

II. America's Future *Unequal Justice Under Law* Articles

1. [A New "Church Committee" Is Needed To Expose Abuses By The U.S. Department Of Justice And FBI](#) - January 6, 2023
2. [The House Select Subcommittee On The Weaponization Of Government](#) - Jan. 13, 2023
3. [Department Of Justice January 6 Lies And Abuses](#) - January 20, 2023
4. [Department Of Justice Mistreats January 6 Political Prisoners](#) - January 26, 2023
5. [DOJ Collusion With The House Select Committee On January 6](#) - February 2, 2023
6. [The Justice Department's Prosecution Of Pro-Life Activists](#) - February 9, 2023
7. [DOJ Uses The Espionage Act To Control Political Opponents](#) - February 16, 2023
8. [Justice Department Targets Traditional Catholics As Domestic Terrorists](#) - February 23, 2023
9. [DOJ Lawyers Lie Without Consequence](#) - March 2, 2023
10. [How DOJ Lawyers Protect The Biden Family](#) - March 9, 2023
11. [Department Of Justice Lawyers Weaponize The Voting Rights Act](#) - March 16, 2023
12. [DOJ Fingerprints On Manhattan DA Investigation Of Trump](#) - March 23, 2023
13. [DOJ Informant Found In January 6 Defense Team](#) - March 30, 2023
14. [DOJ Wages War On Pro-Life State Laws](#) - April 5, 2023
15. [DOJ Refuses To Protect Pro-Life Justice](#) - April 11, 2023
16. [Merrick Garland's Continuing Leftist Jihad](#) - April 20, 2023

[All articles in the previous FBI series and this series are available here.](#)

A New “Church Committee” Is Needed to Expose Abuses by the U.S. Department of Justice and FBI

February 6, 2023

In order to enforce federal criminal laws, the original concept was that Special Agents at the FBI would be responsible to investigate crimes, turning over their work product to lawyers at the Justice Department who would decide whether criminal charges should be brought. If a grand jury returned an indictment, the FBI agents would testify honestly about their investigation, and the juries would be trusted to return an honest verdict. The goal would be justice, not just prosecutorial victories. As prior articles have demonstrated, it is no longer possible to believe that the system currently works as once planned.

When Hillary Clinton willfully violated federal law and Department of State rules by using her own personal non-classified email server, thereby exposing classified documents to unauthorized persons, the Department of Justice should have prosecuted her. However, any prosecution was rendered impossible when former FBI Director James Comey held a press conference to announce his views on the case. He chose to usurp the function of prosecutors, absolving Hillary Clinton of any meaningful wrongdoing by announcing: “My conclusion was, and remains, **no reasonable prosecutor would bring this case.**” Then, there were still professionals at the Justice Department, and one closely involved with the investigation of Clinton’s emails told Fox News that “career agents and attorneys on the case unanimously **believed the Democratic presidential nominee should have been charged.**”

When the FBI believed classified documents may have been mishandled by a Republican, it raided former President Trump’s Mar-a-Lago home in August 2022. Does that look like “Equal Justice Under Law?”

Experienced journalist Jonathan Tobin shared his observation that the federal bureaucracy generally has become overwhelmingly leftist in its makeup. “For decades, **the federal service has increasingly become a bastion for liberal Democrats.** Every study shows that its members are almost uniformly on the left. To give just one example: 95% of federal bureaucrats who donated to a candidate in the 2016 presidential election gave to Hillary Clinton...The worst corruption in Washington is the ability of those with lifetime tenure and no legal mandate to thwart the verdict of democracy as they tried to do after 2016 or, as we saw in Mar-a-Lago.”

With all the scandalous behavior of FBI employees in pushing Russiagate, it is difficult to know whether the FBI or the Justice Department is more compromised. It may be that the Leftist lawyers at the Justice Department have corrupted those in supervisory roles at the FBI,

but the result is the same: Leftists now control both the federal investigatory and prosecutorial functions in America.

On July 18, 2022, Senator [Charles Grassley \(R-IA\) sent a letter to Attorney General Merrick Garland](#) and FBI Director Christopher Wray, stating. “I remain very concerned that political bias by a select group of Justice Department and FBI officials has infected the Justice Department’s and FBI’s usual process and procedure to open and pursue high-profile and politically charged investigations.”

In October 2022, Rep. Jim Jordan (R-OH) revealed that FBI whistleblowers have told Congress that the [Justice Department seeks to “purge” politically conservative FBI agents](#), emphasizing that “You cannot have a political Justice Department and a free society, a free country.”

On November 4, 2022, [House Judiciary Committee Republicans released a report](#) “describ[ing] the FBI ... as being ‘rotted at its core,’ maintaining a ‘systemic culture of unaccountability,’ and full of ‘rampant corruption, manipulation, and abuse,’” concluding that “FBI Director Christopher Wray and Attorney General Merrick Garland have injected politics into the FBI, so much so that it is now fundamentally broken.”

It is highly significant that just days ago, on January 3, 2023, former FBI Assistant Director Christopher Swecker, the Bureau’s retired chief of criminal investigations, called for the creation of an independent commission modeled after the 1970s-era [Church Committee](#). Swecker suggests the committee’s work, this time, be focused on [investigating the politicization of the FBI](#) and proposed reforms.

“[I]t’s basically a wholesale takeover by the Department of Justice, which is filled with political appointees in every top position,” Swecker said. Swecker noted that the Justice Department’s ranks are laden with lawyers who “have made a career out of bouncing in and out of silk-stocking law firms, between the Department of Justice and then these law firms.” He added, “I have to say they are incredibly liberal in their politics. And that has now sort of taken over the FBI, and they are inserting that ideology into their high-profile investigations.”

Swecker argued that far-left ideologues with the administration at the Justice Department have pressed FBI agents into suppression of ideas unfavorable to the Biden administration, and into spying on American citizens. He pointed to the recent Twitter files release as evidence that the politicization of the FBI has trampled constitutional freedoms. “The FBI has an industry outreach program to help exchange information with industry, helping in the counterintelligence efforts of the FBI. This has gone well beyond that,” Swecker said. “This is nothing but domestic spying, and this is nothing but suppression of First Amendment rights and ideas.”

Swecker is not alone in his call for a Congressional investigation. The former FBI Assistant Director for Intelligence, Kevin Brock, also has argued that [a new Church Committee](#)

“would be great for the FBI.” More importantly, it is necessary to prevent future violations of the constitutional freedoms that the DOJ’s politicization of the FBI has endangered.

Justice is no longer blind. These two highly credible former FBI Assistant Directors have described how leftist political appointees in the Department of Justice have coopted the law enforcement mission of the FBI, turning agents into political enforcers for the Biden regime. The new House of Representatives has the opportunity to expose how our own government has been subverted and defund the wrongdoers. If the House fails that mission, there is little hope our Republic can survive.

The best way the House could carry out its duty to the American People is to appoint a Church Committee to investigate the politicization and weaponization of the FBI and the entire Department of Justice. America’s Future calls on them to do just that.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/a-new-church-committee-is-needed-to-expose-abuses-by-the-u-s-department-of-justice-and-fbi/>

The House Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of Government

January 13, 2023

For once, there is reason to believe that the lawless special agents at the FBI and the politicized lawyers at the Justice Department may pull in their horns a bit and become less abusive of the rights of Americans — at least for a while. Why? Because there is a new Sheriff in town. In the nation’s capital, where bureaucrats have been immune from accountability, things may be about to change.

The new GOP House majority moved quickly to implement promises made by Speaker McCarthy to investigate a myriad of abuses by the Department of Justice (DOJ), the FBI, and other federal agencies. On January 10, 2023, the House approved the creation of the “[Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government](#)” under the Judiciary Committee. Established as a Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, this new investigatory body is patterned after a Senate Committee established in 1975 to investigate abuses by these same Deep State agencies that was chaired by liberal Senator Frank Church (D-ID).

The new Subcommittee’s membership of nine Republicans and six Democrats has not yet been chosen, but it will be appointed by Judiciary Committee Chairman Constitutionalist Jim Jordan (OH). Chairman Jordan will choose the Subcommittee’s Republican members from a list of other Constitutional stalwarts serving on the [Judiciary Committee](#), including Ken Buck (CO), Matt Gaetz (FL), Mike Johnson (LA), Andy Biggs (AZ), Tom Massie (KY), Chip Roy (TX), and Dan Bishop (NC). Several of these members of the House Judiciary Committee are the very same members of the House Freedom Caucus who [demanded the Committee be created](#) as a concession from incoming Speaker Kevin McCarthy. [Reports](#) have circulated that the Subcommittee will be chaired by Judiciary Chairman Jordan himself.

Jordan’s [floor statement](#) held back nothing in assailing Deep State Agencies: “Your right to practice your faith, your right to assemble, right to petition the government, freedom of the press, freedom of speech. Every single one’s been attacked in the last two years.”

[H. Res. 12 establishes the Committee](#) and gives it a broad investigative scope, including:

how executive branch agencies work with...non-profit entities, or other government agencies to facilitate action against American citizens, including the extent, if any, to which illegal or improper, unconstitutional, or unethical activities were engaged in by the executive branch or private sector against citizens of the United States...how executive branch agencies collect, compile, analyze, use, or disseminate information about citizens of the United

States...[and] any other issues related to the violation of the civil liberties of citizens of the United States...

The Subcommittee faces a target-rich environment, including the FBI efforts to influence a series of recent Presidential and Congressional elections, politicized prosecutions of January 6 election protestors, control of social media companies by the Deep State, the Justice Department's abusive treatment of parents seeking to change their local school boards and the Department of Homeland Security's failed effort to create a Disinformation Governance Board. According to Congressman Chip Roy (R-TX), the Committee will have the [same funding and staff resources](#) as the Democrats' January 6 committee. The Committee will have exceptional access, including the "[authority to have subpoena power](#) to receive information on intelligence-related activity that's typically only shared with the House Intelligence Committee." The [New York Times](#) is understandably panicked over the likely direction of the Committee, claiming that:

The text of the resolution would also grant Mr. Jordan's panel the power to receive the same highly classified information that intelligence agencies make available to their oversight committee, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Intelligence Committee members have access to some of the most [sensitive secrets in the government](#), including information about covert actions, which are not shared with other lawmakers.

The Subcommittee will face determined opposition by those who want to protect the Deep State from public exposure of its illegal and unconstitutional activities. As journalist Glenn Greenwald puts it: "A core plank of the Dem Party is unifying state and corporate power to censor their adversaries and critics from the internet. But an equally high [priority is to shield the US Security State from investigative scrutiny](#) because they perceive – accurately – they're their allies."

