

What Roman Mars Can Learn About Con Law Jan 6 and the Evidence Against Trump

Roman Mars [00:00:00] Just a note. A few hours after Elizabeth and I recorded this episode, The Washington Post reported that the Justice Department is, in fact, investigating Donald Trump's actions as part of its criminal probe of efforts to overturn the 2020 election results. In an interview that aired that same day, Attorney General Merrick Garland told NBC Nightly News, quote, "We intend to hold everyone, anyone who was criminally responsible for the events surrounding January 6th, for any attempt to interfere with the lawful transfer of power from one administration to another, accountable." So, we're recording on Tuesday, July 26th at 11:14 a.m., and what are we going to talk about today?

Elizabeth Joh [00:00:43] All right, Roman, let's go back to February 12th, 2021. And that was the third day of oral argument in Trump's second impeachment trial. Now, the House had passed one article of impeachment that accused Trump of incitement of insurrection. The Senate trial, of course, was accusing Trump, who is no longer president at that point, of provoking the January 6th attack on the Capitol. And Trump's defense team had been permitted to use up to 16 hours, but in the end, they used just three. And his lawyers focused on three points. First, that the second impeachment was just a political stunt to make sure that Trump would not run for a second term. Second, that Trump's big lie--that the election was stolen, that there was massive voter fraud--wasn't criminal incitement. Instead, everything Trump said--everything--was protected free speech. And third, that there was no proof that connected Trump to the attack on the Capitol. Now, of course, the Senate eventually acquitted Trump on February 13th, even with seven Senate Republicans who voted to convict--because you need a two thirds majority for a conviction. And Trump's second impeachment trial was very, very short--just five days. The members of the House who presented the case against Trump had shown graphic pictures and video about the violence of January 6th. Now, remember, the day started with Trump telling his supporters at the "Stop the Steal" rally that "We try to fight like hell, and if you don't fight like hell, you're not going to have a country anymore." But at the trial itself, there were no witnesses and several Republican senators said that they had made their mind up no matter what. But that wasn't the end of the investigation into what happened on January 6th. In June of 2021, the House established a bipartisan committee to uncover what it called "the facts, circumstances and causes relating to the January 6th, 2021 domestic terrorist attack." And Trump supporters in the House ended up having nothing to do with the committee. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi rejected two of the choices offered by House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy. And after that, McCarthy offered no other nominees. Instead, Pelosi appointed two Republican House members, Adam Kinzinger and Liz Cheney, and both of them had voted to impeach Trump for inciting the riot. And both were the only two Republican House members who voted to create the committee. Since then, the committee's team of investigators has interviewed more than a thousand people, and what the committee has found will eventually make its way into a formal report. But in the meantime, they have held public hearings--eight so far--to reveal their findings to the public. The decision of Trump's supporters in the House not to take part in any kind of investigation turns out to have been pivotal. These eight hearings have had no digressions, no whataboutisms, no "hey, look at me" speeches--just a flood of evidence delivered in testimony, video, and screenshots of texts and emails. And it turns out there is a lot we did not know before--a lot we didn't know at the time of the second impeachment. And according to Vice Chair Liz Cheney, more is coming. So, what have we learned from the January 6th committee hearings, and what does it mean for Trump? Time to find out.

Roman Mars [00:04:31] Let's do it. This is What Roman Mars Can Learn About Con Law--an ongoing series of indeterminate length, where we take the horrors of the modern world and our unprecedented times and use them to examine our Constitution like we never have before. Our music is from Doomtree Records. Our professor and neighbor is Elizabeth Joh. And I'm your fellow student and host--just trying to figure it all out--Roman Mars.

Elizabeth Joh [00:05:22] There is so much that's been revealed in the committee's eight hearings so far, Roman. I don't think we can go over everything in detail.

Roman Mars [00:05:29] I don't think so either. So, let's just hit some high points... Or low points, as it were.

