**BAD ASPECT #2: A PROSECUTION IN SEARCH OF A CRIME**

 *Note: As promised from Part 1, we will now show how a prosecutor can be a real danger - if they are simply wandering about looking for a crime to prosecute. And have already decided who is going to get charged for it.*

 Welcome to Part 2 of the Pelosi Vendetta. Suppose someone had astronomical resources – enough to trace down virtually everything you had ever said or done. Next, they can cherry pick every word out of your mouth (for an entire lifetime). And then use this to recreate you into whatever accusation they want to fling your way. Finally, they have a special court where they have a free rein to play out such games.

 I have just described another reason for something I alluded to in Part 1. Specifically, why federal prosecutors get conviction rates 20% higher than local prosecutors. And only a couple of points lower than ‘prosecutors’ working for a despotic government with no rules of law. So … this article will follow the formula for the first Part 1.

 I want to begin with an educational effort. Joe Everyman needs to be more in the loop – on just how dysfunctional our legal and political systems are getting. And this is even outside of the politicians and their own games.

**BEND, SPINDLE AND MUTILATE**

 For example: A Leona Helmsley case. Let’s consider an utterly irrelevant hearsay statement (that still got submitted into evidence?) A maid once said (that she once said) something to the effect that “only the little people pay taxes”.

 Thus, you have the most well-known “evidence” that a Ms. Helmsley paid very little taxes – and through a deliberate criminal conspiracy (?) Now, in most worlds, making an oft-repeated political statement doesn’t necessarily reflect criminality. Also, there are the other things we mentioned earlier: Wasn’t this hearsay? What about “Prejudicial versus Probative”?

 But we are dealing here in the highly politicized world of federal prosecutions. We think that there are rules against hearsay or “evidences’ that are just prejudicial statements. We think there is such a thing as lawyer to client confidentiality. But why is it that one of Trump’s lawyers could testify against him?

 The answer is simple. For there has always been a loophole (to confidentiality) about a lawyer engaging in a criminal conspiracy. However, this is supposed to be a very difficult hurdle to overcome (for breaching confidentiality). And, again, in local prosecutions it is.

 It is very rare for a local prosecutor to breach the lawyer/client confidentiality agreement. But it is very routine for a federal prosecutor to do so. Another example: the law is explicit that you are immune from prosecution if you rely on a tax attorney to do your taxes.

 Nevertheless, a clearly innocent man once found out that it was not that simple. He somehow wound up in the sites of a federal prosecutor about taxes. And, as often happens, federal prosecutors don’t like taking no for an answer. When the man, correctly, explained to him that he acted only at the direction of his tax attorney the following events then happened:

 1) The prosecutor then charged his tax attorney (who simply did a tax mistake) with deliberately making the mistake for criminal reasons.

 2) He then directed the tax attorney to say that the innocent man (he was originally aiming at) directed him to do it that way. So that,

 3) He then had a “criminal conspiracy” exception in play - and he then used the testimony of the tax attorney against his client (the person he was initially aiming at to charge).

 It never ceases to amaze me that local prosecutors virtually never do this. But that federal cases almost always seem to involve a lawyer who is in a criminal conspiracy – and with the man they were originally aiming at. And that this always manages to skirt the lawyer to client confidentiality in the only way that it can be done. And so it also was with Trump – in having one of his lawyers testify against him.

 Some Post Office packages used to come equipped with labels saying “Don’t bend, spindle or mutilate” on fragile items. In law, however, and especially federal law, the more fragile the item – and the easier it is to bend, spindle and mutilate it – the more it happens. And through an endless array of opportunistic tactics.

 Here, to complete the point, are some of the tactics involved in a prosecution-looking-for-a-crime.

**1) VERBIAGE OFF OF A PIECE OF PAPER**

A major reason, that a transcription of ones’ verbiage, can be unreliable is that it does capture most of a person’s real communications. We all engage in nonverbal communication all the time: facial expressions, voice reflections, the tone of voice, the general mood in the room, etc.

 Some experts have said that it is the nonverbal type of communication that makes up most of what we are really saying and how we are saying it. Along with the items above, there is also the surrounding context that everyone, who was there at the time, were working under. These things tell us much more than just a textual criticism of the language used. And this is the President’s best defense: none of the people listening in (and there were 12 of them) picked up on anything being wrong.

 Also, taking a piece of text - and then bootstrapping a crime to it – is another major ploy of prosecutors in search of a crime. For example, like most people, I was originally naïve about the so-called “perjury trap”. I, like many others, originally thought that the entire concept was ridiculous. “How can there be a ‘perjury trap’ when all you have to do to beat it is to tell the truth”?

 Wrong. This is how it works. It starts with someone who has investigative powers many, many times stronger than, say, a local prosecutor. They can round up virtually every person remotely connected to the matter – and get a virtual encyclopedia of statements made pertaining to every possible subject. And then, after grilling you as exhaustively as possible, here is the next chain of events:

 1) Almost invariably, verbiage can be found between all the statements, that could be construed (if one really wanted to) as being, in some way, inconsistent.

 2) This possible inconsistency is then presumed to be a flat contradiction

 3) This “flat contradiction” is then presumed to be a deliberate lie and

 4) You are the one who will then be presumed to be the deliberate liar

 So that you are now being charged with lying to the FBI. And it is this type of nonsense word games that I think is relevant to the President. So … to go the situation with our President now. Now, granted, it is not specifically federal prosecutors involved at the moment. It is mostly partisan politicians. But the principles are the same.

