



JOEL M. SKOUSEN'S

WORLD AFFAIRS BRIEF

COMMENTARY AND INSIGHTS ON A TROUBLED WORLD

WEEKLY EMAIL PRINTED EDITION

December 13, 2019

THIS WEEK'S ANALYSIS:

[Democrats File Articles of Impeachment](#)
[Horowitz Report Exonerates FBI of Spying](#)
[Year End Financial Crisis Looming](#)
[News Shorts](#)
[Preparedness Tip: Conceal Carry Holsters](#)

DEMOCRATS FILE ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT

The Democrat's "impeachment train to nowhere" is rolling and it is heading for a crash in the Republican controlled Senate. This week and next the Judiciary Committee will spend several days defeating Republican attempts to amend the articles. They will then be voted on in the Democrat controlled House of Representatives, just before the Christmas recess. They will be easily approved, but not without a few Democrat defectors who fear voter reprisals in swing state districts.

But the biggest betrayal of Trump will occur in the Senate, where Senator Lindsay Graham of the Judiciary Committee has vowed not to call any witnesses—leaving only attorneys for Democrats and Republicans to lay out the charges and the defense—which won't change anyone's mind. Only a grilling of Joe and Hunter Biden and damaging testimony by Ukrainian prosecutors could sway future voters into seeing that Trump was justified in seeking Ukraine's help investigating the Bidens. By refusing to make an issue of the Biden's corruption in Ukraine, Senate GOP leaders are secretly colluding with Democrats to defeat Trump in the next election.

According to The [Daily Mail](#) "*Mitch McConnell pours cold water on Donald Trump's call for Hunter Biden and Nancy Pelosi to be witnesses at his impeachment trial as he reveals plans for how he will try*

the president... Mitch McConnell showed no appetite for witnesses when Senate holds impeachment trial of President Trump in January."

Still, in order to placate conservatives, McConnell is putting out the message that he plans on getting the Senate [to acquit the president](#) rather than simply dismissing the charges. While that would give Trump bragging rights, it wouldn't be as good as exposing the corruption of Biden and the Democrats in Ukraine.

Senator Lindsay Graham is McConnell's key ally in sabotaging the hearings against Trump. The Gateway Pundit covers how Sen. Lindsay Graham has consistently [refused to hold hearings](#) in the Senate on the full range of Deep State conspiracies at the Department of Justice against Trump. That now includes the crucial impeachment hearings.

Lindsey Graham took chairmanship of Judiciary Committee to bury Democrat and Deep State Crimes. On May 1, 2019 Lindsey Graham, the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, promised investigations on how the Mueller probe started. He made the comments during testimony by US Attorney General Bill Barr in front of the US Senate.

But Lindsey Graham lied. Lindsey Graham is a fraud.

Lindsey Graham has scheduled NO COMMITTEE HEARINGS on the Deep State, FBI, CIA and has called no witnesses in to discuss Spycgate, or the Ukrainian scandals including Hunter Biden, Joe Biden, Mueller,

Stefan Halper, George Papadopoulos, John Brennan, James Comey, Chris Wray, etc.

Lindsey Graham has no intention of confronting the latest criminal coup against this great American president. In November Lindsey Graham told Sean Hannity he will call in corrupt liar Adam Schiff to testify before the US Senate.

On Sunday Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-SC) told Maria Bartiromo he will end the impeachment process “as soon as possible.” Lindsey will not investigate Schiff or Ukraine — he’s going to hide the evidence from the American public.

And now Lindsey Graham has doubled down. Lindsey says he may not call ANY WITNESSES to testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Lindsey Graham is going to give the Democrats a pass. Lindsey is going to give the anti-Trump CIA ‘whistleblower’ a pass. Lindsey Graham is going to give the Biden Crime Family a pass.

Lindsey Graham is a serial liar.

That is because Graham is allied with the Deep State, as is Mitch McConnell. Here is a prime example of the damaging information Graham and McConnell could put before the public in these impeachment hearings, but won't:

One America News sent reporters into Ukraine recently to interview prosecutors who documented how the American ambassador to Ukraine (one of the Democrat's star witnesses) actually gave them a list of people to fire who were investigating the Bidens—proving that the conspiracy to cover up the multi-million dollar payoff to Joe Biden and son was much broader

than previously thought, and involved State Department personnel. The Conservative Treehouse [has the story](#). In it he outlines the claim that shaking down a foreign country for secret paybacks to corrupt politicians is a widespread problem and involves more politicians than the Clintons and Bidens.

In a fantastic display of true investigative journalism, One America News journalist Chanel Rion tracked down Ukrainian witnesses as part of an exclusive OAN investigative series. The evidence being discovered dismantles the baseless Adam Schiff impeachment hoax and highlights many corrupt motives for U.S. politicians.

Ms. Rion spoke with Ukrainian former Prosecutor General Yuriy Lutsenko who outlines how former Ambassador Marie Yovanovitch perjured herself before Congress.

What is outlined in this interview [video embedded in above link] is a problem for all DC politicians across both parties. The obviously corrupt influence efforts by U.S. Ambassador Yovanovitch as outlined by Lutsenko were not done independently.

