



**H. J. Rogers**  
**Harvard Law School '66**  
**JUSTICE BETH WALKER SHOULD NOT BE**  
**CONVICTED BY THE WEST VIRGINIA SENATE !!!**  
 [No, Justice Walker should hanged at sunrise as a traitor to the people of West Virginia.]

As far as I can determine---and the world history section of the New Martinsville library is relatively sparse---the only other time in world history that an entire Supreme Court was removed was the German high court at Nuremberg after World War II. The recent dust up with the West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals is sad for its extreme pettiness. It would be one thing if they were selling pardons, e.g., (like Governor Barron did) or openly accepting favors from litigants the way that Justices Spike Maynard and "Buckeye" Benjamin did when they went awhoring after Don Blakenship. (Query: Whatever happened to the "Donster"? Did he join the Lost Boys in their peregrinations?)

[For those with short memories for political scandal, Blankenship took Spike and a couple chippies for a vacation on the Riveria while he had a case pending before the Court. "Buckeye" got elected in no small part by collateral expenditures by Blankenship and then refused to recuse himself from a case involving Blankenship. The U.S. Supreme Court called him on this one.]

There is one solid argument why all five justices be removed from office: THEY TREATED PUBLIC MONEY AS IF IT WERE THEIR OWN. The framers of our Constitution sought to insulate the Supreme Court from budgetary pressure coming from the Governor and/ or the Legislature, so our Constitution says that **WHATEVER BUDGET THE SUPREME COURT SUBMITS MUST BE ENACTED INTO LAW**. West Virginia is the only State in the Union that has such a provision in its Constitution. Thus, all matters of court financing was left to the sole and unfettered discretion of the Justices. The Legislature couldn't have changed it if they wanted to; The Governor had to sign whatever budgetary bill was presented. As I write this, Justices Menas Ketchem and Robin Jean Davis have resigned. Justices Allen Loughry and Margaret Workman, and Beth Walker--Walker was elected in 2016, besting, e.g. Darrell McGraw and "Buckeye" Benjamin--will be tried by the 34 members of the State Senate as this article goes to press. Basically, they were all pigs at the public trough, feasting on the swill. Justice Walker's main argument is that this systematic looting of the public treasury was well in place when she showed up in January of 2017. She just followed the famed dictum of the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Sam Rayburn: "TO GIT ALONG YOU GOT TO GO ALONG." Walker even offered to help the Legislature re-write the Constitution to change this section. (This shows Walker's last of understanding of constitutional law, better than the low "C" she got in class.)

**ERRANT NONSENSE !!!** This black-hearted couchon ran for the Supreme Court---using her husband's money---as the knowing puppet of the natural gas industry with the express intent of reversing a recent decision of the High Court which forced drillers to pay more in profits to the landowners. Simply put (which is the only way I can express it, since our outside masters and their native quislings, the well-paid handmaidens who perform the same functions for them that the "Judas goat" does in the stockyards, do all they can possibly do to complicate the situation), the bastards want TO DEDUCT PRODUCTION COSTS FROM THE ROYALTIES THEY AGREED TO PAY WHEN THE LAND AGENTS STARTED COMING AROUND NEARLY A DECADE AGO SIGNING PEOPLE UP TO THEIR LEASES.

Just a couple months into her term, this black-hearted couchon was able to talk the Chief Justice and an Associate Justice into pulling up the case from a few years before which held that the producers weren't allowed to deduct production costs. If there is any principle of the the law which is close to sacred it is STARE DECISIS which means that courts should abide by or adhere to decided cases. [For pedants, the whole phrase is STARE DECICIS ET NOT QUIETA MOVERE. For the benefit of those readers who didn't have the benefit of a Wetzel County education this translates as "To adhere to precedents and not unsettle things which are established."]

Now, I would give Beth Walker immunity from federal prosecution is she came clean about how she seduced these two legal hotshots---whose idea of a big scam was to cheat on their expense accounts---into joining with her to rob the people of West Virginia of maybe \$100,000,000 (or much more) over the years. And Walker gave this money to the hedge fund maestros, the speculators, the absentee landlords, et al., that have been the bane of our existence ever since the real wise guys learned how to profit from our natural resources in McDowell County in the latter part of the 19th century. By the way, one of them was "Black Jack" Bouvier, Jackie Kennedy's step-father. This came in handy when the Kennedy machine contacted Judge Sid Christie in Welch before the 1960 Democratic primary. Sid (who would become a federal judge) knew how to spend the Kennedy money effectively. By the way, Justice Loughry left this story out of the "scissors & paste" book about political corruption in West Virginia. [Al's gotten a bad rap off the feds---who doesn't with their theories of selective prosecution---so I'm really interested in the "whine" he'll make with the 2nd edition of his book.]

