

Will Pelosi Have the Votes to Impeach?

By [Renee Parsons](#)

Global Research, December 10, 2019

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

*Despite an inadequate performance last week by Constitutional law experts before the House Judiciary Committee, Chair Jerrold Nadler released a unilateral committee report on Saturday entitled “Constitutional Grounds for Presidential Impeachment.” The Report came the day after **Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s** [press conference](#) in which she directed the formation of Articles of Impeachment.*

As has become apparent to any objective observer; that is one who prefers facts over fiction, the Democrats remain locked in an imaginary world struggling to maintain a relevance, a stature of standing that no longer exists. Presumably with no Quid Pro Quo, no allegation of criminal conduct, no legally substantial evidence or factual basis and no bipartisan support, in defiance of previous impeachment norms, the Democrats are hell bent on making public jackasses out of themselves.

In a hearing with [Constitutional legal experts](#) expected to score big legal points in support of impeachment, the witnesses instead turned out to be smug, hyper partisan activists as they were consistently [unpersuasive and unimpressive](#). All three displayed not a wit of objectivity or neutrality while touting their own personal political agenda with a foreign policy ax to grind, leaving the unmistakable impression that their testimonies were nothing short of conflated.

Condescending as if pontificating to a class of mediocre law students, [Professor Noah Feldman](#) had suggested in 2017 that Presidential tweets could be grounds for impeachment, indicative of the depth of his thinking as he repeatedly impressed himself with his own rhetoric. [Professor Pamela Karlan](#) opened with a shrillness that grew into a hyperbole spewing divisiveness among the American people and went on to revisit the Russiagate and foreign electoral influence myth ad nauseam. Those dim witted Democrats on the committee repeated the mantra as if held in a spellbound trance whenever “Russiagate” was mentioned. There was no mention of Israel interference in US elections. Testimony of [Professor Michael Gerhardt](#).

Stating that he had not voted for Trump in 2016, GWU Law [Professor Jonathan Turley](#) who is a registered Democrat (as is yours truly) opened with a [brilliant statement](#) as he set the tone for an extraordinarily compelling testimony throughout the day, carefully **explaining to the Democrats why they had not met a credible legal threshold for impeachment**. Factually concise with rational, impartial explanations, Turley effectively disputed Democratic claims that an abuse of power stemming from a **presumed** effort to help one’s own re-election is “*inferred*” and does not constitute proof of intent or direct knowledge of what was in the President’s mind.

However, it did not appear that any of the Democrats had the acute sensibility to

understand Turley's point as there is an edge of lunacy to the collective Democratic mind these days. What the Democrats fail to grasp is the double-standard that every politician makes decisions based on what is best for their reelection just as the Dems are hoping to benefit electorally in 2020 with the farcical impeachment.

After his testimony, Mr. [Turley](#) tweeted.

"Before I finished my testimony, my home and office were inundated with (death) threatening messages and demands that I be fired from GW."

While it was surprising that there was no Democratic Star on either the Intel or Judiciary Committees who stepped forward to make a credible, cogent case for impeachment, it was somewhat surprising that the Republicans had an energetic array of participating Members not limited to Intel ranking member Devin Nunes (Calif), Judiciary ranking minority **Rep. Doug Collins** (NC), **Rep. Jim Jordan** (Oh), **Rep. John Ratcliffe** (Texas) and **Rep. Mark Gaetz** (R-Fla) all of whom can be expected to continue their Bulldog approach as the Committee begins preparing Articles of Impeachment.

For instance, **Rep. Martha Roby** (R-Ala) asked the defining question regarding the purpose of the hearing with "*no fact witnesses*" via a process that has been "*insufficient, unprecedented and grossly inadequate.*" Roby pointed out that the Dems had apparently not considered: that a **constitutional law panel should come "only after specific charges have been made known and underlying facts presented in full due to an exhaustive investigation. How does anyone expect a panel of law professors to weigh in on legal grounds for impeachment prior to knowing what the grounds brought by this Committee are going to be?"**

At her news conference the day after the Judiciary committee hearing, Pelosi was asked by a reporter "[Do you hate President Trump?](#)" Pelosi responded with a shaky false piety as if she knows the votes are not there:

*"We don't hate anybody. Not anybody in the World. **And as a Catholic, I resent your using the word 'hate' in a sentence that addresses me. I don't hate anyone. I was raised in a way that is full - a heart full of love and always pray for the president, And I still pray for the president. I pray for the president all the time, So don't mess with me when it comes to words like that.**"*

It is a curiosity that with the 2020 election a scant twelve months away, the Democrats have not made the case for the urgency of why impeachment needs to occur **right now, immediately, before the Christmas holidays when the Spirit of Good Cheer, Universal Love and Peace for all Americans should take precedence over the Democrat's divisive animosity, pitting one American against another.**

In 2018, thirty one new Democrats were elected to the House; predominately from districts that voted for Trump in 2016 assuring a tough 2020 re-election campaign.

Let's assume that every one of those 31 newbies have been paying very close attention to the Intel and Judiciary committee hearings with two questions in mind:

Is there sufficient legal evidence to convince my constituents to support Articles of Impeachment and is this flawed impeachment campaign worth losing my seat

in Congress?

Did any of those 31 notice when the Constitutional law experts were asked by Rep. Matt Gaetz "[Can you identify one single material fact in the Schiff Report?](#)"- all four remained silent.

House Majority Whip **James Clyburn** (D-05C) has already indicated that he [does not intend to 'whip'](#) the Dems in preparation for an Impeachment vote on the House floor and that the Dems "**expect to lose some votes.**"

Let's do the math: **With 233 Dems and 197 Republicans, if 18 of the 31 House newbies do not vote to impeach, the Democratic Motion to approve Articles of Impeachment will fail with a tie of 215 votes. Whether the Dems lose 18 votes or less, the damage will be irreversible.**

As the Democratic party appears to have lost whatever is left of its sanity and integrity, the question remains why are the Democrats willing to sacrifice losing some of those 31 House seats in 2020?

*

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

Renee Parsons has been a member of the ACLU's Florida State Board of Directors and President of the ACLU Treasure Coast Chapter. She has been an elected public official in Colorado, an environmental lobbyist with Friends of the Earth and staff member in the US House of Representatives in Washington, DC. She can be found on Twitter @reneedove31. She is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

Featured image: President-elect Donald J. Trump and U.S. Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi smile for a photo during the 58th Presidential Inauguration in Washington, D.C., Jan. 20, 2017. More than 5,000 military members from across all branches of the armed forces of the United States, including reserve and National Guard components, provided ceremonial support and Defense Support of Civil Authorities during the inaugural period. (DoD photo by U.S. Air Force Staff Sgt. Marianique Santos)

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Renee Parsons](#), Global Research, 2019

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Renee Parsons](#)

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