Senators from both parties participated in the influence process and part of those influence priorities was exploiting the financial opportunities within Ukraine while simultaneously protecting Joe Biden and his family. This is where Senator John McCain and Senator Lindsey Graham were working with Marie Yovanovitch.

Imagine what would happen if all of the background information was to reach the general public? Thus the motive for Lindsey Graham currently working to bury it.

You might remember George Kent and Bill Taylor testified together. It was evident months ago that U.S. chargé d'affaires to Ukraine, Bill Taylor, was one of the current participants in the coup effort against President Trump. It was Taylor who engaged in carefully planned text messages with EU Ambassador Gordon Sondland to set-up a narrative helpful to Adam Schiff's political coup effort.

*Bill Taylor was formerly U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine ('06-'09) and later helped the Obama administration to design the laundry operation providing taxpayer financing to Ukraine in exchange for **back-channel payments to U.S. politicians and their families.***

My knowledge of how the Deep State operates tells me this is true, but evidence outside of the Clinton Foundation and Biden admission is sparse due to government secrecy. However, one telltale circumstantial evidence is to watch which Congressmen or Senators become wealthy during their term in office. That is almost always a telltale sign of corruption.

In November Rudy Giuliani released a letter he sent to Senator Lindsey Graham outlining how Bill Taylor blocked VISA's for Ukrainian 'whistle-blowers' who are willing to testify to the corrupt financial scheme.

There is only one reason for blocking such testimony—to cover for the participants, which have to include Republicans like Graham and McCain who both traveled to meet with Pres. Poroshenko in 2016 (see picture in link).

Unfortunately, as we are now witnessing, Senator Lindsey Graham, along with dozens of U.S. Senators currently serving, may very well have been recipients for money through

the aforementioned laundry process. The VISA's are unlikely to get approval for congressional testimony, or Senate impeachment trial witness testimony.

U.S. senators write foreign aid policy, rules and regulations thereby creating the financing mechanisms to transmit U.S. funds. Those same senators then received a portion of the laundered funds back through their various "institutes" and business connections to the foreign government offices; in this example Ukraine. [ex. Burisma to Biden]

Sen. John McCain also had a tax exempt entity set up to receive such funds.

*The U.S. State Dept. serves as a distribution network for the authorization of the money laundering by granting conflict waivers, approvals for financing (think Clinton Global Initiative), and **permission slips for the payment of foreign money.** The officials within the State Dept. take a cut of the overall payments through a system of "indulgence fees", junkets, gifts and expense payments to those with political oversight.*

*If anyone gets too close to revealing the process, writ large, they become a target of the entire apparatus. **President Trump was considered an existential threat to this entire process. Hence our current political status with the ongoing coup.***

It will be interesting to see how this plays out, because, well, in reality all of the U.S. Senators (both parties) are participating in the process for receiving taxpayer money and contributions from foreign governments.

A "Codel" is a congressional delegation that takes [foreign] trips to work out the payments

terms/conditions of any changes in graft financing. This is why Senators spend \$20 million on a campaign to earn a job paying \$350k/year. The “institutes” is where the real foreign money comes in; billions paid by governments like China, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Ukraine, etc. etc. There are trillions at stake.

Majority Leader Mitch McConnell holds the power over these members (and the members of the Senate Intel Committee), because McConnell decides who sits on what committee. As soon as a Senator starts taking the bribes lobbying funds, McConnell then has full control over that Senator. This is how the system works.

The McCain Institute is one of the obvious examples of the financing network. And that is the primary reason why Cindy McCain is such an outspoken critic of President Trump. In essence President Trump is standing between her and her next diamond necklace; a dangerous place to be.

So when we think about a Senate Impeachment Trial; and we consider which senators will vote to impeach President Trump, it's not just a matter of Democrats - vs- Republican. We need to look at the game of leverage, and the stand-off between those bribed Senators who would prefer President Trump did not interfere in their process.

McConnell has been advising President Trump which Senators are most likely to need their sensibilities eased. As an example President Trump met with Alaska Senator Lisa Murkowski in November. Senator Murkowski rakes in millions from the multinational Oil and Gas industry; and she ain't about to allow horrible Trump to lessen her bank account any more than Cindy

McCain will give up her frequent shopper discounts at Tiffanys.

*Senator Lindsey Graham announcing today that he will **not request or facilitate any impeachment testimony that touches on the DC laundry system** for personal financial benefit (ie. Ukraine example), is specifically motivated by the need for all DC politicians to keep prying eyes away from the swamps' financial endeavors.*

This open-secret system of “Affluence and Influence” is how the intelligence apparatus gains such power. All of the DC participants are essentially beholden to the various U.S. intelligence services who are well aware of their endeavors. [Not all, but most.]

There's a ton of exposure here (blackmail/leverage) which allows the unelected officials within the CIA, FBI and DOJ to hold power over the DC politicians. Hold this type of leverage long enough and the Intelligence Community then absorbs that power to enhance their self-belief of being more important than the system.

We got a preview this week of how the Republicans plan to defend the president as Stephen Castor, minority counsel for the Republicans on the Judicial Committee, [detailed all his objections](#) to the Judiciary Committee process and impeachment claims. It was an OK defense, but Joel B. Pollak of Breitbart News does a much better job here in a [line by line rebuttal](#) of the Democrat's articles of impeachment. Pollak is a lawyer by training.

