

# **Supremely Qualified: Judge Amy Coney Barrett**

*A Review of President Donald J. Trump's  
Nomination of Judge Amy Coney Barrett to the  
United States Supreme Court*



**United States Justice Foundation**

October 2020

## Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>I. Judge Amy Coney Barrett: A Review of Qualifications.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Extensive Experience.....	4
Faithfully Fair-Minded.....	5
Judicial Temperament.....	6
Committed to the U.S. Constitution.....	6
<b>II. Constitutional Responsibilities: U.S. Supreme Court Vacancies .....</b>	<b>7</b>
President Has Constitutional Obligation to Appoint Jurist in Timely Fashion .....	7
Historical Review: Previous Supreme Court Nominations Confirmed Swiftly .....	8
Joe Biden’s Flip-Flop-Flip on Supreme Court Confirmation Process.....	8
President Trump Merely Following Biden’s Statements on Supreme Court Vacancies	9
<b>III. Debunking the Baseless &amp; Bogited Attacks .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Bigoted Attacks on Religious Views .....	10
2017 Confirmation Hearing: Dogma Lives Loudly Within You.....	10
“Faith on Trial” .....	11
Facebook Lies, Liberal Misinformation & Progressive Propaganda.....	11
Fearmongering by Senate Democrats .....	11
Descent into Anarchy: Attacks on Her Adopted Children, Cues from Bill Maher .....	12
<b>About United States Justice Foundation.....</b>	<b>13</b>

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In nominating Judge Amy Coney Barrett to the United States Supreme Court, President Donald J. Trump has selected a supremely qualified jurist and astute legal scholar with the courtroom experience and judicial temperament to faithfully uphold the U.S. Constitution.

Simply put, Judge Amy Coney Barrett is the perfect choice for the U.S. Supreme Court.

Despite her stellar reputation and undeniable qualifications, the media and Democrat Party have turned the Supreme Court vacancy caused by Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's death into a circus. John Gizzi, a longtime political columnist and White House political correspondent, put it best: "The Barrett nomination, in fact, could be the most ideologically incendiary fight over a Supreme Court nominee since former President Ronald Reagan's nomination of the late Judge Robert Bork in 1987."

The orchestrated campaign against Judge Barrett by progressive activists has been profoundly disturbing, including the following false claim that Barrett discriminated against gays and minorities, "Amy Barret says white people are Gods chosen ones. Minorities must submit to them and that's Gods plan. Obedience."

Even the left-wing fact checking website PolitiFact, which routinely promotes liberal outlets and attacks conservative articles, was forced to acknowledge the false misinformation campaign by progressives.

Nevertheless, win-at-all-costs Democrat Senators have spread false and incendiary progressive propaganda on social media, cable news and even the floor of the United States Senate. In the most egregious attack, Democrat Senator Chris Murphy of Connecticut falsely claimed that Judge Barrett's Supreme Court confirmation would trigger a "humanitarian catastrophe."

The attacks on Judge Barrett are to be expected after the shameful and bigoted attacks on Judge Barrett's religious beliefs during her confirmation hearing to the Circuit Court of Appeals. At that time, the American Bar Association rated Judge Barrett as "well qualified" to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Nevertheless, Democrat Senator Dianne Feinstein of California shamefully attacked the qualified jurist, "When you read your speeches, the conclusion one draws is that the dogma lives loudly within you."

At this historic moment, the United States Senate can recall and renew our civic virtue as a constitutional republic by swiftly confirming President Trump's supremely qualified Supreme Court nominee Judge Amy Coney Barrett. A failure to uphold the rule of law would further accelerate our decline into anarchy and reinforce the tyranny of the mob.

## I. Judge Amy Coney Barrett: A Review of Qualifications

- ✓ For almost three years, Judge Barrett has served with distinction on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.
- ✓ The American Bar Association rated Barrett “well qualified” to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.
- ✓ Judge Barrett clerked for Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia as well as Judge Laurence Silberman on the United States Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C.
- ✓ A renowned legal scholar, Judge Barrett taught constitutional law at Notre Dame Law School, where she graduated summa cum laude and served as executive editor of the Notre Dame Law Review.

