

Jill: Summer's coming to a close, but my taste buds are still on vacation because of HelloFresh's meals. I've had some great ones this week. I made a sweet and spicy lettuce wrap and a Thai chicken curry and I shared with a friend one of the pork dishes and she and her husband loved it. Right now, get free Breakfast for Life at [hellofresh.com/freesisters](https://hellofresh.com/freesisters). I had an egg and spinach one for HelloFresh just before flying to Ann Arbor where I am now, and it was really delicious. That's one free breakfast item per box while your subscription is active. You can also find the link in the show notes.

Kim: Welcome back to #SistersInLaw with Joyce Vance, Jill Wine-Banks, Barb McQuaid, and me, Kim Atkins Stohr. To start, we want to remind you that in less than a week, #SistersInLaw will be live at the 2nd Street Y in New York City. That's Friday, September 20th, and there are just a handful of tickets left, so you really need to hurry. You're not going to want to miss it. Go to [politicon.com/tour](https://politicon.com/tour) and get your tickets today and we'll see you there. And in other news, the new T-shirt is at the merch store. I think you'll love the color. It's been really, really popular. So just go to [politicon.com/merch](https://politicon.com/merch) to find that. You can find all of these links in the show notes.

And we have a great show for you today where we will be talking about the great debate, the presidential debate. We'll also be talking about the Terrorgram risk and we'll talk a little more about Project 2025 and what the plan holds for the Department of Labor. It's pretty scary stuff. But before we get to the show, I want to talk a little bit about autumn rituals because the leaves are starting to fall even here in warm DC and the temperatures are cooling a bit and there are certain things that makes me want to do right, and it usually involves food. So one thing I'm doing probably as you listen to this, dear listeners, I am probably throwing some veggies and chicken and broth and all kind of good stuff into the slow cooker so that I can have my famous chicken soup on hand in little individual servings in the freezer to be ready for flu season, which I know is coming. What are some of the things you guys do when the temperatures start falling, Barb?

Barb: Well, I'm all about football. When I think of fall, I think of football and Michigan football is in full swing. The Detroit Lions are back and better than ever. In fact, I've got a doubleheader this weekend, Kim, I'm going to the Michigan game on Saturday and the Lions game on Sunday.

Kim: Oh, that's really fun.

Barb: Nothing could be better. And I always wear the jersey of my favorite team just in case somebody goes down and they look in the crowd and they say, "I need somebody to come in at quarterback." I'm ready.

Kim: McQuaid, get in there.

Barb: I'm always ready, yeah.

Kim: What about you, Jill?

Jill: So you mentioned flu and, I, instead of cooking soup, went for a flu shot and the new COVID vaccine, and I recommend that everyone listening, the new COVID vaccine is

out now. Go get it. It's still around and it's not a big deal to get, all the drugstores have it, so go on and get your vaccines.

Kim: I'm literally getting both of mine the minute I get done putting the soup on. What about you, Joyce?

Joyce: It's so crazy that the new fall ritual is get a flu shot and a COVID vaccine, but here we are in 2024. Sadly, it will not be fall in Alabama for several more weeks, but I am always a big fan of trying to push it. Fall is one of my favorite seasons, so I've asked my husband to deliver a huge pot of his famous chili this weekend. He makes really, really good chili, full of beans and spicy, and I think there's a little bit of chocolate powder in there, like a little bit of [inaudible 00:04:16].

Kim: I like that.

Joyce: Whatever he does, it really says fall to me. So I'm looking forward to that.

Kim: I will look forward to the sample that I'm sure I'm going to get on [inaudible 00:04:27].

Joyce: Girl, come on down. Bob will have y'all. Bob was given Barb a hard time about, should I even say this, football last weekend. I think it's time for the SistersInLaw to gang up on my husband.

Barb: I'm in. I'm ready. I'm down.

Jill: Not if you'll make me some chili. I would be on his side. Hey!

Did you know your dishwasher detergent pods are almost always wrapped in plastic? Of course, you did. That film around your pods is plastic and it's ending up in our oceans, rivers, soil, and even our own bodies. Thankfully, Blueland is doing something about it.

Joyce: Blueland is on a mission to eliminate single use plastic by reinventing cleaning essentials to be better for you and the planet with the same powerful clean you're used to. Their packaging is the perfect fit for my home, and I love how Blueland uses no single use plastic in any component, including their bottles, tablets, wrappers, and shipping. Even the tablet packaging is fully compostable and all of the products are effective and affordable.

Kim: I love their dishwasher tablets. They're proven to perform on baked on, burnt on stains with no rinse aid needed. The clean is insanely good. Never had I had to run a load twice. And the fragrance free tablets have become a family favorite. Now, we enjoy the smell of our food, not a weird chemically smell that can be left by the old kind of dish detergent. I speak for the sisters when I say we're never going back. We're never going back to expensive, wasteful, plastic-coated brands.

Barb: Is that what she means?

Kim: Yes. That's what she means.

Joyce: Never.

Kim: Even better, you can get more saving Blueland by buying refills in bulk or setting up a subscription. Their subscriptions are customizable and convenient, so you never run out of your most used products. You want to try everything they have to offer.

Barb: They're trusted in more than 1 million homes, including ours, and we're excited to share that Blueland has a special offer just for listeners. Right now, get 15% off your first order by going to [blueland.com/sisters](https://blueland.com/sisters). You won't want to miss this. [Blueland.com/sisters](https://blueland.com/sisters) for 15% off. Again, that's [blueland.com/sisters](https://blueland.com/sisters) to get 15% off. Look for the link in our show notes.

Joyce: So the debate, what looks like possibly the only debate between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris is over. And I suspect that if you're like me, you were holding your breath a little bit for those first few moments just to make sure that all would go well and all did go well. I think that was pretty much the wide take on the debate that Kamala Harris just had an outstanding performance that evening, but I haven't had a chance to talk to my sisters yet, and I'm curious to hear what your reactions to the debate were. Kim, what did you think?

Kim: I thought that the vice president did an outstanding job. I went into it knowing that the bar was set very differently for her than it was set for Donald Trump, which is annoying and angering in so many ways that she had to basically pole vault across her bar where it was set. And Donald Trump, essentially all he had to do was step over his and not trip, which I don't think he did, but she completely soared.

She had to introduce herself, she had to talk policy, but she also had to connect with Americans who don't know much about her. She had to deal with Donald Trump over-talking her and saying crazy things, but also prod him a little bit, do a little rope-a-dope to get him to show his true self. And I think she really did an outstanding job of all of those things. And I will say-

Barb: Crowd size. People are bored in his rallies.

Kim: Oh, that was the best. They were leaving early. I mean, you just knew-

Barb: Out of boredom.

