different thing. We are living in reality where people are going to see that and it's going to have an impact, either it's going to make Trump look more like a martyr and campaign that way, it's going to make people upset because he didn't get any jail time and there are some people who really want him to go to jail, it's going to upset maybe his supporters. I mean, it's not that the election should change the outcome of this case, and it's not, it's just accepting real realities just like judges do every day in how they set their schedule, I think that's it.

Joyce: And I don't usually wear a political hat, but I will here just for one second. I mean, I think court cases are about the law, they shouldn't be about anything else. But if I was a political advisor to one of the campaigns, I would view the importance of this sentencing, because I really agree with both of y'all when you say the public's already seen the evidence, the problem is keeping it on the public's radar screen. The public has a short attention span, and with Trump, that problem is exacerbated by the fact that there's always a new, bright, shiny thing. I mean, you don't even know what to focus on with him. So if you really want the public to focus on the fact that he's a convicted felon, sentencing is a pretty good way to do that.

But knowing that he won't be sentenced, there are some really good alternatives. I mean, maybe a couple of podcasts will have Trump Conviction Commemoration Day in lieu of sentencing. There are ways for the public to remember the convicted felon is on the ballot, and I betcha prosecutor Kamala Harris is going to make sure people remember that.



Kim: And can I make another point? How different is this from the DOJ policy to not do stuff right before election day?

Joyce: But that's different.

Jill: Very different. Yes, very different.

Joyce: I mean, that's about exposing the public to brand new things.

Kim: But tell me, tell me why.

Jill: That's not charging someone, it's not finishing a case that's already underway. But Kim, I know a good podcast to take this issue on, I think that maybe Justice by Design should have exactly what you're saying. What do you all think?

Kim: All right, well I will take a look at that.

Jill: Before I golf or garden, or honestly just go for a walk or to a meeting downtown in the summer, I use OneSkin's OS-01 FACE SPF protect and repair to fight back against sun damage, whether it's at home or traveling for vacation, I feel great knowing my skin will be ready for anything the elements throw at me. I'm especially prone to sun damage based on my youthful bad practices before we knew anything about the dangers of the sun, so I love that OneSkin's regimen works fast, and the formulas feel amazing when you apply them. When anyone asks if I really love OneSkin as much as I've said on this show, I say, "Absolutely." It is definitely true, and you don't need to take just my word for it, Oneskin has over 4,000 five star reviews for their full line of face, body, sun, and travel sized products. I never go anywhere without OneSkin, and we know you'll love it too.

Kim: Something you might not know is that your body starts accumulating senescent cells as early as your 20s. They're also called zombie cells because they stop producing collagen and hyaluronic acid like they used to. Instead, they start secreting an inflammatory substance that makes nearby cells dysfunctional too. Yuck. Luckily, there's a solution for zombie cells, and it comes from our friends at OneSkin.

Joyce: Jill might like OneSkin, but I think I like it even more. On our recent trip to Scotland, the only products I took with me were OneSkin. I had the eye lotion and the face lotion, the sunscreen and the body lotion, and it performed great. We were out hiking all day long, I never got red, never felt dry, I am such a huge fan. And OneSkin was founded by an all-woman team of scientists. It's the first and only skin longevity company to target a key hallmark of aging called cellular senescence by using their proprietary OS-01 peptide. OS-01 is scientifically proven to decrease lines and wrinkles, boost hydration, and help with the thinning skin that often comes with age.

Barb: For a limited time, you can try OneSkin for 15% off using the code SISTERS when you check out at Oneskin.co. With OneSkin, your skin can stay healthy, strong, and hydrated at every age. 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. You can also find the link in our show notes.

Well, it was a very busy week at the Department of Justice in national security cases. First we saw the Department of Justice charge Hamas in a sweeping indictment, charging six leaders with murdering U.S. citizens in Israel on October 7th, which is certainly big news. But I want to start with one that I find the most fascinating, and that is the indictment of two executives for RT, Russia Today, television news, who funneled millions of dollars to a Tennessee media company to create and publish videos to promote Russian interest. This is a blockbuster I think. The charges technically are money laundering and failure to register as a foreign agent, but what's interesting to me is the nature of the charges. Joyce, can you just tell us a little bit about those allegations?