“Not only did the Democrats back away from charging Trump with bribery, obstruction of justice in the Mueller investigation, campaign finance violations, treason, or any of the other wild claims they floated, but the two articles

themselves are fraudulent, based on blatantly false claims of law and fact. Line by line, here they are:

“ARTICLE I: ABUSE OF POWER

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives shall have the sole Power of Impeachment and that the President “shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.” In his conduct of the office of President of the United States — and in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed — Donald J. Trump has abused the powers of the Presidency, in that:

*Using the powers of his high office, President Trump **Solicited the interference of a foreign government, Ukraine, in the 2020 United States Presidential election.**”*

“This is false. Trump never discussed the 2020 election with Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky, nor did he ask them to interfere in our politics. That is simply Democrats’ spin, based on the complaint of the so-called “whistleblower,” which was disproved by the release of the actual transcript of Trump’s conversation with Zelensky. Trump asked Ukraine to look into its widely-reported interference in the 2016 election, and to **look into the circumstances in which then-Vice President Joe Biden demanded, on pain of losing \$1 billion in loan guarantees, that**

Ukraine fire a prosecutor who had jurisdiction over a dormant investigation of a corrupt Ukrainian company, Burisma, on which Biden’s son, Hunter, served as a well-compensated board member. Democrats demanded Ukraine cooperate with Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s investigation into Trump’s supposed “collusion” with Russia in 2018. By their own new definition, that would qualify as pressuring Ukraine to interfere in U.S. politics.”

[Good point but he fails to point out that both the US and Ukraine had a 1999 treaty obligation to pursue corruption investigations. A good rebuttal would have pointed out that focusing solely on how the results of a legal investigation would have had negative political consequences for Biden is NOT soliciting interference, but applying legal consequences to whomever they may apply—even someone in political opposition. The Democrat’s argument that a president investigating an opponent for corruption is an impeachable offense, creates a defacto loophole of immunity from prosecution just for being in opposition to the president—which can never be allowed in law.]

“He did so through a scheme or course of conduct that included soliciting the Government of Ukraine to publicly announce investigations that would benefit his reelection, harm the election prospects of a political opponent, and influence the 2020 United States Presidential election to his advantage.”

“Trump asked Zelensky to work with the U.S. Attorney General, which suggests he actually wanted real investigations. Democrats claim Trump only wanted an “announcement” of investigations. Their only evidence is the testimony of Gordon Sondland, who testified that Trump told him that he wanted “nothing” from

Ukraine, and who admitted that most of what he believed about “investigations” was the result of his own personal presumptions.”

[Still, I believe the president should be defended **on the merits** of investigating corruption. That the consequences had political repercussions on Biden is a side effect, not the primary purpose.]

“President Trump also sought to pressure the Government of Ukraine to take these steps”

“This is false. President Zelensky has said numerous times that he felt no “pressure” from Trump, and that there was no “quid pro quo.” Numerous witnesses testified that Ukraine did not even know any aid was on hold until Politico reported it in late August, more than a month after the call. While some witnesses said that some Ukrainian officials at the embassy in Washington may have been aware of a holdup with the aid, none of them could say exactly when.”

“...by conditioning official United States Government acts of significant value to Ukraine on its public announcement of the investigations.”

“This, again, is false. Numerous witnesses testified that aid was never conditioned on investigations. The Ukrainian government itself has repeated — even today — that it never believed U.S. assistance depended on announcing, or conducting, investigations. The claim was just a presumption by Sondland, who also testified that Trump told him there was “no quid pro quo,” and admitted he had no direct knowledge of any link between aid and investigations.”

[But it is true that Trump’s lawyer Giuliani did go to Ukraine with quid pro quo demands for an investigation. This should not be denied, but defended.]

“President Trump engaged in this scheme or course of conduct for corrupt purposes in pursuit of personal political benefit.”

“The president specifically asked Zelensky to “do us a favor,” referring to the “country.” (Democrat legal “expert” Pamela Karlan tried, absurdly, to argue that Trump meant the “royal ‘We’.”) Investigating both foreign election interference and corruption involving American officials is a matter of public interest. Numerous witnesses agreed that the Bidens had a conflict of interest with Burisma — at the very least — and that it was worthy of investigation. Moreover, Democrats spent years arguing that the FBI’s investigation of the Trump campaign’s alleged “collusion” with Russia was justified because the country had to know if a possible future president was compromised — either by foreign misdeeds or by compromising information in hands of a foreign power. The same applies to Biden. [Good point.]

“In so doing, President Trump used the powers of the Presidency in a manner that compromised the national security of the United States.”

“The argument that Trump “compromised” national security rests on the idea that Ukraine is essential to American national security interests. That may or may not be true, but if so, then President Barack Obama should have been impeached for appeasing Russia and allowing it to invade Ukraine. [Good point.] In truth, questions of national security and foreign policy are largely within the president’s own constitutional purview; his decisions are not impeachable. Regardless, there was never any

interruption in U.S. aid to Ukraine, and the key military aid — the Javelin anti-tank missiles that Trump provided, but Obama had not — was never affected, as numerous witnesses testified. If anything undermined U.S. national security, it was the Democrats’ decision to pursue impeachment in a way that exposed the secretive details of internal decision-making and foreign policy to anyone, friend or foe, who wanted to know.