The manners in which the Subcommittee will operate are not yet set, but they will likely determine how successful it will be. Will the Subcommittee hearings be held in secret, with only occasional press statements being made by its members? Or will the hearings be made public so that Americans can see over a period of months the depth of the corruption? Will witnesses have immunity from prosecution for their testimony? Will witnesses who perjure themselves be held accountable? How will Congress hold three-letter agencies accountable for implementing reforms? Will any of these agencies that have been lawless since their creation be abolished?

The concept is excellent, and the right people seem to be in place. The American people must now support these efforts to reveal the true depth of the Deep State swamp, and then implement a workable plan to drain it!

<https://www.americasfuture.net/the-house-select-subcommittee-on-the-weaponization-of-government/>

Department of Justice January 6 Lies and Abuses

January 20, 2023

Attorney General Merrick Garland used the occasion of the second anniversary of the events of January 6, 2021, to ramp-up his threats against opponents of the Biden Administration. He issued a [press release](#) to warn that “the investigation and prosecution of those responsible for the attack continues to move forward at an unprecedented speed and scale.”

The Department of Justice (DOJ) always describes the January 6 riot as an “insurrection” that “[interfered with...the peaceful transfer of power](#)” so that it can justify abusing the constitutional rights – not just of those few who actually acted aggressively that day – but all others who also supported President Trump and harbored concerns over 2020 election irregularities. The “insurrection” claim allows the federal government to vastly expand its powers to confront the ostensible “emergency” of the “insurrection.” It allows DOJ to do much more than arrest the guilty or “[round up the usual suspects.](#)”

The only problem is that DOJ’s “insurrection” narrative is completely false.

The foundation of the DOJ’s “insurrection” argument collapses on examination. January 6 will go down as likely the only unarmed “insurrection” in the history of the world. Out of nearly 1,000 people charged, [only five were charged with possessing a firearm somewhere in DC](#), and none of those were charged with using firearms during the riot.

[The only person shot on January 6 was a Trump supporter](#), Air Force veteran Ashli Babbitt, who was shot and killed by Capitol Police despite herself being unarmed. Four people actually died at the Capitol that day, all Trump supporters. Besides Babbitt, two died of heart attacks, and one of a drug overdose.

The DOJ, and Democrat shills like new House Minority Leader Hakeem Jeffries, constantly imply that five or sometimes six Capitol Police officers lost their lives “due to the events of January 6.” They speak of officers who “[are no longer with us.](#)” Yet the facts refute the claim. Actually, only one officer died in the 24 hours following the riot, and many lies surround his death.

CNN and MSNBC repeatedly reported that [he was beaten to death](#) by Trump supporters with a fire extinguisher. [The New York Times reported the same.](#) Yet in reality, [Officer Sicknick texted his family the night of the riot](#) to tell them that he had been pepper sprayed but was in good spirits. Not until three months later did the D.C. medical examiner admit that Sicknick had actually suffered two strokes the day after the riot, and [died of natural causes.](#) A lengthy and brilliant expose by [Glenn Greenwald](#) demonstrated the conspiracy of lies between Capitol Police, Congressional Democrats, and the Controlled Media that have convinced Americans that Officer Sicknick was killed by a pro-Trump mob.

The other four officers cited by Jeffries were all suicides. One killed himself three days after the riots, another two weeks afterward, and two in July, some six months afterward. Yet the Left, in its desperation to exaggerate the riot into an “insurrection,” is more than happy to add even the July suicides to its January “body count” — when in reality, not a single officer died of injuries sustained in the so-called “insurrection.”

Why were these lies critical to “the narrative?” It certainly would not support the myth of an insurrection if the public were to be told that only one person died that day — a female U.S. Air Force Veteran Trump supporter, and her death came while she was unarmed and offering no threat to anyone, came at the hands of a Capitol police officer, Lt. Michael Byrd. Documents reveal there was **no good reason** to justify this shooting.

As the FBI uses Chinese Communist Party-style surveillance techniques to identify those who were anywhere near the Capitol that day, it ignores persons like **Ray Epps**, who tried to get protestors “to go into the Capitol.” Epps was immediately identified as a troublemaker by the pro-Trump crowd. “Fed, Fed, Fed,” they shouted as he provoked the crowd. The fact that neither the January 6 Committee or the FBI had any problem with Epps’ rousing outbursts speaks volumes about the dark forces for which he was working.

The truth is that many governments have used agent-provocateurs to infiltrate the ranks of protests to encourage the commission of illegal acts so that the government has an excuse to retaliate against peaceful protesters. The **FBI was caught using this technique** in May 1970 when an FBI informant burned down a building at the University of Alabama to give the government an excuse to arrest 150 protestors.

Indeed, there was no good reason for any of the events of January 6. The Deep State wanted an attack on the Capitol, as demonstrated by the rabble-rousing of people like Ray Epps. The FBI knew everything about whatever may have been planned as it has acknowledged that it had **infiltrated the Proud Boys, Three Percenters, and Oath Keepers**. Importantly, Department of Defense Chief of Staff **Kash Patel** has revealed that President Trump authorized 20,000 National Guard to support local law enforcement in defense of the Capitol, if requested, two days before January 6, but no request, as required by law, came from the Capitol police or from D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser.

With the false narrative of the insurrection, the Biden Administration was able to go on the offense against MAGA Republicans, saying “**Democracy was attacked** during the January 6 insurrection.”

President Biden even claimed the middle-of-the night “assault” on Paul Pelosi by a leftist **Green Party supporter and nudist activist** in October 2022, was a continuation of the events of January 6, to **demonize all his political opponents**: “the mob when they stormed the United States Capitol on January the 6th when they broke windows, kicked in the doors, brutally attacked law enforcement, roamed the corridors hunting for officials, and erected gallows to hang the former Vice President, Mike Pence...whipped up into a frenzy by a President repeating over and over again the Big Lie that the election of 2020 had been

stolen...a lie that fueled the dangerous rise in political violence and voter intimidation....” Horse feathers!

Two years after the January 6, 2021 riot, the DOJ has been fully weaponized to punish and intimidate the political opponents of the Biden Administration, having arranged for more than 900 arrests, nearly 500 guilty pleas entered by terrified Americans, and the **DOJ claims** “[a]t least 250 suspects wanted by the bureau on accusations that they assaulted officers on Jan. 6, 2021, are still at large.” This is exactly the type of weaponization of government that the **House Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government** must investigate and find a way to end before we lose our Republic forever.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/departments-of-justice-january-6-lies-and-abuses/>

Department of Justice Mistreats January 6 Political Prisoners

January 27, 2023

Generally, prison is for those convicted of crimes, not those only accused. Under normal conditions, most who commit non-violent federal crimes, who are first offenders, and who do not present a flight risk are released before trial. All of those descriptions apply to most of the persons arrested in connection with the events of January 6, but these special defendants are being [held before trial for many months](#), some even without indictments having been issued by grand juries. The Biden Department of Justice appears determined to make a special example of these MAGA prisoners.

Many may not realize it, but the federal Bureau of Prisons is an agency in the Department of Justice and therefore under the control of Attorney General Merrick Garland. The Bureau of Prisons is a deeply troubled agency in the best of times. (Only weeks ago, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations released a [68-page report](#) entitled “Sexual Abuse of Female Inmates While in Federal Prisons.”).

However, the Justice Department is reserving some of its harshest treatment for January 6 prisoners who are being held in the notoriously brutal District of Columbia jail. In October 2022, 34 of these prisoners [wrote a letter detailing the harsh conditions](#) they have endured. Many report being denied visits from family, and even from their attorneys. Indeed, those prisoners actually requested a transfer to Guantanamo Bay prison, where at least prisoners are given exercise, time outdoors, access to religious services, and medical care. According to the letter, they have been denied religious services. Prisoners who have refused to take the dangerous COVID injection are treated even more harshly. Some describe beatings by prison guards.

January 6 prisoner Todd Gardner agreed to a guilty plea to avoid the notoriously anti-Trump District of Columbia juries. He is now awaiting sentencing, which has been delayed for seven months. He recently wrote an “open letter,” published on the [AmericanGulag.com website](#), detailing the abysmal conditions in the D.C. jails.

As a J6 defendant, I am treated poorly, harassed and physically abused. We get fed terrible food in portions smaller than elementary school. I have to constantly ask for money from my mom to get food from the commissary. I have been denied my medications and toilet paper. I have also been denied basic human necessities like water and kept from communicating with my attorney.

In June 2021, journalist Julie Kelly, author of the exposé book entitled, January 6, exposed on television the inhumane conditions in “Biden’s ‘Deplorable Jail.’” Those January 6 prisoners

who spoke with Kelly, and laid bare the jail's Third World conditions, later reported how they were retaliated against by being locked down, including 24 hours of solitary confinement. One prisoner messaged his family, "We just found out [they are locking us down for an entire week in retaliation](#) for that [television exposé], with no phone calls, no rec time, 5 min showers, and 24 hours in our cells."

On July 8, 2021, Obama-appointed federal judge Randolph Moss declared "absolutely unacceptable" the D.C. jail's refusal to allow a prisoner to see the evidence against him. The judge declared that [the jail's actions were "not consistent with due process."](#)

On October 13, 2021, Reagan-appointed federal judge Royce Lamberth "held the District of Columbia's corrections director and jail warden in [contempt of court](#)" for mistreating prisoners, and asked the DOJ to investigate potential violations of civil rights. The DOJ claimed that prisoner Christopher Worrell, who suffered hand injuries and a lack of treatment for cancer, had "[invented](#)" his medical needs. Eventually, [Judge Lamberth ordered Worrell released for treatment](#), citing "deplorable" conditions in the D.C. jail, and stating that the court had "'zero confidence' that the D.C. jail would provide proper treatment and not retaliate against Worrell."

More often than not, however, judges presiding over January 6 criminal trials appear to be accepting the allegations filed by DOJ lawyers as true and some judges have both attacked President Trump and reprimanded attorneys representing January 6 defendants.

In sentencing January 6 defendant Kyle Young, Obama-appointed judge Amy Berman Jackson [accused former President Trump](#) of "trying to subvert" the Constitution, and stated that "[t]he judiciary, of all people, must make it clear that it is not patriotism, it is not standing up for America" for the defendant to stand up for Trump.

Obama-appointed [Judge Tanya Chutkan blasted defense suggestions](#) that January 6 defendants were treated unfairly compared to BLM rioters. She stated that it was false equivalence "to compare the actions of people protesting, mostly peacefully, for civil rights" to the rioters "trying to overthrow the government." She said the riot posed a very real danger to "the foundation of our democracy."

Obama-appointed [Judge Amit Mehta rebuked a defense attorney](#) for arguing that January 6 defendants could not get a fair trial in D.C. because many of its residents "despise...traditional values..." Mehta said, adding "This brief ... reads less like a legal brief than something you might read on a blog.... And that's not acceptable."

