

## [Justice Jackson Obliterates Originalism in Voting Rights Case](#)

Imani Gandy: Hello, fellow law nerds. Welcome to another episode of "Boom! Lawyered," a Rewire News Group podcast hosted by the legal journalism team that wants you to know that Black people are real. We exist, we are not Yetis. I'm Rewire News Group's Editor-at-Large, Imani Gandy.

Jess Pieklo: And I'm Jess Pieklo, Rewire News Group's Executive Editor. Rewire News Group is the one and only home for expert repro journalism that inspires you to lean into that fall vibe, and the Boom! Lawyered podcast is part of that mission. So a big welcome to our new listeners, subscribers, and hello, viewers. Imani, I can't get over the fact that we have viewers now.

Imani Gandy: We got viewers, we got viewers. So last week the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in *Merrill v. Milligan*.

Jess Pieklo: And that's a case involving Alabama's redistricting maps and claims that they violate section two of the Voting Rights Act because those maps are super racist. Now, section two is the portion of the VRA that deals directly with blocking people from voting on account of race.

Imani Gandy: The *Milligan* oral argument takeaways, what we're gonna talk about today. Number one, Alabama wants to rewrite section two of the Voting Rights Act so that it protects Alabama's right to gerrymander districts and essentially shove as many Black people as they can into one district, even though Alabama is 27% Black and there is possible to draw another majority Black district, it's possible.

Jess Pieklo: This is just wild. Like, the idea that Alabama with as many Black people as living in that state right now, according to the state, has one district, one. The good news is the big three, which I love this nickname for them, that's Justices Sotomayor, Justice Kagan and Justice Jackson, they were not having it. So this is a case that's all about race, and they made sure that the other justices knew that. You can't have an oral argument about whether or not you're trying to block or dilute voting based on race without talking about race, Imani, it turns out.

Imani Gandy: Makes sense. And also Justices Jackson and Kagan, watching them correct the record with these epic history lessons about what the Voting Rights Act was, what the Equal Protection Clause is, what it was made for, who it was developed for, ensuring that future justices who read their dissents and turn them into majority principles will know where the FedSoc Six went wrong in the 2020s.

Jess Pieklo: I mean, it was so good. The term just came out of the gates with, it was just, it was gangbusters but let's get into it. Imani, I got a basic question for you.

Imani Gandy: Yeah.

Jess Pieklo: The hell does Alabama want here?

Imani Gandy: Well, Jess, what they want is to essentially rewrite 40 years of precedent.

Jess Pieklo: Sure.

Imani Gandy: To make it so that Alabama can run elections on racist maps. I mean, that's essentially what they want to do. Plaintiffs quite reasonably, if you ask me, want Alabama to draw a second majority Black district. Just another one. There's only one. They want two. So that Black voters votes aren't diluted across multiple districts.

Jess Pieklo: I mean it's wild to me how basic this case is right? Alabama currently has one district with Black voters. Is it possible for there to be a second? If the answer to that question is yes, then the Alabama rap is hella racist, like it's just racist. There it is, right. So that's the first step in determining whether or not Alabama's map is racist, is can a second one even exist, right? And if the answer is no, well then I guess, you know, Alabama's on to something here.

Imani Gandy: Right, and plaintiffs, you know, their case should be dismissed. But as you said, the inquiry requires determining whether or not a second map can be drawn. Whether or not a second map can be drawn. In order to do that, what usually happens is plaintiffs submit sample maps, right? Like they submit sample maps to demonstrate that there, it is possible to draw a second map. How can you submit maps demonstrating it's possible to draw non-racist maps without taking race into account? You can't do it. I'm just gonna answer the question. You can't do it, and you can't do it, in fact, so much so that the Supreme Court has already ruled in previous cases that there is no race neutral requirement when you're trying to figure out whether maps can be drawn in a non-racist manner. It just makes common sense. And indeed, in a 1986 case called *Thornburg v. Gingles*.

Jess Pieklo: *Gingles*.