On September 26, 2020, President Trump fulfilled his constitutional responsibilities by nominating Judge Amy Coney Barrett of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. <sup>1</sup>

Immediately, President Trump received high praise for his nomination from a diverse collection of civic leaders and constitutional scholars representing a cross-section of ideological beliefs. From the conservative perspective, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell said, “President Trump could not have made a better decision. Judge Amy Coney Barrett is an exceptionally impressive jurist and an exceedingly well-qualified nominee to the Supreme Court of the United States.” <sup>2</sup>

Even far-left progressives have offered strong praise and support of President Trump’s nomination. Harvard Law Professor Noah Feldman, a vociferous critic of President Trump, who testified in favor of Democrats’ impeachment of the President, authored an opinion-editorial, headlined, “Amy Coney Barrett Deserves to Be on the Supreme Court.” He writes, “She was legally prepared enough to go on the [Supreme Court] 20 years ago.” <sup>3</sup>

John Gizzi, a longtime political columnist and White House political correspondent, put it best: “The Barrett nomination, in fact, could be the most ideologically incendiary fight over a Supreme Court nominee since former President Ronald Reagan’s nomination of the late Judge Robert Bork in 1987.” <sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Tarm, Michael. “[Amy Coney Barrett, Supreme Court nominee, is Scalia’s heir](#),” Associated Press. 9-27-2020.

<sup>2</sup> McConnell, Mitch. “[McConnell Applauds President Trump’s Selection of “Exceptionally Impressive” Judge Amy Coney Barrett](#),” U.S. Senate. 9-26-2020.

<sup>3</sup> Feldman, Noah. “[Amy Coney Barrett Deserves to Be on the Supreme Court](#),” Bloomberg. 9-26-2020.

<sup>4</sup> Gizzi, John. “[Judge Barrett to Be Biggest Senate Battle Since Bork](#),” Newsmax. 9-27-2020.

## Extensive Experience

Judge Barrett’s extensive experience is universally recognized by law professors, legal scholars, and constitutional experts from across the ideological spectrum. In support of her 2017 nomination to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, more than 70 legal scholars, including Neal Katyal, who served as acting solicitor general to President Barack Obama and Vice-President Joe Biden, wrote:

*“Although we have differing perspectives on the methods and conclusions in her work, we all agree that Professor Barrett’s contributions to legal scholarship are rigorous, fair-minded, respectful, and constructive. Her work demonstrates a thorough understanding of the issues and challenges that federal courts confront in their daily work.”*<sup>5</sup>

At the time of her appointment, the American Bar Association rated Barrett “well qualified” to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. For almost three years, Judge Barrett has served with distinction on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Previously, Judge Barrett clerked for Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, who reputedly praised her judicial acumen and intellect. Based on its reporting and interviews with colleagues, the Associated Press reports that Barrett’s reputation as a Scalia clerk was “as bright and adept at picking apart poorly reasoned arguments.”<sup>6</sup> Judge Barrett has been judged as supremely qualified to serve on the United States Supreme Court.

“There is absolutely no question that the 48-year-old Barrett, a constitutional scholar who clerked for the late Justice Antonin Scalia and is now a judge on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, is qualified,” writes John Daniel Davidson, the Political Editor at The Federalist. “She is highly qualified, and everyone knows it.”<sup>7</sup>

In addition to her clerkship for Supreme Court Justice Scalia, Barrett served as a clerk to the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. for the highly regarded Judge Laurence Silberman.

A renowned legal scholar, Judge Barrett taught constitutional law at Notre Dame Law School, where she graduated summa cum laude and served as executive editor of the Notre Dame Law Review.

---

<sup>5</sup> [“Letter in Support of Nomination of Amy Coney Barrett to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit”](#)

<sup>6</sup> Tarm, Michael. [“Amy Coney Barrett, Supreme Court nominee, is Scalia’s heir,”](#) Associated Press. 9-27-2020.

<sup>7</sup> Davidson, John Daniel. [“There Is Simply No Good Reason To Not Immediately Confirm Amy Coney Barrett,”](#) The Federalist. 9-26-2020.

## Faithfully Fair-Minded

Following her nomination, 22 State Attorneys General co-signed a letter of support for Barrett's nomination, writing, "Judge Barrett is a distinguished legal scholar and an exceptional appellate judge with a track record of interpreting the Constitution according to its text and original public meaning."<sup>8</sup>

Harvard Law Professor Noah Feldman, a fierce critic of President Trump, first became acquainted with Judge Barrett more than 20 years ago when they both clerked for the Supreme Court during the 1998-99 term. Although he served as one of the Democrats' star witnesses in the impeachment case against President Trump, Feldman argues that "the principled, brilliant lawyer" ... "deserves to be on the Supreme Court". He writes:

*"I disagree with Trump's judicial nominee on almost everything. But I still think she's brilliant. Of the thirty-some clerks that year, all of whom had graduated at the top of their law school classes and done prestigious appellate clerkships before coming to work at the court, Barrett stood out. Measured subjectively and unscientifically by pure legal acumen, she was one of the two strongest lawyers."*<sup>9</sup>

Nicole Garnett, the John P. Murphy Foundation professor of law at University of Notre Dame, has known Judge Barrett more than 20 years. She writes of Barrett, "Her intellect and heart are unrivaled...an exceptional judge, award-winning teacher, generous colleague, loyal friend and loving mother. And the obvious pick to serve on the Supreme Court. She is brilliant, to be sure, but also humble, generous, loving, kind."<sup>10</sup>

Jonathan Turley, the Shapiro Professor of Public Interest Law at George Washington University, even draws parallels between Judge Barrett and the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, whom Barrett has been tapped to replace.

*"The nominee most like Ginsburg is Judge Amy Coney Barrett. They both finished law school at the top of their classes. Both went on to teach at leading law schools and both started their careers with an emphasis on procreational rights and constitutional interpretation. Deeply religious, both cited the role of faith in their careers and convictions. Like Ginsburg, Barrett refused to yield to the choice of family over career... Both women earned a reputation for civility and what Ginsburg described as showing us that 'you can disagree without being disagreeable.'"*<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Letter to Senator Mitch McConnell, 9/30/2020

<sup>9</sup> Feldman, Noah. "[Amy Coney Barrett Deserves to Be on the Supreme Court](#)," Bloomberg. 9-26-2020.

<sup>10</sup> Garnett, Nicole. "[I've known Amy Coney Barrett for 20 years. Her intellect and heart are unrivaled](#)," USA Today. 9-26-2020.

<sup>11</sup> Turley, Jonathan. "[This Supreme Court nomination is a testament to the values of feminism](#)," The Hill. 9-26-2020.

## Judicial Temperament

Judge Barrett has demonstrated through her legal scholarship and during her tenure on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit a respect for “stare decisis,” the judicial principle to respect precedent and previously established legal decisions.

In 2017, Barrett co-authored a journal article in the University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law that provided a thorough and well-reasoned evaluation of legal precedents. “Once a precedent is deeply rooted,” Barrett co-wrote, “the Court is no longer required to deal with the question of the precedent’s correctness... None of this is to say that a Justice cannot attempt to overturn long-established precedent. While institutional features may hinder that effort, a Justice is free to try.”<sup>12</sup>

Even in diminishing the importance of “judicial temperament,” Harvard’s Feldman of the Obama-Biden administration opined, “She will be an ideal colleague. I don’t really believe in “judicial temperament,” because some of the greatest justices were irascible, difficult and mercurial. But if you do believe in an ideal judicial temperament of calm and decorum, rest assured that Barrett has it.”<sup>13</sup>

## Committed to the U.S. Constitution

Judge Barrett has made clear her commitment to defending and upholding the United States Constitution. “Judges are not policymakers,” Barrett explained in her White House remarks, “and they must be resolute in setting aside any policy views they might hold.”<sup>14</sup>

In its analysis of Barrett’s writings and speeches, the Associated Press found compelling evidence of “a commitment to originalism, a concept that involves justices endeavoring to decipher original meanings of texts in assessing whether someone’s rights have been violated.”<sup>15</sup> Judge Barrett has defined originalist judges as those who “must adhere to the original public meaning of the Constitution’s text.”<sup>16</sup>

Perhaps the best summary of her ardent defense for originalism is the simple and clear statement affirming that she shared the same judicial philosophy of her mentor Justice Scalia. “His judicial philosophy is mine, too.”<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Tarm, Michael. “[Amy Coney Barrett, Supreme Court nominee, is Scalia’s heir](#),” Associated Press. 9-27-2020.

<sup>13</sup> Feldman, Noah. “[Amy Coney Barrett Deserves to Be on the Supreme Court](#),” Bloomberg. 9-26-2020.

<sup>14</sup> Whelan, Ed. “[Justice Barrett Would Extend Scalia’s Legacy](#),” National Review. 9-20-2020.