The D.C. jail even repeatedly [refused to allow a congressional visit](#) to a constituent of then-Congressman Louie Gohmert, who reported that a jail supervisor "said she won't talk anymore and that we're trespassers." Calling it like he sees it, Rep. Gohmert added, "We're in totalitarian, Marxist territory here."

For the leftwing leaders at the DOJ of what reporter Julie Kelly calls "a war on terror against the political right," third-world treatment of their political opponents appears to be a

premeditated strategy — and the constitutional concepts of due process of law and the prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment are the latest casualties in that war.

Now that the Republicans have assumed control over the House of Representatives, with the constitutional “power of the purse,” the only question is how long it will take for them to use that power to end the Department of Justice’s abusive treatment of the political opponents of the Biden regime.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/departments-of-justice-mistreats-january-6-political-prisoners/>

DOJ Collusion with the House Select Committee on January 6

February 2, 2023

The “House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol” labored for 18 months to convince the American people that MAGA Republicans were an existential threat to America. Vice President [Kamala Harris](#) pushed this ridiculous narrative when she identified the three days when “our democracy came under assault” as “December 7th, 1941, September 11th, 2001, and January 6th, 2021.” How absurd!

The good news is that the [January 6 Committee](#) disbanded as the Republicans took over the House of Representatives last month, ending the show trials and “made-for-TV” broadcasts of disinformation and this chest-thumping charade. Now, House Republicans have promised to release the January 6 videos that Democrats withheld, giving Americans a chance to learn what Paul Harvey used to call — “the rest of the story.”

First, the nation should pause to give thanks that Liz Cheney (R-WY) and Adam Kinzinger (R-IL) — the only two Republicans appointed by Nancy Pelosi to serve on the January 6 Committee — are no longer in Congress. Cheney lost her effort at re-election, gathering only 29 percent of the vote in a Republican primary, but now [pondering a run for President](#) in 2024. Kinzinger, seeing the writing on the wall, declined to seek re-election, but he too refuses to go away, as he seamlessly transitioned to the role of a [CNN political pundit](#).

Certainly, the Committee’s effort to spread the lie that unarmed Americans tried to topple the federal government on January 6 has been accepted by those who Rush Limbaugh used to call “low information voters.” But one of the most dangerous precedents established by the January 6 Committee may be its work acting on behalf of the Department of Justice.

On January 3, 2022, the [New York Times](#) described the Committee’s work as looking for evidence that crimes were committed:

[A]s the committee and its dozens of investigators issue subpoenas for documents, phone records and bank records, the panel is **closely looking for evidence of criminality** that the Justice Department might not have unearthed...
[G]iven that the Jan. 6 committee’s staff is led by a...pair of former U.S. attorneys, any recommendation they make would most likely be taken seriously by federal prosecutors. Investigators are **looking into whether a range of crimes were committed...**

Was that a legitimate goal for the Committee? While the Democrats were still in charge of the House, one of their last actions was to try to prevent the American people from accessing the files of the January 6 Committee. “[T]he vast majority of raw information the panel collected [was] slated to be sent to the National Archives, to be [locked away for up to 50 years](#).” It

seems likely that the Committee did not want its close ties to DOJ to be revealed. Fortunately, incoming Speaker Kevin McCarthy's new House rules required the January 6 Committee to instead [turn over all records to the House Committee on Administration](#), and also ordered the National Archives to return any records already in its possession.

When the Justice Department investigates people, there are many [rules it must follow in obtaining evidence](#). Targets of Grand Juries must be advised they are targets. There are rules about subpoenas to lawyers and members of the press. These rules were developed to protect the Constitutional rights of Americans. But those rules do not apply to Congressional committees, and thus it is tempting for the Department of Justice to collude with Congressional committees to gather evidence not for any legislative purpose, but for DOJ lawyers to use in prosecutions. There are many indications this happened.

When a legitimate Congressional investigation discovers evidence of a crime, it can make a "referral" to the Justice Department to investigate and, if required, prosecute. It is quite another thing for a Congressional committee to work behind the scenes with DOJ to collect information that DOJ could not collect directly, thus circumventing the procedural protections afforded Americans during a criminal investigation.

After the January 6 Committee was in operations for nearly a year, in May 2022, the [DOJ requested certain transcripts of interviews and depositions](#) collected by the January 6 Committee. The request stated that those transcripts "may contain information relevant to a criminal investigation we are conducting." In response, Committee Chairman Bennie Thompson (D-MS) was reported to have agreed to share the information they created, holding back only their draft report. Eventually the Committee apparently shared evidence from its 1,000 witness interviews and thousands of documents. It seems likely these files have also been shared with the [Special Counsel](#) appointed in November 2022 by Attorney General Garland to investigate the "transfer of power" following the 2020 Presidential election.

The Committee [final report](#) was issued on December 22, 2022, only days before Republicans took control. The report's Executive Summary (pages 98-112) contains criminal referrals against President Trump and numerous other persons. Having gathered evidence without the need to comply with DOJ rules, the [report is described as "an exhaustive legal roadmap"](#) for the DOJ lawyers to pursue criminal charges. Those charges center around challenging the certification of election votes – exactly what [Democrats had done in prior elections](#).

When the January 6 Committee was attacking Trump, the establishment press was cheering them on. Now that House Republicans are looking into misdeeds of Democrats, establishment "legal experts" are warning that the "Republicans' roving [investigation could do significant damage to criminal matters](#)."

Since Attorney General Garland has now appointed a Special Counsel to investigate President Trump on two separate matters, perhaps he could appoint just one Special Counsel to

investigate his own Justice Department. Americans deserve to know whether the Deep State's agents in Congress have been doing the bidding of the Deep State at the Justice Department.

Before he was appointed to the Supreme Court, Justice Robert Jackson served as Attorney General under President Franklin Roosevelt. In 1940, Jackson [addressed the nation's federal prosecutors](#), explaining that their duty was not to win cases, but to do justice: "Although the government technically loses its case, it has really won if justice has been done." The prosecutors in the Biden Justice Department would do well to heed Jackson's advice. And any DOJ prosecutors who may have conspired to have the January 6 Committee collect evidence on their behalf should be identified, exposed, and held to account.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/doj-collusion-with-the-house-select-committee-on-january-6/>

The Justice Department's Prosecution of Pro-Life Activists

February 9, 2023

Our nation's charter, the [Declaration of Independence](#), begins with the recognition that all men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights." Although no effort to set out a complete list of those rights is made in that document, three rights are specifically identified: "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." The Declaration explains that it is "to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men..." Thus, the lawyers at the U.S. Department of Justice work for a government that was formed to secure the right to life, but now they have come to act as the enforcement arm of the abortion industry. Not only do these government prosecutors show no respect whatsoever for the Right to Life, they are conducting a shameful war against Life and those who seek to defend it.

At 6:45 on the morning of September 23, 2022, pro-life activist Mark Houck, a father of seven, awakened to a hammering on his door. When he opened it, he saw 10-15 marked and unmarked cars, and [five federal agents with assault rifles](#). "They said they were going to break in if he didn't open [the door]. And then they had about [five guns pointed at my husband](#), myself, and basically at my kids," recalled Houck's wife, Ryan-Marie. "Okay, I'm gonna open the door. Stay calm. [I have seven babies in here](#)," Houck urged the agents. "[The kids were all just screaming](#). It was all just very scary and traumatic," Ryan-Marie said.

Houck was arrested at gunpoint. When Houck's wife asked for the arrest warrant, "[We're taking him with or without a warrant](#)." Houck was "[shackled at the waist and feet](#) once he arrived at 'the federal building.'"

The raid occurred despite Houck's attorney, former federal prosecutor Matt Heffron, having [offered U.S. Attorney Anita Eve](#): "[i]f the government decides to go forward...I will accept a summons on my client's behalf, rather put Mr. Houck and his family through needless disruption." But the federal prosecutors wanted disruption. They wanted to put Mr. Houck and his family through the terror of an early morning raid. And even more importantly, they wanted to use the Houck raid to instill fear into the hearts of pro-life activists.

The lawyers at the [Justice Department charged Houck](#) with violating the "Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act" (FACE), which was introduced by Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA) and then-Congressman Chuck Schumer (D-NY), and signed into law by President Clinton in 1994. In the Senate, [17 Republicans](#) voted for this vague and dangerous bill, including current Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY).

What terrible conduct must Houck have engaged in to deserve the type of treatment formerly reserved for drug kingpins and members of organized crime? In court, 14-year-old Mark

Houck, Jr. testified of the events for which his dad was charged. Abortion clinic [escort Bruce Love repeatedly harassed Mark, Jr.](#), as he and his father peacefully protested outside a Philadelphia abortion “clinic,” telling him, “Your dad’s a bad person and your dad’s harassing women.” Court documents revealed that Love “[repeatedly initiated profanity-laced verbal confrontations](#) with Houck and his son, Mark Houck Jr.” At one point, Love tried to provoke Houck by telling the Roman Catholic Houck, “Why don’t you go home and masturbate? Go be with your pedophile priests.” When Love approached Mark, Jr, his father, Mark, Sr. finally shoved him away. For that “assault,” the DOJ raided and prosecuted Houck — [almost a full year after the incident occurred.](#)

Twenty-two members of Congress wrote a [letter to Attorney General Merrick Garland](#), denouncing the “excessive level of force,” and attacking the DOJ’s “extraordinary overreach for political ends.” Congressman Chip Roy (R-TX), who spearheaded the letter, charged that “Attorney General Merrick Garland oversees an increasingly politicized FBI that seems hell-bent on making examples of average American citizens who don’t align politically with the administration.”

Senator [Josh Hawley \(R-MO\) also sent a letter to Garland](#), noting the DOJ’s vast disproportion in enforcement, given that the DOJ “turned a blind eye to the epidemic of violence across the country by pro-abortion extremists against pregnancy resource centers, houses of worship, and pro-life Americans – violent acts that are prohibited by the very same law” under which Houck was charged.

“Biden’s DOJ...[treated Mark like a domestic terrorist because of his faith](#). This type of intimidation has no place in America,” said Congressman Andy Biggs (R-AZ).

When Houck’s case went to trial, the jury [reached a unanimous “not guilty” verdict](#). “This is a win for Mark and the entire pro-life movement,” said Peter Breen of the Thomas More Society, which defended Houck. “The Biden Department of Justice’s [intimidation against pro-life people](#) and people of faith has been put in its place.”

Houck has announced he would [sue the FBI](#) for the abuse he suffered, but the courts have made such suits extraordinarily difficult.

An editorial in the *Washington Examiner* decried [the Biden Justice Department’s “anti-religious bigotry](#) and its willingness to stretch the law to meet its ideological ends.”