Elizabeth Joh [00:05:33] Low points. But I think there's a way to think about their findings that's useful: by interpreting the January 6th attack on the Capitol in a way that would be most favorable to Trump. And so that version of events, I think, would go something like this. Trump knew that his supporters were enthusiastic, but Trump had no idea that they would engage in that level of violence, attacking police officers with flagpoles, baseball bats, pipes. And true, there's no doubt that the rioters interrupted the joint session of Congress that was meeting to certify Biden's victory. But this was just a political rally that really got out of control. And not only that, in Trump's best version of events, he really did believe that he had won the election. Of course, he lost. But that's what Trump genuinely believed. And that explains why he and his advisers filed multiple lawsuits, pressured state officials, and pressured the vice president to overturn the result. But what we've learned so far from the January 6th committee shows us that none of this is true. So, key figures in Trump's inner circle all testified that they didn't believe the election was stolen and that they told Trump that directly. So, for example, Attorney General Bill Barr testified that he told Trump that the claims about massive voter fraud were bullshit. But Trump's supporters believed it. And these claims of a rigged election--massive voter fraud--were used to raise \$250 million for an official election defense fund. That fund didn't really exist, and the money went to a political action fund. Then there was the pressure campaign on the vice president. Trump tried to convince Pence to declare victory for Trump at the joint session of Congress. And that was even though John Eastman, Trump's personal legal adviser, admitted in front of Trump that this plan was probably illegal. Rudy Giuliani, Trump's other legal adviser, also knew the plan was probably illegal. And in the end, Pence, of course, refused to take part in the plan--and Pence ended up fleeing for his life on January 6th. And his own Secret Service agents called their loved ones because they thought they might not be able to leave the Capitol alive. And then there was the fake elector scheme. Trump was personally involved in a plan to pressure local officials in key states to set aside the actual election results and recognize a slate of fake electors instead. I think a lot of people are familiar with the fact that Trump called the Georgia Secretary of State, Brad Raffensperger, himself, three days before the riot to see if Raffensperger could find enough votes to overturn the outcome in the state of Georgia. But in the fourth committee hearing, we learned that the plan was actually larger than that. Trump, Giuliani, and Trump's chief of staff, Mark Meadows, were also personally involved in pressuring Arizona House Speaker Rusty Bowers to try and help overturn Arizona's election's results, too. And then Trump leaned on his own Justice Department; he wanted to see if they could help him remain in power. But when Justice Department officials told Trump there wasn't any evidence of massive voter fraud, Trump said, "Just say the election is corrupt and leave the rest to me." And Trump planned and came very close to installing an environmental lawyer and a Trump yes man, Jeffrey Clarke, as acting attorney general--that's the top job--to do whatever Trump wanted at the Justice Department. And

then maybe one of the most shocking revelations during the hearings came from Cassidy Hutchinson. Hutchinson is a former White House aide to Mark Meadows, Trump's chief of staff, so she was there during a lot of these events. This is what she testified to: Trump personally knew that the crowd on January 6th was heavily armed, but with that knowledge, Trump demanded that security checkpoints at the rally be removed. Trump said, "I don't fucking care that they have weapons. They're not here to hurt me." Hutchinson also testified that Trump intended to be at the Capitol with his supporters and even got in some kind of a showdown with the security agents inside the presidential SUV because they didn't think it was a good idea to go there. But there was even more to the plan. Trump wanted the march to the Capitol to happen but wanted it to look spontaneous. There's even a draft tweet from his Twitter account. It said, "I will be making a big speech at 10 a.m. on January 6th at the Ellipse. Massive crowds expected. March to Capitol after. Stop the Steal." And this is in the context of his supporters watching everything Trump tweeted. Stephen Ayres participated in the January 6th attack. In fact, he has already pleaded guilty to criminal charges. But he testified before the committee that the crowd, including him, was just following what Trump said. And then there was Trump's deliberate inaction; during the 187 minutes between Trump's "Stop the Steal" rally and his tweeted speech to tell the rioters to go home, Trump sat in a dining room at the White House and watched TV coverage of the riot. His aides, Republican members of Congress, his family members all pleaded with him to do something. I mean, he was the president. He could have called the secretary of defense or anybody else in the military. But Trump chose to do nothing. So, for example, we learned that as the attack was happening, the Pentagon called the White House to coordinate a response. Eric Herschmann, who was an advisor to Trump, told Pat Cipollone, who was White House counsel, that the president didn't want to do anything. So, that's just some of what the hearings have revealed. And that version of events I just gave you that are most favorable to Trump--they're just not very plausible. There's never going to be a statement from Trump that says, "I intended to stop the certification by Congress, sent a mob of my supporters to the Capitol, knowing that they were armed, and also hatched a multipart scheme to overturn a legitimate election of Joe Biden." But most criminal cases don't have that kind of statement. But there is now an enormous amount of evidence suggesting that he did just that.