“...and undermined the integrity of the United States democratic process.”

“The only violation of the democratic process is Democrats’ attempt to overturn the 2016 election. As Democrats argued vehemently during the Clinton impeachment in 1998-9, such an effort should not be undertaken lightly. And as Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) argued — before her impeachment effort failed to earn Republican support — impeachment should only be done with bipartisan support lest it be seen as a purely political endeavor.

“He thus ignored and injured the interests of the Nation.”

“On the contrary: protecting our elections, investigating corruption, and preventing foreign aid from being misused by corrupt governments are all the duties of the President of the United States, in furtherance of his Oath of Office.

“President Trump engaged in this scheme or course of conduct through the following means:

“1) President Trump — acting both directly and through his agents Within and Outside the United States Government

“Trump did not have “agents.” He had Senate-confirmed diplomats, as well as informal diplomatic channels. As numerous witnesses

testified, there is nothing inherently wrong or unusual in a president using informal diplomacy.

“(A) a political opponent, former Vice President Joseph R. Biden,

“It is still unclear that Biden will be Trump’s 2020 opponent. Regardless, Biden is more than a political opponent. He was the former vice president, who was in charge of Ukraine policy for the Obama administration in that capacity. As Trump himself learned, potential presidential candidates enjoy no privilege protecting them from investigation.

“(B) a discredited theory promoted by Russia alleging that Ukraine — rather than Russia — interfered in the 2016 United States Presidential election.”

“The theory is not “discredited,” but supported by a variety of mainstream media sources, such as an investigative piece in Politico in January 2017 titled: “Ukrainian efforts to sabotage Trump backfire.” Democrats pretend that only Russia or Ukraine could have interfered in our election. The two are not mutually exclusive. Russia seems to have interfered more — though the results of that interference were negligible — but Ukrainian officials did, too.

[Republicans should never agree that Russia interfered in our election. The release of the DNC emails was by a disgruntled DNC staffer, and the Facebook posts by Russian sources were on both the Right and Left. The claimed Russian hacking in to voter registration databases could have been falsified by the NSA, and doesn’t alter the vote count in any way.]

“(2) With the same corrupt motives,

“The use of the term “motives” is crucial. In the House Judiciary Committee’s report on the legal

and constitutional foundation for impeachment — written entirely by Democratic staff and ignoring all of the experts who testified — cited the discredited impeachment of President Andrew Johnson to argue that a president can be impeached for “illegitimate motives” even if he has otherwise acted lawfully. This is, in fact, an illegitimate basis for impeachment. [Right, no one has proved what Trump’s motives were.]

“...that Congress had appropriated on a bipartisan basis for the purpose of providing vital military and security assistance to Ukraine to oppose Russian aggression and which President Trump had ordered suspended;

“Again, the Javelin anti-tank missiles were not affected — and it was Trump, not Congress, that made the policy decision to arm Ukraine with lethal weapons, in contrast to President Obama, who denied Ukraine that assistance.

“...and (B) a head of state meeting at the White House, which the President of Ukraine sought to demonstrate continued United States support for the Government of Ukraine in the face of Russian aggression.

“Trump had already invited Zelensky to the White House with no preconditions. And Ambassador Kurt Volker, the Special Representative for Ukraine, a highly-regarded career diplomat, testified that there was no linkage between a White House meeting and investigations. Sondland said otherwise, but admitted he had no direct knowledge.

“(3) Faced with the public revelation of his actions, President Trump ultimately released the military and security assistance to the Government of Ukraine,”

“This is pure speculation, contradicted by other evidence. No one testified that Trump released the aid because he was afraid of “public revelation of his actions.” In fact, Sen. Ron Johnson (R-WI) wrote to the House Intelligence Committee to describe a conversation with the president in which he said the matter was still under review in late August and early September. That was after the Politico article emerged, but it does not follow that the president was trying to minimize culpability. As Byron York of the Washington Examiner noted, there is an even more banal explanation: Congress was going to appropriate the funds on its own anyway, and so Trump relented by Sep. 11.

“...but has persisted in openly and corruptly urging and soliciting Ukraine to undertake investigations...”

“This suggests Trump did not have “corrupt motives”; he still believes the investigations to be in the public interest.

“...for his personal political benefit.”

“False. [Pure speculation by Democrats.]

“He has also betrayed the Nation by abusing his high office to enlist a foreign power in corrupting democratic elections.”

“This is more than a false statement of fact. It is an attempt to insinuate that the president committed treason, without actually charging a separate article of treason. It is a sign that Democrats know how weak this first article really is.

[He should have responded that exposing corruption in a political opponent is NOT corrupting elections but ensuring they do not allow corrupt people to gain elective office].

“Wherefore President Trump, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to national security and the Constitution if allowed to remain in office,...”

“This is an argument for removing Trump not because of what he has done, but because of what **he might do**. It is an argument for pre-emptive impeachment, an idea grossly at odds with the Impeachment Clause and basic justice. [Excellent point.]

“...and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with self-governance and the rule of law.

“Arguably, it is the Democrats’ fraudulent impeachment that is incompatible with self-governance and the rule of law — especially when undertaken in apparent defense of Joe Biden, whose conflicts of interest remain unexamined. [He should also have pointed out that no law has been broken by president Trump so the “rule of law” violation claim is invalid.]