Kim: You just knew. You just knew. But what's gratifying for me is I've had a couple of strangers stop me on the street to talk about her performance in the debate and how it went. And I think that's exactly what, that shows proof of a job well done and a winning performance.

Joyce: Yeah, I think that's a good point. I mean, it's easy to forget for people who've been Harris watchers for a long time, and I mean, I think we're all hardwired to appreciate the talents of people who look like us. She's a former prosecutor, so of course prosecutors and women lawyers are going to get what's going on there and be appreciative of her. I too have been amazed by so many people who felt the need to stop me and express surprise

that she did so well because frankly, that was I think the expectation among women lawyers. Jill, what did you make of the debate?

Jill: I was at a watch party and was after the party, I led a discussion, and of course you would not be surprised that people who came to a watch party where I was going to be discussing something would have been fans of the vice president, and they were. They were nervous. They weren't surprised by her doing so well, but they were so relieved that it had gone perfectly. I mean, everyone had a zinger that they thought was the favorite or a gaffe that he had that really made them go, "That really shows who he is."

And I think she really was pitch perfect. She walked the line between being overly aggressive for a woman, and as Kim mentioned, the bar is different for her than it was for him. And the same is true. A man can be much more aggressive in his attack. A woman has to be careful not to be overly aggressive and therefore to offend people in the audience. And she really was perfect. She was exactly presidential and strong. She showed she could stand up to bullies and to foreign dictators like all the ones that Donald Trump loves. And I thought she was just absolutely perfect.

Joyce: Yeah, I mean, I think that that was the assessment, and I heard people say that this was the best debate performance by a candidate in more than 50 years, and that seems to be fair. What really struck me about it, so I did this unusual thing. Y'all know I have a Substack and we did a chat, a live chat during the debate and it made me reflect upon this because as you might expect, that chat was full of thousands of people who were hardcore Democrats, hardcore supporters of the vice president's. And in the media, what we usually see is, at best, Trump supporters or moderate Republicans weighing in on the Democrat. We're not ever treated to this notion of just an entire room full of committed Democrats talking about the strengths of our candidates.

And that's actually the exposure I had during the debate, and it was really uplifting and interesting and a wonderful break from having to listen to all of the MAGA crazy. So I highly recommend to our listeners that you take advantage of opportunities to surround yourself with like-minded people just to give yourself a little bit of a break from the pressure that's all around us from the pro-Trump forces. I think we all deserve that, and I was grateful that the vice president gave us that. So Barb, what was your takeaway from the debate?

Barb: Well, one, I was on your Substack and it was really fun.

Joyce: I know you were.

Barb: It was fun. You'd share a comment and you'd see other people's reaction to it. So kudos to you for hosting that because people were able to share in real time their reaction to some of the things they were hearing. So I thought that was a really interesting exercise in civil discourse. So I thought that was great. First, may I just say as the tall one of the group of the SistersInLaw, love it to see Kamala Harris walk out like a boss in her navy blue suit. I mean, prosecutors, that's the uniform.

Joyce: It is.

Barb: You walk out in the navy blue suit and she walks over to Trump who shows no interest in shaking her hand. So she's got to go not only past her own podium, not only past the middle of the stage, all the way over to his podium and fearlessly sticks out her hand in a friendly, not hostile way. They've never met before. And she says, "Kamala Harris." She introduced. And he grudgingly takes her hand, but I thought she really owned that moment. And may I add all 5'4" of her, she's 5'4", what a boss.

Joyce: I love it. She's taller than you, Barb.

Jill: 5'7" with her high heels, Barb. 5'7".

Barb: She is small but mighty, so I love that he's 6'3" and she fearlessly approached him, and I really thought it was just a great moment. So that I love. I always am looking and hearing and listening for disinformation that has become my singular focus in life these days.

Kim: Oh, my God. You must have been exhausted.

Barb: Yeah, it was exhausting. But we've already made a comment about eating of pets, and I really do want to talk about some of the disinformation and the other about her earrings were a listening device with someone feeding her the answers. Even when Trump said, "Crime is up." Absolutely not true. He used so many of the classic tools of disinformation used by authoritarians throughout history. I mean, this dog eating thing. This is not harmless. This is not funny. It's made up, it's baseless, but why does he do it? He does it because he wants to portray Haitian immigrants as other, scary, not like us, barbaric. That is a trope that people have used about Jewish people, about minorities and others. It's a scare tactic, and that's why he leaned into it. It doesn't even matter if it's not true because it just reminds people of this danger of immigrants, which is part of his narrative, so false. And of course, we learned in recent days extremely dangerous, extremely harmful because that city got threats to it. City hall, they had to close down their schools. It's a terrible thing that they're engaging in.

This thing about her earrings are a listening device. Again, do people believe it's true? Probably some do, probably some know it's a joke, but they're trafficking in this because it suggests that she's not smart enough, whether it's because she's a woman or she's a minority, she's not smart enough to say all of these smart things that she said. No, she said these things because she was prepared. She cares enough about the dignity of this office and the seriousness of this moment that she spent a lot of time and it was clear preparing for those questions to give the best answer that she could.

And I thought that the other thing that was so offensive was when asked whether he regretted his answer about raising her race, that she recently turned Black, he doubles down on it and he reminds people that she is a minority and that she's a woman. Because once again, I don't care if she's Black, Black, Black, Black. And the way he says it too, he says it with such disdain, "She's Black." And then, he also throws in right in the middle of that, "And she put out. Yep, there, I'll say it." What is that all about? So degrading her, it's sexism, it's misogyny, it's racism, but it's all out there just to remind people of all of those things that she's not one of us. She's not the kind of strong male leader that we've always had as a president here. And so, that also is a tactic of disinformation. So I just wanted to share those observations.

Kim: Can I just add, I just want to say to that point, Barb, and on that put out notice, I had a lot of people push back on me saying, "Well, I'm not sure that that's what he meant." I think he said that she put out something about being... I'm like, first of all, she never put out anything about being Black. She just lived her life. So the fact that he said, "She put out." And then he said, "All right, I'll say it." It's like he punch... That's exactly what he means. So one part of the important thing about disinformation, let's stop sand washing. It's this idea to say, "Oh, well maybe he meant..." No, Donald Trump has never had nuance. Donald Trump says exactly what he means as bluntly as possible, using the fewest and simplest words that he can. Believe him, believe him, no sane washing.

Jill: I want to point out two other really horrible things he did. You're right, Barb, about the earrings, and I don't know how many of you follow fashion, but Tiffany's sells those earrings. And if you look Tiffany earrings, they are exactly what she was wearing, period, end of sentence. And secondly, when you said-

Barb: But you don't have a transmitter in your earrings, Jill?