<sup>15</sup> Tarm, Michael. “[Amy Coney Barrett, Supreme Court nominee, is Scalia’s heir](#),” Associated Press. 9-27-2020.

<sup>16</sup> Freeman, James. “[Amy Coney Barrett and the Scalia Standard](#),” Wall Street Journal. 9-28-2020.

<sup>17</sup> Newburger, Emma. “[Amy Coney Barrett pays homage to conservative mentor Antonin Scalia — ‘His judicial philosophy is mine too’](#),” CNBC. 9-26-2020.

## **II. Constitutional Responsibilities: U.S. Supreme Court Vacancies**

- ✓ President Trump has a constitutional obligation to fill the Supreme Court vacancy.
- ✓ In 2016, then-Vice President Joe Biden stated: “I made it absolutely clear that I would go forward with the confirmation process as chairman even a few months before a presidential election”
- ✓ 88 Percent of the Time U.S. Senate Has Confirmed Supreme Court Nominee in Election Year When President and Senate Are Same Party.
- ✓ In 1975, just 19 days after the nomination, then-Senator Joe Biden voted in favor of GOP President Gerald Ford’s Supreme Court nominee, John Paul Steven.
- ✓ It took just 42 days for the U.S. Senate to confirm Ruth Bader Ginsburg to the Supreme Court.

### **President Has Constitutional Obligation to Appoint Jurist in Timely Fashion**

President Donald J. Trump has the exclusive power and irrevocable right to appointment Justices to the United States Supreme Court. According to Article II, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the President of the United States “shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court...”<sup>18</sup>

The U.S. Constitution does not limit this responsibility during election years nor does it set forth a mandatory evaluation period for which a nomination must be considered. As the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg observed, “There’s nothing in the Constitution that says the president stops being president in his last year.”<sup>19</sup>

In point of fact, the U.S. Senate has confirmed a Supreme Court nominee during an election year 88 percent of the time when a President and the U.S. Senate are controlled by the same political party as is currently the case with the nomination of Judge Barrett.

Indeed, even the Washington Post, which has pushed a progressive agenda under owner Jeff Bezos, notes, “There’s nothing in the Constitution that prevents a Supreme Court vacancy from being filled, regardless of how close to an election it opens up.”

There are no explicit restrictions on the qualifications of Supreme Court Justices contained under the Constitution. Justices are bound by the U.S. Constitution to act in “good behavior.” Article III, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution stipulates that judges “shall hold their offices during good behavior...”<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> [Article II, Section 2](#), Clause 2 of the United States Constitution

<sup>19</sup> Blake, Aaron. “[How the GOP is trying to justify its Supreme Court reversal](#),” Washington Post. 9-21-2020.

<sup>20</sup> Article III, Section 1 of the United States Constitution

## **Historical Review: Previous Supreme Court Nominations Confirmed Swiftly**

In 1975, just 19 days after the nomination, then-Senator Joe Biden voted in favor of GOP President Gerald Ford’s Supreme Court nominee, John Paul Stevens. Bloomberg News notes, “When the Senate considered John Paul Stevens’s 1975 nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court, he didn’t get a single question about the Roe v. Wade abortion-rights decision issued less than three years earlier.”<sup>21</sup>

Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, for whom Barrett has been nominated to replace, was confirmed after just 42 days of consideration by the U.S. Senate.<sup>22</sup>

## **Joe Biden’s Flip-Flop-Flip on Supreme Court Confirmation Process**

Joe Biden was all for the president filling a Supreme Court vacancy during an election year – when it benefited him and the far-left progressive agenda. Biden has had three positions on filling a Supreme Court vacancy during a presidential election year.

In a 1992 speech on the floor of the United State Senate, then-Senator Joe Biden opposed then-President George H.W. Bush nominating a replacement for a potential vacancy on the Supreme Court. “Once the political season is underway and it is, action on a Supreme Court nomination must be put off until after the election campaign is over,” he said.<sup>23</sup>

By 2016, Biden had changed his mind. His statements in 1992 were taken out of context, he flip-flopped: “I made it absolutely clear [in 1992] that I would go forward with the confirmation process as chairman, even a few months before a presidential election if the nominee were chosen with the advice and not merely the consent of the Senate, just as the Constitution requires.”<sup>24</sup> In a New York Times opinion editorial, then-Vice President Joe Biden unambiguously supported nominations during an election year, writing:

