

# Another Word That Ends in “Y”

by [Joseph DeMaio](#), ©2022



*[geralt](#), [Pixabay](#), [License](#)*

(Feb. 17, 2022) — Hillary (“BleachBit, What BleachBit?”) Clinton has broken her silence on the recent John Durham [revelations](#). Her pithy response, [coughed up](#) as a Twitter “tweet,” was straightforward: “Trump & Fox [News] are desperately spinning up a fake scandal to distract from his real ones. So it’s a day that ends in Y.”

Memo to – let us be polite here – HRC: there is another word that ends in “Y”: “solitary,” as modifying the term “confinement.”

HRC’s breaking of silence should not be confused with the Goofball at 1600’s painfully audible [breaking of wind](#)..., but the lingering aromas are not that dissimilar. The Durham revelations, of course, relate to credible evidence presumably already assembled by Durham and his investigators in his “Trump-Russia Collusion Hoax” investigation.

Among the more interesting tidbits in the motions seeking rulings on whether conflicts of interest exist are that lawyers, law firms representing the HRC 2016 presidential campaign and the Democratic [*sic*] National Committee (“DNC”) were up to no good.

The rest of her tweet was equally misguided: “The more [Trump’s] misdeeds are exposed, the more they lie. For those interested in reality, here’s a good debunking of their latest nonsense...,” inserting a link to a grammatically-challenged magazine [article](#).

Let us examine – briefly, but arduously – the *Vanity Fair* article in that vaunted periodical of legal analysis produced by one “Bess Levin.” Oh-so-cleverly entitled

“You’ll Never Believe It but Hillary Clinton Did Not, in Fact, Spy On Trump’s White House,” and sub-captioned “In less breaking news, Donald Trump remains a moron,” the author comes to HRC’s defense with “journalistic” guns a-blazing..., but misfiring. Comically.

First, the title misleads the reader to think that the Durham filings directly accuse HRC of “spying” on Donald Trump. They do not. As necessary factual backdrop for Durham’s motions to inquire into conflicts of interest, factual recitations of billing records, prevarications, meetings and related events such as payments for “services rendered” and tying the DNC to questionable activities were disclosed.

Because [Rule 47](#) requires that motions such as those made by Durham in both the [Danchenko](#) and [Sussmann](#) cases “*must* state the grounds upon which it is based...,” (Emphasis added), Durham’s inclusion of a sufficient body of factual evidence to support examination of the conflicts issue was not only proper, it was mandated.

Second, the VF article devotes an entire paragraph to Trump’s misidentification of “John Durham,” the Special Counsel, with someone called “Robert Durham.” Granted, the error is one that should not have been made, but as far as we know, Trump [never called](#) Mike Pence “President Pence.”

It is more than a bit amusing that Levin would fixate on that mistake as opposed to the reality that the evidence thus far assembled by Durham cannot be so easily trivialized. As recently [observed](#) by Louisiana Senator John Kennedy (R. LA): “If you’re going to be a smarta\*\*, first you have to be smart.”

Let that sink in. Durham – as a Special Counsel from the U.S. Department of Justice owing a solemn duty of candor to the court – is representing to U.S. District Court Judge Christopher R. Cooper, an Obama appointee, that he “will establish” at trial that “Tech Executive-1” and his associates “mined” (*i.e.*, dug for and extracted) “the ESOP’s DNS traffic *and other data for the purpose* of gathering derogatory information about Donald Trump.” (Emphasis added)

Third, the VF article author addresses the accessing of White House computer servers claimed to have occurred in the Durham motions, noting that the practice took place in the Barack Hussein Obama, Jr. administration, thus intimating that the whole controversy is “much ado about nothing” because the acts took place on the watch of the Second Usurper in Chief, the “SUC.”



## EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

**E**very day, the President of the United States is faced with dozens of decisions, each with important consequences for working families. To provide the President with the support that he or she needs to govern effectively, the Executive Office of the President (EOP) was created in 1869 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The EOP has responsibility for tasks ranging from communicating the President's message to the American people to promoting our trade interests abroad.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/executive-office-of-the-president/>

Ummm... so what if *some* accessing of White House computers took place prior to the Trump inauguration? The Durham motion in the Sussmann case states, in paragraph 5 thereof: “The Government’s evidence at trial **will also establish**... [that] Tech Executive-1 [now believed to be one Rodney Joffe, a person *not* identified by name in Durham’s motions] and his associates exploited [the previously-existing domain name system (“DNS”) Obama-sanctioned security arrangement] by mining the EOP’s [Executive Office of the President] DNS traffic and other data **for the purpose** of gathering derogatory information about Donald Trump.”

Given the sanctions that he could face if he were being intentionally untruthful regarding his statement that he “will establish” facts at trial, it is unlikely that Durham selected those words casually.

It is that “for the purpose” language that should trouble Tech Executive-1 and those with whom he dealt. That language strongly suggests that Durham already has in his arsenal empirical evidence of intent and, as they say in criminal proceedings, “scienter.” The legal term “scienter” means a mental state embracing the knowing intent to deceive, manipulate, or defraud and includes knowledge that one’s actions are wrong.

If true, Durham’s ammunition stockpile, whether consisting of affidavits, witness statements or – OOoooo... recovered emails or texts – may well contain enough ordnance to annihilate claims that HRC or her sycophants and lawyers had nothing..., **nothing** to do with the current controversy. Perhaps this explains the run on “earned-on-receipt” Beltway criminal defense attorneys.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

MICHAEL A. SUSSMANN,

*Defendant.*

Case No. 1:21-cr-00582

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT FOR FAILURE TO  
STATE AN OFFENSE AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

<https://www.scribd.com/document/559565757/Sussmann-Motion-to-Dismiss>

Accordingly, it should also come as no surprise that Sussmann's lawyers today filed a [motion](#) to dismiss the Durham indictment. Spread over 26 pages of legalese and contentions that Sussmann's "purported false statements" to FBI General Counsel James Baker in 2016 – even if taken as true, a requirement when considering a motion to dismiss – were and are "immaterial" in determining Sussmann's culpability, the motion was likely under construction well before Durham's filings inquiring into the conflict of interest issue.

One wonders if the Gray Trollop – along with the DNC/HRC cabal of "journalistic" outlets – will apply the same standard of coverage to the Sussmann motion to dismiss as it did to Durham's filings last week. Durham's motions were deemed to be so far beyond the comprehension of Trollop readers that consideration was given to ignoring the story altogether because it would necessitate actual *mental thinking* by readers. Oh, the [humanity!](#)

The smart money says that Pravda on the Hudson will characterize the motion to dismiss by Sussmann's lawyers as "clear," "compelling" and "dispositive"... , much like their characterization of the original Trump-Russia collusion hoax – debunked by Robert Mueller – as being indisputable. Right.

The Trollop's original motto – "All the news that's fit to print" – should be changed to something more like "If hypocrisy did not already exist, we would invent it."

What clowns.