



Sen. Hawley Demands Answers About Jackson's Judicial Record on Sex Offenders

As Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson draws closer to Senate confirmation as Biden's "Diversity Hire" for the Supreme Court, her past is coming out to haunt her. Not only is she unsurprisingly in favor of Critical Race Theory, but her judicial record shows she is also soft on sex offenders — even those whose crimes were against children.

Though President Joe Biden promised that his nominee would be "someone with extraordinary qualifications, character, experience and integrity," he also promised to limit his choice based on sex and color, adding, "And that person will be the first black woman ever nominated to the United States Supreme Court." While those remarks were made in late January, his promise to make a "Diversity Hire" for the Supreme Court goes back to his days on the campaign trail.



Sen. Josh Hawley (AP Images)

And Biden has kept to that politically-correct promise, despite an [ABC poll](#) that found that 76 percent of Americans "believe Joe Biden should 'consider all possible nominees'" and not just "consider only nominees who are Black women, as he has pledged to do."

He appears to have overlooked his promise that his choice would have "extraordinary qualifications, character, experience and integrity." Because as Jackson's confirmation hearing approaches, things from her past are coming to light that show a decided lack of "extraordinary qualifications, character, experience and integrity."

First as *The New American's* Cort Kirkwood [reported](#), Jackson has a history of promoting Critical Race Theory while appearing to believe that the 1619 Project is real history. That means that either Jackson is a deliberate liar or — more charitably — she simply isn't that sharp. After all, anyone who takes time to study history — as Jackson must have done at some point in her life, such as college — would know that the 1619 Project's distorted version of history lacks anything resembling credibility.

If she is a liar, she is not "someone with extraordinary qualifications, character, experience and integrity." If she is intellectually challenged, she is not "someone with extraordinary qualifications, character, experience and integrity."

So, as Kirkwood's article wonderfully illustrates, her peddling of CRT as genuine history would — all by itself — mean that she is not qualified to sit on the Supreme Court. But, like the man on the late-night infomercial says, "But wait! There's more."

Jackson's lack of understanding history pales in comparison to what her judicial record reveals about



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on March 19, 2022

her lack of “extraordinary qualifications, character, experience and integrity.” Her handling of cases involving sex offenders — even those who committed sexual crimes against children — has Senator Josh Hawley (R-Mo.) demanding answers.

Hawley took to Twitter to express his outrage over what he was finding as a result of researching Jackson’s record. His initial tweet became a lengthy thread, exposing Jackson’s record for all to see.

Hawley’s barrage of tweets containing damning info on Jackson began when he tweeted, “I’ve been researching the record of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson, reading her opinions, articles, interviews & speeches. I’ve noticed an alarming pattern when it comes to Judge Jackson’s treatment of sex offenders, especially those preying on children.”

Next, he tweeted, “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. 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.”

And then, Hawley unleashed a torrent of examples that support his assertions.

In one tweet, accompanied by a photo of the document he cites, Hawley wrote:

As far back as her time in law school, Judge Jackson has questioned making convicts register as sex offenders – saying it leads to “stigmatization and ostracism.” She’s suggested public policy is driven by a “climate of fear, hatred & revenge” against sex offenders

He also tweeted that when Jackson was “a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission,” she “advocated for drastic change in how the law treats sex offenders by eliminating the existing mandatory minimum sentences for child porn,” and quoted her (with accompanying document) as saying that some people who possess child porn ‘are in this for either the collection, or the people who are loners and find status in their participation in the community.’”

Hawley sarcastically asked, “What community would that be? The community of child exploiters?”

Staying to the child pornography theme a little longer (since it seems Jackson spent quite a bit of time on the subject), Hawley also tweeted, “Judge Jackson has opined there may be a type of ‘less-serious child pornography offender’ whose motivation is not sexual but ‘is the challenge, or to use the technology.’”

If Jackson thinks there may be child pornography offenders who search for, find, download, and view pictures and videos of children being sexually abused because they enjoy “the challenge” of using “the technology,” we are back to where we started earlier; She is either a liar or has roughly the intelligence of a bag of pencil shavings. In either case, she shows her decided unfitness to serve in any capacity at all.

Hawley wasn’t finished yet, though. He wrote that “In her time on the U.S. Sentencing Commission, Judge Jackson said she ‘mistakenly assumed that child pornography offenders are pedophiles’ and she wanted ‘to understand this category of nonpedophiles who obtain child pornography.’”

And Hawley pointed out that her ideas are not merely academic or theoretical. “On the federal bench, Judge Jackson put her troubling views into action. In every single child porn case for which we can find records, Judge Jackson deviated from the federal sentencing guidelines in favor of child porn



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on March 19, 2022

offenders,” he tweeted. He followed that tweet with a case in point, writing, “In the case of *United States v. Hawkins*, the sex offender had multiple images of child porn. He was over 18. The Sentencing Guidelines called for a sentence of up to 10 years. Judge Jackson sentenced the perpetrator to only 3 months in prison. Three months.”

And it isn’t just those with photos and videos Jackson let off easy. Hawley had other examples, including a mass consumer of child pornography who had heinous plans for a young girl. He tweeted, “In *United States v. Stewart*, the criminal possessed thousands of images of child porn and also hoped to travel across state lines to abuse a 9-year-old girl. The Guidelines called for a sentence of 97-121 months. Judge Jackson sentenced the criminal to just 57 months.”

Hawley lists multiple other such cases. And they all follow the same theme. Jackson seems always to have taken it easy on sexual predators who target children. And that is true even if the child is the sexual predator’s own young daughter, as in the case of *United States v. Sears*, in which, as Hawley tweeted, “the sex offender distributed more than 102 child porn videos. He also sent lewd pictures of his own 10-year-old daughter.” Though the guidelines recommended 97-121 months in prison, Hawley tweeted, “Judge Jackson gave him 71 months.” Doing the math, his daughter will still be a minor when the man who objectified her for his perverse sexual pleasure gets out of prison, even if he serves every day of his Jacksonian sentence.

Biden, though is unmoved by this and is doubling down on Jackson. Though it is obvious that Jackson is entirely unqualified, Biden still seems happy that she is black and female. And liberal mainstream media — as usual — seem to be likewise unmoved by the facts.

After his tweets had been shared and liked thousands of times, Hawley tweeted, “Judge Jackson has yet to address her alarming record on child porn offenders. But rather than ask her questions, the Washington Post is regurgitating White House talking points. Their ‘fact check’ questions & my answers below. Now go ask the person nominated for the Supreme Court.”



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.