

Impeachment

Impeachable Offenses:

- Repeatedly soliciting and welcoming foreign election interference
 - Won the election with Russian help that he solicited and welcomed
 - Mueller report
 - “Russia if you’re listening...” The Russians began their hacking operation on that same day
 - “If it’s what you say, I love it especially later in the summer”
 - Publicly lying about having no Russian contacts when he and his campaign had well over 100 known contacts with Russians
 - <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/01/26/us/politics/trump-contacts-russians-wikileaks.html>
 - Solicited Ukrainian interference by using extortion and bribery to compel a public investigation into his political opponents based on false pretenses
 - Requested that China investigate his political opponent
 - Admitted he would accept foreign help in the future
- Felony campaign finance violations that contributed to his narrow win
 - Hush money paid to porn stars Stormy Daniels and Karen MacDougal was hidden from the public and the FEC, rather than reported as the law requires, preventing this negative information from becoming public and influencing voters to disfavor him in the election
 - Trump was named by the SDNY as an unindicted co-conspirator, referred to as “Individual 1” in the federal indictment of his personal lawyer, Michael Cohen, for this exact crime- a crime for which Cohen is currently serving a 3-year sentence in federal prison. The only reason Trump was not indicted along with Cohen is that Trump is the president and DOJ follows the advice of the OLC memo written by the Nixon administration, which opines that the president is immune from federal indictment.
- Using inauguration funds corruptly
 - <https://www.thedailybeast.com/federal-prosecutors-investigating-trump-in-augural-fund-report>
- Emoluments clause violations
 - Accepting money and acclaim from foreign officials staying at his properties
 - Attempting to hold the G7 at his property
 - Accepting foreign donations to his inauguration fund

- <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/13/us/politics/trump-inauguration-investigation.html>
- Obstructed justice at least 10 times trying to interfere with Mueller's investigation
- Obstructed justice in the inquiry relating to his conduct with Ukraine
 - Instructed subordinates not to testify
 - False claims of executive privilege
 - False claims of attorney-client privilege
 - Hiding evidence by abusing code-word classification system
 - Materially altering 7/25/19 call transcript by removing incriminating portions
- Perjury
 - Mueller testified that Trump was not truthful in his written testimony
 - Roger Stone was convicted for lying to Congress when he denied communications with Trump about his efforts to get dirt on Hillary from Wikileaks - contacts that Trump while under oath also denied recalling
- Suborning perjury
 - Implicitly communicated to Michael Cohen that he should lie to Congress
- Breaking oath of office
- Corruption and graft
 - Rerouting military and government travel to stay at his properties
 - Scam university - Trump paid \$25 million to settle a lawsuit for defrauding students
 - Scam charity - Trump paid \$2 million penalty and admitted misusing veterans' charity funds for his personal benefit (helping his political campaign, buying a portrait of himself, paying settlements for defrauding people at his golf club, buying a Tim Tebow helmet, etc.), his scam charity was shut down and he was forbidden from operating another charity in NY and his children who were on the board were required to go through training
 - Defrauding other charities
 - Mar-a-Lago membership rates doubled when he became president
 - Security clearances for family and cronies who represent natsec threats
 - Uses his office to promote and advertise his and his family's businesses
- Persistent lying to the public
- Flagrantly abusing power
 - Requesting that officials falsify records to benefit him politically
 - Selectively enforces environmental law against CA
 - Selectively enforces antitrust law against CNN

