

If you don't regularly receive my reports, request a free subscription at steve_bakke@comcast.net !
Follow me on Twitter at <http://twitter.com/BakkeSteve> and receive links to my posts and more!
Visit my website at <http://www.myslantonthings.com> !

TRUMP, MUELLER, BARR: IMPORTANT QUESTIONS FOR MANY AMERICANS



By Steve Bakke  May 31, 2019

Democrats are outraged, Republicans are preparing counterpunches, and Trump is gloating. After over two years (22 months under Special Counsel Robert Mueller) listening to charges of Presidential/Russian conspiracy, Mueller reported no conspiracy was found. It's become great theater as both sides in this drama are now hogging the stage.

The drama started with FBI Director James Comey's questionable handling of the 2016 investigation of candidate Clinton's computer security negligence. Comey "became the story" and Trump removed him. Comey had leaked information to the press, hoping a Special Counsel would be named, and eventually along came Mueller. William Barr became Attorney General just before Mueller's investigation concluded.

As to the Mueller report itself, here is my "layman's analysis" of a few questions many of us have been asking asking.

Question: When did Mueller become aware there was no evidence of a Trump/Russia conspiracy? The Steele dossier was the basis for the FISA warrants which were central to the investigation. Soon after Mueller's appointment it was known the dossier was unsubstantiated and financed by Clinton and the DNC. Without substantiation, there was no legal basis for the warrants. Comments by Sen. Feinstein, and James Clapper, America's top spy, indicated there was no evidence. And FBI official Peter Strzok texted Lisa Page there was "no there, there." Mueller was certainly aware of this soon after taking charge.

Before the end of 2017, Mueller decided not to renew allegations of conspiracy, and existing FISA warrants lapsed. So, why did Mueller let the President "twist in the wind"? Was he hoping for a "slip up" by Trump? Refer to commentaries by former Assistant U.S. Attorney Andrew McCarthy for further analyses.

Question: Why didn't Mueller conclude about obstruction of justice? The frequently reported reason is that the Justice Department has a policy that a sitting President can't be indicted. It seems that in spite of the restrictive department policy, Mueller could disclose the evidence worthy of prosecution without issuing an indictment. He did conclude there was no conspiracy with Russia. If Mueller had found indictable conspiracy violations, he could have communicated that fact without violating the policy. So why didn't he offer a

straight-forward opinion on obstruction? His equivocation is being described as an “extraordinary legal defect.” One could argue Mueller didn’t do his job.

Mueller wrote: “While this report does not conclude that the President committed a crime, it also does not exonerate him.” That seems unusual and is part of the “legal defect” referred to above. Our justice system presumes innocence, and a prosecutor’s job isn’t exoneration. Rather, a prosecutor makes prosecutorial decisions. In effect, Mueller said to AG Barr, “here, you do it,” and the AG did. Barr was determined to conclude the Justice system’s proper role in this, and extricate it from being weaponized by Congress. And he told the Senate Judiciary Committee exactly that.

Question: Doesn’t the President have to succumb to Congressional oversight? The President is definitely subject to oversight, and Democrats accuse Trump of ignoring the fact that Congress is a co-equal branch. But Democrats are forgetting that the President is also obliged and sworn to use all his powers and legal rights to enforce the law. That responsibility includes protecting the Executive Branch’s Constitutional authority.

Question: The House is contemplating holding Barr in contempt, and “impeach Barr” is being leaked from Democrats’ lips. Why are Democrats going after Barr so aggressively? Maybe they feel the best defense is an aggressive offense. One purpose is to keep the Trump accusations alive as long as possible – ideally through the 2020 presidential election cycle. They hate Trump and want to control the narrative.

And Democrats know “their own” are next on the “hot seat.” They want to discredit Barr’s investigation into the unsubstantiated Steele dossier – the original basis for the failed conspiracy investigation. Remember, Clinton’s campaign and the DNC paid for that dossier. And there’s a Justice Department investigation into a high-level coup attempt to “get Trump.” What goes around.....

That’s my “layman’s analysis” of several questions. There are many more, and answers are hard to find in all this confusion.

Coming next: Following Mueller’s surprise public statement, many new questions need to be asked. And what will happen with other investigations going on....investigating the investigators? Trump opponents are now in the hot seat. Also, more to come regarding potential impeachment hearings