

# KETANJI JACKSON IS TOO SUPREMELY STUPID TO BE A SUPREME COURT JUSTICE

<https://www.2thepointnews.com/ketanji-jackson-is-too-supremely-stupid-to-be-a-supreme-court-justice/>

Even before

Ketanji Brown Jackson's extraordinary statement that she does not know what a woman is, I'd concluded that she's a dim bulb and, really, the judicial equivalent of Kamala Harris: an uninspiring Black woman who's floated effortlessly upward through affirmative action and fealty to leftism.

I'd spent the day mentally writing an attack on her, only to see Tucker Carlson hold forth with an incendiary monologue that attacked her "I'm not a biologist" lunacy, the whole transgender madness that the left is advancing, and the real agenda of remaking society in an ugly way, especially through the death of free speech.

I'm posting it below since it's over 15 minutes long, so please finish reading me before you watch him, okay?

As you watch it, keep in mind a point I've made repeatedly: the giveaway that this whole transgender thing is a con is the word "transgender." If swimmer Will Thomas really were a woman (and really believed he is a woman), he wouldn't call himself a "*transgender* woman." He'd just say, "I'm a woman." The same is true for "Woman of the Year" Richard Levine, the assistant secretary for health.

The moment that word "transgender" comes out, it's a tell that this isn't a real gender. Indeed, if you get confused as to whether a "transgender woman" is someone born female and claiming to be male, or vice versa, simply substitute the word "fake" for "trans."

Will Thomas is a fake woman who is stealing swimming awards and accolades from real women. Richard Levine is a fake woman who stole the title of first female admiral in the United States Public Health Service Commissioned Corps from a future real woman.

Again, *trans* = *fake*.

And that gets us to why the left is encouraging people like Thomas and Levine. Tucker helps us understand this with his exhilarating attack on Brown Jackson, the lie of transgenderism, the leftist turnaround on what constitutes a woman, and the frightening role of social media, especially Twitter, in ending free speech as a way to push these lies throughout society.

If you watch the whole video, you see that Tucker covers Twitter CEO Parag Agrawal's express attacks on free speech, which he considers a danger to a "healthy" society, a danger that he and others like him must destroy.

Here's a different way of thinking about the social media sites' role in America. Combining the principles behind the First Amendment and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 makes what Agrawal is saying and doing unconstitutional and unlawful — as in, attorneys general need to step in to stop them.

The Civil Rights Act arose because private businesses were shutting their doors to people based on race. One could argue that freedom of association gave these businesses the right to choose who was allowed to enter. But that's not the path Congress chose. Instead, in Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Congress stated:

*(a) **Equal access** All persons shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations of any place of public accommodation, as defined in this section, without discrimination or segregation on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin.*

In a way, social media are places of public accommodation. Today's censorious tech giants, rather than being in the business of selling food, lodging, or entertainment (the targets of the Civil Rights Act), are in the business of selling and re-selling ideas. If they close their doors to classes of people they dislike, their monopolistic status means that the targeted class is out in the ideological cold.

Perhaps the most basic premise of the United States is that the free exchange of ideas is essential to a free country. If the government can break up monopolies in oil, transport, lodging, and dining, it's inconceivable that it cannot break up a monopoly on the most important thing that matters: the free exchange of ideas and information.

Indeed, I would argue that there's a powerful argument to be made that we need not update the Civil Rights Act or create new laws directed at the tech tyrants.

Because the Constitution is about the spread of ideas, and because the tech giants are impairing the 21st-century method of spreading ideas, their behavior is a *prima facie* violation of the Constitution that can be barred without any legislative acts — although it's certainly helpful to use the Civil Rights Act by way of analogy.

Back to Judge Jackson. Issues & Insights makes an excellent case why she is supremely unqualified to be a Supreme Justice. Decide for yourself — then enjoy Tucker.

A Big NO on Ketanji Jackson Brown:

We've now listened to three days of a scheduled full week of testimony by Supreme Court nominee Ketanji Brown Jackson. And to be honest, we've heard enough. Anyone who truly cares about the Constitution and the rule of law should reject Jackson.

Jackson has a winning smile and pleasant demeanor. Those are nice personal traits, but not ones that necessarily elevate you to the Supreme Court.

Still, she's also a Harvard Law grad, clerked for Justice Steven Breyer, worked as a public defender, served on the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia from 2013 to 2021, and was confirmed by the Senate to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit just last year.

But do those credentials really matter? Maybe they should, but unfortunately they're mostly political window dressing.

As both President Joe Biden and the Democrats have made clear, Jackson was selected because she was, 1) African-American, 2) a woman, and (most important of all) 3) a leftist. Unfortunately, none of those things are actual qualifications for the Supreme Court.