- Intervened to cause Amazon to lose a federal contract
- Needlessly and cruelly separating families
- Degrading crucial institutions and the rule of law
- Mental and emotional incompetence
- Inciting racism, violence, and division
- Undermining US military, diplomatic, and economic objectives
- Extortion and bribery
 - Ukraine
 - NY DA Cy Vance
 - FL DA Pam Bondi
- Abusing classification systems for political gain
- Disloyalty to America
 - Offering aid and comfort to America's adversaries
 - Russia - see "Trump's Actions That Benefit Russia at America's Expense"
 - North Korea
 - Canceling SK war games at KJU's request
 - Legitimizing NK by giving meetings with no pre-conditions or requirement that NK denuclearize
 - Granting massive diplomatic and military concessions to NK in exchange for nothing
 - Turkey
 - Betraying the Kurds to be slaughtered by Turkey
 - Apologizing to Erdogan when Erdogan ordered his bodyguards to assault US citizens to punish them for protesting. This happened TWICE and they even attacked US law enforcement and Secret Service agents
 - Considering handing over US resident Fetullah Gulen (Erdogan's scapegoat for the supposed "coup attempt" he used as an excuse to purge and execute his political rivals)
 - Saudi Arabia
 - Defending SA for butchering US resident and Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi
 - Disparaging and betraying American allies and elevating brutal dictators
 - Damaging America's soft power
 - Damaging America's reliability
 - Damaging America's alliances
 - Attacks on the First Amendment and the press
 - Attacks on the integrity of democratic systems

Ukraine Scandal Overview:

- Overview
 - Trump requested that Ukraine announce investigations into Joe Biden and the “Crowdstrike” conspiracy theory, both of which have been thoroughly debunked and have no basis in reality, and he conditioned a White House meeting and vital military aid he was required to provide on this announcement. This request only benefited himself, not the US.
 - **Trump requested a “thing of value” from a foreign entity that only personally benefited himself. This is likely a campaign finance crime.** It is a thing of value because Trump could use the investigation announcement to help him win the election by citing it as proof of his opponent’s (and the democrats’) wrongdoing, and it was requested from a foreign entity (the government of Ukraine).
 - FEC Chairperson Ellen Weintraub confirmed through multiple public statements that a request like this violates campaign finance law: “[T]he law is pretty clear. ... It is absolutely illegal for anyone to solicit, accept, or receive anything of value from a foreign national in connection with any election in the United States.”
<https://www.vox.com/2019/10/4/20898491/trump-foreign-solicitation-ukraine-china-fec-ellen-weintraub>
 - These investigations had no value whatsoever to the United States, because the allegations are all plainly false, and the investigation is only a smear campaign meant to influence the election
 - **Trump offered a White House meeting in exchange for the announcement. This is likely bribery** because he is offering to do an official act in exchange for a personal favor. He even called the investigation announcement a “favor.”
 - **Trump withheld military aid that Congress required to be given to Ukraine, and he told Ukraine through intermediaries that they could only receive the aid if they made the announcements he wanted. This is likely extortion** because he endangered Ukraine by withholding aid they desperately needed to survive Russia’s attacks in order to coerce them into making the announcement he wanted.
 - He only released the aid AFTER he got caught and Congress had announced investigations into the matter.
 - He moved the record of the 7/25 call (and other calls as well) onto the secure server to hide the evidence of his crimes. This coverup is itself a crime, as it misuses the classification system which may not be used to conceal embarrassing or incriminating information.

- **The president conditioning US help on something from another country is only bad if that something doesn't help the US and only helps the president.** Here, the investigation announcements were a personal favor to Trump meant to interfere in the election to help him win, and they had no value whatsoever to America, since the basis of the investigations are proven lies.
- The only defense Trump has is that 1) announcing investigations into the Democrats for supposedly helping Ukraine hack them and framing Russia for it (and then hiding Hillary's emails on a server in Ukraine), so they could *lose the election* just to later make Trump look bad, and 2) announcing investigations into Joe Biden for replacing the corrupt prosecutor who was taking bribes to protect the company Hunter worked for, with one who would actually investigate wrongdoing (which occurred BEFORE Hunter started working there) together are somehow in the interests of the US and only happen to benefit Trump incidentally.
- And that it was not only in our interest to get those announcements from Ukraine, but that it was MORE important than helping our Ukrainian allies fight back against our mutual adversary, Russia, which had recently *invaded* them and continues to kill their people in their own homeland on a daily basis!
- We are supposed to believe that Trump, the most corrupt president since Harding, was just *that* concerned about corruption in Ukraine, and that his concern *just so happened* to manifest as a request to investigate democrats and help exonerate Russia, and investigate Joe Biden, the front runner among his presidential race opponents, having shown no interest whatsoever investigating any other corruption, in Ukraine or anywhere else in the world.
- It's completely insulting and I don't understand why they love to prove how much they love the taste of boot by publicly debasing themselves when they claim to believe such rubbish.
- Cast
 - **Volodymir Zelensky** - new president of Ukraine, elected on an anti-corruption platform
 - **Kurt Volker** - US Special Representative for Ukraine Negotiations and part of Trump's backchannel to pressure Ukraine announce investigations into his political opponents
 - **Gordon Sondland** - \$1M Trump donor, ambassador to the EU, told Ukraine the aid was conditioned on the investigation announcements
 - **Rick Perry** - US Sec. of Energy, part of backchannel to Ukraine

