

*CHURCH OF THE GARDENS*  
*FROM THE DESK OF THE CHURCH ADVOCATE*  
*Scott E. Stafne*



---

May 15, 2017

**IMPEACH CORRUPT JUDGES, NOT TRUMP**

---

The list of biased democrats calling for the impeachment of President Trump is growing... check [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#). But the shrill shrieks for impeachment of Trump by the democratic party are only empty rhetoric designed to solicit donations for something which will not happen.

Under Article 1, section 2, clause 5 “the House of Representatives ... shall have the sole power of impeachment.” Under Article 1, section 3, clause 6: “[t]he Senate shall have the sole Power to try all **Impeachments**. ... When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the **Concurrence** of **two thirds** of the Members present.”

Democrats must think we the people are stupid. Republicans control both the House of Representatives and the Senate. How are they going to get the House to impeach and 2/3 of the Senate to convict President Trump when it is not apparent he committed any crime? Since the founding of our Republic other nations have attempted to influence the outcome of its

elections. Does anyone really think Israel and international elites were not involved in helping either or both of the major party presidential candidates in the 2016 election?

The truth is Trump is not likely to be impeached under these circumstances and Democrats call for his impeachment is simply to rattle its political base (which by now should be almost nil) for political contributions.

President Trump, on the other hand, makes a good point that the present power of the Judicial department, especially the Ninth Circuit, should be more closely examined. Good reasons for Congress actually overseeing the judiciary include that departments regular abuses of power, some of which I identified to Iowa Senator Chuck Grassley and Texas Senator Ted Cruz in this [letter](#) supporting the President's reasonable demands for better oversight of this nation's courts.

The biggest mistake our founders made was in creating the judicial department, which has pretty much used every trick in the book to usurp power from the people and the other branches of their government. The judicial branch of government was supposed to be the weakest branch of government. But by eliminating the checks and balances the Constitution imposed on its power and the judiciary's "over-the-top" interpretation of "judicial review" the Judicial Department lays claim to being the only "check" on the other branches of government. But this is heresy; history being rewritten by biased a department of government under the Court's questionable interpretation of judicial review that judges can willy-nilly change the meaning of the Constitution through judicial review.

Our founders wisely imposed the Jury as the check on judges. Most judges, sitting high upon their judicial pedestals wearing their black robes, refuse to acknowledge this anymore. But the primary role the jury is to play with regard to exercise of judicial power by judges is obvious. One who understands this is Massachusetts federal district court is Judge William G.

Young. In an [address Judge Young gave to the Massachusetts Bar Association](#) in 2014 he states that each branch of the federal government was given two types of types of Constitutional officers. “The legislative branch that makes laws has senators and representatives.” The executive branch has the president and vice president. And the judicial branch has judges *and juries*.

As Judge Young points out the Constitutional role of juries is made explicit both in the language of the original Constitution and in two of the proposed amendments the federalists promised in order to achieve the ratification of the Constitution.

And then – and it very important to understand this – then in the organization of the three branches of government ... [i]n Article III, after those couple sentences of judges, it [the Constitution] says: “The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury.” ... And of course, people wouldn’t buy it, they wouldn’t go for the Constitution, until it had a Bill of Rights [guaranteeing juries as constitutional officers in both criminal and civil cases.]

But devious judges and lawyers began almost immediately to get rid of those juries, which were intended to be the people’s most basic check on judicial tyranny. It was our founders way of giving the people a veto on the judicial departments arbitrary exercise of judicial power. Another check on the judicial department’s improvident exercise of power was the Constitution’s limitation on that department’s authority to decide only cases arising under statutes and treaties enacted by the other two branches of government. But lower federal courts pretty much ignore these limitations when they want to and the Supreme Court is too busy to police and denounce this unconstitutional usurpation of power by lower federal judges.

So where are we?

Many would argue, including myself, we have an unchecked judicial oligarchy in which judges claim a right to rule over the people during the course of their ever technology increased life spans.

This isn't fair to the vast majority of Americans, who don't have access to those doctors and drugs who appear to keep federal judges alive almost indefinitely.

It is not just weird, it is politically crazy, that most of the judges still claiming the power to tell us all what to do are over 75 years old. One old man (at least "old" for most of us) is still "judging" at 104 because the Constitution allows judges to remain in power for life. This is absurd and denigrates the promise that once was America, a government of we the people, to a myth which is not factually sustainable.

***How would you like to grow up in a generation where your great grandparents had the last say, even though they were cranky, abrupt, and knew virtually nothing about the technology of the present?***

So back to impeachment. Our corrupt Federal Department (composed of mostly elderly judges or judges intended to become elderly in office to promote the agendas of the republican and democratic parties) injures, kills, and imprisons millions of our citizens with impunity because Congress refuses to oversee and impeach them.

Because of federal judges's life tenure the grounds for impeaching federal judges is far less demanding than impeaching the President.

So why doesn't Congress consider impeaching judges who fail the Constitution's "good behavior" standard rather than attempting to impeach a President who presumably has both branches of Congress on his side for conduct which has gone on since presidential elections began?

Think about it. Even if we assume Trump has done something wrong, doesn't it make more sense to impeach judges who do not exhibit "good behavior" because otherwise they will emboldened by their lifelong tenure to cause more injustice, especially for the young?

Human experience teaches the very nature of aging into the seventies and beyond promotes a callousness about justice which is inimical to governing.

Accordingly, if Congress is finally ready to perform its oversight and impeachment functions it makes more sense to begin with an examination of judges who can do (and have done the most harm to the people) over the course of a lifetime, rather than a President who is limited to four year terms in office.

In my judgment, even if I assume Trump is a would be dictator fighting an entrenched judicial oligarchy which has existed for years, I would side with Trump because the Judicial Department is killing and injuring more people. There will be no justice until the problems with this nation's judicial system are solved.