Jill: Of course, I do. How do you think I know what to say?

Barb: Some smart man is in the next room transmitting all the answers.

Jill: Exactly, of course. Behind every smart woman, there has to be a man manipulating her. But the other thing was his shocking statement about, "I don't know, I think she had those questions because she seemed to really be prepared for those questions." Well, honey, anybody who was preparing for a debate who wanted to be the president would've thought, "Gee, I think I'll be asked a question about immigration. Gee, I think I'll be asked." Of course, she was prepared for those questions because they were the obvious questions that any candidate would be asked. Why was he not prepared?

Barb: Who could have seen that coming? A question on the economy?

Jill: Exactly.

Barb: Who could have seen that coming?

Kim: He was asked about a healthcare plan. Who would expect to have a healthcare plan at a presidential debate?

Jill: Yeah.

Joyce: Kim, to your point about sane washing, I think not only does the media do that all too often for Trump, and that's this new term, if you haven't heard it yet, that's come into vogue about Trump to say, "Oh, well, even though the words that came out of grandpa's mouth made no sense, here's what he really meant to say." And that's become shorthand for that practice that Trump supporters have done really since the beginning that the media does. But what worries me the most is when I see people in the public or in the community doing. Even people who don't like Trump, who say, "Oh, well, no one could have ever meant what he actually said, so he must have meant X." And I think we need to quit doing that. The whole point is Trump gets away with lying. He gets away with the

disinformation because we let him, and I think this is a zero tolerance moment where every time he does it, he needs to be called out. Maybe that's by the media, but maybe that's by me tonight over drinks with my girlfriends.

Barb: That sounds like a concept of a plan.

Joyce: It could be the concept of a plan, absolutely. But here's the difference between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris. She has ideas, she turns them into actual plans, and then she puts them into motion and people benefit because it's Kamala Harris for the people. And that's what we saw at the debate. Okay, well look, obviously this is a topic that gets us all, or at least it gets me a little bit angry because I have had enough of listening to people try to make sanity out of Donald Trump's insane notions. But I do want to belabor the point about the debate just a little bit because I think you guys each have interesting perspective. And Kim, I'm curious, did you see it differently as a journalist than you did just as a person, as a lawyer, as a woman? Does your journalistic assessment give you any different sorts of insight into how Harris did?

Kim: Well, it gave me insight both in how she did, but also how the debate was carried out. I was really gratified to see at least some level of fact checking, at least in the first half of the debate. It started waning toward the end where the moderators did a really good job of just stating, as a matter of fact, things that Trump said that were absolutely wrong. I think that's important. And I was aware as a journalist that this was an event that a lot of people were watching, watching with their own eyes in real time.

And so, having some, and it is a journalistic endeavor, that's why it's hosted by members of the press. So I think the fact that we had some controls in there, Donald Trump stepped over the mike off rule, which at the end of the day, fine, I think America should hear what he has to say and what he's saying under his breath to the vice president. So I wasn't that unhappy with that rule going out of the window, but it did feel like a journalistic event and not just a platform for Donald Trump just to spew whatever he wants without any limitations. So in that sense, yes, I thought it was good.

Jill: The last time in the debate, there was a lot of defensiveness about, well, journalists can't be part of the debate, so we can't do the fact checking. And I think this time, they did a brilliant job of just picking out some of the most egregious things and confronting him with them. And then, he has these stupid answers like, "Well, I saw it on television, so it must be true." That was in defense of saying that in Springfield, they're eating your pets. And I thought they did a really good job. It was a highlight for me to see the journalists doing it in a really good way.

Joyce: Hey, Jill, I have a question about how you viewed another aspect of the debate. You're our tireless advocate for the ERA, and I'm interested in how you reacted to the weird criticisms. There were people talking about how she looked, her hair, her facial expressions, how do you react to that?

Jill: So I would answer all those comments as she was perfect. She looked presidential and that's what we should be talking about, not what she was wearing. Her hair looked great, but it looked presidential. That's what's important. I, of course, am extremely sensitive to this kind of thing as the victim in the early days of practicing being the only woman and news coverage always starting with what I wore before I talked about what I said in

court. So I'm particularly sensitive to the sexism that that portrays and ERA isn't going to change it. Only a culture shift is going to change that, and we need to be aware of that so that we stop talking about those things. Although in fairness, we do talk about the extra long red tie, and we saw pictures of these two twins. I don't know if you saw David Kennerly, who was the White House photographer, oh gosh, 40 years ago, posted a thing with two twins from *The Shining* looking evil and horrible standing next to Trump and Vance in their identical blue suits and long red ties.

So there is some comment, and we talked about Walz wearing his lumberjack shirts, so maybe there's some equalization, but we talked about Obama's beige suit, which was a whole new thing about talking about how men dress. Let's grow up guys, and let's talk about what people are saying because as good as her performance was, as good as she was in how she spoke and how she got under his skin without really being offensive, she also talked about policy. She also talked about what she's going to do to move us forward, and that's what we should be talking about.

Joyce: Yeah, I think that's an important point because the policy position she took largely got lost in a lot of the other conversation. And Barb, you wrote a really interesting piece about the stakes for the election given the supreme Court's broad grant of immunity to presidents in the last term. What's your take on the meaning and focus that that should bring to this entire process?

Barb: Yeah, I thought one of the most significant points Kamala Harris made during the debate was to explain that sometimes you hear people say, "Look, he's been president before and the world didn't end." Although, certainly, I think some of us have extreme concerns about what did happen in the first Trump administration. "So you shouldn't be worried about a second Trump administration." Kamala Harris has a really important point. She said, "Following the Supreme Court's immunity decision, a second Trump administration would mean a president with no guardrails."

And so, it's going to be a very different presidency than we've had before. We've already seen that the Senate is incapable of convicting a president because you need 60 votes, and there are too many members of their own party who will not convict members of their own party. In the past, we at least had the risk, the deterrence, the specter of criminal prosecution to check a president from abusing his power. We don't have that anymore when it comes to a president engaging in official acts. So when Donald Trump promises to prosecute his rivals and be your revenge, when he says he's going to be a dictator for a day, when he says all of these cases against him are going to be thrown out, there is no recourse. A second Trump administration would be one that is untethered from the law. And as she said, "We now know that this court will not stop him. It's up to the American people to stop him." I thought that was maybe the most profound statement of the night.

Joyce: Well, look, we are all obviously fans of the vice president's performance, but do y'all think that the debate moved the needle with voters? And I hate to say voters that matter, because I deeply believe all voters matter, but we know that the outcome of presidential elections is decided by relatively a small number of voters in a few states. What do you think, Barb? Did the needle get moved in this at all?