Imani Gandy: Or maybe it's *Gingles*. I'm not sure *Gingles*, *Gingles*, you're jingling baby. Go ahead baby, little LL Cool J. It's like a GIF, GIF situation. I'm not sure we should teach the controversy, but the point is, in 1986, the Supreme Court carried on and on and on about all of these tests that you have to, you know, you know lawyers love our three-prong tests. I'm not gonna go into the *Gingles* three-prong test because quite frankly, I don't want you to walk into a lake, like.

Jess Pieklo: And it might be the *Gingles* three-prong test for all we know.

Imani Gandy: In which case you've walked into the lake for no apparent reason. We don't want that. But what I do want to explain is that it's not possible to draw a map without taking race into account when you're trying to figure out if you can draw a non-racist map. But Sam Alito, he's not about that life. Sam Alito seems to think that it is possible to draw a race neutral map to show that a majority Black district can be drawn. Like, he's just simply lying about what the court

has said in its precedent, which is, I know, very shocking, but it's also quite irritating because it just gums up the works.

Jess Pieklo: It's, and this is a really important point that Imani's making here, so let me go back to it. Like the big fight here is, you know, what did the districts in Alabama look like right now right? So this is a gerrymandering case where you've got districts that look all janky and all sorts of things, and Sam Alito's like, "No, no, no, no, no, no. I know the Court has talked about this, but really we don't need to, we don't need to talk about it. We can just go ahead and take Alabama at their word that they're not drawing racist districts when they're putting out this map." And it was, I mean, I think we're gonna see a lot of bad faith from Sam Alito this term. He's feeling very empowered, but he was just out of the gates like gun's a blazin' bad faith on this argument. The good news is, though, neither Justice Kagan nor Justice Jackson were having it. They were not having it at all and that's what we need to talk about now, right?

Imani Gandy: Yes, please, please.

Jess Pieklo: Sam Alito is gonna spend an entire Supreme Court term stroking his chin, thinking big thoughts on things like race and these women aren't having it. It was glorious to hear them working in tandem to just call him out and basically say, no, you do not get to make up the law. You do not get to gaslight the rest of the Court and the American public, since arguments are still streamed right now, in terms of what precedents around voting rights is, and not just in terms of this case, which was beautiful in and of itself, but in terms of the way race has worked historically in this country with regard to voting.

So we had Justice Kagan who just absolutely backed Alabama Solicitor General into a corner when she was asking, as a matter of federal law, if Alabama could draw a map that included no majority Black district. Like could Alabama just say, you know what folks, you get no representation. Like that was amazing. And the Solicitor General was like, well, I don't know. What's the Voting Rights Act really supposed to get at? That's a good question, Elena. Solid question there Justice Kagan, right? Like, I mean, you covered this. You were all over it on Twitter for oral arguments.

Imani Gandy: I was and you know, part of me wants to just take a good 10 minutes and just read her soliloquy, but we're not gonna do that because it's gonna, it would just take too long but I do wanna hit the main points that she said, right? First she said that the point of the Voting Rights Act is to ensure equal political opportunities. She called it one of the greatest achievements of American democracy, right?

This idea that you're supposed to allow equal political opportunities regardless of race, and to ensure that Black people could have as much political power as white Americans could. So then Elena Kagan goes on to talk about the 1982 congressional amendment to the statute, right? So the Court had interpreted the statute far too narrowly for Congress's liking. So Congress said, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, you guys didn't actually do what we meant, so we're gonna amend the statute. This is actually a results statute. This is a statute that looks at impact, not

just intent, right, because it's not very often that you're gonna get legislators that are like, We don't want them Negroes in the South voting. Like that's just not normally how it happens. It's normally a lot more underhanded. So the Court, the Congress said, we're gonna look at impact, not just intent.

Jess Pieklo: This is amazing because Elena Kagan is a textualist now. Like she's a textualist. That's what textualists do. They look to the text of the statute to solve the problem ahead of them. And she looked and said, hey, look, Alabama, the text says your map is racist.