Roman Mars [00:12:17] I mean, now that they've presented all this--they've really presented a narrative to the American public about what happened--what's going to happen now?

Elizabeth Joh [00:12:26] Well, surprisingly, the committee has already said that they're going to continue to hold public hearings in September. So, that means there's more that they have uncovered and they're eventually going to release a report. So, this is a House committee; they have the power to subpoena, call witnesses, and things like that, but they can't actually start a criminal prosecution. The most they can do is recommend to the Justice Department that it pursue criminal charges. And that would mean recommending criminal charges against Trump possibly--who is now a private citizen--he's no longer president. But even that--that would be a very big deal because he is a former president.

Roman Mars [00:13:03] And what could they charge him with in this case?

Elizabeth Joh [00:13:07] Okay. So, at the moment, Trump is in a lot of legal trouble already. There is the financial fraud investigation of his business by the Manhattan DA. There's the financial fraud investigation of his business by the New York Attorney General. There's the state election interference investigation by the Fulton County, Georgia District Attorney's Office. There's a lot of other stuff already happening. But if the Justice

Department decided to do something, we'd be talking about a federal prosecution. So, let's focus on some potential federal crimes.

Roman Mars [00:13:39] Okay.

Elizabeth Joh [00:13:40] So, I think one thing--one potential crime--would be the felony of obstructing an official proceeding. So, this crime punishes anyone who corruptly obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding or attempts to do so. And for this crime, there are different parts or elements to the crime that need to be proven. First, that the person obstructed, influenced, or impeded. Second, be it in an official proceeding. And third, that the person did so corruptly. So, what's funny about this crime is that this is a federal criminal statute that Congress passed in response to the Enron corporate fraud scandal in the 2000s. But the language of the crime isn't limited to that kind of accounting fraud situation. And in fact, hundreds of January 6th rioters have actually been already charged with this specific crime; and usually these are the folks who are more involved in the serious and violent conduct compared to people who just happened to be illegally in the Capitol but didn't do more than take pictures or selfies or things like that.

Roman Mars [00:14:49] So, what evidence suggests that he's guilty of this crime?

Elizabeth Joh [00:14:54] Well, so, first you need an official proceeding, right? That's part of the crime. And even though it doesn't specify what's included, I think it's pretty clear that Congress meeting in a joint session to meet their constitutional responsibilities is an official proceeding. So, I don't think that's too difficult.

Roman Mars [00:15:12] It sounds officially to me.

Elizabeth Joh [00:15:14] That is right. Then you need the required conduct, right? You have to prove that there was some obstructing, or influencing, or impeding of that proceeding. And thanks to the committee's investigation, it appears that we now have a lot of evidence pointing to all the ways Trump tried to stop Congress from officially declaring that Biden had legitimately won the election. But then there's a trickier part. The law says that the defendant has to have acted corruptly.

Roman Mars [00:15:44] This is the one I find most curious--like, what counts as corruption in this case?

Elizabeth Joh [00:15:49] So, this one's not as obvious as the other parts of the crime. So, in general, under criminal law, you can't claim that you didn't know something was against the law. That's generally not a defense. But that's not exactly what "corruptly" means. And that word "corruptly" appears in a lot of other federal criminal statutes. And if we look at how courts have interpreted that word, this would require proving that Trump--or a hypothetical defendant--obstructed the joint session of Congress in a way that was blameworthy or wrong. In other words, did he have a wrongful purpose?

Roman Mars [00:16:24] So, what suggests that he acted corruptly?

Elizabeth Joh [00:16:27] Okay. So, remember, before the committee's public hearings, you might have said that, well, maybe this is difficult. I suppose there's a question as to whether Trump genuinely believed that he had won. If he did believe that he had won--of course that's not true, but maybe he believed that he won--it would have been harder--not impossible--but harder to argue that he had the appropriate corrupt intent. But eight

hearings later, we have so much in the live testimony and the taped interviews from his aides, Trump allies, White House officials, Justice Department officials that strongly, strongly suggest that Trump knew he lost but pushed people to lie about it anyway and took steps to try and stop Congress from certifying Biden's win. And even if the Justice Department were to be concerned--in a hypothetical prosecution--that they couldn't prove that Trump knew that the big lie was a lie, they actually have another tool. And that's a well-known criminal legal doctrine called "willful blindness."

