



Written by [R. Cort Kirkwood](#) on December 6, 2019

## Turley Attacked Before Impeachment Testimony Ended

Before law professor Jonathan Turley finished testimony about the impeachment of President Trump before the House Judiciary Committee on Wednesday, the leftist rage machine whirred to life.

Turley's opinion that impeaching Trump is "wrong" because the Democrats have failed to make a case for it didn't go over well, and so before he even emerged from the committee room, his office was hit with threats and demands he be fired.



Even worse, Democrats and media leftists lied about his arguments about impeachment relative to Bill Clinton and Barack Obama.

December 4 wasn't a good day to be an honest Democrat.

### Get Turley

[Writing in \*The Hill\* yesterday](#), Turley "lamented that, as in the impeachment of President Clinton from 1998 to 1999, there is an intense 'rancor and rage' and 'stifling intolerance' that blinds people to opposing views."

But "my call for greater civility and dialogue may have been the least successful argument I made to the committee," he continued. "Before I finished my testimony, my home and office were inundated with threatening messages and demands that I be fired from George Washington University for arguing that, while a case for impeachment can be made, it has not been made on this record."

One of those demands went to the dean of the school, [reported Sarah Carter](#), who republished it at her website.

Turley, the writer averred, is "defending the indefensible and I hope that all of the Deans at GWU Law and the students will recognize that he is not serving in the best interest of our country and is a detriment to the success of your school's future reputation. His actions today were spineless and shameful. He is clearly a lackey for the Trump Administration. I trust you will act appropriately and reprimand this sad excuse of a man."

But worse than that was what Democrats and media leftists did to the professor.

Failed Democrat presidential candidate [Eric Swalwell of California actually attacked](#) Turley for defending a client, an attack parroted by MSNBC's Rachel Maddow, while committee chieftain [Jerry Nadler's closing remarks](#) "fueled" the "false narrative" that Turley contradicted his views on the impeachment of Bill Clinton. [Dana Milbank of the \*Washington Post\* misrepresented](#) Turley's views on Barack Obama's misuse of executive powers.

### Turley's Testimony

Turley offense?

Turley, who voted for Obama and Hillary Clinton, repeated [what he has said](#) for some time; the



Written by [R. Cort Kirkwood](#) on December 6, 2019

---

Democrats are manufacturing crimes out of political differences.

“I hold no brief for President Trump,” [he told](#) the committee in 53 pages of written testimony. “My personal and political views of President Trump, however, are irrelevant to my impeachment testimony, as they should be to your impeachment vote.”

Turley said “lowering impeachment standards to fit a paucity of evidence and an abundance of anger” is a dangerous precedent for future presidents, and “if the House proceeds solely on the Ukrainian allegations, this impeachment would stand out among modern impeachments as the shortest proceeding, with the thinnest evidentiary record, and the narrowest grounds ever used to impeach a president.”

Turley said the impeachment process has “raised serious and legitimate issues for investigation,” such as the disputed “quid pro quo,” i.e., that Trump demanded Ukraine investigate the Biden-Burisma influence-peddling scandal in return for military aid.

“Yet moving forward primarily or exclusively with the Ukraine controversy on this record would be as precarious as it would premature,” he testified.

“Although criminality is not required” for impeachment, [he said](#), “clarity is necessary. That comes from a complete and comprehensive record that eliminates exculpatory motivations or explanations. The problem is that this is an exceptionally narrow impeachment resting on the thinnest possible evidentiary record.”

“The record is facially insufficient,” he continued. “The problem is not simply that the record does not contain direct evidence of the President stating a quid pro quo.... The problem is that the House has not bothered to subpoena the key witnesses who would have such direct knowledge. This alone sets a dangerous precedent.”

Upshot: The problem with the case of the Democrats isn’t that Trump can’t be impeached, but that they haven’t proved their case.

Thus the hate-Trump Democrats have moved to quickly to impeach Trump.

The law professor also offered a list of the ridiculous grounds myriad Democrats have offered to remove the president, including Representative Al Green’s silly resolution after Trump called for the NFL to fire players who kneel during the National Anthem.

Even law professors who know better have offered spurious grounds for impeachment, including fundraising for senators. “CNN Legal Analyst Jeff Toobin declared, on the air, that Trump could be impeached solely on the basis of a tweet.”

[Turley said](#) a president cannot be impeached because the Democrats or anyone else is “mad.”

He closed his written testimony with a few lines from “[A Man For All Seasons](#),” Robert Bolt’s play about St. Thomas More, who told his son-in-law that even the Devil himself deserves the protection of the law.

So, Turley told the committee, does Trump.

*Photo: AP Images*

*R. Cort Kirkwood is a long-time contributor to The New American and a former newspaper editor.*



## 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.



[Subscribe](#)

### 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.