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Mailbag

Truth in history

You won't find a single statue in Germany honoring the Nazis. But the Germans haven't erased their history, forgotten their past or failed to learn from it. Instead, they have found a way to learn from a horrific and shameful chapter without glorifying or romanticizing it.

Every German student spends part of every school year studying Nazi Germany and the Holocaust, and must visit at least one concentration camp before graduating from high school.

Germany's treatment of its painful history shows the falsity of the current argument posed by some in the United States (including President Trump) that the removal of Confederate statues and the lowering of the Confederate flag would erase our history.

Statues don't teach us history. A statue of Robert E. Lee on horseback, looking gallant, doesn't teach anything about the Civil War. It romanticizes and idolizes it.

Flying the Confederate flag teaches nothing about the system it represented, or the human toll it took.

Let's teach our children the truth about our history, without any romantic veneer.

And let's lower that flag and take down those statues.

MALIA EDEL
Concord

Norms, law and the impeachment power

T he Path of the Law, written in 1897 by then-Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., is one of the most important essays in American legal history.

Originally delivered as an address to law students at the dedication of a new building at Boston University Law School, and later published in the Harvard Law Review, The Path of the Law cautioned students who wished to understand the true nature of law against confusing it with moral norms.

Moral norms might lead a person to conclude, for example, that one should honor one's agreements. But the law of contracts does not. If it is in a person's economic interest to violate contract A in order to enter into a more lucrative contract B, the law usually poses no barrier.

Keeping law and moral norms conceptually separate can be a tricky business because the law is peppered with lots of moral jargon, and is frequently misunderstood as a body of principles that mark the line between right and wrong.

To differentiate law from mere norms, Holmes famously argued, one must look at it from the perspective of a "bad man, who cares only for the material consequences which ... knowledge (of the law) enables him to predict."

So understood, law consists of
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A Little Perspective

VIPIN NARANG, WRITING IN THE WASHINGTON POST: "Yes, Kim Jong Un (pictured) is a brutal and a conscienceless opportunist who lacked even the most rudimentary knowledge of the basics of government. Oh, and a miscreant who bragged about greasing women.

Now we also know that Trump has the self-control of a 2-year-old, can take three different sides of an issue in as many days and has no interest - not a scintilla - in learning even how this government he runs works.

He's curdling international alliances of long duration, alienating allies, encouraging enemies, and creating a general sense of untrustworthiness and unpredictability. His Cabinet and sub-Cabinet appointees happily dismantle as much of the government as they can.

Most disgracefully, he also shows no qualms about making the presidency, with its perks, power and prerogatives, just another
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NHsnapshot


Jimmy Carter meets Lloyd Roble during Carter's 1976 campaign for president in Hooksett. Roble's country store was a fixture on the campaign trail for presidential primary hopefuls. When Carter stopped in for coffee and a doughnut, Roble was one of the first to hear the line, "Hi, I'm Jimmy Carter and I'm running for president."

NHwayback

SEE DEMOCRATS D3
The scope of the Democratic defeat requires a new humility

**DEMOCRATS FROM D1**

history of feeding at the same corporate trough as the Republicans. It has been very hard to know what Democrats stand for. The Hillary Clinton campaign was the absolute embodiment of this approach. The belief was that it was enough to be anti-Trump because he was so uniquely disgusting.

The Hillary campaign slogan was “Stronger Together.” That has to be the apogee of meaningless. Let me offer a suggestion: The Democrats must be the party of progressive change— not a status quo party. We already have one conservative party, the Republicans. Democrats need to provide a stark contrast to the Republicans. Clintonian triangulation is not a progressive vision of the future.

One of the most maddening aspects of the last election was Trump's ability to seize the mantle of being a change agent. The Democrats mistakenly ceded that territory because they were caught up in defending the progress made under President Obama. In touting the status quo, the Democrats utterly misread the public and its anxieties.

Even though Trump is a fraud and a pathological liar, he had the political horse sense to know people were hurting badly. Siding with “forgotten” Americans was smart politics. The Clinton campaign lost touch with the public mood at the same time it played it safe. While he did not win, Bernie Sanders had a much more accurate read on the public. His populist message attacking Big Money did strike a nerve. He showed the possibility of running without reliance on millionaires and billionaires. His millennial support grew, in part, because of his awareness of crushing student loan debt and the need to address that.

Democrats need to learn from what was positive about the Sanders campaign. The America Sanders described was much closer to the mark than Clinton's take. The Democrats' continuing cluelessness about the reasons for Sanders's popularity is sad. Maybe they should not be so ready to dismiss the candidate who has the highest approval rating of any politician in the country.

I know this will be unpopular to say but, along with Hillary Clinton, I blame President Obama for the Democratic defeat. Obama bailed out banks more than working people. His justice department even prosecuted the white-collar criminals who crashed the economy. Nor did he do much to help the 5 million people who lost their homes to foreclosure.