Roman Mars [00:17:33] Okay. Tell me about willful blindness.

Elizabeth Joh [00:17:35] So, Roman, the helpful picture here for willful blindness is imagining the ostrich with its head in the sand, right? That's willful blindness. Willful blindness is when you personally believe that there's a high chance that something is true--like "I lost the presidential election"--but you take steps to avoid knowing it. So, when that happens, courts--including the Supreme Court--have said that you're just as criminally responsible as someone who actually knows, in other words, "I know I lost the election." So, this is an alternative tool for the government in a possible case against Trump--a criminal case--if they were concerned that maybe there might be some problems proving that Trump actually knew that his big lie was a lie.

Roman Mars [00:18:23] I mean, why does it matter that he believes it or not? I mean, if he, you know, was convinced that it was stolen or whatever and still contributed to something that was an act of domestic terrorism, why does it matter if he believes it or not?

Elizabeth Joh [00:18:38] That's a good question. And the reason why is because most crimes require not just that you do a bad thing or a wrongful thing but you have what the criminal law calls "the mental state"--the kind of blameworthy intent. So, if you have someone who's completely deluded, in a way, the criminal law says, "Well, you're just not as responsible as someone who knows you're doing a wrong thing and you want to go ahead and do it anyway."

Roman Mars [00:19:06] It just seems to be contrary to how we view terrorism, for example, which usually or often has an undergirding of religious conviction or political conviction that is--you know--fully felt but still leads to evil acts.

Elizabeth Joh [00:19:22] Yeah, I think that's right. I mean, in a way, that's a good contrast. But let's go back to the awful events of September 11th. And in those instances, we say that the person may have been motivated by some sincere religious belief, but they also clearly know that they are doing things that are going to lead to the potential deaths of dozens, hundreds, thousands of people. And I'm glad you raised that, because it also brings up the question related to Trump about, well, January 6th failed, right? I mean, Biden did become the president of the United States. So, what's the big deal? But, you know, if you look at 9/11 prosecutions, many of them involve prosecuting attempts. And the reason why that matters is to remind everybody that the criminal law takes attempt really seriously. It doesn't matter that you failed. What matters is that you have that blameworthy state of mind and then you took a step--a couple of steps, maybe inconsequential steps--but you're telling everybody that you're willing to engage in this really bad act.

Roman Mars [00:20:30] So, besides this obstructing an official act with a corrupt intent, what other crimes could he be accused of?

Elizabeth Joh [00:20:38] For Trump, there's the potential charge of conspiracy to defraud the United States. Now, this federal law makes it a crime for two or more people to conspire to defraud the government. So, a conspiracy is a criminal agreement. And from this description of the crime--defrauding the United States--maybe it sounds like a strange crime to talk about. But the Supreme Court has made it very clear that defrauding isn't limited to cheating the government out of money or property. It can also mean--and this is what the Supreme Court has said--that you can obstruct a government function by deceit, craft, or trickery or by means that are dishonest. So, in other words, if you interrupt a government function by dishonest means, that can amount to the crime of defrauding the United States. So, to convict someone for conspiracy to defraud the United States, you need to show that you've entered into an agreement to obstruct a lawful function of government--like counting the votes to certify the presidential election--by dishonest means, and you just need one act--even a relatively small one--to show that you wanted the conspiracy or that criminal agreement to go forward.

Roman Mars [00:21:51] Okay. And so how do you convict Trump of that?

Elizabeth Joh [00:21:56] Well, we heard a lot of testimony from the committee's hearings that outlined this multi-stage plan involving Trump, John Eastman, for example, and other Trump allies, where they planned to interfere with the certification process, pressured the vice president to declare Trump the winner, spread lies about election fraud, and pressured state officials to change the results of the elections in their states. And all of this was done with the aim of interfering with Congress's plan to certify Biden's win. And Trump, Eastman, and others almost certainly knew that this was illegal because people kept telling them that to their face.

Roman Mars [00:22:39] Okay.

Elizabeth Joh [00:22:41] So, that is a kind of similar crime, but a distinct one. So, it's possible that in a hypothetical prosecution against Trump, he might face that charge as well. And there's one more crime to talk about. And, Roman, I think you're curious about this one. It's possible that we could be talking about wire fraud.

