

Daily Meditation 07/07/2023

The Silliness—and Clear and Present Danger—of Today's SCOTUS

Good morning.

Today we continue our meditation on the dangers in the present Supreme Court. They do not seem interested in hearing arguments from those who suffer from their decisions. They don't want to hear, apparently, from women or from the 62% of Americans who are against outlawing all abortion.

They don't want to hear from their own colleague, Justice Jackson, who is a black woman, and has understood and studied her own legacy and lays it out powerfully in her dissension statement from the recent Affirmative action decision.

It's like their minds are all made up already. Why should they hear about what killing Dobbs does to women? Why should they hear from black people about what killing affirmative action does to advancing their cause, and what they've been through for centuries as slaves under Jim Crow and the rest?

Much of this is deja vu for someone my age, because I remember the protests of the early 60s, late 50s, sitting at lunch counters and so forth. People marched, people went to jail, many of them teenagers. And, of course, people were murdered, including the Rev. Doctor King. It's as if these sacrifices do not enter the equation with this particular Supreme Court. They're so sure of themselves, they've come with the answers, because then they make up laws that don't make any sense to me as a citizen, that undo decades and decades of jurisprudence, and without any convincing arguments, as far as I can tell.

Of course, everything evolves and I'm not saying that affirmative action as we had it is the last word. Why don't we improve it, instead of throwing it out the window?

So I highly recommend this article in today's meditation. It's called "A License to Hate." And that very short phrase, a license to hate, is obviously very pungent, and very real, because this is a ridiculous case against a gay couple wanting to hire a web designer for their wedding.

And the majority of the Supreme Court leaped at the opportunity: first of all, they wanted the case, invited it to come all the way to the Supreme Court. But they didn't do their homework. They didn't know that this lady who brought the case, the plaintiff, Lorie Smith, made it up; it was a made-up case.

She gave the name of the so-called gay person wanting to hire her as a webmaster. And he has since the case was declared come clean, said he never asked for this, that it's something she made up. Why would he? He's a webmaster himself; he would do his own web mastery. But equally importantly, he's not gay and has been married to a woman for 15 years.

So this woman who won her case at the Supreme Court, the all-knowing Supreme Court, full of bigots, made it all up.

Her lawyer defends her and says, "No one should have to be punished by the government to challenge an unjust law." That's her lawyer's answer. So what, it doesn't matter that it was all in her head. I'm sorry, but you don't need a doctorate in law to know this is crazy stuff, that six judges decided in her favor without even asking the question, never brought in apparently, the individual who this woman says was demanding that she do something against her faith.

But the bottom line is the title of the article. I urge you to go and read "A License to Hate." Because once this case is over the finish line, which it is, I guess, it opens the door. It is a very slippery slope.

If this woman can make something up like this, other people can project their hatred and make equally unjust decisions. The Supreme Court has given a license to hate to every crazy one in the land, to everyone who is filled with hate. So much for justice.

Thank you. We'll see you tomorrow.