Joyce: Yeah, I mean, I think it's really fascinating, it reads like a spy novel, it must've been a great week to be in DOJ's national security division. And I really don't want to gloss over the Hamas case either, because I think it's so critically important that we're seeking accountability for the murder of an American citizen by Hamas, a terrorist organization that blatantly disregarded the life and safety of Americans, Israelis, and other nationals. So I think it was important for DOJ to do that, and they were very efficient about doing it. This was an unsealed indictment, brought in, I think, a responsive fashion to the crimes that were committed.

The RT case, this is so intriguing, it hits sort of close for us in Alabama because funded by the good folks at RT, a Tennessee company that is reported to be Tenant Media allegedly created and posted hundreds of English language videos on social media sites, TikTok, Instagram, YouTube, and X, and they were echoing Russian state propaganda. So the allegation is that these podcasters and other influencers who were working with Tenant didn't know that they were spreading Russian propaganda, or at least the government can't prove that, they're being portrayed more as useful idiots, as dupes. But this stuff was widely viewed online, 16 million views on YouTube alone. And all of this stuff is designed to create division and dissent in the United States in order to influence the election, which gee, sounds an awful lot like 2016 to me.

Barb: And Kim, another fascinating aspect of the reporting on this is that some right wing media figures shared some of this content. Who are they and how are they responding to these charges?

Kim: Yeah, so these are, I guess you can call them influencers, white... right, oof, that was a four-year clip. Right wing influencers who backed Donald Trump, who, as you said, were on YouTube and Instagram and all of these places, and they joined this company that was Tenet that was actually backed by Russians, and they were paid huge sums of money.

So I'm going to answer your question a little in reverse to sort of explain this. They claim, "We did not know who Tenet was, we thought this was a media company, we were duped, we are victims here." I mean, I'm talking about people like Liam Donovan and Tim Pool and Lauren Southern, these are people that are well-known in that world, and they were spewing all kinds of talking points which turned out are right in line with the things that Russians were saying, even though they claim that all of their content was original. But they are saying that they were duped by this, but listen, let me tell you

something, I make my living in media in various forms, including now YouTube and social media, digital print. Nobody ever offered to pay me \$400,000 for just four little short videos, and if they did, the first question I would be asking is, who is this?

Barb: Yes.

Kim: They all said they did not realize that this guy, who purported to be a Greek business guy that was in charge of this, I would have at least Googled him, and when there was absolutely no footprint for him I would be like, nah, I don't want this money. Something's fishy, I'm not doing this, there is no way. I just want to explain to people who don't always know what media people or journalists make, \$400,000 is a sum of money that most journalists will never see in their lives. I've never seen that kind of money, I've never been paid that. They didn't ask any questions, they didn't have any curiosity, I'm skeptical.

Barb: The other thing about it is, leaving the aside that this turned out to be a Russian origin, and they're spewing all kinds of things about Ukraine, that's damaging to Ukraine and helpful to Russia, and sowing discord in U.S. society, just trying to get us all mad at each other with race baiting and xenophobia, and all of these issues. Who takes content from other people? If you're an influencer, don't you just, like Kim, when you write a column, don't you share your views? If somebody said, "Hey, Kim, I'll pay you \$400,000 if you say Ukraine stinks." No, that's not how it works.

Kim: No, no, and you're not even labeling it as, if I'm talking about what someone else says, I cite them, I attribute them. If on this podcast we're talking about a sponsor, we say it's a sponsor. We are not out here just saying stuff pretending like it's our views and it's being fed to us.

Jill: Well, they did say, "Well, it's what I would've said anyway."

Barb: Oh my gosh, give me a break.

Jill: So yeah, why not take the hundred thou per hit?

Kim: Sure, sure.

Barb: Wow. Dear listeners, let me inform all of you that none of the sisters-in-law are receiving a penny from any hostile foreign adversary to share views on their behalf.

Kim: We can assure you.

Joyce: I don't even express my husband's views. Every once in a while he'll like, "You should say X," and I'll be like, "No, dude, uh-uh."

Barb: Yeah. Well, Jill, let me ask you this question. So these two defendants are at large, I think they're believed to be in Russia with whom we do not have an extradition treaty, so there's not really any prospect for their arrest. Why do you suppose strategically DOJ would file these charges and file them now if there's no likelihood that they're actually going to bring these people to justice in a trial?