- **Andriy Yermak** - Aide to Zelensky who was told about the conditions on the aid
- **Marie Yovanovitch** - original US ambassador to Ukraine who was removed after a dishonest smear campaign carried out by Giuliani, Parnas, and Fruman (as well as some Ukrainians) in order to clear the way for Trump's backchannel
- **Bill Taylor** - Acting US ambassador to Ukraine who replaced Yovanovitch
- **George Kent** - US Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs
- **Alexander Vindman** - Lt. Col. who was on the 7/25 Trump-Zelensky call
- **John Eisenberg** - ordered the 7/25 call record moved to the secure server after Lt. Col. Vindman raised concerns about its legality with him
- **Rudy Giuliani** - Personal attorney to Trump who was spearheading the Ukraine backchannel
- **Igor Fruman** - Associate of Giuliani who was assisting with backchannel communications and smear campaign against Yovanovitch, recently indicted for campaign finance violations, conspiracy, and making false statements
- **Lev Parnas** - Associate of Giuliani who was assisting with backchannel communications and smear campaign against Yovanovitch, recently indicted for campaign finance violations, conspiracy, and making false statements
- **Burisma** - Company whose owner **Zlochevsky** committed money laundering crimes before Hunter Biden joined the board
- **Viktor Shokin** - Corrupt former Prosecutor General for Ukraine who refused to investigate or prosecute corrupt companies like Burisma, who was removed for that reason after Joe Biden, with the full support of the entire Western world, applied pressure as he was required to do to carry out his job and fulfill official US policy.
- **Yuriy Lutsenko** - Prosecutor General who replaced Shokin before Zelensky's election, also corrupt
- **Oleksander Danyliuk** - Ukraine's NatSec advisor who told Bill Taylor that Zelensky was concerned about becoming a tool used in US domestic politics
- Ukraine timeline
 - **The alleged wrongdoing at the Ukrainian company Burisma occurred BEFORE Hunter Biden was hired.** Joe Biden, with the support of the US government and the entire western world, pressured Ukraine to fire the corrupt prosecutor (Shokin) because he wasn't doing enough to fight

corruption- in fact, Shokin was the one who BLOCKED the investigation into that company, and Joe Biden wanted him out because of that. **Biden's actions, which had bipartisan and international support, made it MORE likely his son would be investigated.** If Biden were protecting his son, why would he try to get rid of the prosecutor who blocked the investigation of his son's company and insist that Ukraine hire someone else who would actually crack down on corruption? And why would the rest of the western world support Biden corruptly protecting his son? Anyway, how would his son even need protection when he joined the company AFTER all the alleged wrongdoing took place?

- **February 2014** - UK authorities request info from Ukraine re a probe against Zlochevsky related to money laundering allegations.
- **April 2014** - Hunter Biden joins board of Zlochevsky's company, Burisma.
- Sometime after the UK request, Ukrainian prosecutors, Shokin, opened their own case, but Shokin and others weren't pursuing it.
- **December 2014** - US officials warned of negative consequences if Ukraine failed to assist UK.
- **2015** - UK released Zlochevsky's frozen assets because of lack of info from Ukraine.
- **February 2015** - Shokin becomes Prosecutor General and is later criticized by the US and IMF, among others, for not doing enough to fight corruption.
- **September 2015** - US Ambassador to Ukraine, Geoffrey Pyatt, criticized Shokin and others for subverting UK investigation.
- (Shokin took no action re cases against Zlochevsky throughout all of 2015)
- **February 2016** - Kasko, Shokin's deputy, resigned "citing corruption and lawlessness in the Prosecutor General's office."
- **March 2016** - Biden, with the support of other world leaders, threatens to withhold \$1 billion in US loan guarantees if Ukraine didn't dismiss Shokin, "who had been accused of turning a blind eye to corruption in his own office and among the political elite."
 - <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-05-07/timeline-in-ukraine-probe-casts-doubt-on-giuliani-s-biden-claim>
- **March 2016** - Shokin replaced by Lutsenko as PG (who was also corrupt) after massive public protests demanding his dismissal
- **May 2019** - Zelensky sworn in as new president on an anti-corruption platform
- **May 2019** - Yovanovitch removed as Ukraine ambassador; Taylor takes over her duties