*“In every instance we adhered to the process explicitly laid out in the Constitution: The president has the constitutional duty to nominate; the Senate has the constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent. It is written plainly in the Constitution that both presidents and senators swear an oath to uphold and defend. That’s why I was so surprised and saddened to see Republican leaders tell President Obama and me that they would not even consider a Supreme Court nominee this year. No meetings. No hearings. No votes. Nothing. It is an unprecedented act of obstruction. And it risks a stain on the*

---

<sup>21</sup> Stohr, Greg. “[Stevens Filled a Supreme Court Role That Seems Unthinkable Now](#),” Bloomberg News, 7-17-2019.

<sup>22</sup> Reuters Staff. “[How Trump could replace Ruth Bader Ginsburg on Supreme Court, even before election](#),” 9-19-2020. Reuters.

<sup>23</sup> Davis, Julie. “[Joe Biden Argued for Delaying Supreme Court Picks in 1992](#),” New York Times. 2-23-2016.

<sup>24</sup> Blake, Aaron. “[How the GOP is trying to justify its Supreme Court reversal](#),” Washington Post. 9-21-2020.

*legacy of all those complicit in carrying out this plan. I would ask my friends and colleagues — and all those who love the Senate — to think long and hard before going down this road.”*<sup>25</sup>

In 2016, before it became exclusively anti-Trump, the New York Times acknowledged Biden’s contradictory record. The Times wrote:

*“Several elements of the old Biden speech are problematic for Democrats, most notably his position at the time as the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, making him the party’s voice on the handling of judicial nominations. The comments are also directly at odds with what President Obama and Mr. Biden, now the vice president, have been saying in demanding fair consideration for any nominee after the death of Justice Scalia on Feb. 13.”*<sup>26</sup>

Now, in 2020, when it no longer serves his personal interests, Biden has once again flip-flopped on Supreme Court nominations during presidential election years. “Let me be clear: The voters should pick a President, and that President should select a successor to Justice Ginsburg,” Biden tweeted.”<sup>27</sup>

### **President Trump Merely Following Biden’s Statements on Supreme Court Vacancies**

In his nomination of Judge Barrett, President Trump is adhering to Joe Biden’s philosophy of advice and consent on confirming Supreme Court nominations. In a 2016 Tweet, then-Vice President Joe Biden reminded the public that he supported President Reagan’s election year nomination of Justice Anthony Kennedy to fill the vacancy left by Associate Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr.: “As my record shows, I presided over the consideration of Justice Kennedy, Reagan nominee, who was confirmed in a presidential election year.”<sup>28</sup>

In February 2016, then-Vice President Joe Biden told Minnesota Public Radio that didn’t make sense to delay filling a Supreme Court vacancy. “To leave the seat vacant at this critical moment in American history is a little bit like saying, ‘God forbid something happen to the president and the vice president, we’re not going to fill the presidency for another year and a half,’” he said.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Biden, Joseph R. “[Joe Biden: The Senate’s Duty on a Supreme Court Nominee](#),” New York Times. 3-3-2016.

<sup>26</sup> Hulse, Carl. “[24 Years Later, Joe Biden’s Words Haunt Democrats](#),” New York Times. 2-22-2016.

<sup>27</sup> Vavra, Cassidy and Schrader, Adam. “[BIDEN BACKFLIP Joe Biden said in 2016 the president has a ‘constitutional duty’ to fill SCOTUS seat – even before an election](#),” The Sun. 9-19-2020.

<sup>28</sup> Biden, Joe. [Twitter. 2-23-2016](#). @VP44

<sup>29</sup> Greene, Britta. “[Biden: GOP calls to delay filling Scalia’s seat don’t make sense](#),” 2-18-2016. Minnesota Public Radio News.

### **III. Debunking the Baseless & Bogited Attacks**

- ✓ Far left progressives have unleashed a barrage of hateful and baseless attacks on Judge Amy Coney Barrett.
- ✓ One misogynist left-wing blogger attacked Judge Barrett as “a deranged freak show of an extremist.”
- ✓ Progressive comedian Bill Maher called Judge Barrett “a f\*\*king nut.”
- ✓ Democrats are threatening physical violence and a descent into anarchy if they are unable to stop Judge Barrett’s confirmation.
- ✓ In 2017, U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein led a shameful and bigoted attack on Judge Barrett because of her religious views.

