# Has Impeachment Trial Provided a Golden Opportunity?



By: Devvy

Like millions I watched quite a bit of the House impeachment farce. *Never* in my 30 years of being in the trenches have I ever heard such lies and distortions. I must admit after 5 minutes or so each from Nadler, Schiff and his other comrades, I simply had to hit mute until GOP reps were 'allowed' to question the *hearsay and opinion panels* they tried to pass off as witnesses. Next Impeachment Star Witness: Sgt. Schultz

**Then on to the Senate**. Since I don't own a TV, I also watched it live on pbs.org. If I had to miss some of the live broadcast, they provide archives to watch later.

The House managers were zombies repeating the same lies until you wanted to either puke or shoot the tv (in my case computer screen). Rep. Demings is beyond a nit-wit. The woman simply has no association with truth and facts. She should wear a warning sign on her forehead: Room for rent.

Rep. Lofgren showed up looking her usual: Everyone's favorite bar fly. Like Demings, Jeffries, Schiff and Nadler, they all repeated the same scripted lies no matter how many facts, times, dates, places, the WH lawyers presented. I give all of them an A+. They were prepared with documentation and quick with legal responses as well as legal precedents.

Water off a duck's back. The House managers would get right back to the mic and repeat the same lies over and over and over. Actually, I can't find anymore words to describe this farce except what the American people saw was obscene. Right along with scumbag, Chief Justice John Roberts. Below was a question from Sen. Rand Paul.

"My question today is about whether or not individuals who were holdovers from the Obama National Security Council and Democrat partisans conspired with Schiff staffers to plot impeaching the President before there were formal House impeachment proceedings."

Nowhere does Rand Paul use Eric Ciaramella's name in that question. Ciaramella and his role in this seditious conspiracy is all over the Internet. Schifty Schitt says he's never met the fake whistleblower or spoken with him but we *know* that's a bald-faced lie. Whistleblowers are protected as they should be from retaliation at their job. Despite Demorats blathering to the contrary, no law prohibits exposing the person's name.

"Chief Justice John Roberts declined to read a question from a senator from Kentucky: "The presiding officer declines to read the question as submitted." Roberts is basically admitting that Eric Ciaramella is the whistleblower because Rand Paul didn't mention that."

Timing in life is everything and as sure as the sun shines in June, war-monger, John Bolton, is thrust into the spot light over an alleged leak from his new book. Allegedly, supposedly since only a few "trusted" sources have read the manuscript — or not — Bolton accuses Trump of linking a pause on the unconstitutional aid to Ukraine with investigating Joe Biden.

<u>Washington Post Wrote About Hunter Biden, Burisma 3 Days</u> <u>Before Ukraine Call</u>, Jan. 30, 2020 Jumping Jehoshaphat! Hunter Biden and Burisima were under investigation before Trump became president. Trump could not know four years ago about this and just because Hunter's father decided to enter the presidential race does NOT give a free pass to creepy Joe.

Every one of the House managers repeated Trump did this to enrich himself and harmed national security. What the Hell? The man left the private sector and a billionaire lifestyle to work for free. That's right. He donates 100% of his salary to some government agency every month. Trump Continues to Donate Salary —Gives \$100,000 to Repair Military Cemeteries — Liberal Media Ignores the Story

Pray tell how did he 'endanger national security' by putting a hold on unconstitutional lethal military aid to Ukraine to make sure YOUR money would not end up in the hands of corrupt officials and oligarchs?

"My fellow Americans, the United States has had a treaty with the Ukraine government since 1999 called the TREATY WITH UKRAINE ON MUTUAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE IN CRIMINAL MATTERS by which the US and Ukraine government mutually work together to root out corruption and bring guilty parties engaged in criminal matters to justice."

As for Joe Biden whose dementia seems to be worsening, he's got a real problem.

Fired Ukrainian Prosecutor Viktor Shokin FILES FEDERAL COMPLAINT Against Joe Biden, Jan. 29, 2020 — <u>Here is the full document.</u>



Going back to the non-bombshell Bolton book leak. Willard Mittens Romney somehow was allegedly elected to the Senate by the people of Utah.

Romney is a cry-baby so jealous of Donald Trump he reeks **green** with envy. Mittens loved Trump when he endorsed him for the Senate.