“President Trump thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.”

[Note, the Democrats are **adding the provision of disqualification for future office**, which is an option only in impeachment. They want Trump gone forever.]

ARTICLE II: OBSTRUCTION OF CONGRESS

“The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives ‘shall have the sole Power of Impeachment’ and that the President ‘shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other

high Crimes and Misdemeanors’. In his conduct of the office of President of the United States — and in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed —

“Donald J. Trump has directed the unprecedented, categorical, and indiscriminate defiance of subpoenas issued by the House of Representatives pursuant to its ‘sole Power of Impeachment’.

“This is flagrantly false. Every president has pushed back against congressional efforts to obtain documents and summon witnesses — and not just presidents like Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton, under investigation for truly impeachable conduct. **President Obama himself resisted congressional subpoenas over Operation Fast and Furious.** What is unprecedented — except, perhaps, for the Johnson impeachment — is the partisan nature of the inquiry, and the Democrats’ attempt to deny Trump fairness or due process. The House has violated its own precedents in the way it has conducted the investigation, and the White House has resisted cooperation with the House on that basis.

“President Trump has abused the powers of the Presidency in a manner offensive to, and subversive of, the Constitution,”

“On the contrary: President Trump had no choice under the Constitution but to protect the powers and rights of the executive branch from what he, and others, believed in good faith was an overreach by the legislative branch. Moreover, he appealed to the judiciary to resolve his

disputes with the House. The House decided that it did not want to wait for the courts to weigh in. Hence the rush to impeachment — but that is not the president’s fault.

“...in that: The House of Representatives has engaged in an impeachment inquiry focused on President Trump’s corruptsolicitation of the Government of Ukraine to interfere in the 2020 United States Presidential election.”

“A false premise; see Article I, above.

“As part of this impeachment inquiry, the Committees undertaking the investigation served subpoenas seeking documents and testimony deemed vital to the inquiry from various Executive Branch agencies and offices, and current and former officials.”

“It also declined to issue subpoenas to key witnesses, including former National Security Advisor John Bolton, because Democrats did not want to wait for a court battle. They say they needed to rush to prevent Trump from damaging the 2020 election; more likely, they saw the poll numbers heading south and faced angry presidential candidates from the Senate who would have been forced to skip early primary states to sit through a Senate trial.

“In response, without lawful cause or excuse,”

“Of course the president had “lawful cause or excuse,” [that] is **why he went to court**. Democrats may not agree that his “lawful cause or excuse” for resisting subpoenas was valid, but the fact is that he argued a case in the courts.

“(3) Directing current and former Executive Branch officials not to cooperate with the Committees, in response to which nine Administration officials defied subpoenas for

testimony, namely John Michael “Mick” Mulvaney, Robert B. Blair, John A. Eisenberg, Michael Ellis, Preston Wells Griffith, Russell T. Vought, Michael Duffey, Brian McCormack, and T. Ulrich Brechbuhl.”

“As noted above, the president had the **right to resist the House, which chose not to wait for the courts to decide**.

Because of the weakness of the Democrat’s case, some Democrats want to only censure the president, not impeach, as [Politico.com noted](#).

A small group of vulnerable House Democrats is floating the longshot idea of censuring President Donald Trump instead of impeaching him, according to multiple lawmakers familiar with the conversations.

Those Democrats, all representing districts that Trump won in 2016, huddled on Monday afternoon in an 11th-hour bid to weigh additional — though unlikely — options to punish the president for his role in the Ukraine scandal as the House speeds toward an impeachment vote next week.

HOROWITZ REPORT EXONERATES FBI OF SPYING

DOJ Inspector General Michael Horowitz issued his final report on FBI conduct in the investigation of the Trump campaign and Russia. It was a typical whitewash of the Deep State by coming down hard on FBI personnel who are already gone—making it unlikely anyone will be prosecuted—but exonerating the FBI of the larger charge of spying on the Trump campaign. Incredibly, Horowitz told Congress that he found no evidence of any human assets tasked by the FBI to spy on the Trump campaign. Who would ever admit to the inspector general of that kind of illegal activity? Worse, he said that the FBI was

justified in investigating Trump on mere suspicion based upon guidelines and protocols. In fact, all of the evidence pointed to no suspicion. All of it was exculpatory, so how could they be following guidelines?

It is interesting that both AG Bill Barr and his special prosecutor, John Durham, on whom all conservatives are waiting to take down the Deep State actors like James Comey, Andy McCabe, and Hillary Clinton have come out attacking the report. They are playing a loyalist role to Trump, but are secretly also Deep State. AG Barr has already declined to prosecute James Comey and I suspect John Durham's report on the FBI scandals of Comey, Mueller and Clinton will, like Horowitz, target a few little guys and let the big fish go.

