

We brag about the Bill of Rights—the first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution—declared in force on the 15th of December, 1791. Over the past 233 plus years, these amendments have been the bedrock underlying our rights. Article IV reads as follows: “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but on probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.”

How can it be that a woman in Oklahoma City who recently moved from Maryland with her daughters was forced from her home out into the rain in the middle of the night, without time even to dress, and have her computer, phone, money, and papers removed by people claiming to be agents of the U.S. government? How can there be any scenario in which this is legal, ethical, or acceptable? Yet, this is what happened in our country. As it turned out, the law enforcement officials from Kristy Noem’s Department of Homeland Security—thugs would be a more fitting designation—were there to arrest?, question?, detain?, someone who had lived in the house previously. As far as I have been able to read, the family pushed out into the rain in the middle of the night still have not had their possessions returned to them. So, the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution means nothing to the Trump Administration.

But, wait—maybe it was just Article IV that they consider invalid. I wonder how they feel about the next amendment, Article V: “No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any Criminal Case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”

Here, the situation for Trump and his gang of thieves and grifters becomes very murky, indeed. This amendment makes it clear that no person shall “be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” It is pretty clear that immigrants or whoever else might be grabbed in the law enforcement raids are being deported without time or opportunity to have a hearing in a

court. So, it must be that Trump is opposed to the Fifth Amendment, too.

Oh, but there's that other part of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution—the part about not being compelled to bear witness against oneself—commonly referred to as “I take the Fifth.” Trump himself invoked the Fifth Amendment 450 times, Eric Trump 500 times, Roger Stone answered with the 5th to every question from the January 6th Committee in a 90 minute deposition. Attorneys John Eastman and Jeffrey Clark, far right radio host Alex Jones—they all invoked the Fifth in questioning from the January 6th Committee.

So, do Trump and his crowd respect and follow the dictates of the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution? Guess it depends on which part will benefit them.