

Hello, everyone. Stluhdog here. An old guy who knows shit, continuing with **Season 2, an old guy who knows shit explains it all for you.**

Got a BONUS episode today. One of our us supreme court justices just bragged on religious liberty, so I gotta respond with

Episode 6A

Not Just In Bed With the Devil

Copyright © 2022 by LR Hults

Our "supreme court justice" who wrote the opinion overturning Roe, calling it "egregiously wrong", is spending his vacation time at the 2022 Notre Dame Religious Liberty Summit in Rome, where he mocked the many, many country leaders who condemned his ruling, and where he also said this:

"It is hard to convince people that religious liberty is worth defending if they don't think that religion is a good thing that deserves protection," he said. "The challenge for those who want to protect religious liberty in the United States, Europe, and other similar places is to convince people who are not religious that religious liberty is worth special protection. That will not be easy to do."

So, uh, Father Sam (And you know, I discover I cannot write the word "justice" with your name behind it; it comes out "Fr. Sam"), let me give you a little historical context here, this country was founded, a coupla hundred years ago, on the principle of **personal liberty** not religious liberty. There were very strong voices for Christian theocracy among the framers, but, uh, in case you hadn't heard, they were outvoted, and the very first amendment to the constitution makes the compromise very clear: religion gets to do whatever it wants as long as it stays out of the state. It is the FIRST clause of the FIRST amendment. It was the very, very first bone of contention that had to be resolved in an amendment. Ya'll got your freedom to oppress, but the deal was that you keep it to yourselves, and we'll all keep your religion out of our state.

And you, a supreme court justice, are talking about convincing us non-religious types that your religion deserves special protection? HELLO? You are a freakin' supreme court justice. It is supposed to be your job to keep religions from ever getting any special protections at all. Did you miss that in your job description? It is your job to protect OUR rights, NOT your RELIGION's rights.

My family has not sworn fealty to your religion. Your religion does not get to tell my family what to do. This is supposed to be America, for crying out loud! Why in the world would us non-religious types ever subject ourselves to the oppression of a religion we have not sworn fealty to? Oh my goodness! Could it be because we dare to think of ourselves as living in a free country?

Besides, Fr. Sam, religious liberty is not what you are talking about, is it? If you were talking about religious liberty, you would believe that Muslims and Mormons and Buddhists and Hindus and Wiccans and Atheists ALL deserve the same "special

protection" that Christians do. In short, you would be proclaiming personal liberty so that every religion would be guaranteed equal treatment. And we would be at liberty to choose among all of the religious options. That would be religious liberty.

But we all know that that is not what you and your Roman audience mean by religious liberty and special protection, is it?

What you MEAN by religious liberty is religion's freedom to oppress. What you mean by special protection is that the specifically Christian freedom to oppress is more important than any OTHER Religion's freedom to oppress. In fact, the Christian freedom to oppress is more important than our freedom to live.

Religious liberty. Right. What you are really talking about, Fr. Sam, is Christian theocracy, isn't it? Take "religious" and attach it to the word "liberty" and of course you're talking about the American thing to do!

But what you are really talking about is taking away our freedom to live and replacing that with your religion's freedom to oppress. What a classic slimeball lawyer move.

But, sadly, it worked, didn't it? And just like that, thanks to Fr. Sam and his cohorts, women are not free any more. Their freedom is lost, and now belongs to Christianity, exercising its more important freedom to oppress.

In a country where freedom of religion also supposedly guarantees freedom FROM religion. One is tempted to use the words: not just wrong, but egregiously wrong.

I remember seeing an article somewhere about John Roberts being worried that the supreme court might lose some stature or respect as a result of the Republican cheating. You know, Justice Roberts – and I give you the respect of your title, for I believe that you understand the importance of personal liberty – so, you know, Justice Roberts, that train left the station a long time ago. Mitch McConnell drove that train right out of the station when he stood up to the world and taught us all that your institution deserves no respect, it is just a political tool. Now Mitch has had his way, I will resist calling them tools, but come on, I worked with clerks in document processing who argued more logically than the "decisions" handed down by these republican hacks. And we can't fire the religious fascists who openly oppose the constitution.

Sorry, Justice Roberts, nothin' left to respect, there it is. You and I both lose this round, big time, to the political hacks.

Folks, are ya' fond of the personal liberty?

Do not vote Republican.