Imani Gandy: So there. Bang, bang, boom. And then, this was beautiful, and then she went to go on to basically throw shade at the Supreme Court by talking about how the Voting Rights Act has fared so poorly in recent years at the Supreme Court, specifically talking about one, Shelby v. Holder, which is John Roberts' swan song, right, where he gutted sections four and five of the Voting Rights Act, and then she talked about this case from two years ago, two years ago, a year ago, Brnovich v. DNC. And that was not a voter dilution case, right? This case, Merrill v. Milligan is a voter dilution case. That case wasn't about voter dilution, but it was still a section two case. And in that case, the Court was like, this isn't a voter dilution case. Don't worry about it. We're not gonna mess up or overrule precedent when it comes to voter dilution because we really think it's important that Black people keep voting you guys.

And then what do they do in this case? They're about to upend 40 years of precedent because this Court has never met precedent that it was willing to just throw out the window.

Jess Pieklo: It's that whole moment with Justice Kagan was so good because, you know, I've talked about this on the podcast before. One of the things that I really appreciate about Justice Kagan is that she is such an intellectual foil to Chief Justice John Roberts and really just is that balance in terms of temperament, in terms of experience, and if she is up there just literally reading him the receipts on how voting rights precedent has fared under his leadership, that's really, that's strong. And you know what else was really strong was Justice Jackson coming out as an originalist.

Imani Gandy: What? I mean.

Jess Pieklo: An originalist. It was like, yo, Justice Scalia, bud, how ya doing? Let's talk.

Imani Gandy: My ghostly buddy.

Jess Pieklo: Let's talk about the Equal Protection Clause. Let's talk about the Reconstruction Amendments in their original intent. And not just, let's talk about it as a thought exercise. Let's go back to the original joint committee reports when they were debating the 14th Amendment. Like, let's go back and see what they had to say at the time the 14th Amendment was ratified. Were they talking about race or was this to be a race neutral inquiry? And guess what Imani.

Imani Gandy: I'm gonna go with, it was not intended to be a race neutral inquiry.

Jess Pieklo: It turns out that the Reconstruction Amendments, the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments that were passed in the wake of the Civil War that was fought over chattel slavery with race at its core, folks in Congress had a lot to say about race at the time.

Imani Gandy: But I thought it was states rights.

Jess Pieklo: No, no, in fact, they were adamant on the congressional floor that this was to be remedial, that this was about reintroducing folks into society, and that was, by definition, a race focused inquiry. Justice Jackson had it all. It's like, not even to say she did her homework, she like did everybody's homework.

Imani Gandy: She did, she did. I mean, she's just like, I'm gonna go back to this joint committee of old white dudes from 1860 whatever, as a Black woman, I'm gonna read what these old white dudes had to say, and then I'm gonna out originalism you originalists.

Jess Pieklo: It was amazing.

Imani Gandy: And that was just a beautiful thing. It was a beautiful thing.

Jess Pieklo: I mean, but it really, you know, you kind of hinted at it in the intro, and I think we need to talk about it now in the show. It raises the question though, Imani, are Black people even real?

Imani Gandy: I don't know.

Jess Pieklo: Because.

Imani Gandy: Can I scratch it off?

Jess Pieklo: One of the, I mean, this was like this, we're laughing and we're making fun of this, but it was truly the premise more or less, of the conservative line of arguments and attacks here, which is that we don't want to think or talk about a Black community right?

Imani Gandy: Right, right.

Jess Pieklo: I mean, that's really what it is. So one of the things that the Court has to look at when figuring out in this case whether or not votes were diluted, is whether or not districts, you know, voting districts that should be together were broken up, or were they cracked so that communities of interest, and this is a phrase that came up over and over again in the arguments, community of interest were split up, right? Did we break up Black communities to dilute their political power? That's the question.

