

On September 14, 2026, President Trump nominated Robert Edward “Bobby” Long, Jr. to a lifetime seat on the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida. While Long has spent time on the state appellate and trial benches, his record is defined not by impartial jurisprudence, but by a deep-seated commitment to hard-right ideological movements and law enforcement interests. Rather than demonstrating the fairness and balance required for a federal trial court, Long's career reveals a nominee positioned to entrench personal biases, dismantle civil rights protections, and apply an extremist judicial framework for decades.

Long is a longtime operative within the far-right legal pipeline. He has been an active member of the Federalist Society since 2005, climbing the ranks from law school chapter president to steering committee member throughout his entire judicial career. Furthermore, his selection as a Blackstone Legal Fellow in 2006 embeds him directly with the Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) — an organization dedicated to dismantling reproductive freedom and equal rights. Long's sustained, multi-decade allegiance to these groups proves his primary loyalty is to an ideological agenda, rendering him fundamentally unfit for an independent, lifetime federal judgeship.

WIELDS AN EXTREMIST JUDICIAL PHILOSOPHY ROOTED IN “NATURAL ORDER”

Federal district judges must faithfully apply codified text and binding precedent, yet Long has explicitly weaponized his platform to champion a subjective, regressive worldview. In a blatant assault on civil rights, Long used a 2026 speech to attack *Bostock v. Clayton County* — the landmark ruling protecting gay and transgender workers from discrimination — aligning himself firmly with far-right dissenters. He openly argues that judges should interpret laws through the lens of a “created natural order” and a “Western moral ethic,” citing ancient and religious texts like Exodus and Deuteronomy to guide judicial decisions.

Long has similarly expressed a values-based worldview while dismissing structural discrimination. Faced with staggering racial disparities in his own juvenile court jurisdiction — where Black youth made up 72% of arrests and 75% of adult court transfers despite being only 39% of the population — Long trivialized systemic racism. Instead of addressing institutional failures, he placed the blame entirely on individual choices, lecturing children to simply “graduate from high school,” “get married, stay married,” and find a minimum-wage job. This regressive approach is highly relevant to examining how his broader moral framework could inform his consideration of cases involving government policies and marginalized communities.

SIDED AGAINST BLACK VOTERS TO DILUTE REPRESENTATION

Long has already utilized his judicial power to actively suppress minority voting rights, executing the exact anti-civil rights agenda favored by his political patrons. In *Byrd v. Black Voters Matter*, Long joined an appellate decision that reversed a trial court order protecting North Florida's only Black-performing congressional district. The practical result of this decision was that the trial court judgment protecting Black voters was completely wiped out from the region.

Writing a separate, aggressive concurrence in that case, Long rejected the challengers' efforts to preserve minority voting power. He dismissed their constitutional protection against diminishing minority voters' ability to elect candidates in an effort to "lock racial gerrymanders in perpetuity." Instead of being grounded in the law, Long grounded his concurrence in his personal ideas of racial equality, subverting the spirit of Florida's Fair Districts Amendment to ensure that race-conscious government action was blocked. His concurrence articulated a broader hostility toward civil rights protections that would bear directly on the voting-rights disputes he would encounter as a federal judge.

DEEP PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL BIAS FAVORING LAW ENFORCEMENT

A federal trial judge routinely presides over critical civil rights cases, police misconduct lawsuits, and criminal trials, demanding total neutrality. Long's unusually extensive personal, professional, and institutional identification with law enforcement forms an irreconcilable conflict of interest for his independence on the bench. He joined the Sheriff's Explorers before finishing eighth grade, calling it his "second family," and later stated that the program made him who he is today.

Those ties continued throughout his legal career, creating a blatant double standard. Long spent years as general counsel and an executive command staff major for the Leon County Sheriff's Office and built a private practice career representing law enforcement agencies and private prison entities like the GEO Group in wrongful death actions. Long has repeatedly spoken about law enforcement in deeply personal terms, publicly telling deputies to "be proud of that uniform" and describing them as people who belong to a proud lineage facing "the world's demons". This intense institutional allegiance leaves a significant part of the record open to questioning his impartiality in criminal prosecutions and civil rights litigation.

CONCLUSION

Anyone confirmed for a lifetime role on the federal judiciary must demonstrate a commitment to fairness, independence, and equal justice for all. Robert Edward “Bobby” Long, Jr. fails this standard completely. His career is a roadmap of stripping Black voters of political representation to replacing constitutional law with personal religious dogma. Because he lacks the neutrality, independence, and dedication to civil rights necessary to serve the public, Long remains fundamentally unfit and unqualified to serve as a federal district court judge.