Roman Mars [00:23:00] Oh, yes. I want to hear about wire fraud. Like, this has become the catchall way that you--you know--mount a federal prosecution, and I never really understood it. So, tell me about wire fraud.

Elizabeth Joh [00:23:13] Okay. So, wire fraud happens when you use a wire transmission over state lines to advance a fraudulent scheme. So, that can include using a phone, but it can also include using email, websites, social media, anything on the internet. Mail fraud is the same thing, just a different means; you're using the mail. And wire fraud and mail fraud--these two crimes--are really, really broad and they are a favorite tool of prosecutors. A prosecutor once famously said that when it comes to the federal mail and wire fraud statutes, they were like our Stradivarius, our Colt 45, our Louisville Slugger, and our true love. And the reason why is because if you're going to engage in a fraudulent scheme in today's world, you're not going to do it door to door, right? You're going to use the mail, or the phones, or the Internet. So, that's why it applies in so many different situations.

Roman Mars [00:24:12] So, how does wire fraud sort of apply to Trump in this case?

Elizabeth Joh [00:24:16] Well, at the end of the second committee hearing, we found out that Trump had raised something like \$250 million after the election to support something

called the "Official Election Defense Fund." But according to Trump aides who were interviewed by the committee's investigators, there really wasn't any fund like this, and most of the money went somewhere else. So, that sounds like a deceptive scheme; it deceived people into thinking they were sending money based on a lie--voter fraud. And it also deceived people because the money wasn't even going to any real election defense fund. Now, the details about this deceptive scheme aren't as developed in the public hearings compared to the case for obstructing an official proceeding or defrauding the United States. And we may find out more in a later hearing or in the report itself. But at a minimum, it's something clearly that the committee is interested in because there's a reason they brought up this money that kind of disappeared--it's unclear where it went. Now, there are some other criminal charges that might be involved in a criminal case against Trump. But the obstructing official proceeding and defrauding the United States--those are the ones, I think, that most clearly line up with the committee's public findings, and they're serious crimes with potential prison terms.

Roman Mars [00:25:34] When you watch the proceedings--and with what you know of these types of prosecutions--did you see them, like, lined up the way a prosecutor would? You know what I mean? Was it designed to funnel people's thinking into these specific crimes and charges?

Elizabeth Joh [00:25:54] You know, partially, yes. You know, we also don't really know what the Justice Department is doing on their own. But I think, in a way, what we're seeing here is the committee itself sort of presenting the case to the public as if we were all the jury watching the case unfold. So, I think that's been the really important aspect of it--just a very sober laying out of the facts, lots and lots of facts, corroborated in multiple different ways, and showing the public that this was not a one-off accusation, you know, not one person he said she said. There was so much in this multipart scheme that connected itself all the way to Trump.

Roman Mars [00:26:37] Yeah. Of course, the sort of, like, stopping of the proceeding of the certification of the vote is a big deal. But when I think about the Capitol insurrection, I really think about violence. If we say that Trump incited the riot, why can't we convict him of things related to the violence that happened?

Elizabeth Joh [00:26:58] Well, I mean, I certainly think that it's within the realm of possibility that Trump could be tied to the deaths and injuries that happened during January 6th. But, you know, the reason we're talking about these other two crimes--obstructing the official proceeding and the conspiracy to defraud the United States--you know, the evidence is much clearer to support those charges. And I think prosecutors kind of look at what is not just possible, but the more important decision is what is probable to secure a conviction. I think those two crimes come to mind; they're at the top of the list. There's a long line of possible crimes, but those are the two likeliest ones. And don't forget, I think that prosecutorial decisions--particularly what's going to happen in the case of a possible United States versus Donald J. Trump--you know, you have to think about the public reaction. And a charge of criminal homicide against the former president would be so politically sensational, I think it would be sort of toxic to bring up. And so, I think that plays a role as well. So, you know, a conviction is a conviction for the prosecution, right? And these two crimes themselves have serious prison terms. So, I think those are the kinds of factors that would be weighed.

Roman Mars [00:28:14] Yeah. This is like Al Capone getting convicted of tax evasion.

Elizabeth Joh [00:28:18] Yeah, something like that. Except Al Capone wasn't the former president of the United States.

Roman Mars [00:28:25] Well, only because he didn't set his mind to it.