Barb: I don't know. Who are these undecided voters? How can you possibly still be undecided? How can you not know who these people are after all of this time? So it's hard for me to

get into their heads, but I would like to think that for people who did not know much about Kamala Harris or believed some of the false claims they'd heard about her, had to have been impressed with her. I mean, she used all the tools a good prosecutor uses. It was as if she was doing cross-examination and closing argument. She had facts, she had evidence, she had arguments. And so, I hope that she was able to draw a contrast between herself and Donald Trump. But it's hard to know that our elections these days because of the Electoral College come down to a handful of swing states and even within those states, to a handful of people who I think often view an election as how it's going to affect their lives.

And for people who are hurting financially, I don't know which of these presentations is most persuadable to them, but I guess we'll see. But I think one of the things I've read post-debate is that Kamala Harris believes that this election will be what's referred to in baseball, as a game of inches. A fair ball is a foul ball. Home run is an out by a matter of inches in a close game, and so that she's not taking anything for granted and is going to work. And in retrospect, I'm sure Hillary Clinton worked as hard as she thought she needed to do, but here in the swing states, in the blue wall of Michigan, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, voter turnout was not high. And there was some thought after the fact that perhaps she did not campaign as vigorously here as she could have. I've been seeing Harris and Walz here all the time. And so, one hopes that they'll be here to try to convince some of those swing and undecided voters that they have their best interest at heart.

Joyce: Yeah, I mean, I think that's a big deal. I note with interest that the campaign seems to be spending a little bit of time in Georgia, in North Carolina, in Florida. Florida's always the great white whale for Democratic voters in the South. I mean, often thought to be in play, only rarely has been, but I think it's great that the campaign is clearly trying to talk, and I think in particular, to moderate women voters in those areas. Kim, what was your takeaway? Did the debate move the needle at all? Is that maybe why the campaign has made some of those moves?

Kim: I don't know. I'm out of the game of predicting what people will do based on anything. But one thing that I can say is that I hope for, like you were talking about people in the margins and who does Harris need to try to persuade, folks like young people who are disaffected and might stay home rather than voting for anyone, or conservatives in the vein of Bush conservatives and Reagan conservatives who care about the United States standing in the world and how clear she was.

For example, on her answer about Ukraine, which was so great and common sense call juxtaposed Donald Trump's refusal to say that he wanted Ukraine to win the war that Russia initiated, and things like that, that would get people to say, "You know what? I may not, I'm not a liberal. I may not like all of Kamala Harris's policies, but she speaks like somebody who can lead a nation and keep it from absolute chaos. And so, for this election, I can make that one vote. I can be like Liz Cheney or Dick Cheney, and just for this one election, save our country so that we can rebuild it."

Joyce: Yeah, I think that's a smart point. Jill, did you see any shift, any possible signs of optimism following the debate?

Jill: The group I was with, as I said, was clearly in her corner anyway, but they were very reluctant to say that she won because she didn't have a knockout, they said. And I questioned them on that because, one, I don't think she needed a knockout. She needed to introduce herself to that handful of people in the six states that matter in this election. And I thought she introduced herself in a way that said, "I am presidential timber. I will take care of you. I have the plans and the policies to do it," and that she showed him to be the incompetent, awful person that he is. I was disappointed that she didn't say one thing, which is when he kept saying, "Well, you've been vice president for three and a half years. If these are such great things you're going to do them. Why didn't you do them?" And I wanted to ask, "Why didn't you do them? You were president for four years and you didn't do any of the things you promised to do." But other than that, I had no criticism of anything she did.

And I also said something about making sure that we campaign for women to support her, because there has been a history of women not supporting them. And I've had conversations with them and who say, "Well, can't vote for her because she's not strong enough to stand up to dictators and I need a bully who will be a bully for me." And even though you say, "Well, he is a bully, but he's not going to be a bully for you. He's going to be a bully for his own interests." I was surprised I got pushback saying, "Women have saved democracy in the past and they'll do it again." So I hope that's true and that women are going to be very supportive of her in ways that they weren't of Hillary and that it can make the difference in who's going to win this election.

Joyce: Whether your style is fresh-faced, full glam, or somewhere in between, you've probably seen Thrive Causemetics' viral tubing mascara. It's the one in the turquoise tube all over your socials. Thrive has so many other amazing products, and each one is certified as 100% vegan and cruelty-free with zero parabens, sulfates, or phthalates. It's easy to see why Thrive's bestsellers have thousands of five-star reviews.

Barb: Yeah, I think I told you guys, my friend Mojo did a swim across Torch Lake in northern Michigan, and I asked her afterwards how it went, and she said, "My Thrive Causemetics mascara made it for the whole swim." So it outlasted the swim and yours will too. But I also want to mention about the name, because cause is in the name for a reason. Thrive not only defines luxury beauty, they give back too. Every purchase supports organizations that help communities thrive. Thrive Causemetics donates to eight major causes, including those impacted by cancer and domestic abuse, veteran and education organizations, and more. I'm so glad we're a part of it. Like us, you'll look and feel great with Thrive. What's your favorite product right now, Kim?

Kim: I'm not sure I can pick one. The mascara is the GOAT. That's the greatest of all times. And I also really like their eyeshadow sticks because they don't make your eyelids look blotchy or ashy, but I also really like their new EmpowerMatte precision lipstick crayon. It goes on very easily, but it lasts forever and it doesn't have that dried-on caked-on feel that long-lasting lipsticks can sometimes have. I have used a bunch of colors, but I like brandy because it goes on smoothly, but it really looks natural. You can wear it day or night. And this perfect two-in-one lipstick and liner allows you to line, define, and fill in all in one step. It even has a built-in sharpener. So cool, it reminds me of school. And better yet, it's waterproof and sweat-proof and lasts up to 12 hours while delivering rich opaque pigmentation. You'll love how it glides on tug-free giving you even color across

the lips with the bold non-sticky, velvety finish. Just allow it to set and you'll get 12 hours of hydration and wear.

Jill: It's a really amazing product. I was surprised at how accurate that description is. It really works, but Thrive has so much more to offer. So refresh your everyday look with Thrive Causemetics, beauty that gives back. I recently tried some new colors and I love the golden bronzy tones that are perfect for fall. Right now, you can get an exclusive 20% off your first order at [thrivecausemetics.com/sisters](https://thrivecausemetics.com/sisters). That's Thrive Causemetics, C-A-U-S-E-M-E-T-I-C-S.com/sisters for 20% off your first order. You can find the link to your perfect daily look in our show notes.

