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States CANNOT Make Abortion "Unduly" Difficult

In *Whole Women's Health*\(^1\) the court held that Texas' higher abortion clinics standards were NOT REALLY for safety. Their purpose was to make access to abortion more difficult. *So much more difficult that it was "undue.\(^2\)"

**Agree**

The whole thing had nothing to do with medical care, it was just sucking up to voters. This statute was only a way to get votes from the hillbilly\(^3\) Evangelical crazies. (Texas Republican politicians (Rick Perry, etc.) couldn't care less about poor women. Rich, white, Anglo Republican women can get abortions whenever they want, inside or outside the state and its laws.)

Texas' clinic standards closed down 20 of the 40 clinics in Texas, especially harming many poor Hispanic women in the Lower Rio Grande Valley.

**Disagree**

Talk about judicial overreach! (A) Protecting state residents is the job of state legislatures, implied in the U.S. Constitution. Who gave unelected Federal judges that power? (B) Does Justice Sotomayer have an M.D. after her name? What qualifies her to make medical decisions? (C) Having decided that abortion is a fundamental right, how can state legislatures make getting them “burdensome”? By unconsciously admitting that, the courts shows it disingenuousness

Thomas and Alito say that there is no convincing evidence that the Texas law caused the closing of those clinics. Maybe it was something else. Clarence Thomas agreed!

---

\(^1\) Whole Women's Health Et Al v. HELLERSTEDT; (Texas State Commissioner of Health Service)

\(^2\) In a 5 to 3 decision (Scalia still being dead) requiring clinics to meet hospital standards and have admitting privileges at local hospitals was (A) medically unnecessary and (B) places undue burdens on women. Therefore the Texas law and similar laws in 20 states were struck down.

\(^3\) Jesus Christ said nothing about abortion and was definitely hostile to the nuclear family (“family values”).
Get Real

Men have always controlled women, always will⁴. That is how God set it up and commanded us to live. It’s even in the New Testament.
Also, there is never a shortage of women volunteers for and defenders of the system.

Hot babes flock to rich men for money, status and “protection.” If a woman wants control over her body, let her become a “10” and marry a rich guy. (It only takes $100,000 surgery.) Besides, if you don’t want to have babies don’t have sex. Take responsibility for yourself!

As Rush Limbaugh says “feminism was invented by and for ugly women.”

Bribing Politicians Is Legal
(by making it impossible to prosecute)

In McDonnell v. U.S., the court interpreted bribery statutes in a very narrow way.

Facts
in McDonnell vs. The United States

Republican Virginia Governor Robert McDonnell (and his wife Maureen) took gifts from wealthy businessman Jonnie Williams. The gifts included $175,000 in gifts and loans including
1. a Rolex watch
2. shopping sprees (“ball gowns”) for Maureen
3. money to cater his daughter’s wedding, etc.
4. loans

William’s company Star Scientific was trying to get a free pharmaceutical evaluation of its supplement Anatabloc. Anatabloc was sold as a supplement but would have been much more profitable if sold as a prescription drug. For that, the FDA requires expensive testing which Star didn’t want to pay for.

⁴ The following is a litany of unrelated, irrational non sequiturs which are commonly stated as conservative thinking.
In exchange, McDonnell
1. facilitated meetings with officials of state universities
2. hosted promotional events in the Governor’s mansion
3. spoke to state government officials about the virtues of Anatabloc
4. sought state grants to fund the study

Both McDonnell and his wife were found guilty of “eleven felony counts” of “public corruption.” The evidence revealed “tawdry tales” of shabby behavior. He petitioned the Supreme Court for relief on now familiar grounds.

McDonnell’s Defense

*Citizens United* made “access” to politicians a “fundamental constitutional right.” You remember *Citizens United*, “corporations are people, my friend.”

Contributions to a politician ensures that he would listen to you, but not that he would do what you want. You only bought “access” to him, not to his vote, etc.

The Ruling, All 9 Justices

In order for it to be “corruption” the law requires that an office holder perform “official acts” in exchange for things of value. Just taking gifts (bribes) is not illegal, it’s *doing something “official” in exchange* that matters. However the court said that “arranging meetings”, “contacting officials” and “hosting events” in the governor’s mansion are, *in themselves*, not “official acts.” (Those are just what politicians ordinarily do for people who give them stuff.) Only when he “influences or intends to influence a specific official decision the government actually makes” is it an “official act.” Roberts had previously written that “access bought in this manner are not corruption...They embody a central feature of democracy.” This ruling is just a narrow interpretation of the statute

Roberts asks us to ignore the “tawdry tales of Ferraris, Rolexes and ball gowns”

---

5 The University of Virginia and the Virginia Commonwealth University.
6 the court’s term
7 It sure as hell was for federal bank examiners, but not apparently for politicians.
and accept that the instructions given the jury were too broad. Holding politicians to such a strict standard would have a "chilling effect" on office holders ability to help people who give them stuff.

**Agree**

Making it easy to prosecute politicians for taking bribes would have a "chilling effect" on helping constituents. The job of office holders is to help constituents, etc. "Overly-jealous prosecutors" could hinder that.

**Disagree**

When did the helping people become a conservative value? Providing government services to people who can afford to bribe politicians actually reduces services to everyone else. It pretty much defines who among the populace can get help... those rich enough to pay for it.

To be convicted of “corruption”, a politician must NOW sign a quid pro quo contract, take a video of himself accepting bags of gold and a selfie snorting coke with his “constituent.” Literally, that’s how court watchers talk (and laugh) about it.

Short of that, it’s ok for politicians to accept anything of value in exchange for anything that helps the special interests that bribe them. Go Court!

