

Ruth Bader Ginsburg

Elder Tess Lambert

MARCH 10, 2020

Silent prayer: Amen

Good afternoon. So we are going to do a review to tie a few loose ends together to remind us of some of the key points before we move on. So it doesn't all seem disconnected.

We began by looking at the dispensations. Always four dispensations in a Reform Line. We showed how it's one message, and then we focused on the Latter Rain ('LR'), when you have this message that begins with the World Wars and ends with Equality; so that, that main subject was about the King of the North ('KoN') and the King of the South ('KoS').

Now there is more than just the 'KoN' and 'KoS'. There's all these sub-elements; these smaller connected parts. So we also find their story. For example, it's what we started looking at here. (Board)

We have layers. If we were to come to the history of 2018 and 2019, then we are on two different Reform Lines.

The Priest's and the 144,000.

For the 144,000 we are in the Early Rain ('ER') between 9/11 and the Sunday Law ('SL'). In here is Raphia (R) and Panium (P). 2019, 2021.

We're also in the dispensation of the Priests, and for the Priests 2019 is the Close of Probation ('CoP'), so we have been in the history of the 'LR'. So we have to look at this as layers. We have to remember that we are on more than one Reform Line, because the people who've left struggle with two subjects we've taught.

In 2018 we taught equality so people leave over that issue, and then in 2019 we teach about the 'SL' waymark - the Triple Application. We bring in *Early Writings* and 1850. So we have these two subjects that people struggle and wrestle with: Equality and the nature of the "SL".

The reason we have these two subjects is because we're on two different Reform Lines. We are on the Priest's Line, where we have the Midnight Cry ('MC'), and Exeter ('E'), which is pointing to the 'CoP,' 2019. And on the Line of the 144,000, 2019 is Concord ('C'), and it's the Increase of Knowledge ('IoK') on the 'SL'. We also have to have the 'IoK' on the 'SL', because we're on both Reform Lines. So the message is Equality, but it's also going to shed light on other topics.

One of the accusations Elder Jeff makes, his first accusation and his main accusation, is that we've covered up the role of the Papacy, and we've made it all about the United States. So when it was presented in October, what was the first message presented? The very first message presented in that September or October school was Fatima.

Now I had a problem here. I wanted to present something about the Papacy and I wasn't sure why. I presented Fatima. I wanted to do a Line of the 'Counterfeit,' but it had not come together. There were still a couple of elements I was wrestling with, so I just did Fatima, and put

the Line of the 'Counterfeit' to one side. Then, over those couple of weeks towards the end it all fit into place. Just in a couple of days the Line of the 'Counterfeit' made sense.

So I chose to teach it after all, but I did it last, because at the beginning the study hadn't been completed. So I wanted to say that, because it wasn't my intention to break the study into two parts, but because of how the message opened I was forced to start with Fatima, the first presentation on the Papacy, and finish on the Papacy - last presentation on the Papacy.

So you know if it's the Midnight Cry ('MC'), then it has to be significant that the first and the last presentation is on the Papacy. And that wasn't through human planning. The same thing happened with the World Wars - WWII at the beginning, and the message closed with WWI. That wasn't human planning.

So, while this knowledge is about the 'KoN' and 'KoS' in this history there is a connection that the 'KoN' has to the Papacy. We see that right back in 1989. So once we understand the 'KoN' and the 'KoS,' then this study also gives us bits of light on other topics, and one of those is the Papacy.

Then when we come up here (pointing to 9/11 on 144K line - 2019 is the 'loK' of the 'SL.' If we were to expand this dispensation it's 9/11, it's Boston (B). Remember our repeating pattern. The message is unsealed. There's going to be an increase of knowledge (2019 dashes up), 2019 is Concord (C) and it's going to be formalized at Panium (P) 2021, which is all preparation for the test - the 'SL'. So that's the dispensation for the 144K.

Series of questions begin:

So in 2019 it also becomes important that we understand the Papacy, because what do you expect to happen at the 'SL'? What do we know that happens at the 'SL'?

There's a Resurrection, "the healing of the Deadly Wound." (Revelation 13:3) So the 'Resurrection of the Papacy.'

What else happens at the 'SL'? Class answers, External Events. Class answers, The Seventh Kingdom starts to rise. Tess says, Starts to rise? Class answers, "It's there." Tess says, We have the Seventh Kingdom.

So what does that mean for the Kingdom? How does the Seventh Kingdom show it has risen? What marks the Seventh Kingdom? How could you know if you're in the 6th or the 7th?

So the 6th is America and the Seventh Kingdom would be the head of all the other nations, but still America. Tess "So it's still America, but how do you know that America has changed?"

Class answers, "Dictatorship." Tess- "Dictatorship?" Class- "How it speaks." Tess- "How it speaks, and how is it going to speak?"

So we talked about the 'SL.' I think E Parminder discussed that, but we know that's not the Sabbath/Sunday issue. The Republican horn is broken when it discriminates against minorities. So this where we take in 1850, and that discrimination of slavery.