Law professor Jonathan Turley takes apart this whitewash in this analysis [published by The Hill.com](#):

*...Horowitz spent 434 pages to primarily conclude one thing, which is that the **Justice Department acted within its guidelines in starting its investigation into the 2016 campaign of President Trump.***

*Horowitz did say that the original decision to investigate was within the discretionary standard of the Justice Department. That standard for the predication of an investigation is low, simply requiring "**articulable facts.**" He said that, since this is a low discretionary standard, he cannot say it was inappropriate to start. United States Attorney **John Durham**, who is heading the parallel investigation at the Justice Department, took the usual step of issuing a statement that he did not believe the evidence supported that conclusion at the beginning of the investigation.*

Horowitz is wrong about Comey's weak "suspicions" meeting the standard of "articulable facts" —which means there is evidence that one can consider facts and articulate them clearly. That rules out mere suspicion!

*Attorney **General William Barr** also issued a **statement disagreeing with the threshold statement.** Nevertheless, the Justice Department has a standard requiring the least intrusive means of investigating such entities as presidential campaigns, particularly when it is the campaign of the opposing party. That threshold finding is then followed by the remainder of the report, which is highly damaging and unsettling. Horowitz finds a **litany of false and even falsified representations used to continue the secret investigation targeting the Trump campaign and its associates.***

But by dismissing the main charge of spying on the Trump campaign, and imputing no political motive by James Comey against Trump, it was easy for Barr to decline to prosecute Comey.

... the Justice Department not only failed to report [falsified information] to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) court but also removed evidence that its investigation was on a collision course.

*The investigation was largely based on a May 2016 conversation between Trump campaign adviser **George Papadopoulos** and **Australian diplomat Alexander Downer** in London. Papadopoulos reportedly said he heard that Russia had thousands of emails from Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton.*

Actually, it started with Papadopoulos being approached by a Deep State agent, Joseph Misfud (masquerading as a Russian agent), who [fed Papadopoulos the false info about Russian](#)

[possession of DNC emails and “dirt on Hillary.”](#)

Misfud also fed Papadopoulos the line that he could help arrange meetings with president Putin, which induced Papadopoulos to email the Trump campaign several times saying, “he could arrange a meeting” with Putin. All of this was leading Papadopoulos into being the “link” between Trump and Russia—but it was all a setup to justify Comey’s instigation of a secret campaign against Trump for Russia collusion!

Democrats and the media lambasted Trump for saying the Justice Department was “spying” on his campaign, and many said it was just an investigation into figures like Carter Page. Horowitz describes poorly founded investigations that included undercover FBI agents and an array of different sources. What they discovered is the real point of the Horowitz report.

From the outset, the Justice Department failed to interview several key individuals or vet critical information and sources in the Steele dossier. Justice Department officials insisted to Horowitz that they did not interview campaign officials because they were unsure if the campaign was compromised and did not want to tip off the Russians. However, the report says the Russians were directly told about the allegations repeatedly by CIA Director John Brennan and, ultimately, then-President Obama. So the Russians were informed, but no one contacted the Trump campaign so as not to inform the Russians? In the meantime, the allegations quickly fell apart. Horowitz details how all of the evidence proved exculpatory of any collusion or conspiracy with the Russians.

Worse yet, another agency, which appears to be the CIA, told the FBI that Page actually was working for it in Russia. He was

*considered an “operational contact” gathering intelligence for the CIA. The FBI was told this repeatedly, yet it **never reported that to the FISA court** approving the secret investigation of Page. **His claim to have worked with the federal government was widely dismissed.** It then gets even worse. Horowitz found that investigators and the Justice Department concluded there was no probable cause on Page to support its FISA investigation. That is when there was an **intervention from the top of the FBI, ordering investigators to instead look at the Steele dossier** funded by the Democratic National Committee and the Clinton campaign.*

*Who told investigators to turn to the dossier? Former FBI Deputy Director Andrew McCabe. He was fired over his conduct in the investigation after earlier internal investigations. Horowitz contradicts the media claim that the dossier was just a small part of the case presented to the FISA court. He finds that it was essential to seeking FISA warrants. Horowitz also finds **no sharing of information with FISA judges that undermined the credibility of the dossier or Christopher Steele himself.** Surprisingly little effort was made to fully investigate the dossier when McCabe directed investigators to it, yet investigators soon learned that critical facts **reported to the FISA court were false.** FISA judges were told that a Yahoo News article was independent corroboration of the Steele dossier, but Horowitz confirms that **Steele was the source of that article.** Thus, **Steele was used to corroborate Steele on allegations** later found to be unfounded.*

The report also said that Steele was viewed as reliable and had been used as a source in prior cases, yet Horowitz found no support

for that representation and, in fact, found that the past representations of Steele were flagged as unreliable. His veracity was not the only questionable thing. Steele relied on a character who, Horowitz determined, had a dubious reputation and may have been under investigation as a possible double agent for Russia. Other facts were also clearly misrepresented. The FISA application had been based in part of an exchange with Page and an FBI source. Page was asked by the source if he expected an “October surprise” and, when pressed, said there could be the release of 30,000 emails. That was a reference to reports that 30,000 deleted Clinton emails were being sought. But the statement was misrepresented to FISA judges as a reference to the Democratic National Committee emails.