What do we pay taxes for? Don’t office holders have salaries? Why do they need cocaine and Rolex watches? Third world counties run on corruption. In Mexico trials are conducted on paper with judgements handed down years later to the highest bidder. Is that what this Supreme Court has in mind?

Under this ruling, you get as much justice as you can afford!

**Get Real**

Never in history has there been a government that was not owned by and in the service of the rich and powerful. That is the very definition of the word. If any individual has a government doing his bidding, he is by definition, "powerful."
Talk of democracy and *equal before the law* is only an opiate of the masses. It sedates the *sheeple* so that the rich can rule unencumbered. Thus is will always be. Why not just get honest about it and make it official?

Only the wealthy have the time and interest to run governments. Besides, they have a lot more invested in the nation than poor people. Populism (voter interference) leads to government by amateurs. Do you want Donald Trump in charge?

**Statutes Interpreted According to Status of Defendant**

At the same time the court was giving maximum leeway to RICH WHITE MEN, in Voisine *v. United States* it was nailing redneck yahoos to the barn door.

**The Ruling**

Congress meant to include all domestic violence cases, including “reckless” (not “intentional”) behavior. It was a loophole in the law that needed to be closed.

**Facts Of The Case**

Billy Bob Voisine was permanently forbidden to own a gun because of an earlier misdemeanor? He had (years earlier) been convicted of slapping his girlfriend. When he shot a bald eagle (no less), the previous conviction came to light and the Feds charged him with violating Federal Firearms laws.

The court expanded the Federal statute to include what the judges decided Congress actually meant\(^8\), not what it actually said\(^9\).

---

\(^8\) When the Federal statute was written, many domestic violence cases were held as misdemeanors, and therefore not included.

\(^9\) The late Justice Scalia would have howled if this were done about any decision with which he disagreed. However in this case he would have not uttered a sound.
Agree

Guns are dangerous. Men are dangerous. Men found by the courts to be dangerous should never own dangerous guns. An accidental oversight in wording was only a loop-hole that needed to be closed. Don't let legal quibbling put women in danger.

Disagree

If gun ownership is so fundamental a right that it was put in the Bill of Rights (as # 2), how can it be permanently revoked by a years old misdemeanor (slapping a girlfriend.) Where else is a constitutional right revoked by a misdemeanor? Nowhere!

Get Real

GET REAL! This case was decided by the socio-economic standing of the defendant. Voisine's real crime was being a redneck. If he'd been lawyered up, he would have borrowed a rifle (for shooting bald eagles) or just bought one unofficially. (You can get as many assault rifles as you want from a guy named Chico, in the nearest alley.)

Do you really think that Governor McDonnell would have been treated like Voisine? In McDonnell's case a statute was interpreted very narrowly (making him innocent). In Billy Bob's Voisine's case it was interpreted very widely (putting him in jail).

It is the different socio-economic status of the defendants that make the courts decisions. Is the McDonnell bribery case, the governor took bribes. Bribing is normally hidden (by educated politicians with legal advice) in sophisticated ways; e. g. "campaign contributions," PAC's or charitable gifts to "The Clinton Foundation." Rednecks don't have the education or advice for that. The defendant's status is the real deciding factor.

The Supreme Court should STOP being dishonest and admit how it operates and who it serves.

10 Besides the bitch probably had it coming. I paraphrase Antonin Scalia here from a televised discussion of his decision to execute an innocent man. He said the guy probably had done something else wrong anyway. He deserved to be executed for something.
Legislatures Can Make Getting An Abortion Burdensome
(on poor women)

Just don’t make it “unduly” burdensome. How burdensome is just burdensome enough? Why would you make it burdensome at all?

This is another example of unconscious or concealed white male privilege. How burdensome should Viagra prescriptions be? How burdensome is bourbon compared to marijuana. Relative to the crack, how burdensome is buying cocaine at the academy awards ceremony?

Supreme Court Judges Can Decide on Scientific Facts

OK sure. Abortion is less dangerous than childbirth, until Evangelical doctors testify for the AMA. Then you’ll have medical experts saying that same sex marriage harms children, prayer heals and the world is 6,000 years old.

How does this court deciding science facts differ from the pope deciding the earth was flat?

I give the Court a grade of C. It’s just more sleight-of-hand service to the wealthy and powerful based on political calculations of what they can get away with.

What do you think?

The bull shit gets so deeps you have to spout wings to fly above it.

Sebastian Zebadiah Twit
September 16, 2016
Later Thoughts

“Bipartisanship” Opinions Offered

In an effort to present the issues fairly, I have offered bipartisanship interpretations. “Bipartisan” may actually mean ignorance, lying-about-the-facts, hate mongering, demagoguery, conspiracy theories, fascism or out and out treason\(^\text{11}\); it is for you to decide. “Get Real” is the view that you might call “cynical,” realistic or only NOT PC.

Implied Rulings

Every court ruling implies many unstated assumptions in which we are asked to pay no attention to the man behind the curtain.

\(^{11}\) LBJ and Republican Senate Majority Leader Everitt Dirksen had a conversation (recorded on a White House tape) in which they agreed that Richard Nixon had committed “treason.” (Nixon had advised the South Vietnamese Government to refuse LBJ’s peace office in exchange for a better deal from Nixon.) You never hear the word “treason” publically mentioned. Johnson and Dirksen agreed to keep it secret so as to maintain public confidence in the political system. As a result, Nixon won the presidency. During LBJ’s term, 5,000 Americans were killed in Vietnam. During Nixon’s, an additional 45,000 were killed.