Barb: This week brought a federal indictment against two American men with conspiring to promote a white supremacist terrorist network that calls itself the Terrorgram Collective. The men allegedly use Telegram, the encrypted app, to communicate with others all over the world. The indictment alleges that they conspired to recruit, radicalize, and equip others to carry out attacks on federal officials and critical infrastructure to incite and accelerate a race war against Black, immigrant, LGBT, and Jewish people. The indictment alleges that the two men, one from California and one from Idaho, were also responsible for soliciting an actual shooting in Slovakia and a stabbing in Turkey. Joyce, I want to start with you because you wrote about this in your Substack. Can you tell us more about your views of this indictment, and in particular, help us understand this concept of acceleration?

Joyce: Yeah, I think that's the right place to focus on this case because acceleration is what makes the indictment and the whole situation so concerning, or should make it concerning for all of us. The goal here that this group had was to accelerate the downfall of American democracy by taking actions like attacks on leaders that were designed to break our society apart. So accelerationism is actually a formal ideology and it's centered on the belief that the white race is superior, that society is irreparably corrupt and cannot be saved by political action, and that violence and terrorism are necessary to ignite a race war and accelerate the collapse of government and the rise of a white ethnostate. And if that sounds familiar to you, if maybe you grew up on the West Coast and are about my age someplace in your early 60s or later, this might sound eerily reminiscent of Charles Manson and the Manson cult because it's that same notion that race war, the promotion of race war is the goal.

So look, we are already a fragile democracy, and it's not difficult to understand how a few acts of violence could set off the powder keg. That's why it's so important that DOJ brought this indictment. They indicted two people, a California man named Dallas Humber, an Idaho man named Matthew Allison. It's a 15 count indictment. They're charged with being the leaders of a transnational terrorist group, and they are charged with civil rights violations, including soliciting others to engage in hate crimes. They wrote very deliberate manuals for how to commit those crimes, charged with soliciting others to engage in terrorist attacks against Black people, immigrants, LGBTQ people, and Jewish people. And they were using social media platforms like Telegram to achieve their goals.

I'll just point out one of the worst things that I read about in the indictment, and it really is a list of horrors if you read through it, but one of the acts that they're charged with is creating something called the list, which is just what it sounds like. It's a hit list. And on

that hit list, they named individuals who they wanted their followers to target for violence often because of their race, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or gender identity. And it included federal officials including a United States senator, a United States district court judge, and a former United States attorney. They didn't identify any of them by name, but those people plus state officials, municipal officials, and leaders of private companies and non-government organizations, and that's the nexus of terror and criminal conduct here.

Barb: Yeah, thanks for breaking that down. You think that if the US attorneys were either of us, they would've told us, right?

Joyce: I'm hoping. Yeah. I mean-

Barb: I didn't get notification.

Joyce: I immediately, I wondered who it was.

Barb: Yeah, I'm hoping that we're just not that big a deal, so I hope it's not us. Yeah, this idea of acceleration I think is super interesting, and I think it is something that has been present in these anti-government groups, in these white supremacy groups for decades and people who are not familiar with it, to them, it sounds kind of kooky. When we were investigating and prosecuting militia groups, for example, in Michigan, we bring these cases where this group of guys who were shooting things in the woods and building bombs wanted to do this. They wanted to participate in this acceleration, this idea of a civil war, start a war with the federal government in hopes that they would retaliate excessively and it would set off this whole race war. To an ordinary citizen, that really sounds kind of kooky. And so, sometimes it's a real uphill battle to get judges and juries to understand that just because they might not succeed in what they're planning to do does not make them less dangerous. In fact, if anything, the fact that they're so irrational might make them even more dangerous than you might assume.

So let me move on to you, Jill. One of the things I found interesting about this indictment is something that we have not really seen much before. It was a joint announcement from the National Security Division, which ordinarily handles terrorism cases, and the Civil Rights Division, which ordinarily handles hate crimes cases. They were both together in this case, which seems to be a cross between traditional terrorism hate crimes cases. Should we be thinking of terrorism and hate crimes separately or is this signaling a new era of thinking about them together or should we have been thinking about them together all along?

Jill: I think we probably should have all along, although they are, I want to point out both separate crimes and you can commit an act of terrorism without it being a hate crime. 9/11, which we just had the anniversary of, was definitely terrorism, but it wasn't aimed at a particular group. It was aimed at Americans and democracy, but it wasn't a hate crime. And not all hate crimes are terrorism. Some of them are just hate crimes against an individual. But in this case, they were doing both at the same time. And so, it made sense to have an indictment that includes both of those things as indictable offenses and to make sure that the defendants were arrested before it was announced because obviously there was some fear that they would do some damage or flee, and so that's why they were arrested in this kept secret until after the arrest.

Barb: Yeah, I think it's really interesting. I remember, Joyce, do you remember this when there was, I think it was the shooting in Charleston, South Carolina, by-

Joyce: At Mother Emanuel Church?

Barb: Yeah, when I won't name his name, but the shooter came in and shot up and killed a number of people at that church, and he was charged with hate crimes. There was no terrorism charge for mass shootings, which I think is a gap in the law. And I remember Loretta Lynch who was at the time the attorney general was speaking about this case and people were pushing her and saying, "Why didn't you charge this case with terrorism? Why didn't you charge terrorism?" She said, "Look, there's not a terrorism statute for a mass shooting in a church." But let me say this, I think hate crimes are the original terrorism charge. It is designed to provoke terror and fear in particular communities, to intimidate, to prevent them from engaging in all of the rights and privileges in society. So I really think that these two concepts are really very, very similar.

Well, Kim, let me ask you, whenever you start engaging in criminal intervention, when people are expressing some viewpoint about the world, sometimes there is a tension with First Amendment rights of free speech and First Amendment rights of free association. And I'll also note this indictment comes at a time when the founder of Telegram, which was the social media platform that the Terrorgram group was using, the founder of Telegram has been arrested in France for permitting the platform to be used to facilitate crimes. And some people have argued that his arrest is a violation of free speech. I don't know that that could happen in the United States, but it's happened in France. Do you have any concerns about this indictment and its tension with free expression or free association?

Kim: No. I mean, because even under... I mean, I know this is France.

Barb: I like your candor.

Kim: But under the principles of the First Amendment here, which is very, very strong protections, even then the First Amendment does not protect against elements of a crime. And there are so many crimes, including hate crimes that have an aspect that requires communication, requires planning. That's why you can, if people speak in coordination to committing a crime, that's conspiracy. That's part of the conspiracy. There is speech that is not fully protected when being done to serve a criminal purpose, and in this case, it's a national security threat to boot. We certainly didn't care about the ability of Osama Bin Laden to talk to other terrorists in his network. So I would equate it to something like that. So I'm a strong proponent of freedom of speech, but this ain't it.

Barb: Yeah, totally agree. There's a difference between speech and conduct, and this case is all about conduct. Let me just turn briefly to one other event involving the Department of Justice this week. You may have seen that Merrick Garland gave a big speech in what's called DOJ's Great Hall. It's in the Robert F. Kennedy main justice building, huge hall. It was also streamed live to the rest of DOJ's 150,000 employees to whom Garland expressed his thanks. Joyce, what did you think was the purpose of this speech. We're coming on election season. Why do you suppose Merrick Garland was giving the speech now?

Joyce: Yeah, I doubt it had much to do with the election. I think it had more to do with the fact that all of the United States attorneys were in town for their yearly conference. So the attorney general used it as an opportunity to address the entire workforce, and that's not unusual. Attorneys general might do that once a year or maybe once every other year. They might do it when something really critical happens. But to me, this sounded like the kind of speech you give when you're about to be out, when you're about to drop the microphone.

Barb: Yeah. Didn't it?

Joyce: And although they're important for morale, attorneys general do this from time to time, this speech capped a month of really hard hitting impressive indictments, and they came after DOJ has taken a lot of criticism, particularly for hanging back when it came to Trump in January 6th. So I think the attorney general felt entitled to tout the good job DOJ was doing and to tell folks in the field and in Washington that they were doing a great job and that he was proud of them. But I really do think this is a prelude to his departure and maybe he'll only be a one-term attorney general.

Barb: Yeah. It's funny you should say that because the word that came to my mind was valedictory, the farewell, carry on, thank you, let's review what we've accomplished together. I kind of did too. He also talked about he was very disgusted by the threats that have befallen Justice Department prosecutors and wanted to say, "You should not have to endure this, but thank you for the work that you do."

Kim, I want to ask you this question, and that is Merrick Garland has been accused of weaponizing the Department of Justice by Donald Trump and Jim Jordan and some others who are critics of the current administration. Did it sound defensive? Do you think he was there to, he talked a lot about the integrity and the independence of the department and about how decisions are made. He talked about the principles of federal prosecution, how important it is to not use politics as decision points. Did you think he was being in any way defensive of that sort of criticism?

Kim: I think that the job of the attorney general is to defend his department and the people in it. So I thought he was doing exactly what he ought to have been doing. And in the process, giving the Americans a civics lesson in what the DOJ is supposed to do and not supposed to do, and certainly defending his department. I personally wish he had done a lot more of this along the way and not in the interest of keeping with how things are institutionally done, wait until we get to a point of absolute crazy where Donald Trump and his associates are spreading all kinds of unfounded lies and really misinforming, disinforming the nation about the role of the DOJ. I wish he had done more of this earlier.

Barb: Yeah, he has periodically, he talked about this when he first, day one, when he was introducing himself to the country, I think one year after January 6th, he gave a speech like this and he's gone to Congress and said some of these kinds of things. But of course, the parts, the clips that make the news are the clips where senators are accusing him of violating the First Amendment rights of parents and other kinds of things. So I think Merrick Garland certainly is one who has worked pretty hard to tout the independence and the integrity of the department maybe to a fault.

And Jill, I want to come around to that side because certainly there are critics who have accused Merrick Garland of moving too slowly to charge Donald Trump with a crime, and now we find ourselves on the eve of another election, and Trump has not yet gone to trial in either of the federal cases. Do you think he was being a little defensive there like, "Hey, look, if you want to be independent and have integrity and follow the principles, this is the price you might have to pay." Do you think he sounded defensive about that?

Jill: So let me say, I lived through this once before because Watergate, there was an attorney general, Edward Levi, who deliberately set out to restore the credibility of the department and took care to act slowly. Let me just say that if Merrick Garland intended this to be a defense of the slow action, it was too subtle and too nuanced to be effective. So it failed to be a defense, even though I think a lot of people would like a defense, and it's not a defense to say, "Well, we have these rules and therefore we can't," because you look at how fast they've acted on other things, including Iran attacking Donald Trump, and they're going right away after that. So I don't think it was effective. It may have been intended as a defense, but I was not impressed.

Barb: Yeah, I have read some very scathing criticisms of Merrick Garland along the lines that you are suggesting that he had one big case and whether it's fair or not fair, he failed to bring that case to trial during the time in the four years he served as attorney general. I will, however, defend him because I think the most important thing a leader can defend is the mission of their organization. And the mission of this organization is to do justice, not to go after political enemies. And the job of a Department of Justice is not to prevent people from being on the ballot or to prevent people from voting from them. It is to hold people accountable.

I know many people, and there's been reporting on this, say that they sat around for the first year and focused only on the physical attackers on the Capitol and not on Donald Trump. But the official line on that has been, yes, they did. They were going after cell phones and they were litigating privilege issues because Trump and his minions have fought every step of the way, tooth and nail, and it takes time. I prosecuted a big case. I oversaw the prosecution of a big case during the time I was US attorney of the former mayor of Detroit. Now, luckily, I got to serve two terms, so I had a chance to see it through to fruition, but it had already been ongoing for years when I became US attorney in 2010. We got it indicted. It was tried and sentenced by 2013.

It took a long time to bring that case, and there were a lot of criticism. Why haven't you charged this case? Why hasn't this case been charged yet? The January 6th committee had those hearings, but putting on one side of a case without any cross examination, without lawyers on the other side, without having to rely on the rules of evidence with being able to use hearsay is one thing, and proving a case beyond a reasonable doubt by a jury unanimously is quite another. And so, to the extent Merrick Garland's job was to uphold and restore independence and public trust in the Department of Justice, I think he's done his job.

Jill: I have to just add that I don't agree completely because in Watergate it took us 18 months from our appointment to a jury verdict. That included a tapes hearing. It included going to the Supreme Court. We could have gone on for years. There was so much more to be revealed, but at some point you have to say, "I have some crimes here and it's time to hold someone accountable, and I'm stopping." And I think that's the mistake.

Kim: So in one way, this is my least favorite time of the year because I have exactly zero vacations planned. I took a couple over the summer, but it's still important to take care of yourself, and that means taking a moment for self-care and reconnecting with your body. And for me, one way I like to do that is going all out with what I call an everything shower routine, and I use OSEA. It makes me feel like I'm in a spa. I've started incorporating their new Undaria Algae body wash, and it's iconic, all-natural, uplifting, citrusy scent that takes me away to a personal tropical paradise every time I use it.

Barb: Wow, all that in the shower?

Kim: Yeah, it's great.