*In addition, the source relied on by Steele was presented as conveying damaging information on Trump. When this source was interviewed, he said he had no direct information and was conveying essentially bar talk. He denied telling other details to Steele. These contradictions were known to the Justice Department, but it **continued to seek warrant renewals from the FISA court without correcting the record** or revealing exculpatory information found by investigators. That included the **failure to tell the court that Page was working with the CIA.** Finally, Horowitz finds that an **FBI lawyer doctored a key email to hide the fact that Page was working for us and not the Russians.***

Despite this shockingly damning report, much of the media is reporting only that Horowitz did not find it unreasonable to start the investigation, and ignoring a litany of false representations and falsifications of

evidence to keep the secret investigation going.

Of course, that was the entire intent of the OIG report—to exonerate Comey and the FBI.

YEAR END FINANCIAL CRISIS LOOMING

Could this be the long anticipated downturn that helps deny president Trump bragging rights about the economy? Zoltan Pozsar (formerly of the FED and now Credit Suisse) is the most respected financial guru on repo agreements and he is sounding a warning about a coming year-end banking crisis that could spill over into a major sell off of stocks and bonds. International finance is very complex with lots of speculation in Foreign Exchange, Repo agreements (short term lending schemes), derivatives, Treasury bills and various types of bonds. There are swaps, highly leveraged futures contracts, and even a year-end banking system penalty system (G-SIB scores) that will be forcing commercial banks and investment banks to boost year end reserves by selling collateral. Repo lending rates have skyrocketed recently, just as they did prior to the 2008 mortgage crisis, indicating a dangerous shortage of cash bank reserves. This guarantees a year end selloff of all kinds of assets in order to lower a bank’s G-SIB scores (to avoid high penalties) which could trigger a financial panic. Pozsar says only a new FED inflationary QE 4 (Quantitative Easing) can avoid the crisis. All this complexity is laid out by [ZeroHedge](#).

NEWS SHORTS:

Big Conservative Party Win in UK Elections:

This gives PM Boris Johnson the mandate he needs to pass the Brexit deal he made with the EU that was stalled in Parliament prior to the election. Sadly, it’s a sellout of Brexit just like the deal made by Theresa May. It also secretly integrates the UK military into the new EU Army that will replace NATO.

Pensacola Shooting: Trump temporarily suspends all foreign student training. Only in the aftermath of a deadly terrorist shooting do we find out that the Pentagon is spending millions training foreigners at the elite Naval Flight training center in Pensacola. There were about 300 Saudi students in various stages of Naval flight training in the US. One of them turned out to be a terrorist. But that shouldn't have surprised US intelligence given that all of the 9/11 hijackers were Saudis. Why give them priority in learning to fly US military aircraft, when there is a severe US pilot shortage? They should send them all packing, back home.

Here's a [must read link](#) to a report by a former Navy Pilot who still has contacts at Pensacola that tells how bad the situation is with the Saudi students:

1. They aren't chosen for flight training by merit, but by how wealthy their parents are, so they are spoiled kids with little work ethic.
2. Their failure rate is high and the Saudi government pays for Navy tutors to make up for their lack of study. The Navy isn't allowed to discipline them, but turns that over to Saudi "handlers."
3. There were 10 Saudi student pilots involved in the conspiracy, and 3 that went along with the killer to film it all. So, we can't trust the Saudis to vet these students. All must be sent home.

YouTube Admits to Censoring Conspiracy: CEO Susan Wojcicki tells Lesley Stahl of "60 Minutes" that Google employs 10,000 people to focus on "controversial content," and bragged about being able to stop "70%" of it. But she admitted one of their biggest struggles is to keep their employees from being converted to the conspiracies they censor! The doubters get anti-conspiracy "therapy." Interesting. [Real Clear Politics reported on it.](#)

Kim Jong-un "Denuclearization is off the table:" North Korea has finally admitted they have no intention of denuclearizing, a move that will be very embarrassing for Donald Trump who was fooled into believing Kim. This week, Kim used a previously claimed "dismantled" test site to test a new rocket engine. While Trump has returned to mild threats about military action against NK, no one believes he has the stomach to do that anymore. In [this link](#), yet another NK defector says Trump has been fooled by Kim and that things in NK are much worse than he thinks. Wake up Mr. President.

"Pocahontas" Admits her Claims to Indian Heritage were False: Sen. Elizabeth Warren has finally admitted that her [false claims of Indian heritage](#) was all part of an effort to gain positions based upon minority affirmative action. Harvard Law School News Director Mike Chmura, at the time, bragged about Warren's status as the "first woman of color" tenured at Harvard Law. In NH she admitted, "I shouldn't have done it. I am not a person of color, I am not a citizen of a tribe," Warren said. "And I have apologized for the confusion I have caused on tribal citizenship, tribal sovereignty, and for any harm I have caused." The media is taking extraordinary means to downplay the story, but Warren's polling numbers are falling rapidly.

Trump Succumbs to Mexican Pressure: Trump said the president of Mexico "asked him nicely" [not to declare Mexican drug cartels terrorists](#) after killing several Mormon families on a road trip back to the US. What Trump doesn't know is that the Deep State has an arrangement with Mexico to certify trucks laden with drugs as "drug free" so they avoid inspection coming across the border. Trump has unwittingly allow these ruthless cartels to continue their war against rival gangs, of hapless citizens of both countries.