So Equality becomes the subject for both the Priests and the 144K, which is why we are opening up this whole history.

What else happens at the 'SL?' Another external event. This is shipwreck (= minorities on board) in Acts 27. So you know this is Adventism, as well as the United States. What's another external event? At the 'SL' we have the Resurrection of the Papacy; we have this law that violates the Constitution, and there's one other.

Class answers, Death of the KoS? Tess says, "The one I wanted to mark is Islam." I'm just highlighting these (bullets under SL), so that we can see we are in the 'loK.' So it's not just the 'KoS', the 'KoN', and the World Wars. We have to be able to see the other layers, because we are also in this 'loK' in this 'SL' waymark, which means we need to understand the Papacy, which we begin to understand in the history of '18 and '19. The nature of the 'SL' we did not begin to understand until 2019. The Millerite understanding of Islam, in their own history opened up 2019. So we are here. (Person in between C and E waymark on the unsealed line).

So, we expect to understand all of these subjects. So when we say it's the 'KoN' and the 'KoS' we are being specific. We are showing the beginning of the 'MC' message for the Priests. Does that make sense? That this 'KoN' and 'KoS' message that develops into Equality (=) is the subject of our 'LR,' but we also have the subject of the Papacy.

So, even when we look at the Third Diadochi War, which is all about the 'KoN' 'KoS,' it adds in some details of the Papacy, some details of Islam, because all of these players do interconnect. So that enabled us to be able to Compare and Contrast what Resurrection means. What Resurrection meant for the Papacy demonstrates what it meant for the 'KoS.' So, Resurrection is what you take back what you lost when you died. So, the Papacy resurrects when it takes back what it lost in 1798. The 'KoS' resurrects when he takes back what he lost in 1989. So, that's where we spoke about the Resurrection. The Resurrection of the Papacy at the 'SL.' It had to start a war to get back what it had lost. The Resurrection of the KoS; it also had decided to take back what it had lost. We are all OK with that?

So that's just review of what we had done at the Q&A meeting, and we also showed how that message had developed with two witnesses at each step. Two witnesses for 273, two witnesses to bring us to WWII, and then we have the two witnesses of the Omega history of Pynhuss combined with WWII, which showed us the latter end of our history. And then we could bring in the Third Diadochi War and WWI, the two witnesses, particularly for the early half of our history. So if we covered what I wish to at this school, which isn't likely, we will go through that. So we have the 'KoN' and the 'KoS,' which takes us to Equality.

Sister Kathy can you show us how it does that with the Wars to Equality?

The 'KoN' and the 'KoS' took us to geography, and we saw they were polar opposites and that the 'KoN' is Church over State, the 'KoS' is State over Church, and then we connected that with Marriage, and that brought us to Equality, because we saw inequality in both the 'KoN' and the 'KoS'.

So through studying the World Wars in the 'LR' dispensation of the Priests from 2014 to 2019, the study of WWIII took us directly to a study of Equality, and what are the External Events of this history? Because this message was a testing message for three groups: Priests, Levites and Nethinims. So if you're not a Priest you don't know about any of those studies we've talked about. If you're not a Priest how are they tested on these issues? External Events. So give me some. So you've gotten right to the end 2019, and there's an Impeachment.

New Line - "WWIII" to Equality

(Tamina was in the class but I could not hear her responses. Only caught the words, Syria, Russia and Donald Trump.) Then following Tamina's input Tess says, How does that teach them of Equality?

Tamina responds, but it's inaudible and Tess says, That helps us, but they cannot do the model of geography.

Tamina responds again and Tess says For a Nethinim they can't look at that and bring it into Equality. So I'm not asking how Nethinims see all of this, but how are they tested on Equality? Tamina says something about the Women's issues or the political issues/system. Tess says, I would suggest that it's the same thing, because it's the political system that's driving inequality between men and women.

Tamina also mentions Russia and Putin trying to change the constitution. And Tess says so we see this in 2020 with them trying to change the constitution. But then Tess explains that she wants to keep it in this 2019 waymark dispensation.

So there's laws against abortion. That's happening around 2018 (Abortion laws) what else? External events? 2014 to 2019? How the Levites and Nethinims are tested on Equality. '14 to '19. So Tamina has mentioned Impeachment, but I'm not sure if that one teaches them about Equality that's more this subject (pointing to WWII), but I was hoping to focus.

What else happens? So 2015, you have Same Sex marriage, what else? We all turned into good news watchers (chuckles). So around 2018 do you want to name them? AOC, Rashida Talib and there's one other, Yes Ilan Omar. Three minority women. They become the really greatest visible enemy of the far right because they hit every box of discrimination except homosexuality. 2017 (marks Homosexual laws against.)

So we have three people in 2014 Sessions, Miller and Bannon. We should all know who Stephen Miller is. These three come together and they begin overturning the Establishment in 2014.

So what else happens? We are all thinking too hard. So I'm just going to put down the election of Donald Trump. We say what he did, but we don't talk about his election (chuckle). What else?