Imani Gandy: And the answer to that question is abso-fucking-lutely yes it did. Like it is not rocket science that Black voters in the Black Belt in Alabama constitute a community of interest. I would say it's not rocket science that Black people across the country constitute a community of interest considering that this country was founded on anti-Blackness. It's got anti-Blackness woven into the fabric, and therefore many of us with Black skin, with brown skin, have a community of interest insofar as we want white people to leave us alone and let us live right? We want white people not, not to, I don't even wanna say leave us alone. We want people to support programs, government programs, government policies that permit Black people to have the same amount of political power as white Americans do, right?

That's exactly what Elena Kagan was saying. But Sam Alito, little Sammy, little pew, pew, pew, pew, little angry Sammy, he's not so sure that Black people constitute a community of interest. He's not so sure that Black people are even real. Like, do we exist? Why would we constitute a community of interest? He claims that Black voters might vote one way and white voters might vote another way, but that's not based on race. It might just be that they have different ideas about what the government should be doing. If one ethnic group has different ideas about what government should be doing from another ethnic group, that usually is correlated to race. Like, what are we talking about here people? It's absolutely bonkers. And so of course, community of interest correlates with race.

That's the whole point of the VRA. It's the whole point of the V- it's the whole point of the VRA, right? It just, it cannot be, that there's no community of interest among Black people. It cannot be that the VRA requires a race neutral inquiry. It's just, that's just incorrect. It's incorrect.

Jess Pieklo: I mean, and the good news is, again, Justice Sotomayor was all over this point, right? And you know, we said this, so one of the big fights in this case is what a community of interest is. And now Alabama is arguing that Mobile and Baldwin counties, Imani, are communities of interest. Why would that be, I wonder?

Imani Gandy: I'm gonna go with maybe they're all white. Are they all white? Oh my God, I got it. Did I win?

Jess Pieklo: You win, you win. They're all white communities, they've never been split up. But it just so happens, as you said that the Black Belt, which is predominantly Black.

Imani Gandy: Black as fuck.

Jess Pieklo: I mean, it's a Black Belt, has been split three, four, five, six, 48 ways at this point and we know why that is. And I mean, Justice Sotomayor, in the oral arguments just said it. She's like, yo, Sam, no, that's not it at all. Like, and you're not confused about this. And it was really, I mean, on the one hand, I hate that a jurist like Sotomayor has to call out her colleagues for their feigned confusion, right? Like Justice Sam Alito is a smart man. He knows what he's doing. When he's pretending to be confused it is absolutely an act, right? Like it's, but again, I appreciate that she's doing the work, that, especially with arguments streaming right now, the

folks who are able to tune in or to go back and hear them later can hear that because there's probably no greater argument for court reform happening right now than the conservative justices just staying mic'd up.

Imani Gandy: Absolutely, absolutely. And so now that we've talked about community of interest, we've gotta talk about another key inquiry when it comes to Voting Rights Act cases, voter dilution cases, and that's compactness.

Jess Pieklo: Oh yeah.

Imani Gandy: That relates to, essentially, it's essentially it's an inquiry into housing discrimination. It relates to how districts are drawn, right? And if you are drawing districts in a way that just smushes a bunch of Black people into one area that necessarily has to do with housing and that's what was so great about Justice Jackson is because she made that connection, right.

For years, we've been talking about Sonya Sotomayor as being the Justice on the Court who makes connections, who draws connections from the law to real people. Now she's got a friend, she's got a friend who's doing the same thing. She pointed out that the inquiry into compactness is necessarily an inquiry into housing discrimination. We're talking about a situation in which race has already been infused into the system. So it's absolutely preposterous for Sam Alito or any of the other conservative justices to be pretending as if this has to be a race neutral inquiry when the race has, it's already baked into the system. Like that's the thing.

And what I loved about that is because as soon as she said that, I was like, oh my God, Jess made that similar point last week. Like you made the exact same point. Can you talk about what it is that brought you to that point and how proud you must be that Justice Jackson reiterated it.