The Wall Street Journal denounced Houck’s prosecution as “a [case that never should have been brought](#),” noting that “The FBI’s decision to arrest Mr. Houck as though he were John Dillinger also suggested a political stunt.” Even the trial judge asked the DOJ prosecutor if federal law didn’t “seem to be stretched a little thin here.” The *Journal* noted that “the raid appeared calculated to send a political message...less than two months before the midterm elections.”

Now that the House Republicans' newly created "Weaponization Subcommittee" has promised to investigate the DOJ's out-of-control terror tactics, we shall see if Congress does something more effective than letters and press releases.

But the real lesson of the Houck case is that DOJ prosecutors cannot get convictions unless juries cooperate. In this case, the trial was held in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and the jury refused to believe DOJ prosecutors who tried mightily to convict an innocent man. The trials of January 6 defendants in Washington, D.C. courts have almost uniformly shown that D.C. juries seem to hate Donald Trump so much that almost always they will do whatever told to do by Biden prosecutors — hardly the type of "impartial jury" guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment. In trials held outside of D.C., results may be very different.

While we can hope that the House Republicans will reign in a weaponized Department of Justice, the hope that is within our control is that the People will realize that prosecutions initiated by the Biden DOJ are often political persecutions, and in such cases, the duty falls on jurors to acquit.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/the-justice-departments-prosecution-of-pro-life-activists/>

DOJ Uses the Espionage Act to Control Political Opponents

February 16, 2023

In August of 2022, after the FBI seized documents from his Mar-a-Lago home, liberal media outlets reported that former President Trump could be imprisoned for up to 10 years for [violations of the “Espionage Act.”](#) Not surprisingly, when then-Vice President Biden was found to have taken classified documents, some conservative media personalities were happy to encourage similar [Espionage Act charges be brought against Biden.](#) If every President is now to be threatened by this law, it is time to learn its pedigree.

The Espionage Act of 1917 is one of the tools government prosecutors use to threaten Americans. That law, like other such laws, are usually enacted in wartime when constitutional liberties go out the window. Woodrow Wilson was re-elected President in 1916 using the slogan “He Kept Us Out Of War.” A few months later, in April 1917, he dragged America into the First World War. Two months after that, on June 15, 1917, he persuaded Congress to enact The Espionage Act. That law was made even worse the next year when it was amended by the Sedition Act of 1918. Those laws were applied with a heavy hand by the Wilson Justice Department to punish Americans who opposed America’s entry into World War I, opposed the draft, or otherwise dissented from Wilson’s policies.

The Espionage Act was written in vague terms to prevent gathering information about national defense, obstructing enlistment in the armed forces, or encouraging dissension within the military. It declared certain writings that urged “treason” to be unmailable — which Postmaster General Albert S. Bursleson used to deny mailing “privileges” to 74 newspapers. In “late 1917, Wilson’s Attorney General Thomas Gregory warned dissenters not to expect mercy from ‘an outraged people’ and ‘an [avenging government.’”](#)

A highly regarded history by Stanford University Professor David M. Kennedy, [Over Here: the First World War and American Society](#) (Oxford University Press: 1982) catalogues the abuses of power by the Justice Department. AG Gregory “favored broad construction and vigorous application of the Espionage Act, on one occasion publicly chastised a federal judge who had instructed a jury to acquit a man for calling the President a “‘Wall Street tool.’” The courts vigorously applied the Espionage Act, in one case convicting a man for questioning the constitutionality of the wartime draft. AG Gregory even sought “an amendment [to the Act] that would allow him to prosecute ‘disloyal utterances.’” AG Gregory happily reported that “scores of thousands of men are under constant observation throughout the country. AG Gregory claimed to have recruited several hundred thousand private citizens keeping an eye on disloyal individuals and making reports of disloyal utterances. All this sounds quite familiar to those living through the Biden regime. Truly, “there is nothing new under the sun.” *Ecclesiastes* 1:9.

Thousands were indicted under the Espionage Act, and nearly 45 percent were convicted. Justice Department lawyers delayed appeals, fearing that the Supreme Court would strike down the laws they were applying. As “disloyalty” prosecutions began to ramp up, it was said that federal prosecutors had the power of “an angel of life and death clothed with the power to walk up and down in his district, saying, ‘This one will I spare, and this one will I smite.’”

One of those Justice Department prosecutions targeted Charles Schenck, who was accused of mailing socialist pamphlets to recent draftees which compared the draft to involuntary servitude and urging men to express their resistance to the draft. Schenck’s conviction was affirmed unanimously by the Supreme Court just as the war was ending. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes fashioned the now-famous phrase, “[t]he most stringent protection of **free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theatre** and causing a panic.” *Schenck v. United States*, 249 U.S. 47, 52 (1919) (emphasis added). Today, that one sentence is repeatedly invoked by leftists to demonstrate that the First Amendment is not absolute, and certainly does not protect conservative political voices. (Interestingly, when leftists invoke that statement, they uniformly omit the word “falsely.”)

In that same 1918 term of court, the Supreme Court upheld a similar conviction for “disloyalty,” reasoning that the defendant’s newspaper articles criticizing U.S. military involvement might be circulated in quarters where a little breath would be enough to kindle a flame. *Frohwerk v. United States*, 249 U.S. 204, 209 (1919). A third case in this trilogy was *Debs v. United States*, 249 U.S. 211 (1919), where the Court upheld a conviction for a speech inciting a refusal of duty in the military and the recruiting and enlistment service.

It only took until the next term of the Supreme Court for Justice Holmes to begin to reverse his position: “It is only the present danger of **immediate** evil or an intent to bring it about that warrants Congress in setting a limit to the expression of opinion where private rights are not concerned. **Congress certainly cannot forbid all effort to change the mind of the country.**” *Abrams v. United States*, 250 U.S. 616 (1919) (emphasis added). Holmes moved even further away from authoritarianism, dissenting in *Gitlow v. New York*, 268 U.S. 652 (1925).

Finally, in *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444, 447-448 (1969), the Court overturned *Schenck*, explaining:

[T]he constitutional guarantees of free speech and free press do not permit a State to forbid or proscribe advocacy of the use of force or of law violation **except where such advocacy is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action** and is likely to incite or produce such action.... A statute which fails to draw this distinction impermissibly intrudes upon the freedoms guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments. [Emphasis added.]

Today, rogue Justice Department prosecutors are again becoming “an angel of life and death clothed with the power to walk up and down in his district, saying, ‘This one will I spare, and this one will I smite.’” Donald Trump draws an FBI SWAT team, while Joe Biden’s stolen documents don’t even draw flies. The Espionage Act needs to be buried in the grave along with *Schenck*, its judicial progeny. Americans of all political stripes should demand that the First Amendment again mean what it says — “**Congress shall make no law.**”

When the judiciary met a runaway Justice Department power in 1919, America was the loser. Rarely do nations get second chances. Rather than wait for the Courts, The Espionage Act of 1917 should be stricken from the weapons arsenal of federal prosecutors.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/doj-uses-the-espionage-act-to-control-political-opponents/>

Justice Department Targets Traditional Catholics as Domestic Terrorists

February 23, 2023

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) [represents on its website](#) that it upholds four values:

- **Independence and Impartiality.** We work each day to earn the public's trust by following the facts and the law wherever they may lead, without prejudice or improper influence.
- **Honesty and Integrity.** Our employees adhere to the highest standards of ethical behavior, mindful that as public servants we must work to earn the trust of, and inspire confidence in, the public we serve.
- **Respect.** Our employees value differences in people and in ideas and treat everyone with fairness, dignity, and compassion.
- **Excellence.** We work every day to provide the highest level of service to the American people and to be a responsible steward of the taxpayers' dollars.

Let's examine one recent leaked analysis to evaluate how well the DOJ has been doing thus far in 2023 according to the standards it sets for itself.

An FBI whistleblower revealed that the FBI's Richmond, Virginia Field Office completed an ["intelligence" analysis](#) dated January 23, 2023 that describes:

the increasingly observed interest of **racially or ethnically motivated violent extremists** (RMVEs) in **radical-traditionalist Catholic** (RTC) ideology almost certainly presents opportunities for threat mitigation through the exploration of new avenues for tripwires and source development. [Emphasis added.]

[The FBI document](#) accused Catholics of "an over-emphasis in white US nationalism." The FBI further describes these dangerous Catholics as having rejected "the Second Vatican Council" and finds that a preference for the Catholic Mass in Latin instead of the vernacular is a warning sign.

The FBI's conclusion that "Traditionalist Catholics" are tied to "violent extremists" was based in part on the work of the discredited, leftist Southern Poverty Law Center.

Let's compare these slurs on Traditionalist Catholics to the DOJ's values: Does DOJ show "impartiality" without "prejudice?" Does DOJ inspire the "confidence" of the American People? Is DOJ treating people with "respect?" Is citing the discredited SPLC evidence of "excellence?" With its vitriol against Roman Catholics, DOJ has sunk to new lows by every standard.

While there have always been serious problems at DOJ, during the last Administration, there was a commitment made to religious freedom. On October 20, 2017, the DOJ

issued [guidance for all Executive Departments and Agencies](#) interpreting the religious liberty protections in federal law. That guidance was directed by President Trump's [Executive Order No. 13798](#). The prior Justice Department's guidance sources Religious Liberty to our Creator, giving it the high and lofty position it should hold in our pantheon of rights:

Religious liberty is a foundational principle of enduring importance in America, enshrined in our Constitution and other sources of federal law. As James Madison explained in his Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments, the free exercise of religion "is in its nature an unalienable right" because the duty owed to one's Creator "is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of Civil Society."

It only took a little over five years for the Justice Department to move from promising to **protect** Americans who are exercising their religious freedom, to **targeting** those same people as "Radical-Traditionalist Catholics."

Digging deeper into the report, we see the FBI's politics revealed in its concern that RTCs might have common interests such as opposition to abortion rights, affirmative action, immigration, and "LGBT protections." If people of faith oppose the leftist political agenda, they must be violent extremists.

It is not just abortion that has gotten the Church in Biden's crosshairs. The memo also cited an article in the far-left magazine, "The Atlantic," which "[slammed Catholic rosary beads](#) for increasingly being associated with right-wing Christians, especially those who are gun owners" as ammunition for its assault on Catholics.

The Biden Administration may have other reasons to target Catholics. On June 18, 2021, America's Catholic bishops approved a document instructing Catholic churches to [deny Holy Communion to pro-abortion elected officials](#). One such elected official, of course, is President Joe Biden, nominally the second Catholic President. During his 2020 campaign, the St. Anthony Catholic Church in South Carolina denied communion to candidate Biden for the same reason. But for whatever reasons, the "Catholic" President's administration seems to have practicing Catholics squarely in its crosshairs. His Justice Department attorneys recently did their best to jail pro-life Catholic father Mark Houck for peacefully protesting at abortion clinics, discussed in our article last week.