So you have this effect between one camp led by - Obama and Clinton vs. Trump. So with Obama and Clinton you have two minorities represented. What else? So Trump is overturning everything that Obama did. I think the Climate Accord becomes an important part of it. So there's a crisis on the Southern border. What does Trump call that crisis?

An invasion.

So there's a Southern American "Invasion." An invasion of immigrants. And Stephen Miller comes out with this plan to separate parents and children and make it as awful of an experience as you possible can, so they'll be discouraged from coming.

And AOC calls these "Concentration Camps." What else?

Overturning the Dreamer's Act it's known as DACA. That means that when parents come in and then they have a child in America the parents are illegal immigrants this gives a way for their children to become American Citizens.

Tamina is speaking, but it's inaudible. Tess marks 2018 Megyn Kelly and then says, so the #MeToo movement hits the Fox network. We also have Trump's travel ban, specifically Muslim countries, particularly also Africa. But with Africa some of that was more recent with 2020. So we have Trump's travel bans and we also have his many verbal attacks on women. One of whom also was Megyn Kelly.

So does anyone have anything else they want to add? This is really just the tip of the iceberg -to remind us how toxic these last five years were. All started with Steve Bannon in 2014. And what's going to happen is that they're going to overturn the court systems.

Question? This waymark (SL) on the Line of the 144K, it's not a SL. Is it a law?
Who says No? Why No?

(Tess seems to be repeating class responses.) *So it's not an issue between Sabbath and Sunday so there's no need for a law.* So if its an issue of equality why does that not then become a law? How else can you control people if other than a law? *For Trump it's not for equality.* (Tess seems to be repeating class responses). *Trump does not like the idea of keeping Sabbath.* So in our old narrative they are going to pass a law that goes directly against Sabbath. Stops people from keeping it. So now it's not the Sabbath he doesn't like it's equality he doesn't like. So why would that not be through the law? *Fake news.* Fake news can't make you do anything. *It might trick other people into doing it. If it's a Sabbath/Sunday issue then fake news might convince them to keep Sunday.* But fake news would never have convinced you to keep Sunday.

Tess responds with, I don't think he (Trump) keeps Sunday. So I don't think he particularly cares. I agree with you. Tamina speaks about the 1888 SL and our day. Tess writes boardwork for 1850 - 1888 while Tamina is commenting.

So you can only persecute by the State when there's law. So 1888 they wanted everyone to keep Sunday so they are going to try and force it on people through law. So in 1888 there is law. What about 1850? Now the issue is slavery. They can use conspiracy theories fake news. Try to convince you to practice slavery, but they can't make you. They can't make you support slavery until when? The Fugitive Slave Act, which is a law.

So if we are going to say it's not a law because it is no longer a SL this is a triple application - 1850 + 1888 = our SL. Pointing at 1850 Tess says, This was a law and at 1888, this was a law so why would our SL (in the triple application) not be a law? (Pointing to 1850, 1888 says this is the 'History of Failure'. Just like 1989 was for the Papacy. So it's failure internally and externally. Ellen White says it's all set up. The movement is currently in progress. So we have 1850 - law, 1888-law, and our SL - law. Sop I'm suggesting we shouldn't discount the law. If that makes sense?

So what do they have to do to implement a law?

Depends on what kind of a law. Any law. They have to introduce a bill, but that bill will just fail. What do they have to change? *Constitution.* Not the Constitution, not first. What do they have to do first? *Change the culture of the people.* The people matter but not everyone matters the same.

I would suggest it's the Judicial system. It's the judges. So they need, I know it's more complicated but they need the House and the Senate and then they need the Supreme Court. Then they need all the other courts. It's the courts that they need to change, because in

Obama's years if you had of introduced a travel ban into the Supreme Court would it have passed? No. What do they need to do? First work? Change the courts.

So Donald Trump, he was given a gift because in 2014 Republicans took the House and one fellow Mitch McConnell, what he was able to do was block Obama to the point where he couldn't appoint any judges. So you have this judicial system where many judges are appointed for life.

So George bush in his time as President he appointed to the Supreme Court two judges and into the Circuit Court, lower court, 62. This he did in 8 years.

Obama in 8 years appointed 2 judges to the Supreme Court and 55 circuit judges. . .

And then Mitch McConnell in 2014 stopped Obama from appointing anymore judges. He just held it up so that Obama could not appoint anymore judges, not to the Supreme Court and not to the Circuit courts. and Mitch McConnell says, He says today, "This is the most significant thing he's ever done in politics to stop Obama from being able to appoint any judges."

And Donald Trump says, "Appointing judges is the most important thing he's ever done as President."

So both Mitch McConnell and Donald Trump knows how significant this is.

So now you have Trump, Bush had (8) years and Obama had (8) years, Trump in (3) has appointed two Supreme Court judges and 51 circuit judges.

He's (Trump) almost equaled Obama in three years what Obama did in eight. And he's appointing judges who are very conservative.

So the Supreme Court and these main Circuit Courts have gone from liberal courts, or balanced courts, to strongly conservative courts led by conservative judges who are appointed for life.