Beth Walker's husband had a veritable "shitload" [a highly technical legal term that, dear reader, you'll have to puzzle out on the own] of natural gas and energy stocks. [He reported "loaning" his wife \$525,000 during the campaign.] Then a day before the oral arguments to formally re-hear the the matter, Justice Walker announced that her husband had divested himself of stock in any company "engaged in the business of producing coal, oil and gas, wind or solar energy." That is, dear friends, the equivalent of locking the chicken coop after the fox is on the inside. Neither Justice Walker nor her significant other deigned to explain any other this.

At the very worst, the charges against the other justices amount to little more than petty larceny. **WHAT BETH WALKER DID IN THIS ONE CASE---AND WHO KNOWS WHAT OTHER CHICANERIES SHE PULLED OFF---WAS HIGHWAY ROBBERY!!!** I have no idea of how much she and her husband profited personally from this. We would need her tax returns to see how all of this was handled. **HOWEVER, THERE IS NO DISPUTING THAT SHE TOOK AND WILL CONTINUE TO TAKE MONEY FROM NATIVE WEST VIRGINIA LANDOWNERS AND TRANSFER IT OUT OF STATE CORPORATE INTERESTS.**

**THUS, BETH WALKER WILL GO DOWN AS THE BENEDICT ARNOLD OF WEST VIRGINIA. I DEFY ANYONE TO PROVE ME WRONG.** No single individual has done more harm to more people in the history of our State than Beth Walker. If only Woody Guthrie had the prescience to have been gender inclusive we could of sung his lyrics at Walker's wake: ". . . some men will rob you with a six gun/ and some with a fountain pen."

Unfortunately, after the State Senate draws and quarters Justice Loughry, I predict that their blood lust will abate and our Senators will end up giving a pass to Walker and Peggy Workman. What they did was arguably not illegal, one Senator told me. Of course, impeachment is not a legal matter but a political one. But as Wetzel County's greatest latter day savant, Tom Loehr, a lawyer, a CPA, a State Senator, and by the grace of Gaston Caperton, State Treasurer was wont to say: "TIME WILL TELL".

## SCOTUS NOMINEE THINKS IT'S OK TO 'DISAPPEAR' CITIZENS WHEN FIGHTING TERRORISM

On July 9, President Donald Trump nominated D.C. Circuit Court Judge Brett Kavanaugh to fill retiring Justice Anthony Kennedy's seat on the U.S. Supreme Court. Kavanaugh once served as a law clerk for Justice Kennedy, who reportedly recommended him to Trump as a suitable replacement. Libertarians would appreciate aspects of his judicial record, which leans toward constitutional originalism on most issues, but Kavanaugh also has a significant dark side. He's willing to sacrifice our most fundamental liberties in the name of fighting terrorism.

"Unfortunately, Brett Kavanaugh has a troubling track record of giving a pass to excesses in the war on terrorism," said Libertarian National Committee Chair Nicholas Sarwark. "It's good that he's a Second Amendment supporter, but it's unacceptable that he's also willing to suspend the Fourth and Fifth Amendments when he deems it necessary."

The Constitution and Bill of Rights shall not be suspended even during time of war.

When Amir Mohamed Meshal, a natural-born citizen of the United States, fled from Somalia's civil war into Kenya in 2007, he was captured by the U.S. Combined Joint Task Force. The American Civil Liberties Union complaint filed on his behalf claimed that Meshal was "interrogated more than thirty times by U.S. officials who failed to adhere to the most elementary requirements of the Fourth and Fifth Amendments and the Torture Victim Protection Act of 1991," and that "U.S. officials repeatedly threatened Mr. Meshal with torture, forced disappearance, and other serious harm." Kavanaugh wrote a concurring opinion in *Meshal v. Higginbotham*, which said that although Meshal's allegations were "quite troubling," he had no standing to pursue claims that his constitutional rights were violated because he was overseas when it happened, and part of a terrorism investigation.

"Matters touching on national security and foreign policy fall within an area of executive action where courts hesitate to intrude absent congressional authorization," wrote Judge Janice Rogers Brown in her decision, with which Kavanaugh concurred.