Despite her superficially sparkling resume, under tough questioning this week, she showed why she shouldn't be privileged with a seat on our nation's highest court. On issue after issue, she whiffed, at times pretending not to have an opinion, or acting as if she didn't really know much about certain landmark legal cases and current controversies.

Indeed, it became very clear under questioning that Jackson has been disingenuous about her legal philosophy and extreme political beliefs that encompass race, gender, crime and culture, among other things.

Her answers were at times not believable. To wit:

Sen. Marsha Blackburn at one point asked a simple question: "Can you provide a definition for the word 'woman'?"

Should be a slam dunk. Women and men are physically different. That's not an opinion; that's a biological fact, beyond serious dispute.

Jackson's answer: "Can I provide a definition? No. I can't." She also said in response to the same question, "I'm not a biologist."

Jackson also came under close questioning for what can only be called her lax attitude as a judge toward sentencing those convicted in child porn cases.

Lax may be an understatement. In a "Note" in the Harvard Law Review, she even once argued that our judicial system was "unfair" to those who sexually prey on children.

"Further research into the Supreme Court nominee revealed that Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson deviated from federal sentencing guidelines in *every single child porn case, favoring the child porn offenders* (emphasis ours) while on the federal bench," noted the Post Millennial, in a lengthy piece looking at Jackson's history.

"Judge Jackson has a pattern of letting child porn offenders off the hook for their appalling crimes, both as a judge and as a policymaker," Sen. Josh Hawley of Missouri, who questioned Jackson, noted last week. "She's

been advocating for it since law school. This goes beyond ‘soft on crime.’ I’m concerned that this a record that endangers our children.”

That isn’t all. Not by a long shot.

Asked by Texas Republican Sen. Jon Cornyn about due process under the Constitution, Jackson claimed judicial activism, a hallmark of leftist jurisprudence, is something she opposes.

In reference to that, Cornyn asked about the infamous Dred Scott decision handed down in 1857.

“I don’t quite remember the basis for the *Dred Scott* opinion,” she said, “but I’ll trust you.”

Don’t remember? Dred Scott was, by common assent among legal scholars, the worst decision in Supreme Court history. It denied African-Americans citizenship, whether free or enslaved. The Dred Scott decision became one of the triggers for our Civil War.

“Don’t quite remember the basis”? C’mon, man.

Finally, under intense questioning by Sen. Ted Cruz, Jackson denied knowing even what Critical Race Theory, an off-shoot of Critical Legal Studies, is: “I’ve never studied Critical Race Theory, and I’ve never used it. It doesn’t come up in my work as a judge.”

But as Breitbart explained: “Georgetown Day School, the private Pre-K-12 school where Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson sits on the board of trustees, teaches radical critical theory pedagogy, and boasts on its website ‘everyone will engage in the work of social justice within all aspects of school life’ — which Judge Jackson would be required to ‘support’ and ‘promote’ as a member of the board.”

Cruz illustrated the point, showing several kids’ books in use at the grade school level at Georgetown Day School, including one called “*Antiracist Baby*.” Some other names from the school’s own website include: “*Picture Books for Young Activists*,” “*The Very Best Code Switch Episodes For Kids*,” “*The Little Book of Little Activists*,” “*Not My Idea: A Book About Whiteness*,” and “*Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life*.”

In short, it she lied to the Senate, point blank. This is, straight up, CRT. It also has nothing to do with legitimate learning about the Three Rs, or, for that matter, exploring our nation’s wonderful, but admittedly imperfect, history.

It hurts her cause, as well, to know that, according to Yahoo news, Jackson “favorably cited journalist Nikole Hannah-Jones, civil rights activist Derrick Bell, and Bell’s wife, scholar Janet Dewart Bell. All three figures have been associated with Critical Race Theory.”

Watch videos [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#) for a fuller understanding of how Jackson is obfuscating and hiding her true agenda, which is perfectly aligned with that of the extreme left in this country.

She speaks at times in reverential tones about the Constitution, even claiming to be something of an “originalist,” but her actions as a judge and individual show otherwise. As others on the left, she sees the Constitution as a highly flawed document created by racist men, infinitely malleable to political ends.

No doubt, the left will try to strong arm the weaker Republicans in the Senate to vote for Jackson. But after the Democrats’ viciously partisan circuses that accompanied the nominations of Robert Bork, Clarence Thomas and, most recently, Brett Kavanaugh, Republicans are under no obligation to soft-pedal their issues with this nominee. They must stand up.

We wish Jackson well as a human being. But no Republican, knowing full well that a majority of Ketanji Brown Jacksons on the court would spell the end of our republic, should vote for her.

Now here's Tucker!

x

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I3Jmv0vZvJ4>

---

*Andrea Widburg is deputy editor of American Thinker*

Copyright ©2024 **2 The Point News** unless otherwise noted.