So the Supreme Court has nine positions to fill and it has always been seen that in this Supreme Court you should have four conservatives, four liberals, and one that is in the middle. Not very conservative and not very liberal. And this balance has been able to be maintained for quite some time. What Trump has done is turn it from this balance to now conservative (5) liberal (4).

So you'll notice all these court cases are coming up this year. There are many court cases to do with Women's rights, the rights of Homosexuals, and the rights of Immigrants the rights of Black people. They are all coming before the courts, and if you look at how the Supreme Court votes you see 5 and 4. Five vote yes and four vote No, but that is no longer the case. This was under Obama. So this is what it has turned into.

So he's (Trump) been able to swing it to majority Conservative, and who is hanging on for dear life? For her life?

Ruth Bader Ginsburg. How elderly is she? How many times has she nearly died? And she doesn't want, and not because of a love of life but she knows it goes to 6/3 and all is lost. So she's determined and everyone else is determined to keep her alive until the 2020 election. If they get Trump out before she dies they can keep, save the Supreme Court. If she dies before the 2020 election he'll (Trump) will be able to appoint another judge and there's really no hope, because he has appointed young judges, relatively, and they're there for life.

Class now comments (inaudible) The difference between a Conservative and Liberal judge. . . it does come down to how they read the Constitution.

So if you had an issue, for example, A homosexual comes into your store and says, I'm getting married." Can I buy a cake from you? And the person says, "No." "I don't cook for homosexuals." Now you have two different interpretations. A Conservative will say it violates his religious freedom to have to cook a cake for a homosexual . And a Liberal would say that the homosexual was discriminated against. The Christian did not have to sanction his wedding. All he had to do was give equal treatment. Cook a cake for him like he would do for anyone.

So it's just like slavery. Back in the slavery history Conservatives would have argued "It violates my religious convictions to not own slaves." A liberal would argue, "You're not the one being discriminated against the slave is." But the Conservative says, "The Bible tells me different races shouldn't mix, and the Glorious Land should have slaves."

So it becomes this argument about whose rights are being violated.

(Class comments inaudible) E Tess repeats comment.

So can a customer be denied service because of an issue over the price, or the product, but can they be denied service because of a prejudice against a customer? About just who they are?

So if you went to the Civil Rights movement, if we just looked at the Civil rights movement and we used the same story.

There is a Black person, an African American man. He goes into a cake store and he says cook me a cake. Bake me a cake for my birthday. And the owner of the store says, "I don't serve Black people. It goes against my religious convictions."

So you can use the same story with the cake, but we already discussed this is what happened with their schools. It went against Jerry Falwell's religious convictions to give education to a Black person. So the African American man says, "Bake me a cake." And the store says, "No." So the Protestant owner says, "No," because of his religious convictions. So is it violating the Constitution for the Protestant owner of that store to be told, "Your religious convictions do not allow you to discriminate against someone."

That's the whole argument with segregation . Because this side is saying, "It's against their convictions" (pointing to Protestant Conservative side of line) "It's violating our religious convictions and persecuting us." "This is force! To force me to bake a cake for a Black person."

So it has moved on from then and now it becomes a story of a homosexual getting married. Now you have the Protestant owner, and he says, "I don't cook cakes for homosexuals; it violates my religious convictions." And now the argument is, whose the victim? Whose being discriminated against?

In the courts a Conservative judge will say the victim is the Protestant owner. A liberal judge will say it's the homosexual, or the African American, or the woman, or the immigrant or the slave.

If that makes sense?

That's how you've had two sides from the very beginning. Now all these court cases come up they've been building from 2014. From 2014 to 2019 they overtake the Supreme Court and Circuit court and swing them Conservative. Now they're flooded with these court cases and these Conservative courts are debating these issues to do with these three groups. And what are these three groups? Since 1989, we went back from 1989 back to the 1960's and what were the three movements?

Civil rights, feminism, so this is race, gender and? LGBTQ. So this is the story of the last forty years, particularly these last twenty. Civil Rights, so it's Race, Gender and Homosexuality . So now we looked a few days ago, we saw how these three movements initiated our Reform Line.

They brought in Reagan who was racist, sexist, and homophobic. He was a Conservative and controlled by the Protestants . Elected and controlled by the Protestants.

So these are the three movements that began our Reform Line.

Steve Bannon will tell you "Everything was good under Reagan." These two years when the Soviet Union fell, everything was just getting set up perfectly and then it all goes off track. Steve Bannon says, It all went wrong. You end up with a President like Obama."

So what's going to happen is this movement of Protestants is going to rekindle in 2014.

If you were to go to 1850 this is the Alpha history and this is the Omega history. When was slavery an issue in America?

If this is 1798 and this is 1850, not directly but this was a SL, when was slavery an issue?

Well before the Time of the End. They already had the issue. This is why it can't be Sabbath/ Sunday. In the Alpha history before the ToE it was slavery and it just builds and builds until, the cup fills until 1850.