Jill: I think there are several reasons. One is someone that Kim already mentioned, Tim Pool, who's one of these people who did this, and he apparently is scared because he changed in favor of Russia against Ukraine, and he came forward with a whole long thing about how Ukraine is the breadbasket of Europe and that they're our greatest ally and we should definitely give them billions of dollars in aid. So the indictment has had this maybe unintended, maybe intended, consequence of influencing the influencers to be more careful about what they're saying and to not take Russian propaganda and repeat it.

And I think disinformation experts in America have said that the government is thinking ahead of the election to crack down on the Kremlin and to make sure that it doesn't have a deep impact on our election, so one way to do that is to warn people. There's also the suspicion that some of the people in Russia who are working for this organization will like, oh, I could get indicted in America and my life could be very limited, so I'm not going to keep working for this group. So I think the indictment has had some good consequences and it was a good thing to do, and now of course these two people can't leave Russia. If they go anywhere where there's extradition, they're going to be arrested.

Barb: Right. Well, fascinating case there, and the other one I wanted to highlight is one that came earlier in the week against a woman who was acting as an agent of the government of China and working as a high level aide in the New York Governor's Office during the administration of both Governor Andrew Cuomo and then into the administration of Governor Kathy Hochul. Joyce, tell us about this one. There's a woman and her husband charged with crimes, what are they charged with?

Joyce: Yeah, I mean, this is pretty crazy. So Ms. Sun was an aide to New York's Governor Kathy Hochul, who, full disclosure, is the wife of Barb's and my former US attorney colleague from New York, Bill Hochul, and the allegation in this case is that she was working to further the interests of the Chinese government and the Chinese Communist Party while she was working in the governor's office. So she and her husband get charged with 10 criminal counts, including visa fraud, money laundering, other crimes. It's really spectacular that she was so close to the chief executive of the state of New York and was able to do this. I think what's really reassuring here is that this came to light, that law enforcement acted swiftly, that both she and her husband are now charged with their crimes.

Barb: Yeah, super interesting. And Kim, can you tell us some of the things she was doing to advance the interest of China in her job as this high-level aide to the governor of New York?

Kim: Yeah, she was literally changing the frontward face of policy of New York State, doing things like removing any reference to Taiwan in the public speeches and in the comments and statements out of the office, removing anything that had to do with the Uyghurs, this is the group of Muslims in China that have been facing horrific discrimination and encampment and just awful stuff. My favorite thing about this case, this is maybe because I'm hungry, is that one of the things she got was roasted duck. She just kept getting, she got-

Jill: Salted duck, salted.

Kim: Salted duck.

Jill: Yeah, many times. So funny

Kim: That was some of the things that she got from the Chinese government to do this. I mean, I should not laugh, this is not funny, Chinese interference with government is not funny, but my God, salty-

Barb: They always get caught with the salty duck.

Kim: I know.

Barb: The tell-tale salty duck.

Joyce: If I'm ever going to betray my country it's going to be for salty duck.

Kim: Oh my God.

Barb: I would've gotten away with it-

Jill: I'm a big duck fan.

Kim: I am too.

Jill: So I would definitely, it's one of my favorite things, although I've never had Nanjing style salted duck, I've only had the Peking duck, so I would love to taste it. It was prepared by the chief chef at the Chinese consulate, so it was specially prepared and delivered. But let's not forget, she also got a lot of money.

Kim: She did get a lot of money.

Jill: They have a \$4 million house in Manhasset and a \$2 million one in Florida, I think, or California, somewhere warm. So I mean, there was a lot of money involved.

Kim: And endless supplies of duck, because there was a lot of duck being sent to her.

Barb: I would've gotten away with it too if it hadn't been for those meddling salty ducks. So amazing. Jill, how can this happen? You and I, and Joyce, we worked in the federal government where they do background investigations and they ask questions about whether someone is living beyond their means. As you just said, she had a house in Long Island, she had a house in Hawaii, they had a lot of luxury items, how do you suppose she gets away with this?

Jill: As a government employee, she certainly wasn't affording it. Now her husband had a business, so maybe that was attributable, but they were also laundering money. And I don't know what the state of New York does, not a job I've had where I've worked for the state of New York, it's something I'll have to put on my bucket list, add to what else I've done. But yeah, I mean, at the federal level, when I was first being cleared for my first job at Justice, they found a job I had when I was in high school for a few weeks that I hadn't listed, which I remembered when they pointed it out, I hadn't hidden it, it's like, oh my God, do you remember every job you ever had, every person you ever babysat for?