- **June 2019** - DoD announces military aid to Ukraine, as authorized by Congress
- **July 18, 2019** - OMB official tells NSC that Trump put a hold on the Ukraine aid
- **July 25, 2019** - Call between Trump & Zelensky where Trump requests the investigations in response to Z's comment about the military aid ("I want you to do me a favor though")
- **July 25, 2019** - Vindman, who was on the call, immediately raises concerns with WH lawyer Eisenberg, who instead of investigating potential wrongdoing, had the call record moved to a secure server
- **July 26, 2019** - Volker visits Kyiv and meets with "President Zelenskyy and a variety of Ukrainian political figures" and provides "advice to the Ukrainian leadership about how to 'navigate' the demands that the [U.S.] President [Trump] had made of Mr. Zelensky," -WB complaint
- **August 2, 2019** - Giuliani meets w. Yermak to follow up on call, and "strongly urged" Yermak to "just investigate the darn things." -Giuliani to NYT
- **August 12, 2019** - Whistleblower files complaint
- **August 26, 2019** - IC IG Atkinson deems WB complaint urgent & credible, and instructs DNI to forward it to Congress within 7 days
- **August 29, 2019** - Riaboshapka replaces Lutsenko as PG
- **September 1, 2019** - Sondland tells Yermak that "resumption of U.S. aid would likely not occur until Ukraine provided the public anti-corruption statement that we had been discussing for many weeks." -Sondland testimony, 11/4/19
- **September 9, 2019** - IC IG Atkinson tells Congress he received an urgent and credible WB complaint and sent it to DNI but Acting Director Maguire did not forward it to Congress as required. Three House committees announce investigations into whether Trump and Giuliani tried to pressure Ukraine into conducting "politically-motivated investigations under the guise of anti-corruption activity."
- **September 11, 2019** - Trump removes hold on Ukraine aid (the night before a Senate Appropriations hearing to consider an amendment forcing the release of the aid) - two days AFTER Congress becomes aware of WB complaint and announces investigations into the matter
- **September 26, 2019** - Whistleblower complaint released to the public

- Call record excerpts
 - “I want you to do us a favor though... I would like you to find out what happened with this whole situation with Ukraine, they say CrowdStrike... The server, they say Ukraine has it.”
 - Matches Putin’s position and contradicts all US intel on the matter: “Second, as we all know, during the presidential campaign in the United States, the Ukrainian government adopted a unilateral position in favor of one candidate. More than that, certain oligarchs, certainly with the approval of the political leadership, funded this candidate, or female candidate, to be more precise.” -Vladimir Putin, 2/2/17.
 - “She’s [Yovanovitch] going to go through some things.”
 - "I heard you had a prosecutor [Shokin] who was very good and he was shut down and that’s really unfair. A lot of people are talking about that, the way they shut your very good prosecutor down and you had some very bad people involved."
 - “There’s a lot of talk about Biden’s son, that Biden stopped the prosecution and a lot of people want to find out about that so whatever you can do with the Attorney General would be great. Biden went around bragging that he stopped the prosecution so if you can look into it... It sounds horrible to me.”
- Key text messages
 - [7/19/19, 7:01:22 PM] Kurt Volker: Good. Had breakfast with Rudy this morning—teeing up call w Yermak Monday. Must have helped. Most imp’t is for Zelensky to say that he will help investigation—and address any specific personnel issues—if there are any`
 - [7/25/19, 8:36:45 AM] Kurt Volker: Good lunch - thanks. Heard from White House—assuming President Z convinces trump he will investigate / “get to the bottom of what happened” in 2016, we will nail down date for visit to Washington. Good luck! See you tomorrow- kurt
 - Here Volker explains that their most important goal is for president Z to announce the investigation into the Bidens
 - [8/9/19, 5: 35:53 PM] Gordon Sondland: Morrison ready to get dates as soon as Yermak confirms.
 - [8/9/19, 5: 46:21 PM] Kurt Volker: Excellent!! How did you sway him? :)
 - [8/9/19, 5: 47:34 PM] Gordon Sondland: Not sure i did. I think potus really wants the deliverable
 - The "deliverable" here is the announcement of the investigation that the meeting is conditioned on.