So these issues relate to equality and they already existed before the ToE is what the Moral Majority was raised up to fight from 1979 to 1989. They are going to try and take it down under Reagan, but in 2014 they come back with a great deal of power.

And we've just started discussing some of the things, a few of these things.

But the first thing they had to do before they attack those three movements was take down the courts. The Supreme Court and the Circuit. They begin that work in 2014 with Mitch McConnell and then all through from the election of Trump to 2019 these three issues.

The three issues have related to immigration, I don't want to be narrow, also the rights of the Black people in America.

There is much more in this history.

So all of those Black people who were arrested on crimes a white person would never be arrested for. They're imprisoned when a white person would never have been imprisoned. They are no longer allowed to vote in an American election. So also their rights that have been argued through the courts.

So I don't want to keep it to immigration . It all comes under this Nationalism. The rights of women and the rights of LGBT. That is what has hit the court system from 2014, which was a planned agenda. It wasn't by accident. And there are many of these court cases planned for this year. So the change isn't just in the White House, the most serious change that has occurred in America is the overturning of the judicial system . And that should matter to us because we should know what has to happen here (SL).

Class comments inaudible.

Tess restates Tamina's comments for us, *You like the emphasis on the Supreme Court because of a book you've been reading called "One Nation Under God" which pushes that subject In God We Trust so the Supreme Court was a great enemy of that movement.*

Which movement?

School prayer movement particularly which is closely attached to In God We Trust. So it was fought through the Supreme Court but they struck it down a couple of times.

So the Supreme Court held back those movements. That's your point.

And what we've seen since 2014 is that wall is gone. So these Christian movements happened under Nixon, Eisenhower and Reagan and those Christian movements were overdid by the Supreme Court , which was really the last line of defense. It's the last line of defense now.

I would suggest it's already gone. Maybe we could say it's had a deadly wound, but it's not quite dead, but they can certainly get the travel bans through now. So I'll give you one external article to read. It's by the Guardian and it's called Trumps Legacy : Conservative judges who will dominate US Law for decades.

We've talked about the Supreme Court and the Circuit court, but there is other courts. Depending on what courts you want to mark this article will talk about 89 Trump appointed judges., which far exceed that overall by Obama or Bush.

So that's one article and there's one by the Washington Post this one is titled, "1 in every 4 circuit court judges is now a Trump appointee." It just begins this is from December 2019. These are both noting this in 2019 that this is what has happened. This is (Guardian) March 10 2019.

The first line in the Washington Post article, " After three years in office President Trump has remade the judiciary system, ensuring a Conservative lean for decades."

I know we don't know how their judicial system all of us know how all of that works, but they're going to broaden this scope to the federal bench, they'll talk about the federal bench, 187 judges. So what I want us to see is how these three movements began that we discussed. That is what Protestantism attacked at the very beginning of our reform line. It's what united them and made them political and that is what has happened in 2014, but as Sister Tamina was sharing they failed in this history.

But now from 2014, thanks to Mitch McConnell they've taken down the court systems, and we know that this (SL) comes three courts and now these three issues that all relate to Equality are being fought in the courts. (Approx 1:24 a good whole Board screen shot) and the courts that have always held back this religious political movement are no longer able to do that.

So we'll start tomorrow looking at the line of Christ, but as we look at the line of Christ I want us to remember this because it does connect. To remember what's happened over these 6 years. This is just a tiny bit, but these are the issues fought through the court system.

A class member comments and Tess repeats it, So the comment is why wasn't it fixed in the Constitution?

The problem is that people will argue about how it is written in the Constitution as it is. People will still argue about what the Constitution means. They'll just find a different way to read it. A different way to define liberal and conservative and it's also a little like the issue of term limits you could only run for two terms. It was never written but everyone knew to do it. Everyone knew how to keep to it so a President only ran for two terms. Even though they legally under the Constitution could run for a third until when?

Roosevelt, not the Theodore version (smile) Franklin. Franklin Roosevelt. By the time he got into his fourth term everyone was panicking. And when he died they finally put it into law - two terms and no more, because while everyone is behaving no one sees the need for a law.

So Reagan comes in and what does he do? He appoints a liberal woman and all the Protestants go crazy. They are so angry. They say to Reagan, "We got you elected!" He doesn't really care about the Protestants, he doesn't really care about the Pope so this is why everything goes wrong. He's happy doing his own thing. He's not properly under the control of the Protestants so he's still kind of doing the right thing to some extent. He keeps the balance when Protestants want it conservative.

No President has been bold enough to do that until Trump. So that's why it all comes in now. Not even Reagan was willing to do this.

We're over time so we'll close in prayer. Tomorrow we'll move onto the line of Christ, but these things are not mine. If you'll kneel with me.