So I don't know how she got away with this, I don't know enough. I tried to check whether she was born in America, whether she's a naturalized citizen, I don't know. Not that that would matter, whether she was an American citizen or not, she should have been checked very carefully. But there may have been no indication, it could have looked like her husband made a lot of money and they had a nice house, so these things happen. Apparently Hochul's office did catch her and fired her and reported it, so they did somehow catch on to it. Maybe they were mad they weren't sharing the salted ducks, I don't know.

Barb: Fascinating. Do you think that we need to worry in our government about other people acting as foreign agents? I mean, we've got all this infiltration from Russia going to these media companies, we've got at least one Chinese spy acting in a governor's office, how do we protect ourselves as a nation from foreign interests who are trying to infiltrate our media, our social media, and even our workplaces?

Joyce: Yeah, I mean, this is such a difficult issue, a lot of it is see something, say something, and it sounds like that may have happened here. You don't want to be paranoid, you don't want to exclude people from government jobs because of their background, but it does suggest that we do need to be thoughtful and careful. And if, for instance, you see something happening like this deliberate exclusion of mention of Taiwan, that's a red flag, and that's something that people should be asking questions about. So I think maybe that's part of the response is don't be afraid to ask questions and push down on why things are happening, there may be good reasons, sometimes though there aren't, and when there aren't we want those brought to light.

Kim: Why are you getting so much duck?

Barb: Well, you raise a really good point because I remember early in the days of the Trump administration there were people who were Muslims and from certain countries of origin who were getting squeezed out in sensitive jobs, and we're an inclusive government, we're diverse, we are better when we represent different cultures and different ethnicities in our government, and so I think we have to look at conduct, we have to look at activity, and we can't base decisions on ethnicity or national origin.

Jill: Support for today's episode comes from Honeylove. Honeylove has revolutionized the wireless bra game by using supportive bonding to eliminate uncomfortable wires and unnecessary bulk. You deserve to feel light and comfortable without sacrificing support. The fabric is so soft, it's liberating. Embrace freedom, flexibility, and comfort with Honeylove's wire-free designs. Plus, for a limited time you can get Honeylove on sale. Get 20% off your entire order with our exclusive link, [honeylove.com/sisters](https://honeylove.com/sisters). Support our show and check them out at [honeylove.com/sisters](https://honeylove.com/sisters).

Joyce: Honeylove's best-selling crossover is so comfortable it's sure to be your new go-to. You get all the traditional support without underwire, and the mesh detailing looks fantastic. The smoothing fabric prevents bulging in the back too. After a long day you'll still want to relax in it, even when it's time for bed. With Honeylove, you'll never sacrifice comfort again. And if you want an even more relaxed option, we recommend the V edition for the same underwire-free support, with molded cups to lift and avoid compression. You'll never go back.



Kim: Honeylove also has incredibly comfortable shapewear, tanks and leggings for everyday support. You'll look amazing when you pair your V-neck with their breathable and versatile leggings, or combine matching shapewear with your crossover. Whether you're going for an everyday look, a workout, or an end-of-summer social event, Honeylove has it covered. You need this in your life, you've earned it.

Barb: And Honeylove is not just supporting women, it's empowering women. Treat yourself to the best shapewear on the market and save 20% off at [honeylove.com/sisters](https://honeylove.com/sisters). Use our exclusive link to get 20% off at [honeylove.com/sisters](https://honeylove.com/sisters) to find your perfect fit. After you purchase they'll ask you where you heard about them, please support our show and tell them we sent you. Elevate your comfort and elevate your style and empower your lifestyle of flexibility.

Kim: The horrific shooting at Apalachee High School in Georgia is gut-wrenching for so many reasons, but there are a lot of legal issues to unpack there, and some of them raise some thorny questions. We know that the shooter, who is just 14 years old, has been charged with four counts of first-degree murder, and his father was also charged with second-degree murder, involuntary manslaughter, and child endangerment.

Barb, I want to start with the charges against the shooter. The charges themselves seem pretty spot on, I think there's no quibble with the fact that this was first degree murder based on the facts that we know, but he's being charged as an adult, though he's 14. Now, this case is horrific, I am not in any way denying that, but criminal defendants have a constitutional right to participate meaningfully in their own defense, and it's, for example, unconstitutional to try someone who doesn't have the mental capacity to participate in his own defense, right?

