Twitter Thread by alexandriabrown, Darth Sugartits

alexandriabrown, Darth Sugartits
@alexthechick

Let's chat about the McCarthy article and why I state that he cannot maintain a consistent position within the article. Let's look at this:



INSURRECTION: The Causation Problem
On the matter of insurrection, the question of causation is even more problematic.

President Trump should have been mindful that his rabble-rousing could lead to violence. But what he wanted (inappropriately) was a political demonstration outside the Capitol, in which thousands of people would chant, "Stop the steal," "Fight for Trump," and similar blather. He did not want them to storm the building. He did not want people to be killed and injured.

What he wanted was to intimidate Pence and lawmakers with the size and zeal of the Trump-supporting crowd. He wanted Republicans to see his followers as a political force to be reckoned with, one that would subject the "RINOs" (redefined as any Republican who does not blindly tow the Trump line) to future primary challenges and political opposition if they did not agree to overturn the election result based on unproven allegations of election fraud and rigging.

All of that is despicable and impeachable. Still, it does not mean Trump *caused* an insurrection — even assuming, for argument's sake, that what happened is properly labeled an "insurrection."

CAN THERE BE A CONSENSUS IMPEACHMENT?
If what the Democrats truly want is bipartisan consensus in the service of national security, rather than political combat, the articles of impeachment they plan to file should charge the president with (a) subversion of the Constitution's electoral process, particularly the Twelfth Amendment counting of the sovereign states' electoral votes; (b) recklessly encouraging a raucous political demonstration that foreseeably devolved into a violent storming of the seat of our government; and (c) depraved indifference to the welfare of the vice president, Congress, security personnel, and other Americans who were in and around the Capitol on January 6.

That would be an accurate description of impeachable offenses. It would not disintegrate into legal wrangling over incitement, insurrection, and causation.

In the space of a few paragraphs, he goes from He did not want them to storm the building. He did not want people to be killed and injured to reckless encouragement and depraved indifference. McCarthy is stating that Trump did not and then did have mens rea as is convenient.

Not only is that intellectually inconsistent, it's outright insulting that McCarthy thinks we will not remember what we read not a few seconds before. Not to mention that McCarthy said this at the beginning of the article:

> Make no mistake, what the president did was reprehensible. It cannot be gainsaid that he recklessly stoked a throng of people, including some mob elements, with rhetoric about the election's being stolen and the purported need to take back the country. But he also made statements about wanting peace and being against violence; and he would plausibly say that he meant the rhetoric about taking back the country in a political sense, not a forcible sense.
>
> Proof of recklessness is not sufficient for a criminal incitement conviction. There has to be specific intent to cause violent crime.

From one SENTENCE to the next McCarthy said it cannot be gainsaid and then immediately he gains the say. I will grudgingly give McCarthy credit for at least gesturing towards a good faith interpretation of Trump's words. But McCarthy's position fails immediately by his own words.

Now, back to the first bit. There is nothing inappropriate about a political demonstration outside the Capitol. Nothing at all. The elision here between people demonstrating outside vs those who broke inside is more vile because of his attempt to deny he's doing it.

The claim is that Trump's actions were impeachable because it led to violence by those who broke into the Capitol. His reference to (inappropriately) at the Capitol is yet another attempt to claim that all those at the rally were acting improperly. He just, poorly, insinuates it.

Either state that everyone attending the rally acted inappropriately or don't. Be an adult and state what you mean, don't try to be sly and then wide eyed that's not what I typed when called out. It's childish and, again, insulting of the intelligence of those reading the piece.

And then there's the truly nasty bit. What is reprehensible and impeachable about citizens gathering to protest what they see is a wrong? What is so awful about primary challenges and political opposition to those people see as failing to act in a manner they deem important?

Read what McCarthy wrote very closely. His position, to the extent any coherent through line can be determined, is that Trump had an opinion as to how the claims of electoral improprieties should be handled and he asked supporters to rally about that. Bad things happened IMPEACH.

Look, I may not be the best person on the Pence gambit because I took one look at what people were saying, rolled my eyes, and then ignored it. But just because I found the position ludicrous does not mean I think it is the Worst. Thing. Evah. I do not think it's subversion.

I think it is a position which is wrong and not supported by the text of the Constitution. Others disagree. That's fine. Those people are, in fact, allowed to rally to express that view. It's not impeachable to advocate for an incorrect view. And it is

assuredly not subversion.

That whole piece boils down to bad things happened at the Whatever and Trump had the rally and Trump is bad and stupid and his supporters have no right to support him or to make their support known and how dare they attempt to influence people impppeeeeeaaacccchhh.

It is not a serious article. It is not a serious position. And it is not presented in anything approaching an intellectually coherent manner. Orange Man Bad did things I think are Bad so Orange Man should go away is more honest than that drivel.
assume corgi here