- [8/9/19, 11:27 AM] Kurt Volker: Hi Mr Mayor! Had a good chat with Yermak last night. He was pleased with your phone call. Mentioned Z making a statement. Can we all get on the phone to make sure I advise Z correctly as to what he should be saying? Want to make sure we get this done right. Thanks!
- [8/10/ 19, 5:42:10 PM] Andrey Yermak: Once we have a date, will call for a press briefing, announcing upcoming visit and outlining vision for the reboot of US-UKRAINE relationship, including among other things Burisma and election meddling in investigations
 - Ukraine agrees to demand for investigation announcement
- [8/10/19, 5:42:30 PM] Kurt Volker: Sounds great!
- [8/13/19] Kurt Volker: We intend to initiate and complete a transparent and unbiased investigation of all available facts and episodes, including those involving Burisma and the 2016 U.S. elections, which in turn will prevent the recurrence of this problem in the future.
- Sondland: Perfect. Lets send to Andrey after our call.
 - Volker sends draft language of Z's statement to Sondland
- [9/1/19, 12:08:57 PM] Bill Taylor: Are we now saying that security assistance and WH meeting are conditioned on investigations?
- [9/1/19, 12:42:29 PM] Gordon Sondland: Call me
- [9/9/19, 12:47:11 AM] Bill Taylor: As I said on the phone, I think it's crazy to withhold security assistance for help with a political campaign.
 - [Sondland calls Trump before answering. He testified to Congress that Trump told him to say the following, and he has no idea if it was true]
- [9/9/19, 5:19:35 AM] Gordon Sondland: Bill, I believe you are incorrect about President Trump's intentions. The President has been crystal clear no quid pro quo's of any kind. The President is trying to evaluate whether Ukraine is truly going to adopt the transparency and reforms that President Zelensky promised during his campaign I suggest we stop the back and forth by text If you still have concerns I recommend you give Lisa Kenna or S a call to discuss them directly. Thanks
- Absurd defenses
 - Constantly changing
 - It didn't happen
 - It did happen but there was no quid pro quo
 - There was a quid pro quo but it was appropriate
 - There was an inappropriate quid pro quo but it is not an impeachable offense

- He got caught before he could complete the crime, so it doesn't count. "Attempted extortion isn't a crime."
- Crime is actually good and normal
- WB talked to one of Schiff's aides so we should end the investigation
- Democrats did [insert random Mueller-related conspiracy theory] so we should end the investigation
- Trump is actually genuinely concerned about corruption and his request benefited US interests. It's just a coincidence that the only 2 investigations he requested were into his political opponents and based on debunked right wing conspiracy theories and Russian propaganda.
- Anyone who speaks out against Trump is a secret democrat, "Never Trumper," or part of the "Deep State"
 - Taylor, Kent, & Yovanovitch are all non-partisan, career diplomats who served under both Democrats and Republicans, and Vindman is a career, non-partisan military officer with an unblemished record
 - Sondland donated \$1 million to Trump
 - All of them were hand picked by Trump
- Process:
 - Claiming that the impeachment inquiry should immediately end, merely because Democrats began with closed door hearings in order to prevent coordination of testimony, as is customary for all investigations, including impeachment investigations
 - Purposely breaking rules, such as yielding time to other members during initial 45 minutes, so that they can make a big deal about how unfair the process is when the rules are enforced
- Attacks on the whistleblower
 - WB is irrelevant now that other testimony and WH admissions have corroborated all the relevant facts
 - Like trying to end a murder prosecution and ignore the gun, the bloody fingerprints, the confession, and the 7 eyewitness accounts, because the person who called 911 might have personally disliked the suspect
 - False 'fruit of the poisonous tree' analogy (WB & IC IG followed procedure exactly and numerous people came forward)
 - Attempt to incite violence and intimidate future whistleblowers
- Confessing the crime
 - The call memo released by Trump contains explicit evidence of the illegal request for election interference and the quid pro quo