 The President, to quote these same people’s defense of Bill Clinton, is also not below the law. For this reason, I will go even farther in the President’s defense than most others. I do not now, nor have I ever in fact, given a good gosh darn about the specific words that Trump said - in a one sentence inside of a one phone call.

 And I feel this way because of simple common sense and because of a simple concern about the common man. In other endeavors that I have been involved in, I have seen the instances where someone is doing a prosecution in search of a crime. Anyone can be converted into a ‘criminal’ if you can search for a one sentence line out of their entire life’s existence - and then spin it as something that represents their whole life.

 There is never anything meaningful in any one sentence being used in the course of any one conversation. The President often speaks casually (and, yes, perhaps too casually sometimes) so how do we even know it was a calculated statement meant to pursue a calculated objective? Every living person – if you just use raw verbiage without a full context – can be made to say anything about any subject matter. Under, that is, the type of a case that I am referring to here – where someone is trying to satisfy an already decided effort at doing a prosecution.

 This entire exercise (of a one sentence line in a one phone conversation) is just as illegitimate an enterprise whether we are dealing with either a Donald Doakes or a Donald Trump. Thus, we are now done with the use of the word games and the Thought Police (from the Part 1). But there is one more ultimate, unbeatable card up the sleeve of every prosecutor out looking for a crime.

**2) MANEUVERING FOR POSITION**

 What is an “intersection maneuver”? A hypothetical: I have just reconstructed everything that you have ever thought, said or done. I now start a stretch in one direction with all the twist, spin, baffle and bull’s whatnot that I can - to project all of it into the worst possible light. Next, I take every possible law on the books and I start a stretch into another direction. (If you have ever exaggerated your income level then I prosecute you for bank fraud - as a recent example of something that has occurred).

 Finally, any place where an ‘intersection’ occurs (the meaning of the law stretched to it’s maximum extreme extent - and everything you have done put into it’s worst possible interpretation) is what I now charge you with for a crime. This is an intersection maneuver and is a routine way to ‘flip’ a witness in federal prosecutions. And, as a judge once said, there is a difference in getting someone to ‘sing’ vs. ‘compose’. If a person’s original story was correct then ‘flipping’ them has them composing a story rather than just relating one, i.e., singing only. And, as one wrongful conviction investigator once said (this one that is now talking to you), this is also a major source of wrongful convictions.

**SO … NOW WE GET TO IT: THE CURRENT STANDOFF WITH THE PRESIDENT**

 This is where we get to the current standoff with the President. The ability of an unlimitedly resourced prosecution team to ‘flip’ someone has been, and is being, used against the President. A recurring practice of witness intimidation is now being done by a Southern District of New York. They are a group of career federal prosecutors who are acting as a Resistance Vanguard rather than a law enforcement body.

In at least two different cases (that I am aware of) the following timeline has occurred:

 1) Someone, in a critical position of the investigation, has spoken favorably of the President

 2) He has then been charged, or threatened with a charge, by the Southern District on a matter that has no relationship to the current round of investigations and then

 3) This person has then ‘flipped’ and started talking negatively about the President

 So … we are while the President is being accused of the Abuse of Power. Currently, a group of career federal prosecutors are using threats of prosecution to engage in a systematic practice of witness intimidation. They are doing it for a personal political agenda and doing it as an ironic way of getting people to testify against Donald Trump – for, and you have probably guessed it by now, Abuse of Power! Use an abuse of power to get people to testify against the President for the abuse of power – an act you can only get away with if you are a member of the Resistance.

 The more major point here is how the Intersection Maneuver is being used directly against the President himself. They have taken the definitions of bribery and abuse of power to such an extreme that I can show you how Presidents Carter and Reagan should both have been impeached for, respectively, their Camp David accord and the START treaty.

 The stance for bribery has been rewritten into “anything of value” – period. In exchange for anything that can be construed to help you – period. In short, when Jimmy Carter had a hope, somewhere in the privacy of his own head, that the Camp David Accords could help him get reelected he became impeachable. He gave something of value to two foreign entities while possibly having a hope that it could help him in a future election. Therefore, it is to be presumed that that is why he did it and that he therefore acted with a ‘corrupt’ intent.

 The same with Reagan and his successful START treaties towards nuclear disarmament. It is possible that the treaties could have helped him politically. Therefore, it is to be AUTOMATICALLY assumed that that is why he did it. And that, therefore, he gave away something of value for personal gain. And on we could go for anyone.

 Everyone politician (and certainly Pelosi) acts politically. That is, they take positions to win elections rather than strictly to help the country. And, thus, every politician attacking the President is guilty of everything they are currently accusing him of – using their powers of office to benefit themselves politically. Under the Pelosi Intersection Maneuver, the Abuse of Power can be used to justify any prosecution - and now has such an amorphous standard that everyone is guilty of it.

**FINALLY, WE ARE FULL CIRCLE**

 So, back again to you, the citizen. The political class is so totally narcissistic and arrogant that they can no longer comprehend even the most basic things. Like, why you can’t reinvent both the laws (and the rules of the law) in any way that you want to - and whenever you might want to do it. Thus, the need is for us to be at least some small amount smarter than a politician (a very minimal goal to say the least.) And the only way to reach a politician with a stance that is at least somewhat smarter than theirs is to make them pay a price in the next election cycle.

 Now, I can understand why Trump can be a difficult person for some people to handle. But he is still not the one, at least at the present time, who is reinventing our legal and political systems on the fly. He is not the person who is still holding 3 and 4-year old personal grudges against his political rivals.

 And who runs his every move and operation around his personal hatreds. This is strictly, at the present time, the works of Pelosi and company. Take this knowledge to the polls with you and give it whatever weight you think it deserves.