Barb: Yep.

Kim: Now, we know that 14-year-olds, scientists say that their brains are not fully formed yet, that's why they're not allowed to see R-rated movies, they're not allowed to drive, they're not allowed to smoke, they're not allowed to be enlisted, vote, it's because they don't have the requisite maturity. So tell us how unusual it is to treat a 14-year-old in such an adult way, especially when his liberty is at stake.

Barb: Yeah. It's, as you say, 14 is so young. Many states have this ability for a prosecutor to decide when a juvenile commits certain kinds of very serious crimes to sidestep the juvenile detention system and instead treat them like an adult, and that's what the prosecutors decided to do here. I think when we think about the purposes for criminal prosecution, what we teach our law students is that the reasons we punish people at all for crimes are, number one, for public safety. If there is somebody out there who is dangerous, a serial killer, someone who commits murder, we need to remove them from society at least for some time until we're confident that they are not going to be a danger anymore, so incapacitation. Another is deterrence, people need to see that, oh, there's a punishment if you do that bad thing, so I better not do that bad thing because I don't want to go to prison like these other people have. Another is rehabilitation, if I put you in the system you can get drug treatment, anger management treatment, vocational training, whatever it is, that can perhaps turn your life around.

And there's one more, and I think there is some disagreement about whether this is a valid reason, and that is retribution. The federal system recognizes the need for just punishment, retributive punishment, as one of the reasons for sentencing. I, and maybe this comes from my Christian origins, have always really struggled with the idea that the criminal justice system is about retribution. I feel like we ought to be better than that, we want to move forward as a society, and so I am all in favor of prosecution to achieve incapacitation for public safety, for deterrence purposes, for rehabilitation, but this idea that I need to extract an eye for an eye is one that has always given me some trouble. And I think when you think about a case like this-

Joyce: Leave that to those of us who are Old Testament people, I don't struggle with it at all.

Barb: All right, well good, that's really interesting. And so I think that when you have something like this, there's such outrage, this is such a horrific crime. People are destroyed, hearts are shattered, when you've got the death of two kids and the death of two teachers, that I think there is a human instinct for retribution, for an eye for an eye. And so I think some think that dealing with him in a juvenile setting, which would result in a finding, if convicted, a finding of delinquency and a possibility of release when the person turns 21, instead I think people want to see someone locked up for the rest of their lives as a way of extracting an eye for an eye.

But I think sometimes that emotion gets the better of us and we don't really think through carefully about what we're achieving here as a society in those purposes of punishment. I'm reminded of a young man in Michigan who was convicted of killing a stranger passing by, he just shot him for kicks, and his name was Nathaniel Abraham, he was 11 years old at the time. He was tried as an adult and he led a very, very troubled life forevermore. I think ultimately he was released, and nothing went well for him for the rest of his life. But you see the pictures of this kid, and he was a baby. He ultimately got released at the age of 20, but it was just a really messy situation, and I think sometimes we allow our emotions to get the better of our logic.

Kim: So Joyce, the shooter's father, who bought this child, Joyce, bought him an AR-15 for Christmas, so he was either 14 or perhaps even 13 when he got this gift. My God. He was also charged, as we said, and this sort of echoes the charges of the parents in that awful shooting in Oxford, Michigan that we talked about before. But the charges here are even more severe, those parents in Michigan were convicted, I believe it was for involuntary manslaughter, here it's second degree murder as well as the other charges, also involuntary manslaughter and child endangerment. But tell us the theory of the Georgia case, because second degree murder has a much higher standard, but how do the prosecutors in Georgia get there, Joyce?

Joyce: Yeah, so it's really interesting, I mean, we don't know for sure because they don't have to tell us at this point, but I'm going to take a stab at what their theory is. They've charged four counts of involuntary manslaughter, that's essentially your reckless conduct or maybe your grossly negligent conduct caused the death of another. That's the same theory that was used, as you mentioned Kim, in Michigan, it's when a parent knows that their child is volatile, that their thinking about doing a school shooting, and you give them access to this kind of a weapon, that you're responsible. And what we know publicly here at this point is that the FBI did confront this child when he was 13 with his father there about some threats he had made. The child denied them, so maybe the dad will claim he

didn't know, but this one's too close for comfort, the AK-47 for Christmas is just really nuts in this setting

Kim: Yeah, after the threats.

Joyce: After the threat, right?

Kim: Yeah.