Elizabeth Joh [00:28:27] That's right. Aim high. And that actually brings up another point, and that has to do with the Justice Department. Even if the January 6th committee decides to make a criminal referral that Trump ought to be prosecuted by the Justice Department, it's really up to Merrick Garland--the attorney general--whether to pursue that case. There's no precedent here to follow; we've never had the Justice Department of a sitting president indicting his defeated opponent, right? But even if Garland decides that Trump should be prosecuted, there's another question: not whether, but when? And here's the reason: If you're a federal prosecutor, you are not supposed to interfere in an election. It's been a long-held norm of the Justice Department, and it's been official policy across administrations, both Democrat and Republican. Now, different attorney generals have issued guidance memos here with virtually identical language. And that language says that federal prosecutors may never select the timing of investigative steps or criminal charges for the purpose of affecting any election or for the purpose of giving an advantage or disadvantage to any candidate or political party. And that guidance also tells federal prosecutors that they should seek guidance regarding the timing of charges or overt investigative steps near the time of a primary or general election. And Attorney General Garland issued his own version of this memo on May 25th, so it's still the policy of the Justice Department. And there's no better example of why this matters than the 2016 election. So, remember the emails--Hillary Clinton's emails--right?

Roman Mars [00:30:19] Yeah. Totally.

Elizabeth Joh [00:30:19] So, in the summer of 2015, we all found out that the FBI had opened a criminal investigation into Clinton's handling of classified information while she was Obama's secretary of state. And Clinton had already announced her run for White House in April of that year, right? And by July of 2016, FBI Director James Comey issued a statement. He said, "Well, there was some mishandling here, but we're not going to recommend criminal charges against Clinton." But in a way, the damage had already been done because, remember, Trump would not stop referring to that email situation, suggesting that there was something criminal there. And do you remember in July of 2016, Trump even asked, "Russia, if you're listening, I hope you find those emails." And then things got much, much worse because just 11 days before the 2016 election, Comey sent a letter to Congress saying, "Well, actually, we have some newly discovered emails that we think are relevant to the Clinton investigation." He doesn't provide any details, but it's shocking news. But then on November 6th, Comey says, "Never mind! We're not going to be doing anything further." The FBI had looked through these emails very quickly, and they were sticking by their conclusion that there should be no criminal case against Clinton. Did Comey's announcement influence the election outcome? I don't think we can know for sure, right? But it was certainly a factor in how people thought about who they were voting for. I'm not suggesting at all, of course, that using a private email account instead of your work email is anything like the seriousness in planning to interfere with Congress and overturning the results of a presidential election. But the timing issue is really an important one. You know, on the one hand, you have the sense that you don't want a Justice Department that appears to be influencing how an election is going to play out. On the other hand, you have the seriousness of what's going on. So, that's the dilemma for the Justice Department: timing. January 6th is clearly a case that was so shocking that it was an attempt to overturn the results of a legitimate election. It failed, but it might not fail a

second time. If the Justice Department decides Trump should be prosecuted, when should that happen? In 2023? Because presidential candidates usually announce that they're running the year before the election, and that would be next year. And Trump may see some advantage in announcing his run in 2022--this year. He might move up his announcement knowing that there's a potential prosecution against him. And an early Trump announcement would make it easy for Trump to say that any announcement of federal criminal charges were just a way to defeat him in the next election.

Roman Mars [00:33:10] Yeah. If the standard of it is interfering with a person, a candidate, or a party--when you have a two-party system and elections every two years--you're always going to be potentially accused of trying to influence some type of result in the election.

Elizabeth Joh [00:33:28] Sure. I think that's right. And keep in mind, the Justice Department policy is just a policy. It's not a law. You know, you can't sue them for doing it or not doing it. It's just a norm that we have. And the question is: Is Merrick Garland willing to break the norm? Is this the time to break the glass and say, okay, we're going to do it?

Roman Mars [00:33:47] Yeah. Thank you so much for talking us through it. I appreciate it.

Elizabeth Joh [00:33:52] Thanks, Roman.

Roman Mars [00:34:00] This show is produced by Elizabeth Joh, Jeyca Maldonado-Medina, and me, Roman Mars. You can find us online at learnconlaw.com. All the music in What Roman Mars Can Learn About Con Law is provided by Doomtree Records, the Midwest Hip Hop Collective. You can find out more about Doomtree Records, get merch, and learn about their monthly membership exclusives at doomtree.net. We are part of the Stitcher and SiriusXM podcast family.