

Impeaching Trump 2.0.

Wanting Trump removed from office for constitutionally protected speech has no legal standing

By [Stephen Lendman](#)

Global Research, January 12, 2021

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [History](#)

In December 2019, the Democratic Party initiated an impeachment process against Trump on two politicized counts with no merit.

Voting was almost entirely along party lines.

There were and remain justifiable reasons to impeach Trump and most of his predecessors — notably for their high crimes of war and against humanity by hot and/or other means.

Dems won't tough these charges, or Republicans, because practically the entire Congress — earlier and now — and much of the bureaucracy share guilt.

Bogus charges in December 2019 included:

1. Abuse of power, falsely claiming he sought foreign interference from Ukraine in the US 2020 presidential election.

No credible evidence was presented because none existed.

Ukrainian President Zelensky debunked the accusation, publicly saying there was no Trump blackmail threat, no quid pro quo, no conspiracy, nothing discussed about withholding US aid for political reasons.

2. Obstruction of Congress, falsely claiming Trump “directed the unprecedented, categorical, and indiscriminate defiance of subpoenas issued by the House of representatives pursuant to its sole power of impeachment,” adding:

“(W)ithout lawful cause or excuse, President Trump directed executive branch agencies, offices, and officials not to comply with those subpoenas.”

“President Trump thus interposed the powers of the presidency against the lawful subpoenas of the House...”

Trump’s unwillingness to participate in the sham process did not rise to the level of obstructing Congress.

It was his legal right to challenge Dems by withholding cooperation because politicized proceedings lacked legitimacy.

So does impeachment 2.0.

Defying reality, it falsely claims that Trump “**engaged in high crimes and misdemeanors by inciting violence against the government of the United States (sic)**,” adding:

He “gravely endangered the security of the United States and its institutions of government (sic).”

“He threatened the integrity of the democratic system (sic), interfered with the peaceful transition of power (sic), and imperiled a coequal branch of government (sic).”

“He thereby betrayed his trust as president, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States (sic).”

Cold, hard facts refute all of the above.

Dems Jamie Raskin, David Cicilline, and Ted Lieu — in cahoots with Nancy Pelosi and over 200 other House Dems — introduced one article of impeachment.

Falsely charging Trump with inciting insurrection, his public remarks and tweets to supporters were polar opposite what’s falsely claimed.

No legitimate tribunal would accept the politicized accusation with no legitimacy.

No credible evidence supports it — just the opposite.

Yet impeachment is virtually certain in the Dem controlled House this week.

On Monday, House Majority Leader **Steny Hoyer** failed to cobble together a unanimously passed resolution that called for Pence to invoke 25th Amendment authority to remove Trump from office.

Adoption is expected on Tuesday by majority vote, politicized impeachment 2.0 to follow — despite transition of power occurring next week when Trump’s tenure ends.

Law Professor Jonathan Turley sharply criticized what’s going on, calling it Kafkaesque.

Wanting Trump removed from office for constitutionally protected speech has no legal standing.

Turley noted that similar remarks for which he’s falsely charged were made by Dems, saying:

“Take back the country.”

“Fight for the country.”

These remarks, similar ones, and those Trump publicly stated are protected speech under the First Amendment.

So are virtually all others — no matter how divergent from the official narrative, no matter how offensive to some people.

If Trump is removed from office for using protected speech in addressing supporters, all Americans are potentially threatened with recrimination.

The risk possible criminal prosecution for truth-telling exposure of government wrongdoing — the way Chelsea Manning, Julian Assange, and numerous whistleblowers were unacceptably mistreated.

If events unfold this way, tyranny will replace fundamental freedoms — the grim process well underway in the US already.

What’s going on should scare everyone. The issue isn’t Trump.

It’s whether policymaking conforms to the rule of law or operates extrajudicially against the American people, especially its truth-tellers on issues which matter most.

Without speech, media and academic freedoms, all other rights are threatened.

That’s the perilous state of today’s America — an open, free, and fair nation in name only, the real thing nowhere in sight.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Award-winning author **Stephen Lendman** lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG)

His new book as editor and contributor is titled “Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III.”

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html>

Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com.

Featured image is from Massoud Nayeri

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Stephen Lendman](#), Global Research, 2021

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Stephen Lendman](#)

About the author:

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached

at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."
<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html> Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com. Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca