

# The Supreme Court Ruled Not for Trump But for the Office of the President

By [Dr. Paul Craig Roberts](#)

Global Research, July 02, 2024

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name (only available in desktop version).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Give Truth a Chance. Secure Your Access to Unchained News, Donate to Global Research.](#)

\*\*\*

*The US Supreme Court has ruled that a president has immunity for official acts, but not for personal acts.*

*Which is which will be a contentious issue. For example, if a president were to have the CIA, FBI, or Secret Service murder a political rival that would be a personal act. But when President Obama had the US military murder a US citizen suspected of being a terrorist, it was an official act.*

But was it?

The justification for the murder was suspicion alone, a bare-faced accusation unconfirmed by a trial and therefore in violation of due process.

Has it ever been established that it is an official act for a president to have a US citizen murdered without due process?

Perhaps it has happened secretly by the CIA but my impression is that President Obama's murder of the Muslim religious leader who was an American citizen was the first public murder without due process and conviction delivering a death penalty.

Nothing was made of the murder because Americans had been indoctrinated with fear of Muslim terrorists and regarded the murder as an act of war.

When Vice President Biden bragged on TV that he forced by withholding billions of dollars in US aid from the Ukraine government unless it fired the prosecutor investigating the Ukrainian company that paid his son \$50,000 a month as a director, was it an official act or a personal act? Why has there been no investigation of this self-serving use of presidential

authority?

The Supreme Court majority emphasized that a president must have immunity for official acts or he can be stopped by lawsuits and politically motivated charges from performing his designated functions. In other words, the Court's decision is based on elementary common sense.

If a president believes an election is fraudulent, it is his responsibility, and thereby an official act, for him to have the election verified. However, the Democrats and whose media defined the issue as "Trump overthrowing the election." Even experts with the evidence in their hands were indicted for aiding and abetting Trump's attempted overthrow of the election.

In other words, the criminal indictment brought against Trump assumed without justification that there was no evidence of election fraud.

As Trump had appointed a Justice Department and an entire government consisting of his enemies, his own government treated his official action as his private action.

A rally in support of Trump was mischaracterized by Democrats, whose media, and Republicans such as Senate minority leader Mitch McConnell as an "insurrection."

What we should be disturbed about is the ability of the Democrats and the whose media to disrupt the 4-year term of a US president with a series of false charges that were never confirmed and then to use unconfirmed charges to indict a former president in an effort to prevent him from again running for president.

Prior to the Supreme Court's ruling, the indictments against Trump were falling apart.

The biased "special counsel" prosecuting Trump was caught lying to the federal judge, who has put the case on hold. Fani Willis entrusted by the White House with Trump's prosecution in Atlanta has been found to have given her lover \$700,000 of taxpayers' money with which he took Fani on vacations. Her case against Trump is also on hold.

In other words, the legal machinery the corrupt Democrats have employed against Trump is too corrupt to be able to do its assigned political assassination.

Now the Supreme Court knocks the props out from under the main charge orchestrated from the fake "insurrection" charge. The Supreme Court's ruling makes it clear that the special council's charges against Trump have no legal basis and should be dropped.

The response of Democrats is revealing. Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor claims that "the President is now a king above the law." Democrat US Representative Bennie Thompson, chairman of the January 6 Insurrection Committee, declared the US Supreme Court to be "lawless and corrupt."

Why aren't these charges from Sotomayor and Thompson applied to where they belong? Where were Sotomayor and Thompson when President Obama claimed the power of a king to assassinate a US citizen without due process of law? Where were they when President George W. Bush claimed the power of a feudal lord to detain suspects indefinitely without due process of law?

The collapse of American law from its basis in facts and reason into emotion has been underway for years.

No one seems to care.

Appointments to the federal courts no longer emphasize knowledge of law and commitment to law as a shield of the people. Instead, people are appointed according to whether a minority or woman is needed, whether inclusion requires a homosexual or a transgendered person. Law is no longer about justice. It is about "equity." It is about disposing of challenges to official narratives. Law is now used to revolutionize the United States, to convert it into a tower of babel with no capability to constrain the ruling elites' use of the country to further their own interests.

This is the issue that needs addressing. How can it be done?

\*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

*Paul Craig Roberts is a renowned author and academic, chairman of The Institute for Political Economy where [this article](#) was originally published. Dr. Roberts was previously associate editor and columnist for The Wall Street Journal. He was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy during the Reagan Administration. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.*

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Dr. Paul Craig Roberts](#), Global Research, 2024

---

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Dr. Paul Craig Roberts](#)

About the author:

Paul Craig Roberts, former Assistant Secretary of the US Treasury and Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal, has held numerous university appointments. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research. Dr. Roberts can be reached at <http://paulcraigroberts.org>

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)