Joyce: But Kim's right. It feels like the Undaria Algae body wash infuses your shower with the healing power of the sea. I usually wait until I finish up what I'm using to start with something new. But I tested it out and promptly pushed everything else aside. The formula is nourishing, and that's thanks to its nutrient-rich Undaria seaweed, glycerin, and oil blend. Combine the ingredients give you a gentler plant-based cleaning experience with an all-natural scent that won't give you a headache. Plus the pH-balanced hydrating formula doesn't strip your skin and leaves it feeling soft and renewed.

Jill: OSEA's Undaria Algae body wash is definitely an everything shower staple. It supports the skin's moisture barrier and the natural plant-based ingredients leave your skin soft, smooth, and revitalized with a gentler cleaning experience than traditional body washes. It smells so good. It is totally immersive for the whole environment. It puts you into an experience with the same famous and uplifting citrusy scent as the best-selling Undaria Algae body oil, which we all love. The notes of grapefruit, lime, and cypress blend with sweet mango mandarin to make using it a real treat. If you're like me, you'll never want the shower experience to end. So make sure you have enough hot water to embrace every moment. Now, I consider it the scent of summer, but it will be great as a reminder of summer when fall starts. I can't wait to enjoy it all year round.

Barb: Well, I'll tell you the all-year scent that works for me is that body butter, that OSEA, man, that is some good stuff. That smells so good, I've said it before, but it makes me want to eat it. It smells so good. It smells like, I don't know, something baking in the oven. Check out the body butter. But we also like it that OSEA is women-founded and led, and we love that OSEA has been making clinically proven seaweed-infused products that are safe for your skin and for the planet for more than 28 years. Everything is clean, vegan, cruelty-free, and climate neutral certified. With OSEA, you never have to choose between your values and your best skin. So upgrade your shower with clean, vegan face and body care from OSEA. Get 10% off your first order site-wide with code SISTERS at oseamalibu.com. You'll get free samples with every order and free shipping on orders over \$60. Head to O-S-E-A malibu.com and use code SISTERS for 10% off.

Jill: Another episode of Project 2025, and this week we're going to look at chapter 18, which is really more like Project 1924 than 2025 because it removes protections we've long counted on from the Department of Labor and its related agencies like the EEOC and the NLRB. And rather than strengthening the American worker, the proposals in this document would eradicate long-standing reforms that ensure the workplaces are fair and promote equal opportunities for all. The reforms often sound reasonable until you think about what they really mean. They take away the powers that Congress gave to these

agencies to prevent exactly what Project 2025 wants to do now. They are so draconian and there are so many of them that we may need more than one episode to talk about this chapter. So I'm going to ask each of you to start by telling me which of the dozens of possibilities that I listed for you you want to talk about. Which do you think is the most significant terrible thing and why? Kim, why don't you start?

Kim: Well, I think one concern that I have, which is similar to that of other provisions throughout Project 2025 is this idea of focusing on the traditional family and what the traditional family means. So to me, what that means is as part of instituting, purging these agencies and filling them with acolytes to the MAGA mission, what's going to happen is you're going to see a reduction in certain benefits, the ability of folks that they could get, things like child care allotment. We've already heard people like JD Vance say, "No, childcare is either the mother staying at home and caring for their children or getting grandma or someone else to care for them." I am very much afraid for that, and that we won't protect childcare, we won't prioritize family leave, which is crucial for not just our families, but for our economy, for people to be able to do these jobs.

We have already seen provisions within Project 2025 that would take away benefits to federal workers themselves. So if they're going to take cut out overtime payments, if they're going to cut out paid leave, if they're going to make it more difficult to get a promotion, if you're working in the federal government, what do you think that the Department of Labor is going to do to regulations covering other workers? They're already signaling out loud that they don't prioritize the need to care for children in a way that is necessary for working people regardless of their gender. You guys, everybody should have protections that allow you to care for your kids, especially when they're newly born. So I really fear for all of those types of benefits, and I already know people who work, who have worked in agencies, including the Department of Labor who have already left just out of the potential that Donald Trump could return and Project 2025 can get ahold of these agencies.

Jill: Yeah, it's really strange that the mission statement says they want to restore the family as the centerpiece of American life. What does that have to do with the Department of Labor's role? But okay, Joyce, what's your most horrible thing that you want to talk about?

Joyce: Yeah. I'm not sure if I have one most horrible, but I'll tell you one that weighs heavily on my mind these days is the way that Project 2025 would widen the systemic inequities in the workplace because it calls for gutting all of the diversity, equity, and inclusion programs in the workplace. And it really, I don't know how DEI became such a buzzword for conservatives, but it has become that, and they insist that the next conservative administration has to eliminate all of these projects. They claim that they're ideological and that they're burdensome.

And Project 2025 also proposes an amendment to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the big statute that's used to push back against discrimination in the workplace. And that amendment would prohibit collecting EEO-1 data. It's data like race that's collected, that's the benchmark that lets workplaces know how they're doing. So by ending collecting demographic data and prohibiting any DEI programming, the only thing that's going to happen is that our workplaces are going to become more and more discriminatory for people who want to trend that way. In other words, it will enable people's worst impulses.

And that I think is really undercutting the entire reason we have a department of labor, but it's consistent with really the hostility to this federal level agency that just permeates this plan.

Jill: And Barb, do you have one that you want to point out?

Barb: So many to choose from, Jill. Designating the Sabbath, for example. Whose Sabbath? But I digress. I just want to talk about one in particular. You may recall that the Supreme Court in an opinion authored by Justice Neil Gorsuch, one of the conservatives, a case called *Bostock versus Clayton County*, held that equal non-discrimination provisions in Title VII protected sex discrimination included sexual orientation and transgender rights because you can't fire somebody on the basis of sex. And in his own inimitable way, Justice Gorsuch talked about if a woman introduces her husband Bob at a party, that's perfectly acceptable. And then, if a man introduces his husband Bob at a work party and gets fired as a result of that, that is an adverse employment decision on the basis of race. So it should include sexual orientation and transgender rights. Project 2025 would make it clear, change the law to make it clear that sex discrimination does not protect sexual orientation or transgender status in the context of hiring or firing. So people could be fired for those things going forward.

Jill: Well, that's three of the many, many possible topics we could have chosen, and I, for one, am going to say we should do another episode on chapter 18.

Joyce: It's great to be able to give yourself the perfect home manicure with Olive and June's salon grade tools and their colors are fabulous too. We've all been scrutinizing the vice president's performance at the presidential debate. I saw some folks online who were scrutinizing her nails, and her manicure was excellent. My guess is that it could have been, I mean, who knows what she uses, but the color looked an awful lot like Olive and June's afternoon tea color, which is my personal favorite right now. 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 seven days or more, and you get fantastic savings because it breaks down to just \$2 a manicure.

