

Jonathan Turley Tells It Like It Is

IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY “DESTINED TO CRASH AND BURN”

by [Joseph DeMaio](#), ©2019



Screenshot: [Townhall Media](#)

(Dec. 4, 2019) — Before reading any farther into this post, first take nine minutes and nineteen seconds to watch the video of Democrat George Washington University Professor Jonathan Turley’s opening statement on his [testimony](#) delivered today to the House Judiciary Committee. That committee, of course, is now considering whether to recommend to the full House the drafting of formal articles of impeachment against President Trump. Turley’s remarks constitute a template which all Americans should digest, because (a) it speaks the truth and (b) it comes from a Democrat.

Professor Turley candidly admits at the beginning of his remarks that he is a Democrat; that he is not a supporter of President Trump; and that in 2016 he “voted against him,” thereby suggesting that he cast his vote for Hillary Clinton rather than not voting. It is a free country... for now.

The point, however, is that he makes precisely the points necessary to underscore that the current proceeding “is not how you impeach an American president.” If the proceedings result in articles of impeachment, Professor Turley opines that the Democrats will rue the day that they cobbled together such a “[slipshod impeachment](#)” motivated out of hate, anger and frustrated revenge over the 2016 election rather than grounded in reason.

By now, faithful P&E readers, it should be apparent from your humble servant’s prior posts that he gravitates to the right side of the political spectrum rather than to the left. Still, when a Democrat law professor has the courage to tell Chairman Nadler and the members of the House Judiciary Committee that the proceedings over which Mr. Nadler is presiding are misguided and could do permanent damage to the administrations of future presidents, that Democrat earns a shout-out from your servant.

In all candor, Professor Turley's remarks regarding the impropriety of the present impeachment proceedings – echoing, albeit in more refined language, the sentiments of President Trump – are in some ways analogous to your servant's prior posts regarding the “natural born citizen” issue.

Specifically, your servant considers himself to be an “equal-opportunity” gadfly on the “eligibility” issue: for the same reasons that Democrats Barack Hussein Obama, Jr.; Rep. Tulsi Gabbard; and Sen. Kamala Harris (moot..., [for now](#)) were not, are not and never will be “natural born citizens” under Art. 2, § 1, Cl. 5 of the Constitution, so too are Republican Senators Ted Cruz, Marco Rubio and former South Carolina Governor/U.N. Ambassador Nikki Haley not natural born citizens. Political affiliation has nothing to do with who is, and who is not, a natural born citizen as contemplated by the Founders.

Returning to Professor Turley's testimony, it occurs to your servant as well that an ulterior motive may have been present in Mr. Nadler's invitation to Professor Turley to testify. After all, it has long been known to the denizens of the Beltway, including Nadler, that Professor Turley thinks that the present impeachment effort is, from an evidentiary and intellectual standpoint, ill-advised and, once in the Senate, doomed. So why would Nadler call upon the professor to state that to the committee, the White House and, thanks to television and the Internet, to the world? Hmmm....

Wait..., after adjusting my tinfoil hat and securing contact with the Mother Ship..., consider this: by now, Speaker Pelosi, Adam Schiff, Jerrold Nadler and anyone on either of the impeachment committees (with the possible exception of Rep. Henry Calvin “[Hank](#)” Johnson, D. GA) should be able to read the handwriting on the wall: the strictly partisan Democrat impeachment farce is in uncontrolled free-fall and destined to crash and burn. Time for an escape and exit strategy.

That being the case, why not invite Professor Turley, as a Democrat and voice of reason, to articulate why moving forward with impeachment is a bad – not to mention stupid – idea. He could be seen as walking the Democrats back from the ledge. Nadler and Pelosi could then say they have studied carefully the “wise” and “healing” words of the professor and, at the end of the day, announce that they just don't think they have the votes (whether they do or not is irrelevant) to secure impeachment in the House.

Accordingly, for the sake of “moving forward,” they will settle for a strongly-worded resolution of censure. That way, they can “save face” and “declare victory” by telling their supporters they have slapped “Orange Man” upside the head and freed up resources to prepare for the 2020 general election, when they will redouble their efforts to reclaim the White House at the ballot box. Faithful reader, you may want to review [this post](#) again.

This potential, of course, is purely hypothetical and, moreover, is premised on the notion that the Democrat House leaders would risk [undercutting](#) their base. Gosh..., who would *ever* expect that from the Democrats?

Stay tuned..., oh, and you might want to stock up on more popcorn.