Joyce: So how do you get to the two counts of second-degree murder, which, as you say, is a much higher standard? Well, I'm going to say what I always tell my law students in class, if you're being asked whether or not something is a crime, you have to start with the statute and the jurisdiction where the conduct was committed. Because states have different statutes, second degree murder is different in different places. And if you look at the Georgia statute, there's this interesting little provision that says a person commits the offense of murder in the second degree when in the commission of cruelty to children in the second degree, he or she causes the death of another human being irrespective of malice.

I know that's a lot of legalese there, but let me explain what's happening. We've got eight counts of cruelty to children, and that's the trigger for second-degree murder here. When they talked about malice and the statute they're talking in essence about intent, and clearly the dad didn't have the intent to kill here, but under this provision of law, intent doesn't matter. And what it's saying very clearly is a person commits the offense of murder in the second degree when, while they're committing that other offense that he's charged with, cruelty to children, they cause the death of another human being without regard to what they intended to do.

So I think that's the theory here, is that by putting the gun in the child's possession knowing that he had had some thoughts of committing a school shooting, he is in essence committing this crime of murder, which is a very serious crime with a much heavier punishment in Georgia than the involuntary manslaughter charge.

Kim: There's a lot left to be desired about the state of Georgia's laws, I think, when it comes to gun violence prevention, but I love this, I think that this is something that other states should look at because I think holding parents responsible for the same reasons that we set out, while there are some serious issues about, in my view, about charging someone so young in an adult system, that means that parents are the ones that are in control and they should face some of the consequences for this, so I think that that is great.

But speaking of the lacking laws in Georgia, Jill, Georgia lacks so many laws that we see in other states, whether it's extreme risk order or so-called red flag laws, which I think would've applied here, straw purchase laws, which I think would've applied here, secure storage laws, which certainly should have applied here, a banning on high-powered weapons and magazines, which also would've applied here. What do you think of these, if it's possible, is most important? I talked about this in this week's episode of Justice by Design with an expert, saying that what JD Vance said is not right, that we need to fortify schools and accept gun and violence as a fact of life, he said. Now, what do you think, Jill?

Jill: So you can start with what you said last as something that will not work, should not work, should not be the default, which is arming teachers and securing the school buildings. Every town has done a study of what states have the best laws, and of course they have lower homicide rates, the ones with the weakest laws have more. And there are some that they consider to be the very basic things that you have to have, and I think we've mentioned all of the ones that in this case would have and could have made a difference.

A red flag law clearly should have been, and could have been if it existed, invoked. A age limit, clearly he was too young to have a gun. Background checks, but background checks are meaningless unless there's a consequence, like if you have A, B, C or D, you cannot buy this gun, and it's not enough that I checked you out and I know you have that, it has to be that you can't have the gun. I think secure storage, he was given the gun so what does secure storage mean? That he was responsible for secure storage? That the parents were responsible? I don't know, but secure storage is something that should apply and every state should have, and even if it's only in a home where there is a child.

Kim: Yeah. Well, that's what you could do, you could say any home where there is somebody under the age of 16 in that home, any firearm, regardless of who. And I'm not sure, Jill, in this case if he could legally own that gun at 14, but that if they're in the house, the gun is locked up securely. But I mean, again, this seems to have been a household where that wasn't really a virtue.

Jill: Right, it seems like in Georgia he couldn't purchase the gun, but he could possess it.

Kim: He could have it, oh dear.

Jill: Yes.

Kim: Good grief.

Jill: So, I mean, that's a bad law that needs to be changed, obviously.

Kim: Yeah. What about you, Joyce and Barb, any other thoughts about this? It's so horrific, but the legal aspect is really important.

Barb: Yeah, I guess the one thing I want to say is when the Crumbley parents were charged and convicted, there were some critics out there saying, well, this just means every parent now is going to be charged every time a young person uses a gun, and I don't think that's the case, I think it is the case only when it is the parents themselves who have been reckless, as the Crumbleys were found to be and as this defendant is alleged to be. And so we talked again about the purposes of criminal prosecution, and I said I'm not so much a retributivist, but I think for deterrence it means parents need to watch for those warning signs of their children, they need to make sure guns are stored carefully, their kids don't have access to them, and I think if it makes parents more responsible then that's a good thing.