During the 2016 election campaign, President Obama and Secretary Clinton emphasized all the economic progress made. They praised the recovery made from the recession, saving 15 million jobs had been created.

The problem is this narrative did not ring true to millions of working people. It includes small cities, towns, and rural America. The Democrats need a respectful and compelling message that can appeal nationally. Too often, to the rest of America, the Democrats look like an economically ascendant coastal elite, disconnected from working-class people.

Message to the Democrats: Not everybody went to Harvard and Yale. If they want to win, the Democrats need to totally overhaul their present leadership. It needs to be said: The leadership has failed. It does not denigrate past leaders like the Clintons or Pelosi to acknowledge that they are the past. It is time for a new generation of Democratic leaders who can make a fresh start. Whatever the merits of past leaders, they all have too much baggage, and they are heavily implicated in the wave of Democratic defeats leading to the Trump debacle.

The Democrats need to stop pretending they can simply repackaging their failed policies. Those policies never seriously challenged income inequality. The scope of Democratic defeat requires a new humility. Considering all the defeats, there may be nothing more ridiculous and obnoxious than self-righteous posturing by progressives. I hope the party advances in a more progressive direction, but the party must have no litmus tests and it should be welcoming to a wide range of divergent views.

I believe the Democrats can turn it around. But, without self-critical evaluation of their mistakes, they could very well repeat them.

(John Blair Baird of Wilmut works at the Social Security Administration. His column reflects his own views and not those of his employer.)
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**CONSTITUTION FROM D1**

"nothing more pretentious" than "the prophecies of what the courts will do in fact." Law is, in other words, nothing more or less than that which actually will lead to adverse consequences if you violate it.

During his campaign and since assuming office, President Donald J. Trump has on numerous occasions acted in ways that many Americans regard as inconsistent with norms we expect the president to observe.

He has, among other things, suggested that a federal judge of Mexican ancestry was biased against him because of that ancestry. He attacked the integrity of judges who ruled against his administration in lawsuits challenging his "travel bans," profited off of the presidency and appointed inexperienced family members to key government posts.

He also has criticized foreign allies, cozied up to foreign adversaries, leveled baseless accusations against former President Barack Obama, fired an FBI director who was investigating whether persons affiliated with his presidential campaign colluded with Russia to interfere in last year's election, and pardoned a former county sheriff who was prosecuted by his own Justice Department and convicted of showing a criminal contempt for the borders of a federal court.

But do any of these norm-violations raise the possibility of adverse consequences that could transform them into violations of "law" under Holmes's definition? In considering this question, note that the president is both privileged and specially encumbered in comparison to Holmes's hypothetical "bad man." In other words, the "law" applicable to the president differs from the law applicable to ordinary civilians.

Insofar as the adverse consequence essential for a principle to be a law (under Holmes's definition) is an adverse court judgment, the president is privileged vis-à-vis civilians.

Most experts believe that, while a president can be criminally prosecuted after leaving office, he cannot be prosecuted while he is president. And while the president may be sued civilly while holding office, the office confers powerful immunities and other constitutional defenses that are unavailable to ordinary civilian defendants.

But insofar as the question is whether mere norm-violations can ground official adverse consequences, the president is specially encumbered vis-à-vis civilians.

The Constitution gives Congress the power to impeach and remove the president for "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." Obviously, conduct constituting a violation of a statute can fall within this constitutional definition.

But experts agree that Congress also may exercise the impeachment-and-removal power for conduct that falls short of being a direct statutory violation— for example, conduct that "merely" violates the president's oath to "faithfully execute the Office of the President of the United States," or to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

So where do things stand with President Trump? Has he violated "law" in a manner that warrants the adverse consequence of impeachment and removal from office?

A special counsel is investigating whether members of the Trump campaign colluded with Russians to meddle in the 2016 election, and whether the firing of FBI director James Comey — who was investigating the same question — constitutes an obstruction of justice. And at least one state prosecutor is also said to be investigating persons close to the president for criminal conduct.

If these investigations yield evidence that convinces Congress that the president has committed one or more serious crimes, the president clearly can be impeached and removed from office on that basis.

But even if no direct violation of a statute is shown, Congress may still impeach the president and remove him from office for repeatedly, serious and persistent violation of presidential norms.

Thus, there is "law" governing the president's conduct that is different from the law governing the rest of us.

In a very real sense, the judgment of Congress regarding the norms of the presidency also can constitute "law" that the president must observe — at least insofar as Congress is prepared to act against a president who violates those norms.

(John Greabe teaches constitutional law and related subjects at the University of New Hampshire School of Law. He also serves on the board of trustees of the New Hampshire Institute for Civics Education.)