

## **NO HOLDS BARRED AUDIO ESSAY VERSION: TRUMP CAN'T SERVE**

PLEASE listen to my full audio essay here: <https://www.freedomdawning.org/text3.mp3>

Per my longer version audio essay at freedom dawning dot O R G, while the 2022 election law provides a means to move against "Trump" taking office, it is obvious to me that the January 6 impeachment already accomplished exactly what SCOTUS demanded in Trump v Anderson: Though I'm not an attorney, this seems so obvious that it totally blows me away that virtually no Constitutional scholars have come to the same conclusion. . That is, that a majority of both Houses of Congress already branded "Trump" as an insurrectionist by way of the January 6th impeachment & trial. After all, what was the purpose of an impeachment, exactly one week before Trump's term was expiring anyway, if not to hang that insurrectionist label around his neck, even if a conviction was not reached? Yes, conviction removes a President out of office, if he is still serving, & kept him from serving again...per Article II of the Constitution. But, my contention is that, even without a conviction, those majority votes still prohibit Trump from serving in the future, per Section 3 of the 14th Amendment. Nothing in that Amendment requires impeachment & conviction for that prohibition to be in place! Think about it: What if, rather than impeaching & trying Trump, a simple majority of both Houses of Congress had merely voted to brand Trump as an insurrectionist? Could SCOTUS, knowing that impeachment convictions are virtually impossible, have said that an impeachment conviction was necessary for the requirements of Section 3, as modified by their decision, to be met? In other words, it is hard to argue that, while an impeachment conviction throws a President out of office AND keeps him from serving in the future, majority votes inadequate to convict don't meet the standards of both the 14th Amendment AND Trump v Anderson. If SCOTUS were to say that Trump actually had to be convicted by the Senate, in order to be prevented from serving as President again, that would be more bogus than the Anderson decision itself. I have no doubt that the Court would not have gotten away with such an opinion. I insist that would have constituted the Court going so far beyond its authority that a majority of the justices would have been forced to go along with hand-maiden injustice Barrett in regard to the one part of her dissent that was correct, that SCOTUS did exceed its authority in deciding that only Congress can brand a President as an insurrectionist!