Despite her stellar reputation and undeniable qualifications, the media and Democrat Party have turned the Supreme Court vacancy caused by Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's death into a circus. Judge Barrett represents a direct threat to the Beltway's Insider culture, described succinctly by President Trump as “The Swamp.” She would bring a refreshing perspective in line with the American people as the only Justice that did not attend an Ivy League law school.<sup>30</sup>

#### **Bigoted Attacks on Religious Views**

Shortly after Judge Barrett’s Supreme Court nomination, the satirical website Babylon Bee foretelling the mainstream media’s vicious and bigoted attacks on her religious beliefs. “CNN Reports Amy Coney Barrett Attended Bizarre Ceremony Where She Ate Flesh, Drank Blood of Jewish Guy,” read the headline of the satirical article.<sup>31</sup>

#### **2017 Confirmation Hearing: Dogma Lives Loudly Within You**

The attacks on Judge Barrett are to be expected after the shameful and bigoted attacks on Judge Barrett’s religious beliefs during her confirmation hearing to the Circuit Court of Appeals. At that time, the American Bar Association rated Judge Barrett as “well qualified” to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Nevertheless, Democrat Senator Dianne Feinstein of California shamefully attacked the qualified jurist, “When you read your speeches, the conclusion one draws is that the dogma lives loudly within you.”<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Tarm, Michael. “[Amy Coney Barrett, Supreme Court nominee, is Scalia’s heir](#),” Associated Press. 9-27-2020.

<sup>31</sup> Babylon Bee. “[CNN Reports Amy Coney Barrett Attended Bizarre Ceremony Where She Ate Flesh, Drank Blood Of Jewish Guy](#),” Babylon Bee. 9-28-2020.

<sup>32</sup> Hewitt, Hugh. “[Anti-Catholic bigotry has no place in the Barrett confirmation hearings](#),” Washington Post. 9-26-2020.

### “Faith on Trial”

U.S. Senator James Lankford of Oklahoma astutely notes that Democrat Senators have consciously decided to put her “faith on trial.

*“Judge Barrett's faith — not her judicial philosophy, her temperament — seems to be front and center. There doesn't seem to be a desire to have a diversity of opinion or background on that. It's just about this one area, her faith. Imposing a religious test on Supreme Court Justices is not only antithetical to the Constitution, it's a very slippery slope, and it's one we have been down before, and I thought we had cleared.”<sup>33</sup>*

*“This open attack on Barrett’s beliefs was roundly and rightly condemned. It should not be repeated. But insinuations that Catholics take their cues from Rome and not from the U.S. Constitution are deeply embedded anti-Catholic smears that still emerge when useful.”<sup>34</sup>*

### **Facebook Lies, Liberal Misinformation & Progressive Propaganda**

Even the left-wing fact checking website PolitiFact, which routinely promotes liberal outlets and attacks conservative articles, was forced to acknowledge the false progressive information campaign.<sup>35</sup> The orchestrated campaign against Judge Barrett by progressive activists has been profoundly disturbing, including the following false claims that Barrett discriminated against gays and minorities:

- x **FALSE PROGRESSIVE PROPAGANDA:** "Amy Barret said gays have a right to be discriminated against because they are against Gods wishes and won't be allowed. Heaven," one Facebook user wrote, misspelling her last name and omitting punctuation.
- x **FALSE PROGRESSIVE PROPAGANDA:** "Amy Barret says white people are Gods chosen ones. Minorities must submit to them and that's Gods plan. Obedience," reads another post from the same user.

### **Fearmongering by Senate Democrats**

Nevertheless, win-at-all-costs Democrat Senators have spread false and incendiary progressive propaganda on social media, cable news and even the floor of the United States Senate. In the most egregious attack, Democrat Senator Chris Murphy of Connecticut falsely claimed that Judge Barrett’s Supreme Court confirmation would trigger a “humanitarian catastrophe.”<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Casteel, Chris. [“Lankford decries religious bias toward nominee,”](#) The Oklahoman. 10-1-2020.

<sup>34</sup> Hewitt, Hugh. [“Anti-Catholic bigotry has no place in the Barrett confirmation hearings,”](#) Washington Post. 9-26-2020.

<sup>35</sup> Kim, Noah. [“What social media posts get wrong about Amy Coney Barrett’s religious beliefs,”](#) PolitiFact. 9-25-2020.