On February 10, 2023, a coalition of [20 state attorneys general](#) wrote to Attorney General Merrick Garland and FBI Director Christopher Wray to protest. It complained that the report extolled "opportunities for threat mitigation through the exploration of new avenues for tripwire and source development." In plain English, it was a recommendation that the DOJ send FBI spies into Catholic churches in a witch hunt for "traditional Catholics" among apparently more "politically correct" "non-traditional" Catholics.

The letter blasted the DOJ for the "un-American and unconstitutional memorandum," demanding that Garland and Wray "immediately and unequivocally order agency personnel not

to target Americans based on their religious beliefs and practices.” Emphasizing that “anti-Catholic bigotry appears to be festering,” the attorneys general wrote, “[S]pying on Catholics in their churches and cathedrals is an absurd use of federal law-enforcement and counterintelligence resources.” The letter demanded that DOJ reveal to the American public the extent to which they have engaged in infiltrating and collecting intelligence on Traditional Catholics.

New York Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan, chair of the U.S. bishops’ religious liberty committee, **blistered the memo’s “religious profiling”** of Catholics. “A preference for traditional forms of worship and holding closely to the Church’s teachings on marriage, family, human sexuality, and the dignity of the human person **does not equate with extremism**,”

Bishop Barry Knestout of the Diocese of Richmond, in perhaps the understatement of the month, stated: “The leaked document should be troubling and **offensive to all communities of faith**, as well as all Americans.” Indeed, it should, and it must if the nation is to survive.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/justice-department-targets-traditional-catholics-as-domestic-terrorists-part-viii/>

DOJ Lawyers Lie Without Consequence

March 2, 2023

Former veteran federal prosecutor and criminal defense attorney Sidney Powell created quite a stir in 2014 when she published her book [*Licensed to Lie*](#) exposing how federal prosecutors routinely lie and abuse their power. Her book addressed the prosecutions of U.S. Senator Ted Stevens (R-AK), Arthur Anderson, and Merrill Lynch executives, and others. Americans need to understand that there is real truth in the title, and that the problem continues.

While federal officials, including prosecutors, lie routinely, ordinary Americans dare not lie to the federal government. In 1948, Congress made it a federal crime, “in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States,” to make “any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation.” 18 U.S. Code § 1001. False statements carry up to a five-year prison term. While that statute could be read to apply to federal prosecutors as well, it should be no surprise that federal prosecutors do not prosecute other federal prosecutors who lie.

In 2016, [Texas and other states sued the Obama Department of Homeland Security](#) (DHS) over its handling of “Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)” immigration cases. For months, Department of Justice (DOJ) lawyers defending DHS lied to the court and to the plaintiff states, assuring them that the new DACA processing guidelines would not take effect until February 2015. However, by January 2015, DHS had already processed more than 100,000 aliens under the new guidelines. After catching DOJ lawyers repeatedly lying, District Court Judge Andrew Hanen was critical, but restrained, in response:

The ... Department of Justice ... has now admitted making statements that clearly did not match the facts. It has admitted that the lawyers who made these statements had knowledge of the truth when they made these misstatements... These misrepresentations were made on multiple occasions starting with the very first hearing this Court held. This Court would be remiss if it left such unseemly and unprofessional conduct unaddressed. [*Texas v. United States*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79546, at *9-10.]

If Judge Hanen really had thought lying by DOJ attorneys was a serious matter, surely he would have taken strong action. But he didn't. In fact, Judge Hanen did not report the DOJ lawyers for ethics violations to the bar, or to those at the DOJ who are supposed to monitor lawyer ethics. Judge Hansen only [ordered the lawyers to take ethics classes](#). Not surprisingly, the DOJ resisted even this minimal rebuke.

In 2020, [DOJ lawyers admitted in emails “Yeah, we lied”](#) in refusing to disclose exculpatory evidence in a money-laundering prosecution against Ali Sadr Hashemi Nejad. One DOJ attorney suggested hiding the exculpatory evidence. “I’m wondering if we should wait until tomorrow [to turn it over to the defense] and [bury it in some other documents](#),” the

lawyer suggested. Having witnessed this malfeasance, District Court Judge Allison Nathan verbally castigated the DOJ attorneys. “The trial team’s failure to promptly investigate the origins of [the key document] and to communicate about discovery with other governmental agencies reflects a [systematic disregard of their disclosure obligations](#),” she stated. “Prosecutors then compounded these missteps through a sustained pattern of refusing to fess up.” Even though they had already obtained a conviction, federal prosecutors dropped the case rather than being required to retry it in the wake of revelations of prosecutorial misconduct.

Justice Department attorneys rarely receive the severe discipline private attorneys would expect if caught committing similar misconduct. One [review of DOJ lawyers](#) has concluded:

[M]any federal prosecutors handling cases ranging from drug trafficking to white-collar crime walk away largely unscathed from misconduct charges, even after judges determine and describe in published opinions how they committed serious offenses, such as intentionally hiding evidence and allowing witnesses to lie to juries. But in their rulings, judges almost always omit the name of the prosecutor. And even if the prosecutor’s alleged misconduct is so grave that the [Justice Department Office of Professional Responsibility] ends up investigating, the agency goes to great lengths to conceal anything that could possibly identify them.

For decades, the DOJ’s Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) has been accused of covering up — or at least failing to address — misconduct by DOJ attorneys. As far back as 1995, a [report by the U.S. General Accounting Office](#) (GAO) found numerous failures in OPR investigations, The GAO report “found several OPR monitored cases with instructions from OPR management to simply “open, count and close.”

Two decades later the problem had not improved. A [December 2014](#) GAO report concluded: “DOJ has not implemented its plan to ... ensure that discipline for professional misconduct is applied consistently and in a timely manner for all department attorneys. Aside from the Executive Office for United States Attorneys, “no other DOJ component has similar procedures or mechanisms in place to ensure that discipline for professional misconduct is implemented.”

Doubtless the most infamous case of the DOJ lying to courts is the saga of [falsified affidavits](#) submitted by DOJ attorneys to the FISA (Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act) Court to obtain permission to spy on President Donald Trump’s 2016 campaign staffer Carter Page, despite the DOJ’s knowledge that the affidavits lacked probable cause. The FISA statute requires that “the Attorney General certif[y] in writing under oath that ... the electronic surveillance is solely directed at ... the acquisition of the contents of communications transmitted by means of communications used exclusively between or among foreign powers....” 50 U.S. Code § 1802(a).

FISA Court Judge James Boasberg found that the affidavits contained “material misstatements and omissions.” Fellow FISA Court Judge Rosemary [Collyer wrote in a scathing order](#) that “[t]he FBI’s handling of the Carter Page applications, as portrayed in the OIG report, was antithetical to the heightened duty of candor” required in *ex parte* surveillance applications. But the falsified affidavits were also [signed off on by then-acting Attorney General Dana Boente](#) and then-Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein. The corruption at DOJ goes to the highest levels.

Nothing destroys the faith of the American people in their government more quickly than the realization that government officials are not our servants, but our rulers. All too many DOJ attorneys have shown again and again that they do not uphold the rule of law, but have contempt for the law. They operate based on the rule: “Perjury for thee, but not for me.”

<https://www.americasfuture.net/doj-lawyers-lie-without-consequence/>

How DOJ Lawyers Protect the Biden Family

March 9, 2023

In October 2022, even the *Washington Post* reported that federal prosecutors likely had enough evidence to charge President Biden's son [Hunter Biden with both gun and tax charges](#). Attorney General Merrick Garland has promised Congress that the U.S. Attorney for Delaware who had been appointed for President Trump had "[full authority](#)" to prosecute Hunter. Yet nearly a half-year later, no charges have been brought.

Just this month, AG Garland admitted that [he would need to "authorize" any prosecution](#) of Hunter Biden, but he assured Congress that he would do so if asked. If AG Garland would need to "authorize" the prosecution of the son of the President who appointed him, and to whom he reports, doesn't that sound like a conflict of interest?

This is certainly not the first time the Justice Department lawyers have found themselves in a compromising position when asked to investigate the potential criminal actions of a President, a Vice President, or their family members. A procedure exists to handle such a situation — the appointment of a Special Counsel. A federal regulation, 28 C.F.R. § 600.1, requires: "The Attorney General, or in cases in which the Attorney General is recused, the Acting Attorney General **will appoint** a Special Counsel when he or she determines that criminal investigation... is warranted, and [that] investigation or prosecution...would present a **conflict of interest** for the Department...." (Emphasis added.)

As to the gun charges, Hunter Biden asserted on a federal firearms purchase form (ATF 4473) that he was not currently using illegal drugs, when, in fact, he was doing so, which he [seems to have admitted](#). By denying use of illegal drugs, Hunter Biden was able to obtain a gun that would have been illegal for him to purchase had he provided true information. A false answer on that ATF form is the basis for a felony charge.

As to the tax charges, the problem stems from reports that Hunter Biden failed to report [income he received from foreign sources](#) on his federal income tax return.

And Hunter is not the only member of the Biden family under federal investigation. The president's brother, James Biden, is also the target of a federal investigation. James Biden is [alleged to have made a half-million dollars in loans to himself](#) from the now-defunct Americore Health hospital business, which have not been repaid.

On October 17, 2022, Senator Chuck Grassley (R-IA) sent a letter to AG Garland, FBI Director Christopher Wray, and Delaware U.S. Attorney David Weiss, alleging that FBI whistleblowers had uncovered evidence of "significant, impactful and voluminous evidence with respect to [potential criminal conduct by Hunter Biden and James Biden](#)." Grassley attached a contract to his letter indicating \$5 million was to be paid from the Chinese government-connected company to Hunter and James Biden for work done while Joe Biden was Vice President.

Despite the seriousness of these charges, and unlike the DOJ's investigation of President Trump, thus far, the DOJ has flatly refused to appoint a Special Counsel to investigate the Bidens. On September 16, 2022, Senators John Cornyn (R-TX), Mitch McConnell (R-KY), Grassley and 27 others wrote a letter to Garland [**demanding that Weiss be given special counsel powers**](#). But other Senators wonder if giving U.S. Attorney Weiss Special Counsel status would solve the problem, as it was Weiss who decided to [**pause a criminal investigation of Hunter Biden months before the 2020 election**](#).

Congressman Jim Jordan (R-OH), Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, also called out [**the DOJ's special counsel double standard**](#). He wrote to AG Garland questioning why “you have declined to appoint a special counsel in this matter, despite appointing special counsels in other investigations. [**Your refusal to appoint a special counsel here is conspicuous**](#) in this context.”

As recently as October 12, 2022, when confronted by the fact his son may be indicted, President Biden doubled down, telling CNN: “[**I'm proud of my son**](#).” While that may be a natural, human response, it provides even more reason for AG Garland to appoint a truly independent Special Counsel.