Joyce: Yeah, I'm there with you on that, Barb. I had written a piece after the Crumbley shooting up in Michigan highlighting just how egregious the parental conduct was there, right? I

mean, they lied to the school. They knew that their kid had access to a gun, the school tells them, "We've found these drawings where the kid is saying, 'I can't stop thinking,' with pictures of guns and blood and dead students." And I think the laws are really good for deterring that sort of reckless, irresponsible conduct by parents.

I suppose I'm joking a little bit when I say that I'm Old Testament because in many ways I really do think that restorative justice is the way to go, and something that I'm very impressed by that I wish had more resources attached to it is this work that DOJ has done on intervention. This is really an FBI sort of a project, where when you identify a kid like this who's struggling, there's not probable cause to believe a crime has been committed, but clearly there are issues, there are ways for the school to monitor and engage in the kind of programming that helps the student grow out of it. We started by talking about the fact that the 14-year-old male brain is not fully developed, it's not finished growing. And so I think these programs, which data shows are very successful, that help people who are struggling get past that hurdle and go on to be productive members of society, that's really what we should be doing. It's a tragic failure when people die in this setting and we lock up a very young man and his dad.

Jill: It's interesting because his grandfather blamed the father saying that, "If he didn't have this damn gun, he wouldn't have gone and killed anybody," and his aunt said that he had been begging for mental health help and nobody did anything. But I also want to say, I had one summer working in juvenile court for Legal Aid Society in the Bronx, and these questions about how you treat a juvenile delinquent, or a person in need of supervision, which is a lesser category, versus what happens in the criminal justice system, and rehabilitation doesn't happen, honestly, in either system, although it maybe more happens in the juvenile system than in the adult prison.

But in terms of safety, someone who does this kind of mass shooting needs to be in some way incarcerated, and then the question is, should he be incarcerated in a casual trial or after a full jury due process trial in an adult court? And should he be subjected to possible life in prison when he's 14 years old, or in the case you mentioned where he was 11 and just randomly for kicks killed somebody. That's really the issue, is in juvenile court, he's going to go free when he gets to be an adult, in all probability, and he's going to be a better criminal than he was when he went in because that's what they learn in jail, in adult prison and in juvenile prison. They're not with people who are going to teach them good things.

So I think we need a better solution to the incarceration that is necessary to at least protect the public for some period of time until this child's brain can develop and he can demonstrate that he is safe to be let out.

Barb: Well, I think I've told you before that I've had my identity stolen more than once, and now we're 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.

Jill: It's almost every day that I get some notice from some company that they've been hacked and that my data has been compromised, so it's wonderful to know that Aura offers a suite of tools to protect everybody, you and your loved ones, including real-time alerts on suspicious activity, computer virus protection, a VPN, a password manager, and even parental controls. And as a childless dog lady, don't worry about parental controls, but plenty of my friends do. Aura is a comprehensive online safety solution that provides every tool you'll need in one place.

Kim: And that's not all, Aura also monitors identity theft, which is a terrible thing when it happens to you, 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 addresses and passwords and social security numbers and other sensitive information, and 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 to resolve things.

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 leaked online. It's all for free when you visit [aura.com/sisters](https://aura.com/sisters). That's [aura.com/sisters](https://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](https://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.

So now it's time for our favorite part of the show. I have missed this so much the last two weeks when I've been on vacation, I had a great time listening to the questions while I was gone, and I'm glad to get to be back in the mix, even as the host. So if you've got questions for us, please do email us at [sistersinlaw@politicon.com](mailto:sistersinlaw@politicon.com), or tag us on social media using #sistersinlaw and ask us your questions. If we can't get to them during the show, keep an eye on our feeds during the week, we try to go in and answer as many of them as we can then.

So this week our first question comes from Deborah and it's for Kim. The question is this, how can someone who is a convicted felon assume an office that requires the highest levels of security clearance in our country? That's a great question. Kim, what do you think?

Kim: Yeah, that is a great question. The answer is because the Constitution says so, or the Constitution does not say so. The office of the presidency naturally inherently includes the ability to see classified documents, to classify documents, to declassify documents, that's part of the job, and also to become president there is no constitutional limit based on the ability to pass the certification necessary to get classified as if you were in the FBI or some other agency in the US government that requires that kind of clearance. The fact that you may not be able to get that clearance on your own does not disqualify you from becoming president, so that is why someone who could be a convicted criminal, there's no prohibition about being a convicted criminal, all you have to do to be president is be 35, win the electoral college, and be a natural-born citizen, that's it.