Immediately following every paid liar for hire on MSNBC, CNN and all the rest who took this leak to the media as fact — Democrats started screaming we must have Bolton testify! We must have more witnesses or it isn't a fair trial! OMG.

Naturally, blustering buffoon, Romney, jumped on the garbage truck. Anything to get Trump. And it's not going to stop. Demorats know they've lost their quest to remove Trump so now their media are all chanting the same talking points that the trial was rigged, blah, blah, blah in an effort to taint the November election. Get ready to hear Trump is impeached forever!

Those mental midgets pledge to not accept an acquittal as legitimate.

However, there actually might be a golden opportunity come out of this manufactured impeachment effort.

"James Madison wrote in The Federalist Papers #45: "The Senate will be elected absolutely and exclusively by the State

legislatures."

As regular readers know, I have been on the non-ratified Seventeenth Amendment since 1993. I filed a lawsuit to keep Sen. Ted Cruz off the ballot. The outcome from the appeals court in Austin, TX was predictable. No one wanted to touch it. All of my filings are here. Latest at top, scroll to bottom for initial filing.

The biggest irony: <u>Ted Cruz at ALEC summit: end direct vote</u> <u>for senators</u>, Dec. 2013 before I filed my lawsuit.

Just need to bring this up from one of my columns:

"On April 11, 2002, the State of Alabama decided out of the clear blue to ratify the Seventeenth Amendment — 89 years after the alleged ratification. Back in 1913, not all states were in session; some were out of session four years at a time. Others took no action on the amendment — Georgia specifically based on an investigation ordered by their governor at the time that the Seventeenth Amendment was not legally adopted by Congress before it was even sent to the states.

"On July 1, 2010, 97 years after the alleged ratification of that amendment, the State of Delaware ratified it. On April 1, 2012, 99 years after the alleged ratification, the State of Maryland voted to ratify the Seventeenth Amendment. How interesting that nearly 100 years after the alleged ratification of the Sevententh Amendment and after people like me have been pounding on this issue for close to two decades, three states just up and decided to vote on an old constitutional amendment."

There has been a virtual black-out on any discussions or even raising the issue of the Seventeenth Amendment except a piece here and there. Most of it is about repealing that amendment. But, how can you repeal an amendment that was never legally ratified?

Okay, drum roll, please.

<u>Utah lawmaker files bill to allow recall of sitting U.S.</u> senator

"The lawmaker, Rep. Tim Quinn, R-Heber City, told the Deseret News in an interview Wednesday shortly after the bill was made public that it's not meant to target any specific sitting Utah senator — but it comes amid heightened national attention on Sen. Mitt Romney, who has been among the few Republican senators publicly critical of President Donald Trump...

"The bill, <u>HB217</u>, would establish a process for legal voters to petition through signature gathering to place a question on the ballot to recall a U.S. senator.

"It would require signatures equal to 25% of the number of active voters in the state on Jan. 1 immediately following the last regular general election. If that threshold is met, the lieutenant governor would place the recall question on the ballot of the next election that occurs at least 90 days after the question is certified.

"Under the bill, an incumbent senator would not be subject to recall if the senator has not been in office for at least one year of his or her current term.

"Quinn said he sees the bill as a "good compromise between pre-and post-17th Amendment" that contains a fitting standards to meet for a recall."

Most Americans don't know you cannot recall a member of Congress. Nineteen states allow recall for any elected official from dog catcher to governor. However, that does not apply to members of Congress.

Been down this road before when well-meaning Americans in New Jersey tried to recall their crook Senator Robert Menendez. I predicted it would go down in flames and the courts rightly ruled so. From my column on that one:

## Sen. Menendez Recall Killed by NJ Supreme Court

"As I predicted back in June, and fully explained in Footnote 1 below, the New Jersey Supreme Court has killed the effort to recall U.S. Senator Robert Menendez: Nov. 18, 2010. Court kills Robert Menendez recall push

"The New Jersey Supreme Court struck down a tea party-led push to recall Democratic Sen. Robert Menendez as unconstitutional Thursday.

"In a 4-2 decision, state Supreme Court justices said that the Constitution forbids the recall of a sitting U.S. senator. Lawyers for The Committee to Recall U.S. Senator Robert Menendez argued that New Jersey law allows for such a recall, but justices determined that law was pre-empted by federal statute."

"Nowhere in Art. 1, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution, Art. 1, Section 3 does it contain any language about recall."