Jess Pieklo: I mean, thank you, yeah. But it's true, like what that, what the compactness, when we're talking about compactness in voting rights cases and in this, we're in civil rights land broadly, right? And what civil rights land teaches us is that all of these issues are interconnected, right? This is the intersectionality of reproductive justice. You can't talk about a voting rights case without talking about housing rights.

Because guess what, we redlined the hell out of all of our neighborhoods as we were in a postwar boom. And when we did that redlining, just like lawmakers weren't on the record saying, you know what we're gonna do is intentionally split up these Black and Brown communities. They had the effect, their policies had the effect of that. So they diluted the neighborhoods, which started the dilution process. And so here we are, and we finally, finally, finally, have a Justice with her civil rights background, right?

During her confirmation hearing, this was what all of the conservatives were very upset about, that she's just too much on the civil rights beat. That's what she brought to the table, was like, look, we have to talk about race because it is infused in every bit of this conversation, because

this is a case about Alabama's racist voting maps, yes, but it's a case about how civil rights work in this country generally also. Yeah, it was a moment, it was a word, as the kids say.

Imani Gandy: It was a word, it was a read as the Black folks say.

Jess Pieklo: And I mean, it's just, it's gonna be a long term with some rough cases, but on day two of oral arguments, which, Jesus Christ, but on day two, really just seeing these women rise to the occasion was, it was worth it, I guess.

Imani Gandy: It was momentous, yeah.

Jess Pieklo: So now let's talk about what we think the Court's gonna do, because.

Imani Gandy: I mean, before arguments, I would've said the Court is just gonna section two entirely.

Jess Pieklo: That was great. That was so grim.

Imani Gandy: Eh, eh, eh, eh. But there were conservatives on the Court, even Sam Alito said to the Alabama Solicitor General, that his arguments were a little bit too far reaching and to focus on the more basic arguments. I mean, he was basically saying, yo, you're, you're just losing the plot. Why don't you come back over here and talk about the basic stuff, stuff that I know that we can probably rule in your favor on.

And you know, they were just trying to get Alabama to make a better argument. And you know, and I'm gonna cede this to you because first of all, Amy Coney Barrett was, I mean, she was spoon feeding arguments to Alabama. She was like, you know, what I think you're trying to say is la la la. And I'm gonna, can you just, can you take the Amy Coney Barrett section because I just wanna sit and bask in the glory of your Amy Coney Barrett impression.

Jess Pieklo: Thank you, Imani. It's my pleasure. I have a question for you though. Do you think that some of the conservative attorneys who are appearing before the Court have it in their mind that the fix is already in?

Imani Gandy: Jesus Christ, it's like.

Jess Pieklo: I'm so sorry.

Imani Gandy: No, it's creepily good. That's like so nasally and it's.

Jess Pieklo: Born and raised Midwesterner here. No, but the, it's a serious question because Amy Coney Barrett was absolutely spoonfeeding questions to the Alabama Solicitor General. Like, basically, like, isn't it the argument that you're making this? Like aren't you really trying to argue that, but you know, when we did the series, we'll hear arguments about Roe v. Wade, lo

those many moons ago, when that was still a case that existed as precedent. We talked about how the attorney for Texas just sort of waltzed in the Supreme Court completely unprepared thinking that they had the case in the bag. I wonder if conservative attorney generals, if conservative solicitor generals, are walking into the Supreme Court relatively unprepared, thinking that they've got the case in the bag. Kind of felt like it with Alabama's Solicitor General. And I mean, Brett Kavanaugh.

Imani Gandy: Brett Kavanaugh's a dumbass. I mean, just, he's a stone cold, dumbass. And it offends me as an attorney, as a Black woman, that he is sitting on the bench with Justice Jackson asking his dipshit questions. You know, stumbling around as he was, with Roberts and Barrett, trying to find a way to kill section two, knowing that Alabama's arguments were ridiculous, but also knowing that they're the FedSoc Six, and they were put on the bench to do the thing. Particularly when we're talking about Roberts, like, this is a man who has been trying to gut the Voting Rights Act literally since 1982, since those amendments that we talked about where Congress said, no, no, no, wait a minute, actually this is supposed to be a results test, not an intent test.