Joyce: I mean, I guess it's really the only way it's workable, otherwise there would be so much potential for the FBI just to deny a security clearance to a president that they didn't like,



and we don't want to open that can of worms, but it still does seem a little bit crazy, so thank you for that explanation. Barb, your question comes from Parkin in Ridgeway, South Carolina, and they ask, can you explain the Dual Sovereignty Doctrine using Trump's cases as an example?

Barb: Oh, isn't this a great question? This is right out of the pages of the criminal procedure casebook. This is great stuff, the Dual Sovereignty Doctrine. Oh, isn't it good? So as you know, ordinarily defendants are protected from the double jeopardy clause from being twice tried for the same case. And so that would mean, for example, he couldn't be tried for election interference two times for the same crime. But the dual sovereignty doctrine says that Georgia, for example, is its own sovereign, and the United States of America is its own sovereign, and each of those sovereigns have different laws. And so the fact that the United States had charged Donald Trump, in fact, I think Georgia went first, right? Georgia filed these charges against Donald Trump for election interference under Georgia law, that did not in any way prevent the United States from filing its own prosecution for really the same conduct because they each have separate laws, separate systems, separate courts, so we call that the Dual Sovereignty Doctrine, and that is the Trump example.

Joyce: Well, from law school to politics, Jill, this last question is for you. We've talked about the ERA a lot and the shameful failure to pass it, and you've often taken the position that it still could be signed into law, so this question from @KC2NPU goes to you. The question says, I was looking at the joint resolution for the ERA, and it appears to have in there that a time limit applies. They ask, is this true? And so maybe you can remind us what the joint resolution is and then answer the question.

Jill: I will, and it's something that passed at the annual meeting in August in Chicago, at the ABA's Annual meeting, the largest voluntary organization of lawyers in the world. And it starts out by saying resolved, that the American Bar Association supports the principles that any time limit for ratification of an amendment to the Constitution is not consistent with Article five of the Constitution. So the answer to her question, which I will then explain, is no, it does not have a time limit, it says that the time limit cannot be there, it says it's inconsistent with Article five of the Constitution, which is the article that allows the amendment of our Constitution.

And you can only have rules that are how you amend that are consistent with Article five, and Article five does not have a time limit in it. It says that it requires two thirds of the states to ratify it, and then it becomes effective, it is then therefore part of the Constitution, it just needs to be published so that people know that it's part of it. And it does not say that you can put in anything other than a requirement that the right number of states vote for it. So I believe that the fact that Congress in its own resolving language said that it would be effective when ratified within a certain number of years, that was never effective, it wasn't part of what went to the States to ratify, the States ratified the language of the ERA, which simply says that there shall be no discrimination based on sex.

And so there you go, it is not in the joint resolution except to say that any such time limit is inconsistent with Article five's language, and therefore I still hope that one of the last acts of President Biden will be to tell the archivist to publish it and make it the 28th amendment of our Constitution.

Joyce: Thank you for listening to #SistersInLaw with Kimberly Atkins Stohr, Jill Wine-Banks, Barb McQuade, and me Joyce Vance. Remember to mark your calendars, #SistersInLaw will be doing a live show at the 92nd Street Y in New York City on September 20th. You can get your tickets at [politicon.com/tour](http://politicon.com/tour). And please show some love to this week's sponsors, Factor, Helix, OneSkin, Honeylove, and Aura. Their links are in the show notes. Please support them because we love them and they make this podcast possible. Follow #SistersInLaw on Apple Podcasts or wherever you listen, and please give us a five-star review, it really helps others find the show. See you next week with another episode, #SistersInLaw.

Barb: Am I allowed to tell our listeners that as we are doing this, Joyce is knitting, Kim looks ready to go for prime time.

Kim: I just ate three tacos.

Barb: Yeah, you look great. And Jill has her hair in curlers, which is a great look.

Kim: And yet she's glamorous, she has something-

Joyce: She looks better in curlers than I look when my hair is done.

Barb: I know, right? She still looks like a million bucks, yeah.

Kim: She is glamorous.

Jill: This is a trick I learned from NBC, I never saw these Velco big rollers, and I would've thought they'd make your hair too puffy and weird, but they actually work and-

Kim: Gives it body.

Jill: It does, it really does, so here I am. Okay, onto the serious stuff.