Kim: And I can guarantee if you use it, there will be no transmission devices in your manicure that can hear messages, but you can count on the mani system for salon worthy nails. It's so convenient and relaxing to do it at home. I literally just did my nails right before we started recording because I knew I could get it done quickly and happily, and I didn't want y'all scrutinizing my nails while we're recording. You definitely won't miss scheduling appointments or traveling to a salon, and it's great knowing you'll be looking your best while saving time and money. My friends, my families, and my SistersInLaw all love it. Anyone who has seen the great colors they offer will be 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. Maybe we can do that in New York City.

Jill: I think that'd be great.

Joyce: That's a date.

Jill: And the best color right now for me is blue. I want my nails to be blue because I want a blue wave, so that's why I'm wearing blue. And the best thing about it is they have these quick dry polishes that only take about a minute to dry. I know it sounds amazing, but it's really true. That's why you save time and you can still feel confident knowing your mani will last for five or more days with only one or two coats. 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 quickly, look real, and last a really long time. 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 Olive and June is an Allure best of beauty winner.

Barb: Olive and June has so many amazing products. You need to try them for yourself. Visit [oliveandjune.com/sil](http://oliveandjune.com/sil) for 20% off your first system. That's O-L-I-V-E-A-N-D-J-U-N-E.com/S-I-L for 20% off your first system. You can also find the link in our show notes.

Kim: We have now reached what is truly, truly our favorite part of the show, and that is answering your questions. If you have a question for us, email us at [sistersinlaw@politicon.com](mailto:sistersinlaw@politicon.com) or tag us on social media. Use #SistersInLaw. And if we don't get to your question during the show, keep an eye on your socials and we'll answer as many there as we can. Up front, we have a question for Barbara from Barbara. The question is, I was taught that the import of Lex talionis, an eye for an eye, et cetera, was that even retributive justice should be proportional. Is that correct, and is it legal principle that informs our loss? Good question.

Barb: It is. You may recall last week we talked about retribution as a basis for sentencing, and it is one of the recognized purposes of sentencing along with deterrence, rehabilitation, and public safety through incapacitation. But this question of proportionality is true. So the Supreme Court has said, "Ordinarily we're going to defer to the legislature to decide what a punishment ought to be." If it's 10 years for certain gun crimes, if it's 20 years for a bank fraud, ordinarily we're going to let the legislature say what that will be.

But to the extent that a sentence is grossly disproportionate to the crime, we are going to say that's a violation of the Eighth Amendment's prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment. So it's been rare, but they have said things like, for example, "It is grossly disproportionate to sentence someone for death for the crime of rape. Only murder is appropriate." I guess there can be other things too. Treason is up there. The death penalty for children, death penalty for people who are mentally infirm. So there is this idea of proportionality, but it tends to be only a backstop when the sentence is grossly disproportionate to the crime.

Kim: Up next, we have a question from Dawn who asks, "Should Biden test the SCOTUS immunity ruling before his term ends to gain clarity and what might that look like?" Joyce, are we going to see Dark Brandon just being immune up in the White House?

Joyce: Look, I think it's endlessly fun to speculate at dinner parties about what Joe Biden might do, but in reality, it's a super serious topic. The Supreme Court has abdicated its responsibility in this area. You do not have to be a Supreme Court justice to know that a president should not have the ability to use SEAL Team six to take out a political opponent. And yet, that's what this Supreme Court seemed to put its little John Hancock on. I think Joe Biden, the most dark Biden, the most Dark Brandon thing that he can do

here is to take a stand for the rule of law and to strictly refuse to do anything that we all know a president should not do. I think that we will see him do that.

Sure, there is a small part of me that would find it deeply satisfying to see him engage in some informal exercise of power that would be satisfying if inappropriate. But I think we're in this moment where the future of the country rests on how this transfer of power is handled. And Joe Biden, I feel sure, who is an institutionalist in all the good meanings of that word, will do everything he can to preserve the important institutions.

Kim: All right. No opening up the Treasury and giving all student loan buyers power is a bunch of cash. I guess that's not-

Joyce: He's keeps trying, Kim. He's tried what, three times now.

Kim: I mean, literally going to the treasury and handing out this of money to... You have student loans here?

Joyce: I've got four kids with student loans. And it's like, "Go, Joe. Go, Joe." But we're denied.

Kim: By my power as president, here's some cash. And our last question is from 2200 Coles, I hope I'm saying it right. You can defame a person, but can you defame a community? Haitian immigrants are facing gross attacks that could incite violence. That is very true. Jill, what do you think?

Jill: Well, the answer is yes, at least in certain states like Illinois, you can defame a person of course, and you have to show a certain harm. The same would be true if you're bringing a suit on behalf of a community. You have to prove that the community has suffered a harm. And I think that hopefully there won't be any physical violence. There won't be any harm to the innocent Haitian immigrants who are not eating pets. But, yes-

Kim: And who are here legally.

Jill: Who are here legally.

Kim: I can't not underscore that enough.

Jill: I said immigrants, they are not undocumented. They are here and they are legal. That is good point, Kim, thank you. And the attacks are gross, that they are being accused of something that they didn't do and don't do because Donald Trump lies. And I'm not saying washing what he says. I'm saying what he did. He lied. He made it up. He said, "Well, I saw it on television." That's not an excuse. So yes, you can, and maybe someone should bring a suit.

Kim: I just want to say, I did not mean to say that it's okay to do this for people who are not in the country illegally. It's not okay to dehumanize anybody, but it's just doing it to people who have the right to be here is especially odious. Well, that's all for this episode of #SistersInLaw with Joyce Vans, Jill Wine-Banks, Barb McQuaid, and me, Kimberly Atkins Stohr. But before we go, remember, there's less than a week left until our

This transcript was exported on Sep 14, 2024 - view latest version [here](#).

#SistersInLaw live show at the 92nd Street Y in New York City. That's on Friday, September 20th. So go get your tickets right now, [politicon.com/tour](http://politicon.com/tour).

And please show some love for this week's sponsors, HelloFresh, Blueland, Thrive Causemetics, OSEA Malibu, and Olive and June. Their links are in our show notes. Support them because they really make it possible for us to bring this podcast to you. And follow #SistersInLaw on Apple Podcasts or wherever you get your pods. And don't forget to give us five stars in the review because that helps people, yes, you be shocked to know there are people who don't yet follow us, but that helps them find our show. See you next week with another episode #SistersInLaw.

Barb: Yeah, Jill and I were walking around campus today. We got stopped everywhere we went by, "Is that Jill Wine-Banks on our campus?" We had a student shaking her hand. We had a biker turn around and come back. BWOC, Jill Wine-Banks.