

Simmer, Boil, Slice, Dice and Stew

"FOOD FOR THOUGHT"

by [Joseph DeMaio](#), ©2022



[roymungez1](#), [Pixabay](#), [License](#)

(Mar. 6, 2022) — Ever wonder how many culinary terms have application to the deepening investigation of Special Counsel John Durham into the origins of the bogus “Trump-Russia” collusion hoax? Yes, Virginia, the same hoax already debunked by [Saint Robert Mueller](#) and which infected U.S. politics in the 2016 general election and thereafter, ultimately leading to two – not one – impeachments of President Trump?

How about these: “simmer,” “boil,” “slice,” “dice” and “stew”? The Durham investigation, which has been simmering for some time, now seems to be coming to a boil as more details of his investigation are made public.

Specifically, if, as he asserts in his “[Opposition](#) to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss the Indictment” involving former Perkins Coie law firm partner Michael Sussmann, the collusion and depth of mendacity between and among Sussmann, “Tech Executive-1,” “Internet Company-1,” the 2016 “Clinton [for President] Campaign” and another Perkins Coie attorney serving as General Counsel to the Clinton Campaign, “Campaign Lawyer-1” is proved at trial – which Durham reiterates will happen – there is the less than remote potential that many of the involved culprits could be sliced and diced before the matter concludes.

Stated otherwise, the culprits might well end up “stewing in their own juices.”

As noted [here](#) and [here](#), your humble servant believes that John Durham may finally be getting to the bottom of perhaps the most deceitful and treacherous plan to destroy not only a presidential candidate, but a sitting president *after* being inaugurated and taking office: Donald J. Trump. Not kidding. Tell me again the Deep State is a figment of the imagination.

Durham's response memorandum lays bare the foolish and even desperate arguments being made by Sussmann's attorneys in their effort to bring Durham's investigation to a halt. Unless Durham's efforts are stopped, the matter seems to be on a high speed monorail to a jury trial where all of the juicy (another culinary term...) details will likely come out.

While the details of Durham's opposition memo are filled with legalese and case citations, as well as numerous references to evidence and testimony to be adduced at the trial, one such assertion made in the response is worthy of note, as it goes to the heart of Sussmann's desperation argument.

That tortured claim is that, even *if* his statements to the General Counsel of the FBI are deemed to have been lies (which of course, he denies), they are "immaterial" lies. Durham characterizes these and other arguments in Sussmann's motion as "absurd" and "fanciful," but those characterizations understate the vacuous nature of the contentions.

At p. 13 of the opposition response memo, Durham states: "[T]he government expects that current and former FBI employees will testify at trial that understanding the origins of data and information is relevant to the FBI in multiple ways, including to assess the reliability and motivations of the source."

This statement plainly telegraphs the fact that Durham likely already has locked up the evidence and testimony of "former FBI employees" regarding one discrete aspect of the case, *i.e.*, whether the "lie" Sussmann related to the FBI General Counsel was "material" or not.

And if Durham has that evidence and testimony locked up..., what *other* evidence and testimony has he already secured which may directly implicate others whose identities are yet to be revealed as the investigation continues?

This uncertainty generates the following question previously discussed [here](#). If you were a person with material, as yet undisclosed information regarding the Durham investigation or felonies relating thereto, and which if kept secret and not disclosed to proper authorities, could expose you to prosecution or indictment under the federal misprision of a felony statute, [18 U.S.C. § 4](#), ask yourself whether you would prefer to (a) be a whistleblower and contact Durham, or (b) run the risk of being indicted if Durham or one of the people he will be using as a witness finds out anyway.

Food for thought..., something perhaps to stew upon.