The Deep State Wears Black Robes



By Cliff Kincaid

March 22, 2025

They say "elections have consequences," except when President Trump tries to implement conservative policies. The federal courts are full of Obama and Biden judges and the Supreme Court is led by a "Republican," John Roberts, who teamed up with a Trump nominee, Amy Coney Barrett, and both sided with the three liberals to dictate continued foreign aid boondoggle spending to the tune of \$2 billion.

These five anti-Trump judges carried the day and President Trump complied with their orders.

Now, President Trump is pleading with Roberts to save his presidency from a group of federal judges working under Roberts' protection and perhaps direction and whose objective is to reassert the "power" of the judicial branch over elected presidents of the United States.

Trump is walking into a trap. He has received very bad advice from his lawyers and political aides.

In order to understand the judicial power grab now taking place, usually described as "Judicial Supremacy," watch my interview with J.B. Williams of the North American Law Center on my Rumble TV channel. He notes that the Democrats are using lawfare, or legal maneuvers of obstruction and interference, to defeat the Trump agenda that 77 million American voters endorsed.

It turns out that Roberts is a member of a special club that includes prominent left-wing judges. Revelations on the X platform by an independent conservative investigative journalist known as "Bad Kitty" have <u>identified the members</u> and their secretive ways.

Attorney General Pam Bondi says over 160 lawsuits have been filed against various administration policies and Senate Democrat Leader Chuck Schumer <u>notes</u> that 235 "progressive" judges were confirmed under Joe Biden that are determined to block the Trump agenda.

Schumer said, "The good news here is, we did put 235 judges, progressive judges, judges not under the control of Trump, last year on the bench, and they are ruling against Trump time after time after time. And we hope that the appellate courts, when it gets up there, and the Supreme Court will uphold those rulings. They restored the money to NIH. They required that 8,000 employees, federal employees, have to come back. We're in over 100 lawsuits against them, and we are having a good deal of success. It's only at the lower court level right now."

"These activist judges are trying to control our entire federal government," Attorney General Pam Bondi said on Fox News.

Do elections have consequences or not?

Liberal-left media organs are highlighting and celebrating various "setbacks" for Trump in the courts, such as:

- Ruling that DOGE likely violated the Constitution in dismantling of USAID. Go deeper.
- Blocking enforcement of Trump's executive order banning transgender people from military service.
- Stopping the administration from terminating \$14 billion in grants to so-called 'climate action" groups.

- Reinstating probationary government employees.
- Ordering the Trump administration to pay USAID funds to contractors.

As J.B. Williams says, the Administration should have declared, in advance, that any rulings that impinge on the constitutional powers of the executive branch would be declared null and void.

President Trump took an oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. So why isn't he defying left-wing activist judges undermining his policies? They do not have a monopoly on the correct view of the Constitution.

Founding Father Thomas Jefferson wrote about this, saying that "...The...question, whether the judges are invested with exclusive authority to decide on the constitutionality of a law, has been heretofore a subject of consideration with me in the exercise of official duties. Certainly there is not a word in the Constitution which has given that power to them more than to the executive or legislative branches."

Jefferson believed that impeachment of judges was entirely appropriate and constitutional. What is more, he believed impeachment was one way for Congress to make the courts responsive to the will of the people.

The Jefferson Administration was involved in the impeachment of federal Judge John Pickering of New Hampshire, who was removed, and Supreme Court Justice Samuel Chase, who was acquitted by the Senate.

Impeaching judges is one way — but not the only way — to reign in judicial supremacy, and Jefferson knew it.

The other way is for the president to simply reject the courts' interpretation of the law and the U.S. Constitution and to reject the courts' jurisdiction.

In a previous <u>broadcast</u> on my channel, Dr. John G. West examined the cultural collapse of the United States and how our political and Christian "leaders" have failed to challenge "judicial supremacy" that has led to "rights" such as abortion and gay marriage that cannot be found in the Constitution.

President Andrew Jackson, one of Trump's favorite presidents, defied the courts. Will Trump?

Trump aides like Stephen Miller are talking tough. He says, "...show us the line in the Constitution where it says a lone unelected district judge can assume decision-making control over the entire executive branch affecting 300M citizens? Any mention of nationwide district court TROs [Temporary Restraining Orders] ? Or permanent all-powerful bureaucracy?"

He adds, "Unelected rogue judges are trying to steal years of time from a 4 year term. It's the most egregious theft one can imagine: robbing the vote and voice of the American People. Any 'conservative' legal commentator who fails to condemn this lunacy has lost all credibility forever."

One commentator, New York Post columnist Miranda Devine, sided with the Supreme Court, saying, "It will be up to the Supreme Court to define the limits of presidential authority, but Chief Justice John Roberts' preemptive scolding of Trump for musing about judicial impeachment doesn't bode well for the president."

Why does the Supreme Court get to decide the ultimate view of what is constitutional and what is not?

Chief Justice Roberts had declared, in response to Trump's threat of impeaching liberal judges, "For more than two centuries, it has been established that impeachment is not an appropriate response to disagreement concerning a judicial decision. The normal appellate review process exists for that purpose."

Yet, the so-called "progressives" had wanted to use this weapon against conservatives. Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, D-N.Y., <u>filed articles of impeachment</u> against Supreme Court Justices Clarence Thomas and Samuel Alito over made-up "ethics violations" and "political bias."

I don't remember Roberts objecting to that course of action. He seems to be under the influence of the "progressives" on the federal bench and in the national Democratic Party. That spells doom for Trump.

© 2025 Cliff Kincaid — All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Cliff Kincaid: kincaid@comcast.net

Cliff Kincaid is president of America's Survival, Inc.
usasurvival.org