


January 6 case against Trump already unraveling

 cnav.news/2023/08/03/editorial/talk/january-6-case-against-trump-already-unraveling/

By Terry A. Hurlbut

August 3, 2023



Less than twenty-four hours after a D.C. grand jury returned an indictment against Donald J. Trump over his role (such as it was) in the January 6 Event, the case already began to unravel. In a previously unaired Tucker Carlson interview, the then-Capitol Police Chief accused higher authorities of covering up. Furthermore, a new firebrand primary candidate for Attorney General of Missouri has offered his devastating analysis of the latest indictment.

The January 6 police chief speaks

Yesterday afternoon *The National Pulse* reported on an interview Tucker Carlson recorded with Steven Sund, after the January 6 Event. Sund told Carlson that Rep. Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), as Speaker of the House, did not act appropriately that day. Neither did Joint Chiefs Chairman Mark Milley, who knew what could happen on Capitol Hill and did not tell Sund. Nineteen minutes into the interview, Sund said the January 6 event “didn’t have to happen.” And if Pelosi and Milley had let him “do [his] job as ... Chief,” it wouldn’t have.

 **EXCLUSIVE:** Capitol Police Chief Called Jan 6 Events ‘A Cover Up’ in Tucker Carlson Interview HIDDEN By Fox News  <https://t.co/ddUdqnbmEZ>

— Trump War Room (@TrumpWarRoom) August 2, 2023

Sund has written a book, *Courage Under Fire: Under Siege and Outnumbered 58 to 1 on January 6*. It is available from Blackstone Publishing wherever books and audio books are available for sale.

Sund told Carlson he suspected a cover-up. He cited “watered-down intelligence,” such as it was, that he had from the military. He also cited lack of National Guard support, both when he asked for it ahead of time and 71 minutes into the event itself. Carlson asked whether he really meant to suggest that Pelosi and Milley were hiding intelligence from Sun. *And he effectively confirmed it*, by speculating that perhaps they “wanted something to happen.”

The public is hearing about this for the first time, because Fox News hid the footage. How the *Pulse* got hold of it, they won’t say – but they blamed Fox News for hiding it. The *Pulse* promised more revelations – including the role of Ray Epps as *agent provocateur*.

Meet Will Scharf

The next great revelation comes from Will Scharf, now a Republican primary candidate for Attorney General of Missouri. Eric Schmitt had been Attorney General in May of 2022 when he, his Louisiana counterpart, and four other plaintiffs sued the government over its censorship campaign. (*Missouri v. Biden*, in the U.S. District Court for western Louisiana, and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.) Last Midterms, Schmitt won election to the Senate, replacing the retiring Roy Blunt. Andrew Bailey became Interim Attorney General in January as Schmitt entered the Senate.

But some in Missouri consider Bailey too moderate for their taste. So they have prevailed upon Will Scharf to challenge him, according to *The Riverfront Times*. “There’s a big difference between Republicans and conservatives,” Scharf told the outlet. “We have a lot of Republicans in the state of Missouri, but we have many fewer true conservative warriors.” Of which he professes to be one, pledging to “take on the establishment” in the election campaign to come.

On Tuesday night, in front of a large and rowdy crowd of supporters, we kicked off our campaign for AG.

“I’ve put hardened criminals in prison, and constitutional conservatives on the Supreme Court. My name is Will Scharf, and I’m running to be your next Attorney General.”

pic.twitter.com/gBmYrPbOYo

— Will Scharf (@willscharf) February 2, 2023

Scharf became famous for this thread, describing his experiences prosecuting violent crime in St. Louis:

Things I learned working as an Assistant US Attorney prosecuting violent crime in St Louis, America's murder capital:

1/11 pic.twitter.com/60umot6nEy.

— Will Scharf (@willscharf) [November 23, 2022](#)

Would you chase an armed bad guy (or two or three) down a dark alley in the middle of the night with no backup?

Would you run through a door knowing that someone could be waiting to shoot you on the other side?

Police officers do regularly.

3/11

— Will Scharf (@willscharf) [November 23, 2022](#)

Fentanyl is killing far more people even than is being reported. There is no heroin left in St Louis. It's all fentanyl, and it's all deadly. And dealers are regularly lacing cocaine and other drugs with the stuff

We need to close the border, and we need to confront China.

5/11

— Will Scharf (@willscharf) [November 23, 2022](#)

Prisons are not full of "nonviolent drug offenders."

The drug trade is totally suffused with violence and threats of violence. Violence is a necessary tool of the drug trade.

And selling fentanyl is violence in and of itself. It's monetizing someone's deadly addiction.

7/11

— Will Scharf (@willscharf) [November 23, 2022](#)

Which leads to my next point:

Crime is highly Pareto efficient—a very small number of criminals commit almost all the crime, especially violent crime.

Each shooter you take off the streets, each dealer, each thug means likely dozens of fewer felony offenses per year.

9/11

— Will Scharf (@willscharf) [November 23, 2022](#)

I could go on in this vein for a while. I'm incredibly grateful to have had the opportunity to work in an outstanding US Attorney's Office, and to support the efforts of truly outstanding law enforcement officers.

Go thank a cop. Seriously.

Any questions?

11/11

— Will Scharf (@willscharf) [November 23, 2022](#)

He wrote about drug abuse – both methamphetamine and fentanyl – the danger and stress of policing, and the need for all three components of the justice system (police, prosecutors, and judges) to work together. Furthermore, he refuted the notion that “the prisons are full of violent offenders.” A small number of offenders, he said, commit most of the crime.

Scharf addresses the indictment

Upon hearing the news of the indictment of Donald Trump, Scharf took it upon himself to read it. When he had finished, he published this very long-form post, instead of a thread.

My Take on the New Trump Indictment

Special Counsel Jack Smith's new indictment against President Trump seeks to criminalize political speech and to criminalize taking incorrect legal advice. Americans of all political stripes should be furious and deeply concerned by the course...

— Will Scharf (@willscharf) [August 2, 2023](#)

He concluded that none of the four charges against Trump would be provable “beyond a reasonable doubt.” Not, that is, “in front of a fair judge and jury.” Furthermore, he predicted that the Supreme Court, were the case to come before them for review, would *disallow* Special Counsel Jack Smith’s “theories of liability” on the criminal counts. In discussing the suspicious timing of the case, Scharf held that the Senate had already tried Trump “for the same offense conduct,” and acquitted him. This raises a question of not only the First Amendment but the *Fifth* Amendment. Which reads in relevant part:

| No person ... shall ... be subject, for the same offense, to be twice put in jeopardy...

Scharf’s main problem with this case is the assessment of Trump’s state of mind. The special counsel is asserting that not only were the claims of election fraud false, but Trump *knew that*. But Trump consistently argued the *truth* of the allegations, and *never* argued anything else. Nor did he ever concede, despite what Smith or anyone else might infer.

Scharf ended by using the phrase “banana republic politics” to describe the prosecution of a political opponent of the administration.

Another January 6 show trial

In sum, this case starts to look like one of many show trials over the January 6 event. That goes double because we’re talking about someone who was still President at the time.

Mr. Scharf’s suspicions of the timing of Trump’s case go to Trump being not only an opposition candidate but a winning candidate. He might have mentioned another ground: that this indictment dropped directly after some sensational revelations about the President’s adult son.

In any event, the revelations of the last twenty-four hours include much material that Trump’s legal team could use. If they don’t get an outright acquittal, they could get a remand for a new trial. But even worse than that, has been the tendency even of legacy media organs to *withhold evidence* vital to the conduct of the defense, not only of Trump but of many persons who entered the Capitol that day.