If AG Garland, a U.S. Attorney, and other DOJ lawyers are allowed to stall and allow the statute of limitations on Biden family crimes to run out, there will be little reason for Americans to trust anything that federal prosecutors say, and we can expect more and more juries to simply acquit anyone charged with a crime by the Biden “Justice” Department.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/how-doj-lawyers-protect-the-biden-family/>

Department of Justice Lawyers Weaponize the Voting Rights Act

March 16, 2023

Serious disputes over the manner in which both the 2020 elections and 2022 elections were conducted continue to this day. “Liberalized” voting practices that were implemented to allow voting by mail, use of drop boxes, and other devices led to serious questions about the integrity of those federal and state elections. Some of those election challenges are still being litigated. One of those challenges was filed by Kari Lake, the 2022 Republican candidate for Governor of Arizona, against Katie Hobbs, the former Arizona Secretary of State, who conveniently established and administered the rules for an election which declared her the victor.

To implement those liberalized voting practices, Democrat lawyers filed more than 200 pre-election lawsuits to undermine election law security practices in order to tilt the election results to Democrats. [The Democrats attacked election laws in state after state](#), demanding wholesale, judicially-imposed changes to the laws passed by the elected representatives of the people. (Records show that during the 2020 election cycle, the Democrat Party paid more than \$40 million to its favorite election lawfare firm, Perkins Coie.)

What is less well known is that in some cases, these state election laws are being overturned by judges at the request not of Democrat Party-funded lawyers, but U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) lawyers funded by taxpayers.

The Voting Rights Act

The DOJ has limited authority to review state election laws under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Act contains a wide range of protections for racial minorities, as well as certain other minority groups. It provides protections against state laws which might disproportionately hinder minority voting, such as literacy tests that once had been used for that purpose. While Congress intended the Voting Rights Act to protect racial and even what are termed “language minority groups,” it is not surprising the powers entrusted to DOJ lawyers and appointees of the President, could be abused to achieve political objectives.

For example, in July of 2021, the DOJ [sent a threatening memo](#) to states warning them not to reverse pandemic-era exceptions to election security laws, despite the original plan that the exceptions be only a temporary COVID measure.

DOJ Attacks Voting Integrity Laws In Red States

In 2015, [the Obama Justice Department sued North Carolina](#) over the state’s decision to shorten the early voting period, and to end same-day voter registration. Is there a national requirement that states allow same-day voter registration? Apparently not, as Massachusetts

and New York, two heavily Democrat states, [do not have same-day registration](#). But neither the Obama nor the Biden DOJ has seen fit to sue Massachusetts or New York.

In June 2021, [the Biden DOJ sued Georgia over its voter integrity law](#), arguing that requiring a photo ID to vote is racist and discriminatory. The DOJ complaint against Georgia was full of references to nooses and racial slurs. Is there a national requirement that bans states from requiring photo ID's? Apparently not, as Minnesota has the requirement, despite having a Democrat governor, legislature, and Secretary of State. But the DOJ has not sued Minnesota.

On November 4, 2021, the DOJ [sued Texas over its recently enacted voter integrity law](#) that required mail-in ballots to contain the voter's Social Security number for vote integrity purposes. Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton defiantly tweeted in response: "Ensuring Texas has safe, secure, and transparent elections is a top priority of mine. [I will see you in court, Biden!](#)#ElectionIntegrity."

DOJ Attacks Redistricting Plans In Red States

After every national census, states re-examine the districts from which public officials are elected at every level of government. According to the establishment press, when Democrats adjust those lines, it is called redistricting. When Republicans adjust those lines, it is described using the pejorative "gerrymandering."

It should come as no surprise that the DOJ has sued conservative states over their redistricting plans. In 2021, [the DOJ sued Texas](#), arguing that because the 2020 redistricting created white majorities in the state's two new congressional districts, the plan automatically was racist and illegal. "The Department of Justice's absurd lawsuit against our state is the Biden Administration's latest ploy to control Texas voters," [tweeted Paxton](#). Meanwhile, the DOJ has turned a blind eye toward extreme gerrymanders to disenfranchise Republican voters in Democrat states such as New York and Maryland.

Blue States Get A Pass

It is certainly not true that redistricting abuses never occur when Democrats are in control. In March, 2022, New York courts [threw out the Democrat legislature's congressional gerrymandering plan](#), noting that "the map was 'beyond a reasonable doubt' illegally enacted with 'political bias' in violation of the state constitution." Another state court threw out the legislature's state senate map as well, noting that the redistricting process was "incapable of legislative cure." However, the Justice Department appeared unperturbed at a process that tilted the playing field on behalf of Democrats in New York.

Maryland's Democrat-controlled redistricting is also infamous for gerrymandering. "In the past, experts have agreed that Maryland has one of the worst cases of gerrymandering in the entire country. A federal judge once said [the current map looked like a 'broken-winged pterodactyl](#), lying prostrate across the center of the state.'"

Faith in elections is so low among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, that fully **55 percent of voters support forensic audits of election results** to ensure there was no vote fraud, with only 29 percent opposing such audits.

It is bad enough when taxpayer-funded judges abuse their power to invalidate state election laws designed to ensure fair elections. It is even worse when the taxpayer-funded lawyers are the ones who file the suits to get those judges to require election laws which undermine election integrity.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/departments-of-justice-lawyers-weaponize-the-voting-rights-act/>

DOJ Fingerprints on Manhattan DA Investigation of Trump

March 23, 2023

On March 18, 2023, former President Trump [posted on his social media](#) website that based on leaks from the office of the Manhattan District Attorney, he expected to be arrested the following Tuesday. Every day since, there have been an endless number of [reports](#) out of that District Attorney's office that an indictment should be forthcoming, with commentators discussing the legal and political issues. The coverage truly has been "wall-to-wall." What should Americans think of this non-stop coverage? We offer two thoughts.

First, when a story is covered incessantly by the press, Americans should first consider whether this is an artificial effort to divert the public's attention from some other matter — often government corruption. The list of topics that the government does not want the People to focus on about is long. At the moment, it certainly includes whether government policies are causing the collapse of the banking system to ease the way to the adoption of a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) which would give total control over our lives to the federal government. And the government certainly suppressed the revelations by the House Oversight Committee into Communist China-connected sources paying billions to the Biden Family.

Beyond that, there is a second question we should ask — did some prior *federal government* action contribute to the present crisis? All the stories about the anticipated Trump indictment focus on the leftist [Manhattan District Attorney](#) and the Manhattan grand jury. There is almost no press attention paid to how the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) teed up the criminal case for the Manhattan DA.

But what exactly is the crime Trump could be indicted for? According to the rumors, the allegations relate to so-called "hush money" payments made in 2016 by the Trump organization relating to Stormy Daniels. It is unclear precisely what state crimes Trump might be indicted for, but they relate to a federal case previously brought against Trump's former lawyer, Michael Cohen. Daniels sold the exclusive rights to her salacious story of an affair — which Donald Trump denies — to the *National Enquirer*. In turn, Cohen purchased the story from the *National Enquirer* for the Trump Organization to prevent it from being published and becoming a publicity distraction.

In 2018, Cohen [plead guilty](#) to a federal campaign finance law violation,. At the time, Cohen was facing dozens of federal criminal charges unrelated to Trump, such as tax evasion and bank loan fraud. However, DOJ lawyers allowed Cohen to plead guilty to violating federal election law. The claim was that Cohen had facilitated a "corporate contribution" to be made in order to "prevent [the story] from influencing the election." The indictment referred to an unidentified person who the media says was Trump, making him guilty by association. But since Trump was not charged, he never had a chance to defend himself. Thus, the DOJ

lawyers wrapped salacious charges around Trump's neck before the 2020 election with no way for him to absolve himself.

There's one small problem — Cohen pled guilty to something that was not a crime. It can't be illegal to make the payments personally if the payments could not have been made by the campaign. If the payment to Daniels had been made by the Trump campaign, it would have violated the law as payments made for a "personal use."

Second, and significantly, federal courts have interpreted the statutory terms "contribution" and "expenditure" and "coordinated expenditures" very narrowly to avoid criminalizing activities which are exercises of First Amendment protected rights. Paying someone **not to publish** a story is not even close to being the same as making a corporate expenditure to disseminate express advocacy to support or oppose a candidate.

DOJ lawyers attempted a similar strategy only once before when Senator John Edwards had helped support his mistress to keep his affair quiet and prevent it from hurting his political aspirations. He was charged with four campaign finance violations, acquitted on one charge, and the other charges were later dropped. Thus, the DOJ legal theory has never previously been successfully used during FECA's 50-plus years in existence, and certainly has not been subjected to judicial scrutiny.

But by incentivizing Cohen to "roll over" (i.e., plead guilty) to the campaign finance charge in exchange for dropping other charges, it allowed the judge to look the other way, never being required to write an opinion concluding that Trump's purchase of the Daniels' story was prohibited by the Federal Election Campaign Act.

If that same legal theory were applied across the political spectrum, Twitter's former head of "Trust & Safety," Yoel Roth, and others at Twitter would be facing federal criminal charges for using corporate resources when it suppressed the circulation of legitimate news stories such as the Hunter Biden laptop story in October 2020. But in the United States, DOJ lawyers have unbridled discretion who to prosecute and who to let off. Regardless of their high-sounding rhetoric, "by their deeds you may know them." *Matthew 7:16*.

So it may seem that the charges against Trump are being investigated by the Manhattan DA, but those charges were based on shameless acts by DOJ lawyers before the 2020 election, and are now being recycled to thwart another presidential run by Trump in 2024.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/doj-fingerprints-on-manhattan-da-investigation-of-trump/>

DOJ Informant Found in January 6 Defense Team

March 30, 2023

Just when we thought the [persecution of January 6 defendants](#) by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) couldn't get any worse — it did.

Jen Loh

Exactly one day before she was to testify as a defense witness for defendant Zachary Rehl, DOJ lawyers disclosed to Rehl's attorneys that their defense witness [was actually an FBI informant](#). The *New York Times* identified that informant as Jen Loh, a Texas-based activist who once ran "Latinos for Trump." (Extending the deception further, Loh apparently is not this informant's real name.)

Loh [had been an FBI informant since April 2021](#), well before Rehl's trial even began. The worst aspect of the story is not just that Loh had agreed to be a defense witness. Loh had embedded herself into the defense team. She had spent the past year "talking with the members of the [Proud Boys] group and their defense counsel about the case and [suggesting possible witnesses and attorneys who could help](#). All the while, [she] was also a paid FBI informant."

The [DOJ had known since at least December](#) that Rehl's defense team trusted Loh so much it included her in meetings with the lawyers formulating defense strategy. Compounding that breach of law and ethics, DOJ lawyers failed to reveal the information to defense attorneys for another three months.