Dear Father in Heaven,

Thank you for our blessings. Lord we see how you have led. We also see the movements of the enemy. This movement is full of people many of whom don't realize their individual responsibility. When they signed up as Priests it came with a set of conditions. They signed up for a job, and many of us do not see the need to take a part in this work. To feed others and not just be fed. We know this takes courage for many people and you are sympathetic to our fees, but when we look at the size of our work just how big the size of our enemies are, not Future for America, they're not our enemies, but we look at what's rising as the deadly wound heals, as church and state come together may we focus properly forward and see the work and the conflict we have in front of us. I pray we'll feel our individual responsibility to take up the work of a priest. I pray this in Jesus name. AMEN

Trump's legacy: conservative judges who will dominate US law for decades

Tom McCarthy



Supreme court justices Neil Gorsuch and Brett Kavanaugh attend the State of the Union address at the Capitol in Washington DC on 5 February 2019. Photograph: Doug Mills/AFP/Getty Images

Many Americans watching the turmoil in US institutions and political norms are yearning for the day when Donald Trump is no longer president. But whether he leaves after 2020 or 2024, Trump has built a legacy in one vital area

that can be expected to stand for decades, long after his Twitter feed has fallen silent, analysts across the political spectrum agree.

That legacy comprises the 89 judges, and rapidly counting, that Trump has nominated, and Senate Republicans have confirmed, to serve at all levels of the federal court system. They are taking up posts from the district courts (53 Trump nominees confirmed out of 677 total) to the appellate courts (34 out of 179) to the US supreme court (two out of nine). Put together they form a kind of conservative judicial revolution that could impact all aspects of American life.

In the past week, Trump's judges tally notched up by three, with the confirmation to appeals courts of Chad Readler, who previously ran the legal effort to dismantle Barack Obama's healthcare law; Eric Murphy, who undermined voting rights, marriage equality and reproductive rights as a state solicitor in Ohio; and Allison Jones Rushing, who has [past ties](#) to an anti-LGBT group and who at 37 years old is the country's youngest federal judge, a lifetime appointment.

As with previous Trump nominees, Readler, Murphy and Rushing were confirmed over the impassioned protests of progressive groups who warned the judges were out of step with the country on crucial issues including immigration, abortion, climate change, LGBT rights, healthcare, voting rights and more.

The overarching concern, said Daniel L Goldberg, the legal director at the Alliance For Justice, is that Trump's judges will now shape American life according to the narrow conservative vision of the elite, predominantly white and male groups guiding Trump's hand as he makes his picks – a vision that is divergent not only from the political left but also from the center.

“I don't think most Americans realize, long after [Donald Trump](#) and his repeated attacks on the rule of law – on the independent judiciary and our constitutional rights – long after Donald Trump has left the scene, his judges will still be interpreting the constitution and our laws for the next two, three, four decades,” Goldberg said.

“And for millions of Americans, who rely every day on critical protections for workers, for clean air and water, for healthcare, for critical rights for women and LGBTQ Americans, there's going to be an attack coming from our courts on some of our most precious rights and legal protections.”

The Trump judge-confirming machine has arguably been run better than anything else in his administration – perhaps because he has had relatively little to do with it. Unlike past presidents, Trump has turned the job of picking nominees over, almost wholly, to the White House counsel's office, which in turn has worked from lists drawn up by the Federalist Society, the country's premier network of conservative lawyers.

The Republican Senate majority leader, Mitch McConnell, has done his part by clearing long-standing hurdles in the nominating process, including one by which home-state senators from either party could veto an undesirable pick. On Wednesday, Politico reported that McConnell planned to go further, by ending a rule requiring 30 hours of debate on each judicial nominee.

“This is a Republican hijacking of the third branch of government,” said Brian Fallon, the executive director of Demand Justice, in reaction to the news. “[McConnell] will be setting a new precedent that it is OK to change the Senate rules in order to get more of your preferred judges onto the federal bench.”

Republicans would argue that Democrats changed the rules first. In any case, the current state of play has worked well for Trump, who has succeeded in confirming 24 judges to appellate courts during the first two years of his term, about 50% more than Obama (15) and George W Bush (16), and a third more than Bill Clinton (18), George HW Bush (18) and Ronald Reagan (19).



While Trump’s supreme court picks have received a lion’s share of the public’s attention, his appeals and district court picks could have more influence over the life of the nation. Photograph: Eric Thayer/Getty Images

“The nomination of judges has been one of the few bright spots of the [Trump administration](#) by a long shot,” said Josh Blackman, a professor at the South Texas College of Law specializing in the supreme court and constitutional law.

While Trump’s supreme court picks, Brett Kavanaugh and Neil Gorsuch, have received a lion’s share of the public’s attention, his appeals and district court picks could have more influence over the life of the nation, because of the relatively limited number of cases the US supreme court hears.

“The appeals courts are crucially important, because every year they resolve 50,000 or so cases, and the supreme court decides fewer than 100,” said Carl Tobias, a professor at [Richmond School of Law](#) specializing in federal judicial selection. “And so for 99.9% of cases, the court of last resort is the appeals court in your region, and so it really is critically important.”

Blackman said “conservatives are by and large happy” with Trump’s judicial picks.

“The Kavanaugh and Gorsuch nominations are sort of the icing on the cake,” Blackman said. “But I think the real action is in the lower courts, which most people don’t even know about.”