Text from the Quinn's bill:

### LONG TITLE

- 8 General Description:
- 9 This bill amends the Election Code to provide for the recall of a United States senator.
- 10 Highlighted Provisions:
- 11 This bill:
- 12 ▶defines terms;
- 13 ▶establishes a process for legal voters to petition to place a question on the ballot to recall a United States senator;
- 14 ▶describes the signature requirements for a petition to recall a United States senator;

Even if they get enough petition signatures, like the Menendez

case, I believe will fail. This was already <u>tried in Wisconsin</u> back in 1997:

"A Milwaukee-based organization called First Breath Alliance presented the petitions, collected over a 60-day period, at state election headquarters in Madison but announced it had fallen several thousand signatures short.

"The group said it had 349,948 signatures to recall Sen. Russell Feingold and 343,494 against Sen. Herb Kohl. A total of 391,000 signatures were required against each senator to force a recall."

Let me point out something for state legislators.

Full text of "Constitution Jefferson's Manual And Rules Of the House Of Representatives Of The United States Eighty Seventh Congress"

"The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose, Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

"Question has arisen as to the power of a State to recall its assent to a constitutional amendment (V. 7042)."

Since several states were out of session at the time of the

vote, have they been deprived of equal Suffrage in the U.S. Senate because they did not participate in the ratification of this amendment? Is fraud (non-ratification) enough to allow a state to declare it null and void in their state?

As many states back then were out of session for four years at a time, they were denied equal sufferage in the Senate. I believe there are more state legislatures with constitutionally minded reps and senators who could really raise legal hell over that amendment.

This is an important link. I went to great lengths to give legislators all the reasons why that amendment must be challenged. The Seventeenth Amendment: A Cancer on our Constitutional Republic — Crushing the Rights of the Sovereign States of the Union

This is not the first interest in getting rid of that destructive non-ratified amendment. Besides the boatload of information at the link above, there are more I found later; listed below in links section.

Today I will call Rep. Quinn's office and try to speak with his Chief of Staff. I proved beyond any legal doubt ratification was two states short. All the documents I presented to the court were court certified both from the National Archives and the State of California archives. Hopefully, I will be able to have a conversation with Quinn down the road and see we can't formulate a plan.

[Just a note about my recent column on the economy. So many emailed asking who could they buy gold from that I trust? I'm sorry I can't answer every email. My friend, Rob Westfall, RWInc., has been a precious metals dealer for a very long time. I've known Rob for well over a decade. He's one of the nicest people you'll ever meet but more important, he knows the trends and markets. His number in Florida is: 813.977.7200]

**Note:** For a thorough, comprehensive education on the Fed, the income tax, education, Medicare, SS, the critical, fraudulent ratification of the Seventeenth Amendment and more, be sure to order my book, <u>"Taking Politics Out of Solutions"</u>. 400 pages of facts and solutions.

© 2020 NWV - All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Devvy: <a href="mailto:devvyk@npn.net">devvyk@npn.net</a>

### Links:

# A Magic Bullet Will Be Needed to Kill the 17th Amendment

Law Professor: 17th Amendment 'Disenfranchised States' Dec. 6, 2016: (CNSNews.com) "The 17th Amendment, which allowed the popular election of U.S. senators, "disenfranchised" state legislatures and altered the U.S. Constitution's checks and balances, Chapman University Law Professor John Eastman told an audience of state legislators in Washington, D.C. last week."

It's Time To Repeal The 17th Amendment And End Direct Election Of Senators—"Out of manufactured hysteria over nonexistent corruption, the Seventeenth Amendment was born, robbing states of their most notable constitutional check on federal lawmaking."

<u>Mike Huckabee Calls for Repeal of 17th Amendment After</u> <u>Healthcare Repeal Fail</u>

Repeal of the 17th Amendment is needed

<u>Georgia General Assembly 2013-2014 Regular Session — HR 273</u>
United States Congress; repeal the Seventeenth Amendment to the United State Constitution; request

Ask Congress to repeal? There's a hoot. It has to be a fight by the states.

<u>Ukrainiain 'Son Of A Bitch Who Got Fired' Files Criminal</u>
<u>Complaint Against Biden For Abuse Of Power</u>

Listen radio: <u>The Impeachment Witch Hunt with Gregg Jarrett Episode 6</u>