And Loh did not confine her dirty work to the Rehl case. Loh was "involved with multiple defendants in the case [\[and\] their lawyers as well](#)." The DOJ spy went so far as to [attend prayer meetings with the political prisoners' families](#). Imagine the kind of person who would do that?

DOJ lawyers deny they ever asked her to spy, but at this point it certainly looks like Loh's contacts with the defendants and their attorneys [compromised their constitutional rights](#) — including attorney-client confidentiality and the Sixth Amendment right to counsel.

Access to Privileged Emails

Apparently the DOJ had many ways of spying on the January 6 defendants. Nicole Miller, a lead FBI investigator assigned to Rehl's case, discussed with another investigator "the content of [emails exchanged between Zachary Rehl ... and his former lawyer](#)." Miller texted the other investigator: "[I need to find other emails](#), but this one email definitely indicates that they want to go to trial." In another thread, another agent messaged Miller, "Found an email thread with Rehl and his attorney....The attorney raised some interesting points." Not explained is how the investigator gained access to confidential and privileged attorney-client

communications. “Another agent told Miller an FBI supervisor instructed the unidentified agent to destroy ‘338 items of evidence.’ To which Miller reacted, ‘OMG INSANE.’”

Rehl’s defense lawyers have now asserted in court filings that they believe the government “doctored internal reports, destroyed evidence, and tipped off prosecutors about defense strategy on the government’s highest-profile January 6 case.”

The DOJ has [bitterly fought defense efforts to admit evidence](#) of the spying by agents of the FBI and DOJ on legally protected, confidential defense communications. Even when evidence has been submitted, it has been in the form of vast “document dumps” of mostly irrelevant information, with no specificity as to what information the government actually intends to use as evidence. Defense attorneys, often overworked and understaffed public defenders, have been [forced to file multiple motions](#) asking the court to require the government even to [identify the information it intends to use as evidence.](#)

District Court Judge

If there had been even a hint that a defense attorney sent a spy into a U.S. Attorney’s office to learn prosecution strategy, or had intercepted privileged emails, almost any federal district judge would have had the defense attorney taken out of the courtroom in chains. Is that what happened here? Not exactly.

Reporter Julie Kelly authored the book, *January 6: How Democrats Used the Capitol Protest to Launch a War on Terror Against the Political Right*. Ms. Kelly has covered this story extensively. She reported that the team led by DOJ attorney Matthew Graves not only misled, but “[continues to mislead court and defendants](#) about actual number of FBI informants.” But the judge in the case, [District Judge Timothy Kelly, is a former prosecutor](#), who Julie Kelly reported “folded to nearly every government demand. He accepted at face value the explanation that the destroyed evidence pertained to an old criminal case and was not relevant to the Proud Boys’ trial. He also refused to take up arguments about violations of the defendants’ Sixth Amendment rights....”

Defense attorneys have tried to fight back, despite the slanted playing field. “The principle is well established that surreptitious [invasions by the government into meetings between attorneys and their clients](#) or witnesses are forbidden, as is any attempt to stealthily uncover the defense’s trial strategy,” said Rehl defense attorney Carmen Hernandez.

Defense counsel Hernandez demanded that the DOJ [immediately release the names of any more informants](#) still on assignment within the defense team. She noted that the DOJ’s conduct raises “serious and [substantiated allegations of governmental misconduct](#)” involving “surreptitious invasion and interference of the defense team by the government.” She filed a motion to dismiss charges, arguing that the DOJ’s misconduct is “a [clear and flagrant Sixth Amendment violation](#)” that “screams for a dismissal.”

As this article is being finalized, [Judge Kelly refused to allow the defense](#) to raise Loh’s history as a FBI informant in court, so the defense decided not to call her as a witness. The

final story about what the DOJ did or did not do here is still to be revealed, but at the moment it looks bad.

It is no longer fashionable to quote Scripture in court, but judges should read Ecclesiastes 8:11: “Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil.” If federal judges allow DOJ lawyers to abuse the justice system, the innocent will go to prison and we all will suffer the consequences as our “justice” system collapses before our eyes.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/doj-informant-found-in-january-6-defense-team/>

DOJ Wages War on Pro-Life State Laws

April 5, 2023

The Declaration of Independence, our nation’s charter, declares that the national government was formed to secure certain rights — including the right to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Do these ancient values still constitute our shared values? Sadly, these values are contested at every turn by the Left.

Probably what the Left hates most about these values is that the Declaration makes clear that we are “endowed” with those rights by “our Creator” — not by our government. If these rights come from the Creator, they are beyond the authority of the government to take away.

- Today, the Left hates “*liberty*” as it moves us to a totalitarian society where, as [T.H. White](#) described it: “Everything not forbidden is compulsory.”
- The Left’s vision of the “*pursuit of happiness*” is reflected in World Economic Forum Chairman Klaus Schwab’s reported prediction of the Great Reset: “In 10 years, they will own nothing — and be happy with it.”
- And, the Left’s view of “*life*” is reflected in the Women’s Health Protection Act which would protect abortion in every state up to the moment of birth (with the sanction of a doctor) — a bill that [passed the House](#), but failed in the Senate last year by a razor-thin margin of [51-49](#).

With the new Republican House majority, the death cult of abortion pins its hopes not on Congress but on the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), which has turned into the *de facto* legal arm of Planned Parenthood. The Supreme Court’s decision last year in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization* was intended to return the issue of abortion to the states, but the DOJ nonetheless continues to insist on imposing the federal government’s will on pro-life states. In case after case, DOJ’s taxpayer-funded litigators have declared war on pro-life laws being enacted in conservative states that seek to protect innocent life.

DOJ Sues Texas Over Its “Heartbeat Bill”

In 2021, [DOJ lawyers sued to block Texas’ “heartbeat bill”](#) which prohibited abortions once an unborn baby has a detectable heartbeat. Stunningly, the DOJ asked the court to recognize the right of the United States government to [sue any state over any state law that the administration in power believes to be unconstitutional](#)— even if no other party would have standing to challenge the state law. When the suit reached the Supreme Court, the Court dismissed it on an 8-1 vote. (*United States v. Texas*, 142 S. Ct. 522 (2021)). In filing suit (before the U.S. Supreme Court’s *Dobbs* decision), [Attorney General Merrick Garland announced](#): “The Act is clearly unconstitutional under longstanding Supreme Court precedent ... in the words of *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*....”

The implications of the DOJ’s suit were clear: if a state passes a law out of line with the administration’s leftwing policy preferences, the federal government will attack the law in

court. If DOJ were to prevail in such lawsuits, it would “open the door wide to DOJ’s bringing [all sorts of individual-rights constitutional claims](#) against whatever state laws offend the current Administration.”

DOJ Sues Idaho Over its Pro-Life Bill

In August 2022, Merrick Garland announced that the [DOJ had filed suit against Idaho over its pro-life law](#). The Idaho law [allows abortions to save the mother’s life](#) or in cases of rape or incest. That is not enough abortion for DOJ attorneys. “On the day Roe and Casey were overturned, we promised that the Justice Department would [work tirelessly to protect and advance \[abortion\]](#),” Garland announced.

Idaho’s Gov. Brad Little responded, “Our nation’s highest court returned the issue of abortion to the states to regulate — end of story. The U.S. [Justice Department’s interference with Idaho’s pro-life law](#) is another example of Biden overreaching yet again while he continues to ignore...crushing inflation and the open border with Mexico.”

The Idaho Supreme Court upheld the law’s constitutionality in January 2023, noting that “the relevant history and traditions of Idaho show abortion was [viewed as an immoral act and treated as a crime](#).” The Justice Department now is [proceeding in federal court against the state](#).

DOJ Threatens to Sue Other States That Pass Pro-Life Legislation

In January 2023, the Justice Department announced that it is prepared to attack other state laws that attempt to preserve unborn life. “We’ve obviously been very active in [monitoring what’s happening in the states](#) and locally, and given that most state legislatures now are coming back into session, we’ll be continuing to do so and looking at any laws that may get passed that infringe on federal protections,” said former ACLU lawyer and now Associate Attorney General, Vanita Gupta, who leads the DOJ’s “reproductive rights task force.”

The battle for the values enshrined in the Declaration of Independence is being waged everywhere, and DOJ lawyers are on the wrong side of every battle.

Where is the resistance to the Leftists in charge of the DOJ? In January 2023, House Republicans assumed total control of the purse strings of the federal government — which gives them the power to defund any component of the Executive Branch that they choose. They must use that power. They must do more than hold hearings, give floor speeches, and write letters to people like Merrick Garland who could care less what they think. How about cutting the budget of the DOJ by 50 percent? The nation would not just survive — it would prosper. And, as a bonus if that were to happen, the lawless lawyers employed at the DOJ would be required to find an honorable way to make a living — for a change.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/doj-wages-war-on-pro-life-state-laws/>

DOJ Refuses to Protect Pro-Life Justice

April 11, 2023

The Biden Department of Justice (DOJ) has had time to identify and investigate thousands of January 6 Capitol trespassers or visitors — and [prosecute 1,000](#) of them so far, found time to investigate [mothers in Loudoun County](#), Virginia, and even made time to go after a [pro-life dad in Pennsylvania](#) who dared to protest at an abortion clinic. But DOJ has had no interest whatsoever in enforcing a federal law to protect the lives of conservative Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court.

On May 2, 2022, Politico published an article entitled “[Supreme Court has voted to overturn abortion rights, draft opinion shows](#).” That article was based on a leak of the [draft Supreme Court’s decision](#) in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Org.*, 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022), which 53 days later would be finalized and issued, overturning *Roe v. Wade*.

In response, the Left exploded in rage against Justice Alito who was identified as the opinion’s author, as well as against the justices who were believed to have joined him (Justices Thomas, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett). As usual, no one could know how Chief Justice Roberts would vote, but it was a certainty that the Democrat-appointees (Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan) would dissent. (Roberts eventually concurred in the Court’s judgment upholding the Mississippi law which banned most abortions after 15 weeks, but refused to join [Justice Alito’s opinion](#) overturning both *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.)

Justice Samuel Alito later described [the justices as “targets for assassination”](#) as leftwing activists apparently believed they could stop the release of the *Dobbs* decision by killing one or more conservative justices. A leftist activist from California, Nicholas Roske, traveled to Washington armed with a pistol, ammunition, and a knife, and was arrested [outside the home of Justice Brett Kavanaugh](#). On social media, Roske stated, “I could get at least one, which would change the votes for decades to come, and I am shooting for 3.” (Many press outlets refused to report that Roske was not just an abortion enthusiast, but [“frequently portrayed himself online as a transgender woman named Sophie...”](#) and as an “Mtf” meaning male-to-female.)