- Mulvaney admitted on national TV that there was a quid pro quo
- Giuliani admitted that his work getting Ukraine to investigate Democrats was done specifically to help Trump personally, not to advance legitimate US government interests:
 - “With all the Fake News let me make it clear that everything I did was to discover evidence to defend my client against false charges. [Democrats] would be horrified by the attacks on me, if my client was a terrorist. But they don’t believe [President Donald Trump] has rights,” Giuliani tweeted.
 - And Trump told Ukraine President Zelensky to work with Giuliani on these matters.
 - “This merely confirms what was so outrageous: Giuliani wasn’t a representative or employee of the United States; his duty of loyalty was 100% to his (personal capacity) client. And yet Trump told Ukraine it had to dance to Rudy’s tune – a tune designed to advance Trump’s personal interests– in order to remain in the U.S.’s good graces (e.g., to secure access, aid, etc.),” wrote Georgetown University Law Center Professor Marty Lederman, an expert in constitutional law and national security law, and former Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice’s Office of Legal Counsel. “This is the highest of high crimes—using the leverage of his position as chief diplomat to advance his own interests—and it’s hard to imagine anything more inconsistent w/Trump’s constitutional oath & duty and more revealing of his utter unfitness for office. And that’d be true *even if there were no quid pro quo* (but of course there was, which makes it all the worse).”
 - <https://lawandcrime.com/high-profile/constitutional-law-professor-in-a-single-tweet-rudy-giuliani-admitted-to-the-highest-of-high-crimes/>

Testimony:

- Republican arguments completely avoid addressing the factual allegations and instead try to refocus the inquiry on the whistleblower and the democrats’ conduct relating to the Mueller investigation, or manufacture fake process grievances
- BILL TAYLOR
 - Explains how there were 2 diplomatic channels, one regular (him) and one irregular (Giuliani/Perry/Volker/Sondland/Mulvaney/Johnson), and points

- out how the goals of the irregular channel directly opposed US interests - namely supporting Ukraine's fight against Russian aggression
- White House meeting with Zelensky was conditioned on Ukraine conducting investigations into Burisma and alleged Ukrainian interference in the 2016 US elections, a condition driven by the irregular channel
 - Morrison told Taylor that Sondland told Yermak (Zelensky's assistant) that the aid would not come until committed to pursue the Burisma investigation
 - Sondland told Taylor that Trump said he wanted Zelensky to announce an investigation into Burisma and alleged Ukrainian election interference. In addition, not only was the meeting conditioned on this announcement, but "everything" (including the aid) was. Trump wanted Zelensky "in a public box," meaning that it was not sufficient to conduct the investigations in private; Zelensky needed to make a public announcement.
 - Taylor has never seen aid conditioned in such a way in 50 years of public and diplomatic service
 - Sondland described to Taylor a "stalemate" if Zelensky did not clear things up in public, meaning that there would be no security assistance unless the investigations were announced.
 - Morrison also told Taylor that the aid was conditioned on the investigation announcements.
 - Ukraine was concerned about receiving the aid. Ukraine also agreed to and was preparing to make the requested investigation announcements on CNN
 - In a meeting when Sondland began (in the presence of Ukrainian officials) discussing conditioning the WH meeting on the investigation announcements, Bolton shut down the meeting, saying he wanted nothing to do with their "drug deal" and that they should report the meeting to their lawyers
 - Sondland told Taylor that Trump is a businessman and businessmen, when they are about to write a check, expect the recipient who owes them something to pay up first, meaning that Ukraine must announce investigations in order to receive military aid. Trump felt "wronged" by Ukraine
 - Ukraine's NatSec advisor Danyliuk told Taylor that Zelensky was concerned about becoming a tool used in US domestic politics