<sup>36</sup> Casteel, Chris. [“Lankford decries religious bias toward nominee,”](#) The Oklahoman. 10-1-2020.

## **Descent into Anarchy: Attacks on Her Adopted Children, Cues from Bill Maher**

Far left progressives have unleashed a barrage of hateful and baseless attacks on Judge Amy Coney Barrett. One misogynist left-wing blogger, The Palmer Report, attacked Judge Barrett as “a deranged freak show of an extremist who is creepily obsessed with taking away the most basic rights of a couple hundred million Americans.”<sup>37</sup> The article had been shared 3183 times. A Biden 2020 campaign staffer claimed that all Catholics should be disqualified from serving on the Supreme Court.<sup>38</sup> Progressive comedian Bill Maher called Judge Barrett “a f\*\*king nut.”<sup>39</sup>

The lowest attack on Judge Barrett was leveled by Ibram X. Kendi, a Boston University professor, who attacked Judge Barrett’s adopted children. The New York Times bestselling author called Barrett a “White colonizer” and claimed that Judge Barrett’s children were “props in their lifelong pictures of denial.”<sup>40</sup>

Democrats are even threatening physical violence and a descent into anarchy if they are unable to stop Judge Barrett’s confirmation. “If they even TRY to replace RBG we burn the entire f-----g thing down,” tweeted progressive Reza Aslan, a professor of creative writing at University of California, Riverside.<sup>41</sup>

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell wryly noted that Democrats have employed these scare tactics and fearmongering for decades. He said, “We’ve gotten the same scare tactics for almost half a century. John Paul Stevens was going to end women’s rights. David Souter was going to send vulnerable people into the Dark Ages. John Roberts was going to declare war on health insurance. And now our Democratic colleagues want Americans to believe that Judge Barrett is on a one-woman crusade to hurt Americans with pre-existing conditions.”<sup>42</sup>

At this historic moment, the United States Senate can recall and renew our civic virtue as a constitutional republic by swiftly confirming President Trump’s supremely qualified Supreme Court nominee Judge Amy Coney Barrett. A failure to uphold the rule of law would further accelerate our decline into anarchy and reinforce the tyranny of the mob.

---

<sup>37</sup> Palmer, Bill. “[Amy Coney Barrett is a deranged freak show of an extremist](#),” Palmer Report. 9-27-2020.

<sup>38</sup> Bernstein, Brittany. “[Biden Staffer Suggests ‘Intolerant’ Views of Orthodox Catholics, Jews, Muslims Should Disqualify Them from Supreme Court](#),” National Review. 9-30-2020.

<sup>39</sup> Enloe, Chris. “[Liberal law prof shreds Bill Maher for personally attacking Amy Coney Barrett’s faith: ‘A f\\*\\*king nut’](#),” The Blaze. 9-26-2020.

<sup>40</sup> Riley, Jason. “[The Left’s Unhealthy Interest in Amy Coney Barrett’s Adopted Kids](#),” Wall Street Journal. 9-29-2020.

<sup>41</sup> Dorman, Sam. “[SCOTUS battle prompts threats, calls for arson: ‘Burn Congress down’](#)” Fox News. 9-19-2020.

<sup>42</sup> McConnell, Mitch. “[McConnell Praises Judge Barrett and Denounces Attacks on Judicial Independence](#),” U.S. Senate. 9-30-2020.

## About United States Justice Foundation



The United States Justice Foundation is a nonprofit public interest, legal action organization dedicated to instruct, inform and educate the public on, and to litigate, significant legal issues confronting America.

USJF was founded in 1979 by attorneys seeking to advance the conservative viewpoint in the judicial arena.

USJF published studies and reports on topical issues and distributes them free of charge to opinion leaders, students and the general public.

USJF has contributed directly and indirectly to legal defense efforts in many celebrated cases involving fundamental conservative principles.

USJF shall not, directly or indirectly, intervene, or participate, in a political campaign on behalf of, or in opposition to, any candidate for public office.

USJF shall not endorse any candidate or contribute money to any candidate for political office.

USJF shall not provide goods or services to a candidate's campaign, raise funds from others in support of or in opposition to a candidate, distribute statements for or in opposition to a candidate, or conduct any other activity that favors or opposes a candidate for political office.

This policy being adopted reflects the practice of USJF throughout its history, since its founding in 1979.