

# Some Additional Comments About Manhattan Project 2.0

by [Joseph DeMaio](#), ©2024



Bundesarchiv, Bild 151-39-23  
Foto: a. Ang. / 1944

The “People’s Court,” 1944 ([Attribution](#): Bundesarchiv, Bild 151-39-23/[CC-BY-SA 3.0](#))

(May 31, 2024) — [*Editor’s Note*: See the author’s preceding article [here](#).]

Now that the completely corrupted and unconstitutional verdict against President Trump has been rendered, the lengthy task of getting it stayed, reversed and set aside begins.

Your humble servant has already suggested labeling the quasi-Third Reich [Volksgerichtshof](#) proceedings in New York City as the “[Manhattan Project 2.0](#).” Candidly, that label may be too kind: at least the first Manhattan Project brought an end to a war. The Manhattan Project 2.0 has likely ushered in the beginning of a new political and electoral war. Moreover, the first project in 1945 targeted a wartime enemy foreign nation. Today, the Manhattan Project 2.0 targets the citizens of the American Republic.

Not hyperbole. Not joking.

As a prelude to what follows here, a particularly interesting summation of the case against President Trump and some of the legal nuances involved was published in 2023, well before the verdict. It is found at Vox.com [here](#).

While that website is generally [acknowledged](#) to be a left-leaning, “no-friend-of-conservatives” platform, the post analyzing Alvin (“No Neck”) Bragg’s theories is

interesting. It includes a prediction that the U.S. Supreme Court could eventually reverse and void the entire proceeding, with or without a verdict, on jurisdictional grounds. Faithful *P&E* readers interested in a short synopsis of what went on in Merchan's judicial abattoir in downtown Manhattan over the past few weeks may want to review the Vox post before proceeding further here.

Back so soon? Good..., let us proceed.

As the winding path to the general election in November meanders through the political jungles and viper-infested swamps of campaign advertisements, there are a couple of additional questions which, it is respectfully posited, should be taken into consideration by President Trump's lawyers. Quite apart from the serial legal and evidentiary errors committed by Judge (*sic*) Juan Merchan in the proceedings, two issues remain unaddressed.

First, under Art. 1, § 10, Cl. 1 of the Constitution, the states are forbidden to "pass any ***Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law*** or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts." (Emphasis added) A "bill of attainder" is generally defined as a law which declares a person guilty of a crime without the prior opportunity to defend or rebut.

Quite apart from the "separation of powers" issue or the "due process of law" protections afforded by the Fifth Amendment, a bill of attainder can, as may exist here, render criminal an act from the distant past which has already been barred by the statute of limitations. While the statute of limitations issue is addressed in the Vox post, there is no discussion of whether in addition to violating President Trump's due process rights, the prosecution of a time-barred misdemeanor offense by No Neck Bragg works as an "attainder" in violation of the U.S. Constitution.

Stated otherwise, once the original State of New York purported offense took place – the bookkeeping entries claimed to falsely camouflage campaign donations or expenses – and the New York misdemeanor statute of limitations period expired, Bragg's resuscitation by linguistic defibrillation of those charges seems ***clearly*** to implicate a violation of both the words and the spirit or rationale of Art. 1, § 10, Cl. 1 of the Constitution.

The only thing missing would appear to be a GoPro video of Bragg yelling "***CLEAR!***" as he shock-paddled the indictment back to life. And that, faithful *P&E* readers, is a violation of a ***federal*** law, *i.e.*, the Constitution.

Which brings us to the next potential issue which President Trump's lawyers have no doubt considered – but in case they have not, they should consider ***immediately***, – a motion to the U.S. Supreme Court under Supreme Court [Rules 21 and 23](#) seeking an immediate stay on the implementation of the verdict or judgment by Judge Merchan. In addition, there is the ***ripe*** and ***real*** potential for a vindictive order to jail President Trump at any time between now and the date set for his sentencing, July 11, 2024.

Supreme Court Rule 21(1) allows for the filing of motions before the Court. Rule 21(4) addresses responses to such motions, specifically acknowledging that “emergencies” may exist which could justify “in an appropriate case” the Court acting on a motion “*without waiting for a response.*” (Emphasis added)

Supreme Court Rule 21(4) states:

“4. Any response to a motion shall be filed as promptly as possible considering the nature of the relief sought and any asserted need for *emergency* action, and, in any event, within 10 days of receipt, unless the Court or a Justice, or the Clerk under Rule 30.4, orders otherwise. A response to a motion prepared as required by Rule 33.1, except a response to a motion for leave to file an amicus curiae brief, shall be prepared in the same manner if time permits. *In an appropriate case, the Court may act on a motion without waiting for a response.*” (Emphasis added)

Supreme Court Rule 23 states:

Rule 23. Stays

1. A stay may be granted by a Justice as permitted by law.
2. A party to a judgment sought to be reviewed may present to a Justice an application to stay the enforcement of that judgment. See 28 U. S. C. § 2101(f).
3. An application for a stay shall set out with particularity why the relief sought is not available from any other court or judge. *Except in the most extraordinary circumstances, an application for a stay will not be entertained unless the relief requested was first sought in the appropriate court or courts below or from a judge or judges thereof.* An application for a stay shall identify the judgment sought to be reviewed and have appended thereto a copy of the order and opinion, if any, and a copy of the order, if any, of the court or judge below denying the relief sought, and shall set out specific reasons why a stay is justified. The form and content of an application for a stay are governed by Rules 22 and 33.2.
4. A judge, court, or Justice granting an application for a stay pending review by this Court may condition the stay on the filing of a supersedeas bond having an approved surety or sureties. The bond will be conditioned on the satisfaction of the judgment in full, together with any costs, interest, and damages for delay that may be awarded. If a part of the judgment sought to be reviewed has already been satisfied, or is otherwise secured, the bond may be conditioned on the satisfaction of the part of the judgment not otherwise secured or satisfied, together with costs, interest, and damages.” (Emphasis added)

Taken together, Supreme Court Rules 21 and 23 present a virtually *imperative* path for President Trump’s attorneys to travel..., and do so *immediately*. Given the corrupted and garden-variety vindictiveness of No Neck Bragg and Juan Merchan, the present risk of an

immediate order of the court to arrest and incarcerate President Trump because, purportedly, he presents a “flight risk” – he does, after all, own “[Trump Force One](#),” a transcontinental Boeing 757-200 – presents a manifest “emergency” situation necessitating immediate Supreme Court intervention.

In the absence of a Supreme Court stay order, and if a not-inconceivable vindictive arrest warrant were to be issued by Merchan, the *real* possibility of a firefight between those sworn to protect President Trump – his *original* Secret Service detail, not a woke one supplied by the slug at 1600 – and New York police officers could detonate at any time.

Moreover, that calamity aside, how could the incarceration of a wrongly-convicted President Trump today – *preventing and prohibiting* him from campaigning for re-election – be defined as anything *other* than distilled election interference? Your servant will wait for an answer.

And all of this chaos, of course, has been engineered and orchestrated by Democrats and their sycophants in the media. November 5 is fast approaching, so think *very* carefully about the person you want leading this Republic into the future: the octogenarian slug at 1600 or the wrongly-convicted Donald Trump. Rocket science, this should not be. Time’s up.