

The Democrat 45 Pogrom

"NOT SO FAST, MARC"

by [Joseph DeMaio](#), ©2022



(Aug. 9, 2022) — Late last month, your faithful servant offered “The Shortest DeMaio P&E Post Ever.” The pithy [post](#) posited that the Democrats have forever – as in “perpetually” – forfeited any claim of right or competence to govern a free people. That empirical fact is being driven home with every passing day..., just look around.

Until a few days ago, the most recent proof of that reality was the passage by the Senate – with zero GOP support and a tie-breaking vote by Kamala (“Ms. Word Salad”) Harris – of the fraudulently-named “Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.”

Never mind that the bill would actually violate [18 U.S.C. § 1001](#) criminalizing the creation and dissemination of false documents, among other outrages, it appropriates funds to hire nearly 90,000 new IRS agents. And if you think all of those agents will be auditing only those making over \$400K annually, you are likely joining the Goofball’s ne’er-do-well son in a drug binge. You should stop. Sober up.

Instead, those agents will likely not differ much from George III's "swarms of Officers to harrass our people, and eat out their substance..." [condemned](#) in the Declaration of Independence. And we all know what happened after that..., don't we?

Now, however, comes the latest outrage: the FBI raid on Mar-a-Lago, President Trump's Florida [residence](#). The purported reason for the search-warrant-supported raid was to look for documents which "45" had retained from his presidency and which the National Archives claimed needed to be turned over.

Really? Seriously?

It has been suggested by Perkins Coie cockroach [Marc Elias](#) that the motivation for the raid lies in an attempt to criminalize and indict President Trump under [18 U.S.C. § 2071](#). Under that statute, a person committing any of the described acts – including possession – of an identified document (there are many) if convicted can be fined and/or imprisoned.



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

In addition, however, subsection (b) of the statute provides that the person convicted "shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States." If 45 could be convicted of violating 18 U.S.C. § 2071(b), he would, according to the Democrats, be disqualified from holding any future office of the United States, including the presidency.

If the Wretch of San Crapcisco's "J6" kangaroo kabuki court cannot secure enough evidence to indict, perhaps such evidence can be discovered – or even concocted..., nah..., that couldn't happen with Marc Elias [opining](#) on it..., could it? – and a conviction obtained, *voilà*, 45 would purportedly be disqualified. Elias even emphasized in his "tweet" the "disqualification" provision in subsection (b).

And with a D.C. jury pool consisting of over 95% registered Democrats and more Democrat federal district court judges than spots on a leopard, what are the odds of getting a "fair trial" there? What are the chances of getting a change of venue? What are


the chances of allowing due process of law to occur? The answer to all three questions is, of course: slim to none, and “none” just left town....

Ahhh..., but not so fast, Marc. As with your “Russia collusion” hoax and your selective, careless reading of the statute, you have failed to note that subsection (b) of the statute, where the “disqualification” restriction appears, limits its reach and application to “such documents” as referenced in subsection (a). The antecedent of “such documents” referenced in subsection (b) is to those identified in subsection (a), but *only* those which have previously been “***filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States, or in any public office, or with any judicial or public officer of the United States.***” (emphasis added).

The manifest purpose of the statute is to address the ***removal or purloining of previously-filed or deposited documents*** from the safekeeping of “any clerk or officer of any court of the United States, or in any public office, or with any judicial or public officer of the United States.” And because it is a criminal statute, it must be strictly construed to limit its application *only* to documents previously filed or deposited with the noted persons or agencies and subsequently stolen or purloined..., and none others. Full stop.

This of course is the statute under which former Slick Willie Clinton aide Sandy Berger was charged and fined back in 2005, but given no jail time (tell me again that “equal justice under law” exists in D.C.) when he stole classified documents from the National Archives and [destroyed them](#).

Finally, as if the foregoing were not enough to eviscerate the roach’s legal opinion as to the applicability of 18 U.S.C. § 2071(b), he also ignores the final sentence of subsection (b) of the statute: “As used in this subsection, the term ‘office’ does not include the office held by any person as a retired officer of the Armed Forces of the United States.”



<https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/article-2/>

Because President Trump, as Commander in Chief of all of the nation’s armed forces, was retired from the office following the 2020 general “election” – the legitimacy of which remains a topic of heated debate – even *if* he were to be convicted under subsection (b) of the statute, that would not – in a rational world capable of reading plain

English – disqualify him from running for and, if elected, again serving the nation as its President. Period.

In conclusion, and to reiterate the admonition of your humble servant’s prior “shortest” P&E post, the Democrats should not be allowed within two light years – about 12 trillion miles – of the reins of governmental power. Ever. They have forfeited any contrary claim, as current events prove. Vote very..., *very* carefully in November 2022 and November 2024.