The power of federal judges in American life is tremendous – and has also worked in favor of progressive ideals. In rulings cheered by progressives since the 2016 election, judges have ordered families separated by the Trump administration at the border to be reunited; blocked the Keystone XL pipeline on environmental grounds; vacated an executive order to weaken federal unions; blocked Trump’s effort to add a citizenship question to the 2020 census; upheld a Trump ban on bump stocks for semi-automatic rifles; and sentenced former Trump aides including Michael Cohen and Paul Manafort to prison.

But federal judges have not always been antagonistic to the president. [In the past year](#), the supreme court has allowed Trump's ban on transgender troops in the military to stand, upheld a revised Muslim travel ban, complicated [abortion](#) access in California and approved a Republican-led [voter purge in Ohio](#) that disproportionately targeted racial minorities, [among other measures](#).

But so questionable has been the quality of some of Trump's nominees that even Republicans have taken pause. On Wednesday, Senator Susan Collins of Maine voted against Readler, saying that his attack on Obamacare amounted to an attempt to deny health insurance to those with pre-existing conditions. Republican senator Tim Scott opposed the nomination of Thomas Farr, who defended a North Carolina [voter ID law](#) that a federal appeals court said was enacted "with racially discriminatory intent", and of Ryan Bounds, who wrote controversial undergraduate newspaper columns at Stanford University including one comparing campus diversity efforts to Nazi Germany.

Trump's nomination of Matthew Spencer Petersen, a federal elections commissioner who had never tried a case, fell apart embarrassingly at Peterson's confirmation hearing when he [could not answer](#) basic legal questions. Trump's nomination of Texas lawyer Jeff Mateer fell apart when it emerged that Mateer had [endorsed](#) "conversion

therapy” for LGBT individuals and called transgender children proof that “Satan’s plan is working”.

Despite those stumbles, Trump has succeeded in placing enough judges to begin to shift the ideological makeup of the judiciary, including on two appellate courts. Under Trump, the 11th circuit (Alabama, Georgia and Florida) has gone from a Democratic majority to a 6-6 split, and the 3rd circuit (Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware) went from a 7-5 Democratic majority with two vacancies to what is likely to be a 7-7 split.

On the question of how the courts might be changing, Tobias said “we just don’t have that much data yet.”

“The longest anybody’s been on the bench is two years, and most of them much less time than that, so it’s really hard to draw conclusions, but they will begin to make a difference I think in the coming years, that’s for sure,” he said.

As for long-term change, Tobias noted that in short order, Trump most likely will have filled every vacancy among the 179 active circuit court judges.

“Trump is not going to have a lot more nominees at that level unless he is reelected,” Tobias said. “I think it depends on whether Trump has a second term.”

... we have a small favour to ask. Tens of millions have placed their trust in the Guardian's high-impact journalism since we started publishing 200 years ago, turning to us in moments of crisis, uncertainty, solidarity and hope. More than 1.5 million readers, from 180 countries, have recently taken the step to support us financially – keeping us open to all, and fiercely independent.

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2019/mar/10/trump-legacy-conservative-judges-district-courts>

1 in every 4 circuit court judges is now a Trump appointee

Colby Itkowitz December 21, 2019



President Trump, shown in the Oval Office on Thursday, said in November, “I’ve always heard, actually, that when you become President, the most — single most important thing you can do is federal judges.” (Jabin Botsford/ The Washington Post)

After three years in office, President Trump has remade the federal judiciary, ensuring a conservative tilt for decades and cementing his legacy no matter the outcome of November’s election.

Trump nominees make up 1 in 4 U.S. circuit court judges. Two of his picks sit on the Supreme Court. And this past week, as the House voted to impeach the president, the Republican-led Senate confirmed an additional 13 district court judges.

In total, Trump has installed 187 judges to the federal bench.

Trump's mark on the judiciary is already having far-reaching effects on legislation and liberal priorities. Just last week, the 5th Circuit struck down a core provision of the Affordable Care Act. One of the two appellate judges who ruled against the landmark law was a Trump appointee.

On Nov. 6, President Trump spoke at a ceremony to celebrate the confirmation of more than 150 federal judges since he came to office. (The Washington Post)

The Supreme Court — where two of the nine justices are conservatives selected by Trump — could eventually hear that case.

[Federal courts have ruled against Trump administration policies at least 70 times](#)

The 13 circuit courts are the second most powerful in the nation, serving as a last stop for appeals on lower court rulings, unless the case is taken up by the Supreme Court. So far, Trump has appointed 50 judges to circuit court benches. Comparatively, by this point in President

Obama's first term, he had confirmed 25. At the end of his eight years, he had appointed 55 circuit judges.

Trump's appointments have flipped three circuit courts to majority GOP-appointed judges, including the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 2nd Circuit in New York. The president has also selected younger conservatives for these lifetime appointments, ensuring his impact is felt for many years.

The executor of this aggressive push is Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), who is almost singularly focused on reshaping the federal judiciary, twice ramming through Senate rule changes to speed up confirmations over Democrats' objections.