- If the US support of Ukraine wavered, Ukraine would be weaker in negotiations with Russia and in the military conflict with Russia, and Russia would likely press this advantage in both arenas
- WH excluded most of the normal State Dep't personnel from the 7/25 call
- Can't rule out the possibility that irregular channels are being used in other countries
- GEORGE KENT
 - WH meeting was crucial for Zelensky because he was newly elected and needed the boost in leverage w. Putin that full US cooperation would provide
 - Asking for such political investigations hurts our national interest because promoting rule of law in Ukraine and moving away from selective political investigations is part of overcoming the legacy of communism
 - Giuliani said that the draft of the desired statement from Ukraine would not be acceptable unless it mentioned Biden/Burisma and 2016.
 - The requested investigations were not on any list of desired reforms and went against US policy and would have undermined the rule of law and our longstanding policy goals in Ukraine
 - Investigating political opponents is a legacy of the soviet era and those prosecutors are instruments of oppression
 - Requests for investigations into political rivals makes it more difficult for diplomats to carry out US policy of advancing American values
 - Giuliani was not promoting US interests with his actions in Ukraine, but rather the president's personal political interests
 - The US did not receive aid until 2 days after the whistleblower complaint was made
- MARIE YOVANOVITCH
 - Lutshenko, Shokin, Giuliani, & DJT Jr. spread lies about her until Trump eventually removed her as ambassador to Ukraine, to clear the way for the irregular channel to enact Trump's private Ukraine policy
 - Sec. of State Pompeo wouldn't issue statement of support out of fear that Trump would undermine it
 - Giuliani sought to get Shokin a visa after it was denied for corruption
 - The method of her removal undermines US policy because it signals to other countries that when a diplomat does something they don't like, they can just spread false information to get them removed
 - Allegations by Lutsenko that she had a "do not prosecute" list were false and recanted by Lutsenko

- Biden's efforts to remove Shokin were part of official US policy as well as the policy of the international Western community
- Replacing a corrupt prosecutor who refused to investigate companies like Burisma with one who would crack down on them made it more likely Hunter would be investigated, not less likely
- Trump's words made her feel threatened ("She's going to go through some things")
- The smear campaign was not just to remove her, since Trump could do so at his discretion; it was to shift the narrative and the balance of power back in favor of the pro-corruption forces in Ukraine

Strategic Considerations:

- Should the articles impeachment focus narrowly on the Ukraine scandal or more broadly include all impeachable offenses?
 - Why a narrow impeachment is better than broad one
 - Staying ahead of the spin - The impeachment inquiry into Ukraine has been successful so far because the developments have been occurring too rapidly for dishonest actors to spin and misrepresent, for the most part. A slower process, like the Mueller investigation was, would allow enough time to deceive the public and acclimate them to the undeniable facts, depriving the Ukraine scandal of its shock value.
 - Chance of removal - If there is any chance of removing the president, it can only be done with a narrow inquiry. Senate Republicans will only vote to remove if doing so is more likely to help them win reelection than an acquittal vote would. Right or wrong, the public has already had time to make up their minds about the Mueller report and Trump's other impeachable offenses. The Ukraine scandal has been the only thing so far that has caused any significant shift in views on impeachment in the voter base of Senate Republicans. Broadening the inquiry could reverse this shift by bringing in offenses that these voters have already excused and by creating the impression that the "witch hunt" accusations are true. Also, if Trump is removed, it's better to remove him sooner (via shorter and narrower impeachment) than later (via a sprawling and broad impeachment).
 - Appearance of impartiality - Impeaching Trump now for offenses that occurred years ago, after declining to do so when those offenses were discovered, gives the impression that the

impeachment is being carried out not to pursue justice but to benefit the Democrats politically. After all, if these offenses really were impeachable, why didn't the Democrats impeach him when they found out about them? Why wait years to impeach for those offenses unless they were deliberately timing the impeachment to coincide with the 2020 campaign season? Focusing only on the Ukraine scandal lends credence to the impression that the Democrats' hands were forced and that they are doing this reluctantly.