Roberts is not about that life. He was in the Reagan administration pushing voting rights policies that Reagan thought were too extreme. If you are pushing policies that St. Reagan thinks are too extreme, you've got problems my dude, like serious problems. And secondly, Alabama's arguments are so bad that two of the three judges on the panel were Trump judges and were like, yeah, dog, that shit's racist.

Jess Pieklo: Get out, get out.

Imani Gandy: Two Trump, they may not have said, "Yeah dog, that shit's racist" per se, but they said something similar right?

Jess Pieklo: Someone pull the order.

Imani Gandy: I mean, you get two Trump judges saying your maps are racist, I'm pretty sure your maps are God damn racist.

Jess Pieklo: I mean, it's just, you know.

Imani Gandy: Oh, oh, oh, oh. Not only did they say that the maps were racist, I'm like so excited, I'm like leaning out, I'm leaning outta the screen.

Jess Pieklo: That's like and another thing.

Imani Gandy: And another thing, I need to leave the room. But another thing, those Justices said that, what did they say? They said it was not even a close one that Alabama had violated the Voting Rights Act, not even a close one. And then Elena Kagan said, it's a slam dunk violation of the Voting Rights Act. So you've got two Trump judges, the liberals on the Court, and

you've got these ding dongs stumbling around trying to help Alabama come up with a way to let them gut the Voting Rights Act the way that, you know, they were put on the bench to do.

Jess Pleklo: Amazing, amazing. And I mean, you know, I talked about Justice Kagan being sort of like the foil to Chief Justice John Roberts. She's not gonna just say a case is a slam dunk like that, like that immediately calls into question the Court's integrity, which is a big thing with Justice Kagan. And she's just out there like she's the one calling balls and strikes now kids.

Imani Gandy: She is, not Roberts. Roberts was supposed to be the balls and strikes guy, but Kagan's like, mmm, no, that's gonna be me now. I'm gonna take up that mantle. She's gonna take up the balls and strikes mantle, Justice Jackson is gonna become like number one originalist. What is even going on with this Court? I kind of love it.

Jess Pieklo: I kind love it. It is wildly off the rails already. We gotta talk about one thing with this case though, that I can't even believe we haven't hit yet, and that is, Imani, this was a shadow docket case.

Imani Gandy: It came up on docket case application. You can't gut the voting rights, well, you can because they did it with Roe.

Jess Pieklo: So, I mean, I was just gonna say, like I was about to be like, imagine gutting 40 years of precedent on the Voting Rights Act and then be like, oh.

Imani Gandy: Oh yeah, they did that with that didn't they?

Jess Pieklo: Yeah, they did that last term, huh?

Imani Gandy: Yeah, yeah, they sure did. It's, what I loved about the fact, well, I don't love that it's a shadow docket case, but I do love the fact that Sonia Sotomayor, in her questioning, called out the fact that it was a Voting Rights Act case. Like that's the reason why she asked in the middle of arguments, so Alabama, what do you want us to do? What do you want us to do?

Jess Pieklo: Yeah 'cause what does Alabama want? They want these maps in place for this election, right?

Imani Gandy: Absolutely.

Jess Pleklo: Even though they were drawn up like, I don't know, 80 years ago or something.

Imani Gandy: Yeah, it was like 10, 11 months prior. So, you know, too close to the election, we had to let the racist map stand. We talked about that in last week's episode, but Sonia Sotomayor said, what do you want us to do, right, because if you want us to take action, that action should be to vacate and remand, right? To vacate the injunction and then remand it back

to the lower court and let the lower court figure it out because it's the lower courts that are the fact finders, not the courts of appeals.

The Supreme Court's not supposed to be finding facts. They've been doing it a whole hell of a lot over the last couple of years, but it's not their job. And Sonia Sotomayor wants to let the Court know that she's not gonna let them get away with this shadow docket nonsense. So she was basically like, what do you want us to do? Vacate, remand, lol, you know? And it's just like, oh, it's too much. It's too much. I just have to say that I really appreciate the work that Jackson and Sotomayor are putting in together, right? In terms of holding this Court accountable, because we know that they're gonna be writing these fire dissents for the next however many years long, 10 years, 20 years, I don't know.

But in the future, those dissents, the ideological underpinnings of those dissents, are going to become the ideological underpinnings of majority opinions in the future. So it is critical to, so that every little bit is rolled out, is fleshed out in these oral arguments, Jackson pointed out the Equal Protection Clause, it was meant for Black people. The 14th Amendment, meant for Black people. Voting Rights Act meant for Black people. In the same way that Sotomayor last term in *Bremerton v. Kennedy*, right, the school prayer case, had to put a literal graphic, a photo in her dissent showing what the prayer looked like.

Because Neil Gorsuch, in his opinion, had said this was just a private moment of prayer. It was just one dude just sitting in the corner falling to his knees and praying. No, the picture demonstrated that it was like a throng of people all on the field with the guy holding up two helmets from each team talking about unity and love under Jesus. This is not, it is, we are living in a world where Supreme Court Justices have to call out the lies as politely as possible of other Supreme Court Justices so that we are not screwed 40 years from now. And I think, I just love that we've got Jackson and Sotomayor just on the ones and twos doing this, just doing the damn thing.

Jess Pieklo: Before we close, I wanna yes and that point, because it is so important for policy, like yes, and this will be the new policy, the new majority opinions in lifetimes, not my lifetime likely, likely not your lifetime, but you know, in lifetimes to come. And also, I said it once, I will probably say it every time we record and talk about oral arguments this term, they're doing the work of making the case for court reform.

How many years have we talked about how broken the federal courts are as a result of conservatives monkeying around with appointments, with packing them full of Trump judges who are ideologues, who don't care about the facts, who don't care about the law? That's what we've seen, and now we have oral arguments continuing to be live streamed. We have Justices absolutely calling out the lies and the gaslighting during oral arguments in their opinions.

This is how the American people see that we need to fix our courts, that this is part of civic reform. So I am here for that big, big bold infrastructure work, 'cause I think that's happening.

Imani Gandy: I love it. Infrastructure that week. We need like an infrastructure year when it comes to the courts, we really do. If you would like to talk to us about any of this stuff, if you wanna talk to us about the Voting Rights Act, if you wanna talk to me about how I'm real and how I exist.

Jess Pieklo: I can vouch.

Imani Gandy: She can vouch, she's seen me in person. She's like touched me. You can follow me on Twitter at @AngryBlackLady. You can follow Jess on Twitter at @Hegemommy, H E G E M O M M Y. You can, and you should follow Rewire News Group on all of the things on Twitter, on Instagram, on OnlyFans, okay, no, we don't have an OnlyFans yet.

Jess Pieklo: We don't have an OnlyFans, Imani?

Imani Gandy: Not yet. Okay, we're never gonna have an OnlyFans. The whole idea is ridiculous. And please make sure to subscribe to us on YouTube because we are on video now. Go to YouTube, subscribe to Rewire News Group, and then you'll get notifications for whenever our podcasts are available.

And if you are not into looking at our gorgeous visages, our gorgeous faces, you can always get the podcast wherever you normally get your podcast. Apple, Google Play, Netscape, Tumblr, what have you. It's all there. GeoCities. I don't know one of those AOL discs that you used to get in the mail.

Jess Pieklo: Who's got a Hotmail account?

Imani Gandy: My mom, actually. At any rate, thank you so much for listening to our podcast. As always, we appreciate you so much and we are just, we're thrilled to be here. We're thrilled you're watching us and listening to us. And what are we gonna do, Jess?

Jess Pieklo: We will see you on the tubes folks.

Imani Gandy: We will literally see you on the tubes, the YouTubes.