

# THE SOFT BIGOTRY OF EXPECTING THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF TO ONLY TWEET

Based on what source does the lawyer for Donald Trump – a client who never listened to security briefings when he used to be President – state (in an interview with Maggie Haberman, but not in his written defense) that the January 6 insurrectionists planned their attack in advance?

Mr. Schoen pointed to another potential argument that could help Mr. Trump, one not related to free speech: that at least some of the Trump supporters who stormed the Capitol planned their attack in advance, suggesting that Mr. Trump was not the inciting force.

“I have no reason to believe anyone involved with Trump was in the know,” he said of the violence that unfolded at the Capitol.

This defense doesn't help Doug Schoen as much as he thinks. After all, the House brief lays out how, even before the Proud Boys were overtly planning for the insurrection (and meeting with Lindsey Graham and finding a spot on a tour of the White House), Trump had called on the extremist group to

During a debate on September 29, for instance, he told the Proud Boys— a violent extremist group with ties to white nationalism—to “stand back and stand by.”<sup>48</sup>

[snip]

On January 2, for example, Fox News reported on a social media declaration by Proud Boys Leader Enrique Tarrio that

the Proud Boys would come to the January 6 rally prepared for violence.<sup>59</sup> Another Proud Boys organizer said, “We are going to smell like you, move like you, and look like you. The only thing we’ll do that’s us is think like us! Jan 6th is gonna be epic.”<sup>60</sup>

As someone who has spent much of the last four weeks tracking what is publicly known about the terrorist attack, anyone following closely enough to know how the Proud Boys, especially, plotted in advance also knows that Trump was coordinating with them going back months and his rat-fucker Roger Stone was coordinating with them even longer, also knows that the mobs breaking into the Capitol timed their move closely with (among other things) Trump’s speech, and knows as well that Trump and Rudy were both coordinating with events on the Hill using the mob as a delaying tactic.

But Schoen seems to be considering talking about what someone who refused briefing knew and did not know about an attack while he was still President.

I especially find Schoen’s certainty about what an ongoing investigation shows given a fairly remarkable passage in the House trial brief. There’s an 11-paragraph section describing, “President Trump’s Dereliction of Duty During the Attack.” The first describes how Trump watched in delight.

As armed insurrectionists breached the Capitol—and as Vice President Pence, the Congress, and the Capitol Police feared for their lives—President Trump was described by those around him as “borderline enthusiastic because it meant the certification was being derailed.”<sup>141</sup> Senior administration officials described President Trump as “delighted” and reported that he was “walking around the White House confused about why other people on his team

weren't as excited as he was as you had rioters pushing against Capitol Police trying to get into the building."142

But it's another five paragraphs before the House brief mentions that Trump was the Commander in Chief.

During this time, not only did President Trump fail to issue unequivocal statements ordering the insurrectionists to leave the Capitol; he also failed in his duties as Commander in Chief by not immediately taking action to protect Congress and the Capitol. This failure occurred despite multiple members of Congress, from both parties, including on national television, vehemently urging President Trump to take immediate action.

That is, the House brief focuses on what Trump did or didn't tweet, and what victims he never called (while calling Tommy Tuberville to coordinate his delaying tactics).

But it barely mentions that Trump sat in the White House watching an attack on the Nation's Capitol – one his lawyer now suggests he had some knowledge of – and he did literally nothing to intervene. True, there is a thoroughly unreliable Vanity Fair piece quoting Trump's flunkies claiming that Trump made preparations the night before. But that account doesn't match the known events, nor does it accord with the long delay in deploying the Guard troops.

In the middle of the impeachment case against Trump is a tacit admission not just that Trump did nothing as he watched a terrorist attack on the Capitol, but no one expected him to be able to do more than Tweet.

The former President's defense claims, with no proof, that he faithfully executed his duty to protect and defend the Constitution and served to the best of his ability.

To the contrary, at all times, Donald J. Trump fully and faithfully executed his duties as President of the United States, and at all times acted to the best of his ability to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, while never engaging in any high Crimes or Misdemeanors

[snip]

It is denied he betrayed his trust as President, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States. Rather, the 45th President of the United States performed admirably in his role as president, at all times doing what he thought was in the best interests of the American people. The 45th President believes and therefore avers that in the United States, the people choose their President, and that he was properly chosen in 2016 and sworn into office in 2017, serving his term to the best of his ability in comportment with his oath of office.

Perhaps that's right. But if that's true, it's a confession that when the nation's capital came under attack, Trump was helpless to do the least demanded of him as Commander in Chief.

Yes, the case against Trump is deeply rooted in his Tweets inciting terrorists and he should be impeached based just on those and his speech. But along the way, all sides seem to admit that Trump didn't even consider doing anything as Commander in Chief as the country was attacked.