



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on July 25, 2019

Mueller Testimony Reveals Probe Was Effort to Get Trump, Not Seek Justice

https://media.blubrry.com/1462062/mcdn.podbean.com/mf/web/kadeyp/Mueller_Testimony_Reveals_Probe_Was_Effort_to_Get_Trump.mp3

Podcast: Play in new window | [Download](#) ()
Subscribe: [Android](#) | [RSS](#) | [More](#)



Turning hundreds of years of tradition on its head — that a man is presumed innocent until he is proven guilty — the testimony of Special Counsel Robert Mueller revealed that the goal of his two-year investigation into allegations of Trump campaign collusion with the Russians was simply about getting President Donald Trump out of office.

As the hearing opened, Jerrold Nadler, a New York Democrat and chairman of the House Judiciary Committee conducting the hearing, asked Mueller about Trump’s assertion that he had been vindicated by the probe.

“And what about total exoneration? Did you actually totally exonerate the president?”

Mueller replied, “No.”

Of course, this premise that an accused person must prove his innocence throws out centuries of legal tradition, going back even beyond the Magna Carta of 1215. It is not the job of a special prosecutor — or any prosecutor — to “totally exonerate” an accused person. If the prosecutor, or in this case a “special counsel,” cannot uncover enough evidence to charge a person with some specific crime, there simply is no case. To “totally exonerate” a person would require the proving of a negative. Accused persons in Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia often had to meet that standard — that they are totally innocent — but that has never before been the case in America.

Representative John Ratcliffe (R-Texas) made this point to Mueller, telling the 74-year-old prosecutor that while the president, like any other American citizen, is not above the law, neither is he “below the law.” In other words, every American citizen is entitled to a presumption of innocence, including the president.

When Republicans asked questions concerning just how the investigation of alleged Russian interference in the election began, they were repeatedly met with terse responses from Mueller that such questions were “outside my purview.” He showed no interest in the question of whether the investigation was simply a political ploy by the Hillary Clinton campaign, and even claimed that he did not know anything about Fusion GPS, a firm associated with the Democrats that developed the Steele “dossier,” which was used to obtain warrants from the FISA court.

When responding to questions about Mueller having several lawyers on his staff who were strong supporters of Clinton, Trump’s opponent in the 2016 campaign, Mueller appeared agitated. “I’ve been



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on July 25, 2019

in this business for almost 25 years, and in those 25 years I have not had occasion, once, to ask somebody about their political affiliation. It is not done. What I care about is the capability of the individual to do the job and do the job quickly and seriously and with integrity.”

If hiring someone “with integrity” was Mueller’s standard, then it would appear that he failed miserably in this case, as it is clear that several members of his investigative team were Democratic Party activists desirous of finding something — anything — to charge Trump with. Despite this obvious bias against Trump, Mueller was unable to find anything with which to obtain an indictment against the president.

One committee member, Representative Jim Jordan (R-Ohio), asked Mueller about the genesis of the investigation. Jordan charged that in 2016, something happened that had never before happened in American history — the U.S. government spied on two American citizens associated with the rival party’s political campaign, George Papadopoulos and Carter Page. Jordan told Mueller that his report said that Papadopoulos’ telling a foreign diplomat that the Russians have dirt on Clinton was what instigated the investigation, as the diplomat then told the FBI what Papadopoulos had said.

When Jordan asked Mueller who told Papadopoulos that the Russians had dirt on Clinton, Mueller said that he could not say. Jordan sharply retorted that he had already said who it was in his report, that it was a man named Joseph Mifsud. Jordan then noted that the report states that Mifsud had lied three times to the FBI, and asked Mueller why he had not charged Mifsud with making false statements, to which Mueller responded, “I can’t get into it.”

Jordan shot back that he had charged several people associated with Trump with making false statements, but not Mifsud.

“I can’t get into it,” and “that is outside my purview” were standard responses by Mueller to many questions from committee Republicans, who wanted to know about the beginnings of the probe.

When asked if someone in his office tipped off CNN that political operative and Trump associate Roger Stone was going to be arrested, Mueller said that he could not get into that, either. It would seem that a simple yes or no would be a sufficient response, as Mueller could not reasonably argue that revealing such information could violate any citizen’s rights, or reveal any investigative techniques.

But what tipping off CNN — a strongly anti-Trump news organization — does reveal is that the entire Mueller probe was not about seeking justice or the truth, but simply going after President Trump and those closely associated with him.

Representative Louis Gohmert (R-Texas) zeroed in on the fundamental unfairness of the probe. “Listen, regarding collusion or conspiracy, you didn’t find evidence of any agreement, and I’m quoting you, ‘Among the Trump campaign officials and any Russian-linked individuals to interfere with our U.S. Election.’ Correct?” Gohmert then asked, “So you also note in the report that an element of any of those obstructions you referenced requires a corrupt state of mind, correct?”

Mueller said yes to both questions, and Gohmert continued, in a denunciation of the Mueller probe. “And if somebody knows they did not conspire with anybody from Russia to affect the election and they see the big Justice Department with people that hate that person coming after them and then a special counsel appointed who hires a dozen or more people that hate that person, and he knows he’s innocent, he’s not corruptly acting in order to see that justice is done. What he’s done is not obstructing justice, he is pursuing justice — and the fact that you ran it out two years means you perpetuated injustice.”

When the gavel interrupted Gohmert’s statement, Mueller responded, “I take your question.”



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on July 25, 2019

By the conclusion of Mueller's testimony, it was quite clear what many Americans have known for a long time — the purpose of the investigation was not to protect the country from foreign interference in the election process, or to seek justice, but as Gohmert charged, the purpose was to perpetuate an injustice, not only against the president of the United States, but the system of justice in the United States.

Photo: AP Images

Steve Byas is a university history instructor and author of History's Greatest Libels. He may be contacted at byassteve@yahoo.com



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe