

Press Release

Articles of Impeachment Against President Trump

“...the House Judiciary stretched the definitions of the law outside its confines. I was impressed with their unity and their conviction and their belief that the President must be Impeached, to the degree that even the law itself wouldn't stand in their way.”

We've all been hearing of the President's Impeachment. Partisanship clearly has its place in this country's politics.

As many criticisms, slanderous accusations and declarations of dissent with regard to supporting the President, our system of governance and Democracy have culminated in a concerted effort to remove him from office, many people now have a bird's eye view of the left wing of the Democratic Party, including their extreme abandonment of this President.

I note that many initial charges, including the violation of the emoluments clause and bribery, didn't sail through the House, as tangible, credible and correlative evidence effect would have allowed.

Typically, after a Presidential election, both Democrats and Republicans rally round the the President, as the President is the choice of the Electoral College and the Democratic process, a system of governance that both political parties hold in their hearts and reaffirm.

2017 hallmarked a unique crossroads in politics, as President Trump did not receive the support that was found amongst his predecessors. Indeed, he was disparaged from the political left to an unprecedented level. Eventually Presidential bashing sparked criticism of the critics.

Next week 50 Senators will decide the fate of the President. Two Articles of Impeachment, the net product of investigations, lengthy reports and legal experts, will be adjudicated.

Article 1 states "by soliciting the interference of a foreign power to take part in our elections." in reference to the President's request for information regarding former Vice President Biden's son from President Zelensky. Those who have been following the Impeachment know that the President included the Attorney General and his personal attorney as persons who would communicate with the state department of the Ukrainian government. Any pertinent information received would have gone to the Inspector General and, if found pertinent, would have been presented to the House Judiciary Committee.

Article 1 refers to an act that did not involve President Zelensky in President Trump's upcoming election. Article 1 presumes the actions of the President at a future date, that the President would have used any damaging information that might have been found in the election in such a way that would have involved President Zelensky.

AND- make note of the presumption of the nature of the information. The information received is presumed by virtue of Article 1 to be damaging to former Vice President Joe Biden.

Press Release

Articles of Impeachment Against President Trump

“...the House Judiciary stretched the definitions of the law outside its confines. I was impressed with their unity and their conviction and their belief that the President must be Impeached, to the degree that even the law itself wouldn't stand in their way.”

Article 1 also suggests that the President would not have preceded legally or within protocol.

It is to supersede the boundaries of the law, as I know and understand the law, to convict a person for a future act, or an act that was available to the person in question that did not occur.

Article 2 refers to the President's failure to comply with numerous subpoenas presented by the House Judiciary Committee, that included his personal tax returns. Article 2 has found that the President of the United States "Obstructed" the House judiciary system while a Court would have charged a violation of a Subpoena with Contempt.

Even the word "Subpoena" Latin: sub meaning under, poena meaning penalty--- not adjudication.

Courts, as defined by law, maintain a Contempt of Court charge for failure to comply with an Order from the Court, not an Obstruction of Justice charge, as Constitutional Rights and Laws are a higher aggregate than a Court.

God given Inalienable Rights defined by the Constitution of the United States, such as the Right to Privacy, vastly transcend the power of the Courts. Meanwhile, laws that protect our rights, are the product of legislative debate and vote for their own unique purpose. A Judge and his or her Court must refer to the aforementioned.

The House Judiciary Committee ironically didn't. Both Article 1 and 2 transcend the law. Article 1 supersedes the definition of an "act" by law. Article 2 presumes that a House Judiciary Committee, acting as a Court, may supersede its role as subordinate to Constitutional Rights and the laws it is fashioned to uphold. Obstruction is a crime and Contempt is a failure to comply.

Basically, the House Judiciary stretched the definitions of the law outside its confines. I was impressed with their unity and their conviction and their belief that the President must be Impeached, to the degree that even the law itself wouldn't stand in their way.

I am also impressed with the President, who, courageously, witnessed his own lynching by an elected mob of Democrats.

Now- on to the Senate.

Regards,
Marcia Horne