Roske was not the only threat. “U.S. Supreme Court Police ... reported a [‘significant increase in violent threats’](#) that include social media posts directed at sitting justices and the Supreme Court building.” Social media posts suggested [“burning down or storming the U.S. Supreme Court](#) and murdering justices and their clerks.” Protests occurred daily at the [homes of the pro-life justices](#).

In response, the Biden Justice department did little to protect the pro-life justices away from the Supreme Court, even though it is a violation of federal law to attempt to picket or parade in an effort to intimidate a judge at the judge’s home:

Whoever, with the intent of interfering with, obstructing, or impeding the administration of justice, or with the intent of influencing any judge, juror, witness, or court officer, in the discharge of his duty, **pickets or parades** in or near a building housing a court of the United States, or in or near a building or **residence occupied or used by such judge**, juror, witness, or court officer.... shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. [18 U.S.C. § 1507 (emphasis added).]

If the protests had occurred outside the homes of pro-abortion Justices Breyer, Kagan, or Sotomayor, how would DOJ have reacted? We don't know, but the DOJ couldn't be bothered to take action to protect the pro-life justices. If the refusal to enforce the law had been based on a view the law was overbroad and likely unconstitutional — a position taken by [Professor Jonathan Turley](#) — that would be one thing. But no such reason was given.

Attorney General Merrick Garland first “[blamed the U.S. Marshals ... for not making any arrests](#)” during his sworn testimony before Congress,” but last month Alabama Senator Katie Britt broke the news that DOJ whistleblowers revealed that the DOJ had “[discouraged the U.S. Marshals Service from arresting protesters](#) illegally demonstrating at the homes of the Supreme Court justices.” Shockingly, the DOJ warned federal marshals that “it would be ‘counterproductive’ for the marshals to make arrests on cases that the DOJ ‘will not charge and prosecute.’” In other words, Garland not only refused to enforce the law, but lied to Congress when he blamed the Marshals Service.

As usual, the response of Republicans was to write letters to Biden appointees who either do not read those letters, or do not care what they read.

On May 11, 2022, a group of 50 House Republicans led by Rep. Claudia Tenney (R-NY) wrote a scathing letter to AG Garland, expressing their “profound concern and deep dismay as [the rule of law in the United States is completely eroded](#) under [Garland's] leadership.” The representatives decried the DOJ's “failure to act [as] a shameless and implicit endorsement of mob rule in America.” Also on May 11, 2022, [governors Larry Hogan of Maryland and Glenn Youngkin of Virginia](#) sent a letter to Garland asking the DOJ to “provide appropriate resources to safeguard the Justices and enforce the law as it is written.”

On June 23, 2022, Rep. Jim Jordan (R-OH) wrote a letter “demanding U.S. Attorney General Merrick Garland turn over documents that could explain [why the Department of Justice has repeatedly refused to prosecute](#) any threats against Republican-nominated Supreme Court justices.”

Last month, Senator Britt reported that as of March 28, 2023 “[not a single person has been prosecuted](#) for illegally harassing Supreme Court justices outside of their homes. The reason is crystal clear: the Department of Justice has willfully chosen not to enforce federal law.”

When the *Dobbs* decision was finally released on June 24, 2022, it was clear that the threats had not worked and the protests began to die down. However, no one can know what will be the long-term effects of these protests. With the Garland precedent of non-enforcement of laws protecting justices established, one wonders if conservative justices will respond by becoming more timid in their decision making, fearing retaliation against their family members.

It is also considered curious that Chief Justice Roberts refused to ask for the help of any federal law enforcement agency to investigate the leak, but rather gave the job to the Marshal of the Supreme Court, who reports to him directly. The Marshal proceeded to engage the firm of former Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff, widely regarded a Deep State operative based on his role in writing the PATRIOT Act. On January 19, 2023, the Court issued a Statement [“Concerning the Leak Investigation,”](#) explaining that the investigation turned up nothing – and it was not possible to know who “disclosed the document or how the draft opinion ended up with Politico.”

In the wake of the release of evidence of the DOJ’s telling U.S. Marshals to stand down, and AG Garland’s lying to Congress about it, a few have [called for Garland’s impeachment](#). But it appears that there is no will among House Republicans to impeach Garland, or to impeach Secretary of Homeland Security Mayorkas who has let the border leak like a sieve, or impeach President Biden who by now could be impeached on a half-dozen different bases. Sending strongly worded letters will not restrain the Deep State. The House Republicans control the purse strings of government, and can defund any agency or program they want, but so far have refused to do even that. Increasingly Americans are viewing House Republicans as inept at best, or possibly part of the problem.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/doj-refuses-to-protect-pro-life-justice/>

Merrick Garland's Continuing Leftist Jihad

April 20, 2023

Merrick Garland's record as Attorney General of the United States has been that of a radical leftist who has politicized and weaponized the Justice Department to a degree that undermines any notion of "equal justice under law." Repeatedly, Garland has demonstrated contempt for the Constitutional rights of Americans. He is the Attorney General who has directed the FBI to investigate parents of school children for disagreeing with government school policies, placed agents in Catholic churches, refused to examine election fraud, ruthlessly prosecuted those near the Capitol on January 6, refused to investigate Hunter Biden's laptop, pushed for abortion on demand up to birth, worked with social media to censor conservatives, raided the home of former President Trump, allowed the ATF to abuse Second Amendment rights of Americans, and the list goes on. (These and other abuses have been detailed in earlier articles in this [series](#).)

Other than strongly worded letters, where is the Republican opposition? Part of the problem is that on March 10, 2021, Garland was confirmed by the Senate for Attorney General on a 70-30 vote. Amazingly, 20 [Senate Republicans supported Garland's confirmation](#): Blunt (MO), Burr (NC), Capito (WV), Cassidy (LA), Collins (ME), Cornyn (TX), Ernst (IA), Graham (SC), Grassley (IA), Inhofe (OK), Johnson (WI), Lankford (OK), McConnell (KY), Moran (KA), Murkowski (AK), Portman (OH), Romney (UT), Rounds (SD), Thune (SD), and Tillis (NC).

When these 20 Republican Senators portray themselves as constitutional conservatives, they should be reminded that they voted to confirm the most lawless, Leftist Attorney General in history. And if they didn't know who he really was, they should have known. Garland's record had been totally exposed when President Obama thrust him on the national stage five years earlier.

On February 13, 2016, the nation's most distinguished conservative lawyer and jurist, Antonin Scalia, was found dead in bed while visiting the ranch of a Texas millionaire in a [remote location in Texas](#). It is not a stretch to say he was the most powerful conservative in America at the time of his death. Justice Scalia had no medical conditions and no terminal illness, and there was no reason to believe he would suffer a sudden death. Nevertheless, there was [no autopsy causing even CNN to write about his "unexamined death"](#). *The Atlantic*, the leading mouthpiece of the nation's ruling elites, was quick to label any effort to learn his cause of death a "[conspiracy theory](#)," even though his removal from the Court could be expected to tip its balance against conservatives on scores of issues, such as abortion, gun control, federalism, and homosexual rights.

In one sense, no one could replace Justice Scalia. Making it worse was that the President of the United States at that time was no friend of conservatives. President Obama would certainly

not nominate another Scalia or Thomas, but if he nominated another Breyer or Ginsburg, it would radically re-shape the Court. Who would President Obama nominate?

President Barack Obama's selection of D.C. Circuit Court Judge Merrick Garland was greeted by a wave of plaudits from the mainstream media choosing a "moderate." The [Washington Post hailed Garland's "instinct for the middle"](#) and "centrist reputation." The *Los Angeles Times* called him "the most moderate Supreme Court nominee anyone could expect from a Democratic president...with a cautious, centrist record." *USA Today* "reported," that "Garland appears to be a safe (that is to say, centrist) choice."

To be sure, the establishment media routinely characterizes committed leftists as "moderates," and described all the recent far-left Democrat Supreme Court nominees in the same glowing language. For example, the *New York Times* lauded Ruth Bader Ginsburg's "resolutely centrist judicial style," and Stephen Breyer as "a judge of moderate leanings." The Washington Post said of Sonia Sotomayor, "her record is clearly that of a moderate," and the New York Times called Elena Kagan a "pragmatic centrist." So, the effort of trying to "sell" Garland as a "moderate" was no surprise.

everyone but 20 Senate Republicans saw through the "con-job" to portray Garland as a moderate. Juanita Duggan of the National Federation of Independent Business wrote in the *Wall Street Journal*, "This is the first time in the NFIB's 73-year history that we will weigh in on a Supreme Court nominee.... In 16 major labor decisions of Judge Garland's that we examined, [he ruled 16-0 in favor of the \[government\].](#)"

As to the First Amendment, *Politico* varied from the standard liberal media script enough to admit, "Invoking First Amendment rights has become a common vehicle for conservatives to challenge agency regulations, but [Garland has shown little receptivity to that argument.](#)" Garland never viewed the Constitution as imposing a limitation on executive branch power.

As to the Second Amendment, in 2000, Garland sided with Leftist Clinton Attorney General Janet Reno, [allowing the DOJ to maintain possession of gun purchase records](#) for six months, despite clear federal law prohibiting maintenance of a gun registry. Garland, while on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, [voted in favor of the District of Columbia's near-total handgun ban](#) later struck down by the Supreme Court in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570 (2008).

A *Wall Street Journal* editorial noted that "Judge Garland's 19-year tenure on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals demonstrates [a reliable vote for progressive causes.](#)" Given that Obama trusted Garland enough to nominate him to the Supreme Court, his leftwing extremism should come as no surprise. One looks in vain for "moderates" among Obama nominations.

Garland had [clerked for the far-left Justice William Brennan](#), who he later cited as a primary influence on his philosophy along with the infamous "living Constitution" Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. His name repeatedly pops up in the administrations of far-left

Democrats. He served in the Justice Department and was nominated to the D.C. Circuit by President Clinton. One looks in vain for any evidence of “moderation” in Garland’s history. Were the Senate Republicans not paying attention?

In his confirmation hearings for Attorney General, Garland refused to say whether illegal alien entry into the United States should continue to be a crime. Arkansas Senator Tom Cotton noted that “when he did answer questions, **he sounded more like a liberal ideologue** who would embrace the radical agenda of the Democratic party’s far left base.” Also during those hearings, Garland argued that Black Lives Matter attacks on a federal courthouse in Portland, Oregon **might not count as domestic terrorism** because they happened at night when the courts were closed. Yet 20 Republican Senators still voted to confirm Garland as Attorney General.

As Elle Purnell wrote in *The Federalist*, “[t]he 20 Republican Senators who voted to confirm Merrick Garland **owe America an apology**.” An apology would be nice, but action would be better. Now that we have a Republican-controlled House of Representatives, with the power of the purse, House Republicans actually could and must act to defund the agencies and programs that Garland has politicized. Nothing less will do.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/merrick-garlands-continuing-leftist-jihad/>