"Leave no vacancy behind" is his mantra, McConnell has [stated publicly](#). With a 53-to-47 Senate majority, he has been able to fill openings at breakneck speed.

That philosophy did not seem to apply in 2016, when McConnell refused to allow Supreme Court nominee Merrick Garland, Obama's choice to replace the late justice Antonin Scalia, a confirmation hearing, let alone a vote.

McConnell insisted on waiting until after the 2016 election, a gamble that paid off when Trump beat Democrat Hillary Clinton. Trump appointed conservative Justice Neil M. Gorsuch for that seat.

McConnell has repeatedly described blocking Garland as one of his greatest achievements.

Before leaving town for the holidays, Senate Republicans hailed McConnell's success.

"You didn't think @senatemajldr would leave town without confirming more judges, did you?" the Senate Republican Communications Center [tweeted Friday](#), with a breakdown of the number of judges confirmed since 2017. "... Merry Christmas, America."

While Trump has wavered on some conservative policies during his tenure, he has reliably appointed judges in line with conservative ideology.

"I've always heard, actually, that when you become President, the most — single most important thing you can do is federal judges," Trump [said at a White House event](#) in November celebrating his "federal judicial confirmation milestones."

[The real reason the Trump administration is constantly losing in court](#)

The three circuit courts that have flipped to Republican majorities this year have the potential to not only change policy but also benefit Trump professionally and politically.

The 2nd Circuit, with its new right-leaning majority, will decide whether to rehear a case challenging Trump's ability [to block critics on Twitter](#), as well as one regarding [Trump's businesses profiting while he's in office](#). The 11th Circuit, which handles appeals from Georgia, Florida and Alabama, is set to take up several voting rights cases.

Trump has facetiously thanked Obama for leaving him so many judicial vacancies.

“Now, President Obama was very nice to us. He gave us 142 empty positions. That's never happened before,” Trump [said in the Oval Office on Thursday](#). “But, as you know, that's said to be the most important thing that a President has.”

When Fox News host Sean Hannity made a similar remark while interviewing McConnell on his show recently, the majority leader made clear that Obama didn't leave those vacancies intentionally.

“I'll tell you why. I was in charge of what we did the last two years of the Obama administration,” McConnell said, laughing.

“I will give you full credit for that, and by the way, take a bow,” Hannity responded.

In April, McConnell limited debate on Trump nominees from 30 hours to two hours, which has allowed him to

push through judges at warp speed. Before that, McConnell did away with “blue slips,” which allowed senators to contest judicial nominees from their home states.

Republicans say Democrats started this trend when then-Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) eliminated the filibuster for most nominees in 2013, a tool the minority party could use to block or delay a confirmation. When the Democrats lost the Senate in 2014, McConnell gained the power to stall Obama nominees, leaving Trump with plenty of vacancies.

The fast clip of judicial confirmations has no doubt shifted the courts rightward, said Russell Wheeler, a judicial branch expert at the Brookings Institution, calling it “a significant impact but not a revolutionary impact.”

At least not yet. Two-thirds of the 50 circuit court judge slots filled with Trump appointees were previously held by other Republican-appointed judges.

There is only one circuit court vacancy left for Trump to fill, but more could open up next year. And if Trump wins in November, there will certainly be vacancies in his second term. There’s also the potential for additional openings on the Supreme Court. Ruth Bader Ginsburg, appointed by President Bill Clinton in 1993, is 86 and has had health problems. Justice Stephen G. Breyer, another Clinton pick, is also over 80.

Chris Kang, chief counsel of Demand Justice, a group that supports liberal judicial nominees, wants Democrats to recognize just how high the stakes are for 2020.

“Republicans have been using the courts to achieve policy priorities that they couldn’t achieve through the democratically elected legislative branch of government,” Kang said. “These federal judges serve for life; that’s a point we take for granted, but not a way a lot of Americans understand it. Trump’s imprint on this country will be felt for decades through his courts.”

Democrats have long been reluctant to talk about the courts in a political way, Kang said. But, with Republicans choosing judges with far-right ideologies, liberals can’t “cling to romantic notions of our courts as impartial,” he added. “That’s not the reality and not how Republicans see it.”

The issue came up at last week’s Democratic presidential debate, when Sen. Amy Klobuchar (Minn.) was asked whether Trump’s appointees would make it harder for her as president to enact her agenda.

Though she didn’t answer that question directly, she said the next Democratic president will “have to immediately start putting judges on the bench to fill vacancies so that we can reverse the horrific nature of these Trump judges.”

Wheeler worries that the polarization of appointments will cause the judiciary to lose public trust, similar to what has happened with other institutions.

“We could be in for a situation if we have a rock-hard conservative majority on the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court overturning a lot of decisions by a [future] Democratic president and Congress — you could be in for a situation where the courts’ legitimacy is called into question,” he said.

Link: https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/one-in-every-four-circuit-court-judges-is-now-a-trump-appointee/2019/12/21/d6fa1e98-2336-11ea-bed5-880264cc91a9_story.html