- Consistency - For better or worse, many democrats made public statements opposing impeachment before the Ukraine scandal became public. Keeping the inquiry narrowly focused on Ukraine allows them to change their views based on the new Ukraine-related facts, rather than having to explain why they opposed impeaching Trump for obstructing the Mueller investigation 6 months ago, but now support impeaching him for that reason.
- Simplicity - The Ukraine scandal is recent, simple, and plainly inappropriate, even to the average voter with no legal background. It takes no sophistication to understand what happened or why it was wrong. There is also less disinformation about it than some of Trump's other impeachable offenses. By contrast, the Mueller report is over 400 pages, and it spans a huge cast of characters and complex legal issues, like what makes someone a foreign agent, or what type of corrupt mindset is required to sustain an obstruction of justice charge. Including other offenses, like those described in Mueller's report, reintroduces that confusion and disinformation, and could reduce the support for impeachment by people who did not support impeachment based on Mueller's report but do support it based on the Ukraine scandal.
- Why a broad impeachment is better than a narrow one
 - Precedent - A broad impeachment sets a precedent that all of Trump's offenses are unacceptable and worthy of impeachment. A narrow impeachment sets a precedent that all of Trump's offenses, with the exception of his extortion of Ukraine, are not grounds for impeachment. A future president could accept foreign emoluments, obstruct justice, request foreign election interference, and as long as he did not also extort that foreign country for the interference, assert that he cannot be impeached for any of it, since the House

already determined here that such behavior does not merit impeachment.

- Elections - Since it is vanishingly unlikely that the Senate will remove Trump, there are only 2 remaining benefits to impeachment: 1) it is a well-deserved mark of shame that will be included in all historical records of his presidency, and 2) it will help Democrats win elections in 2020 and beyond. A short inquiry will be over well before the 2020 election, and the daily avalanche of shocking, scandalous, and bizarre news that has become the new normal will have buried the facts of Trump's impeachable and criminal behavior in the minds of the voters. Impeachment hearings capture the attention of the nation and seize the narrative from Trump. They are one of the few ways to get people to pay attention to the many crimes he has been committing, so they are too useful to dispense with so quickly. Dragging out the hearings all the way until the election will keep the story of Trump's crimes in the headlines until people vote, eroding his support. Impeaching Trump for all of his crimes also requires Senate Republicans who vote to acquit to go on record approving of Trump's behavior, which can then be used against them by their election opponents.
- Should the House use its power of inherent contempt to enforce its subpoenas if the DOJ declines to enforce them?
 - Pros:
 - Obtaining necessary testimony and documents
 - Reestablishes authority lost when the president's associates and appointees defy subpoenas without repercussion
 - Encourages future compliance
 - Prevents permanent, precedential loss of congressional power
 - Cons:
 - Extreme measure to be used only if absolutely necessary as a last resort
 - Escalation into a more violent, authoritarian atmosphere
 - Bad optics to imprison political opponents
 - Enhances division and civil unrest
 - Could provide a precedent for future pretextual arrests
 - Plays into the "coup" narrative
 - Could take a long time to resolve in the courts if the witnesses seek judicial intervention
- Should the Senate change its rules to make the removal vote secret?

- Pros:
 - Likelier chance of removing Trump
- Cons:
 - Inability to hold Senators accountable for their votes
 - Protects Senate Republicans from going on record. Voting to remove would alienate their Trump supporting base; voting to acquit would alienate the rest of their base. They need the support of both groups to win reelection, and keeping the removal vote secret would allow them to avoid alienating either group the way that a public vote inevitably would
 - Could result in Republicans keeping the Senate in 2020
 - If Trump is removed, Pence will become the president, and he's nearly as bad, but generates less opposition. Voting against Trump is an excellent motivator to get people to the polls. If Trump were removed, people might become complacent and stay home. Even if Trump loses in 2020, reduced voter turnout will cause Democrats to lose important down-ballot races, like the Senate.
 - Losing the anti-Trump motivation and giving Republicans an advantage in the Senate race may not be worth having a slightly better president for a few months.
 - Acquitting Trump via a secret ballot allows Republicans to have their cake (avoid removing a Republican president) and eat it too (avoid being held accountable for voting to excuse outrageous criminal behavior)