Democrats Agree to Pass USMCA: Trump, eager to declare victory in the trade wars is blissfully unaware that the onerous aspects of the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) which he campaign against are now included in his vaunted new NAFTA trade deal—international body to rule on trade disputes, minimum wage requirements, percentage content, compulsory unionism, and mandated “carbon pollution” actions. In the midst of an impeachment battle, the Democrats would never hand Trump a victory like this unless it was to accelerate globalist control.

Federal judge blocks use of billions of dollars in Pentagon funds to build border wall: Claiming that Trump’s declaration of an emergency was illegal, anti-Trump Judge David Briones of the US District Court for the Western District of Texas said Tuesday that the administration cannot use military construction funds to build additional barriers on the southern border—as if stopping the illegal alien invasion of the US isn’t sufficient to use emergency powers. The injunction on targets one set of Pentagon funds, however, leaving in place the money the Supreme Court allowed to be used earlier this year. Trump will appeal.

Greta Thunberg is Time’s Person of the Year: Time Magazine, which is only a shadow of its former self, always uses its person of the year title to promote a radical agenda. This year, Time promotes the continual drumbeat of “climate change” by naming radical Swedish climate change teen Greta Thunberg as its “person of the Year.”

PREPAREDNESS TIP: CONCEAL CARRY HOLSTERS by Andrew Skousen

Owning a concealable weapon is the single most important piece of your self defense preparations, but only if you have it with you when you need it. Where possible, everyone should apply for

and get a concealed weapon permit, especially women who need the force multiplier of a gun. A good holster is a key part of owning a concealed weapon. There is a huge variety of holsters out there so here are the key criteria to find the right one.

There are [many ways to carry](#) a concealed weapon. Outside the waistband (often abbreviated OWB) is comfortable and easy to get to, but hard to conceal unless you wear long, untucked shirts, sweaters or jackets all year round. The more common holster is inside the waistband (IWB). Typically this is tucked inside the hip near your shooting hand, where you instinctively reach for it. But the side position is hard to conceal and is encumbered by things like the seatbelt in the car. For these and other reasons, many people find the front 12 o’clock or “appendix carry” position more comfortable and practical. Most IWB holsters can be tried in multiple positions around the belt line.

[Shoulder harnesses](#) allow the best access to your gun whether seated, standing or moving around, but they are harder to conceal unless you always wear a suit coat or jacket. If your concealed carry gun is small enough you can also carry it in a front pocket, either loose or in [special holsters](#) that keep it upright, clean and protected from your keys, but it is hard to get to while seated.

Comfort is critical. If you don’t like how the holster feels you won’t wear it. Nothing will be perfect, but it should be adequately comfortable in a variety of typical activities including sitting in the car, at a desk and when walking or working. I recommend trying out a few different kinds of holsters and returning the ones that don’t work for you. You may end up choosing two or three alternatives, such as an IWB holster for hot weather when you wear jeans or shorts and a t-shirt, a shoulder holster for cold season when you wear a jacket, and perhaps an external

carry option such as a conceal-carry purse, fanny-pack or personal bag to be armed when you leave the house.

For safety, make sure the gun fits so securely in the holster it won't ever fall out under typical activities, including running from or toward a threat. Custom-molded plastics like kydex shine in this area since they are custom formed to your [specific gun model](#). This is very secure by clamping around the trigger guard to hold the gun securely while also covering the trigger to protect it from getting snagged or bumped.

A good holster needs to present the weapon quickly and preferably allow reholstering easily. If you can do it silently, even better. To help prevent a "gun jacking" where someone else gets a hold of your firearm and uses it against you, Joel recommends the holster have a securing strap or release button such as [these models from Blackhawk](#).

Concealment depends more on the weapon size and how you carry it, but some holsters can help blend in the shape, while others actually make it more bulky. [The hardest dimension to conceal](#) on a weapon is the handle grip length which is why so many concealed weapons only give you a three-finger grip. Flatter areas of the body lend themselves to concealing the handle better, so depending on your body shape, consider carrying your weapon on the front or back of the body such as appendix carry or at the small of the back.

If you have to tuck in your shirt for work or at church and don't always wear a jacket, sweater or vest, consider a "[tuckable](#)" holster—meaning it has a slot between the holster and the clip to tuck a shirt down to cover the gun. This is the hardest way to conceal a gun which often makes a bulky shape under a shirt (called "printing"). With a tuckable holster the clip will still be

visible. Some users find it is significantly harder to pull up a shirt tucked in between the gun and your belt. [A belly-band holster](#) doesn't slow down the shirt in the same way and can be very comfortable. It wraps around your torso with a slim velcro attachment and has slots and pockets for both the gun and other accessories. The [Relentless Tactical belly band](#) is made in the USA with a lifetime warranty and is on sale for \$30.

Another unique holster for tucked or untucked shirts is the [Urban Carry G3](#). Its unique holsters drops the gun down below the belt line for better concealment but keeps a nice looking clip at the belt to grab and smoothly pull up the gun and present it above the belt. The older [G2 version is on sale](#) for 40% off.

Just as the right handgun should match your hand size and help your accuracy, the right holster should be comfortable to your preferred way of carrying your gun, and your typical activities. You may need a [sturdy belt](#) to go with it, and don't forget [two extra magazine holders](#) for hard times when there may be more or longer firefights. Someday concealed carry will not be optional, and you will be glad you worked out a comfortable way to stay armed all the time. [END]