"If the Torture Victim Protection Act of 1991 does not constitute 'congressional authorization,' I don't know what would," Sarwark said.

So, although conservatives may appreciate Kavanaugh's vetting by the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation, and feel a sense of nostalgia that Reagan Attorney General Ed Meese was in the room during his nomination announcement, they shouldn't overlook Kavanaugh's disturbing evisceration of the Bill of Rights.

"We like Kavanaugh's skepticism about the administrative state," Sarwark said. "It's long past time to do away with the Chevron doctrine of deference to bureaucracies. We're concerned, though, that a judge who claims to believe in interpreting the Constitution as written has apparently not read the Fourth and Fifth Amendments. Before confirming Kavanaugh, senators should question him closely on the provisions of the Bill of Rights that were ignored in *Meshal v. Higginbotham*."

Libertarians are running a record number of candidates for local, state, and federal office in 2018, and Libertarian elected officials can be counted on to appoint judges who will be faithful to all the provisions of the Bill of Rights, all the time.

## Why are consumers going meatless?

A strong economy gives us the time and money to think about the ethical, environmental and moral implications of our food choices

By Sylvain Charlebois  
 Senior Fellow  
 Atlantic Institute for Market Studies

It seems the pleasure of eating is being overpowered by values-based food consumption. And it's happening at an astonishing pace. Vegetarianism and veganism are coming into their own, allowing more people to 'come out of the cupboard' to speak openly about and affirm their commitment to a self-imposed diet. They're doing it for animal welfare, the environment, health - whatever factor is deemed personally important.

But make no mistake, this trend is an indication that the economy is strong.

Human psychology shows us that consumers traditionally indulge, ironically perhaps, in times of uncertainty. Fear of food insecurity is very powerful. Consumers who lose their job, for example, often treat themselves to sweets and other unhealthy offerings, just to forget about their reality for a while.

But it appears that healthy eating habits are winning over indulgence. And once long-term food security is achieved, even if it's based on pure optics, many things can change.

The food security concept recognizes the importance of food quality in a general sense, including food safety, nutrition and health, as well as the experiential aspects of food shopping and consumption. This is likely where our economic cycle is now.

Years ago, food conversations were about flavours, tastes and traditions. Today, we talk more about morals and values linked to how we consume food, simply because we can afford to.

Stock markets are on a tear and the unemployment rate is nearing an all-time low. Food is not just about survival; it's about making a socio-economic statement as much as a moral one. At some social gatherings, people can be made to feel as though eating meat is a crime.

In the past, consumers recognized that they had limited ability to influence the choices they were offered. They doubted that even collective action would work to change those choices. And they made little connection between threats to global food supply and their daily consumption practices.

That's all changed, thanks to the abundance of free time we now enjoy.

Most of our time is spent looking at a screen of some sort. Technological advances, coupled with our pursuit of convenience, have given us a lot more time to think differently about food. Grocery shopping and cooking take less time than the pre-industrial practices of hunting and harvesting. And ready-to-eat food means we save even more time, which we can spend on developing a philosophical attitude toward food consumption.

Technology makes our lives simple, and with simplicity comes greater coherent thought and enhanced self-awareness as a consumer, particularly as a food consumer.

In response, the industry is adapting quickly. McDonald's is offering Big Macs without the meat and, according to some sources, the Beyond Meat Burger campaign at A&W is a great success. We've also seen changes in packaging and labels to appeal to the increasing number of consumers who are rejecting the status quo.

But it all really comes down to the state of the economy.

The unemployment rate is incredibly low, and according to human resources giant Morneau Shepell, salaries should go up by an average of 2.6 per cent over the next 12 months.

More money in consumers' pockets will allow them to believe they can trade up, or perhaps sideways, when making food choices.

Also enticing to consumers is a weaker than expected food inflation rate across the country. Food inflation remains more than one per cent lower than the general inflation rate.

However, grocers are indicating that prices will increase due to U.S. tariffs. While the rationale of raising prices due to tariffs is highly disputable, when grocers use financial updates to let consumers know prices may go up, it's a sign. Loblaw and Metro have done it and it wouldn't be surprising if Sobeys follows suit. Food inflation should reach 2.0 to 2.5 per cent by year's end.

But even with higher food prices, the buoyant economy allows more of us to think about the ethical, environmental and moral implications of our food choices.

And we can afford to - for now.