

Of Fantasies, Scissors and Smoking Strings

IS THE “IMPERIAL PRESIDENCY” ABOUT TO BE TAKEN DOWN?

by Joseph DeMaio, ©2014

Articles of Impeachment

 3420  760  5  6

This is the full text of the Articles of Impeachment adopted by House Judiciary Committee on July 27, 1974.

- [Analysis of the Judiciary Committee Votes by Party](#)

Article 1

RESOLVED, That Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanours, and that the following articles of impeachment to be exhibited to the Senate:

ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT EXHIBITED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE NAME OF ITSELF AND OF ALL OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AGAINST RICHARD M. NIXON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT OF ITS IMPEACHMENT AGAINST HIM FOR HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANOURS.

ARTICLE 1

In his conduct of the office of President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has prevented, obstructed, and impeded the administration of justice, in that:

On June 17, 1972, and prior thereto, agents of the Committee for the Re-election of the President committed unlawful entry of the headquarters of the Democratic

If Nixon warranted impeachment in 1974, what do Barack Hussein Obama’s actions warrant today?

(Jun. 6, 2014) — Where to start... where to start?

Heeding the advice of an old law school professor, begin at the end with what you would want a Supreme Court opinion to state as it validates your position, then hypothesize backward from there to what your initial claim would be. While the Supreme Court would not be involved in issuing an opinion, the Chief Justice would be involved in the proceedings.

Under that approach, the House would vote Articles of Impeachment, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court would preside over the impeachment trial by the Senate, resulting in

the conviction and removal from office of Barack Hussein Obama for, at minimum, fraud, forgery and usurpation of the office of the president and, at maximum, treason. The fact that Joe Biden (or Speaker of the House John Boehner, if Biden were also disqualified) would then become president, while lamentable, would need to be considered unavoidable, but necessary “collateral damage.”

In addition, a subsequent, separate Supreme Court opinion would declare each and all of Mr. Obama’s actions while usurping the office to have been void *ab initio*, Latin for “from the get-go.” Those void – not “voidable” or discretionary – invalidations of actions would include the nominations of Justices Sotomayor and Kagan. The decision would also in the process overrule any prior decisions suggesting his legitimacy as a *de facto* occupant of the office, despite The New York Times’ gushing approval and ratification of the usurpation.

Justice Sotomayor would author the opinion and Justice Kagan would separately concur, with both jurists resigning and stepping down at the end of the day when the opinion was issued, thereby confirming their placement of the U.S. Constitution first, and their horribly misplaced allegiances to Obama (and Harry Reid) second.

Interesting fantasy. Fat chance.

While that scenario might be a spectacular dream, still, the depth and breadth of the deceit, treachery, venality and treasonous behavior of the squatter at 1600 – and which defalcations grow bolder and more dangerous each day – would clearly justify indulging in that speculation.

From the inception of the usurpation, this individual, along with his apparatchiks and apologists in the Democratic Party, the Communist Party – and now in the wake of the completely lawless and dangerous Bergdahl/Gitmo fiasco, the Taliban – has proven, beyond a shadow of doubt, that neither he nor the gaggle of politicians around him are fit to govern a free people. The usurpation was enabled, of course, by an electorate so foolishly infatuated with a “black” (really?) politician that it was willing to turn a blind eye to the fact that, like the emperor, he wore no clothes. Memo to the electorate: wake up.

Granted, the regime may be fit to impose tyrannical rule and, like other prior dictatorships, capable of making the trains run on time, especially between Las Vegas and L.A. But its operatives are *completely* incompetent and unfit to govern a democracy, let alone a representative republic such as the United States. Period. They must go, one way or the other. They should do what Sotomayor and Kagan would do in the above-described fantasy: resign and bring the nation’s metastasizing “dope and strange” nightmare to an end.

For anyone doubting this truth, all that needs to be done is chronicle the “high crimes and misdemeanors” (not to mention felonies) thus far perpetrated by the regime. First and foremost, peddling the fraud upon the electorate that he was or is a natural born Citizen

constitutionally eligible to hold the office in the first place; then there was Fast and Furious, where his “Justice Department” orchestrated the trafficking of guns into the hands of Mexican drug cartels, resulting in the deaths of, among many others, American Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry; then there was the White-House-directed IRS assault on conservative entities; then there was the Benghazi lie and cover-up... more on that later...; then there was the NSA spying scandal; then there was the Veterans’ Affairs scandal, revealing the deaths of military veterans who had answered the question of “what they could do for their country,” only to be denied promised medical care in return.

And this list doesn’t even get to the ICE dumping of illegal immigrants at bus stations in Phoenix; or the debasing of the currency with more debt accumulated in the last five years than since 1789; or the lunatic lies masquerading as the “law of the land” under the comically mislabeled “Affordable” Care Act; or the EPA’s pogrom to kill the energy sources of the nation in order to launch electricity rates on a course to Mars. Etc., etc.

The regime’s response to all of this has been, in effect, either “Bush is at fault;” “That hateful video is to blame;” “We learned about it when everyone else did in the newspaper” or “Let them eat cake.” Rumor has it that last remark did not work out so well for Marie Antoinette. Given all of the offenses and lawless actions orchestrated by the usurper and his sycophants over the past five years, one is tempted to ask: what will it take to dislodge these cockroaches from office and what will their next outrage be?

How about this? Given that the regime apparently sees no problem with “exchanging” five of the “worst of the worst” enemy combatants at Guantanamo for one “POW” – who from all accounts was a deserter who had already abandoned his military post and the nation and was happily giving aid and comfort to the Taliban in Afghanistan – would it be too long a reach to ask if other prisoners and enemies of the United States might also be used as bargaining chips for other purposes?

What if – just sayin’ – the regime found it necessary to take drastic action because the House Select Committee on Benghazi now formed held the potential to discover and reveal what *actually* happened at Benghazi and *why* it happened? Consider this (as hopefully will the Benghazi Select Committee): one of the wilder “vast, right-wing conspiracy theories” suggests that the Benghazi tragedy was actually a botched kidnapping gone awry when four Americans decided to fight back rather than surrender. This theory, while not yet substantiated, provides a lot of answers to a lot of questions.

As noted here and as others have repeated here, the “theory” posits that the regime, desperately needing an “October surprise” to bolster the usurper’s plummeting poll numbers as Election Day approached, struck an “oh-dark thirty” deal with then-Egyptian President Mohammed Morsi. The scheme would have “allowed” U.S. Ambassador to Libya Christopher Stevens to be “kidnapped” by Morsi supporters, but then taken to a safe place. Ambassador Stevens, of course, could not be told of the plan... understandably, he might have disapproved.

Then, as Election Day approached, the “terrorists” would gradually ratchet up their “threats” to kill Stevens unless the United States released into Morsi’s control Sheikh Omar Abdul-Rahman. Recall that Abdul-Rahman, the so-called “Blind Sheikh,” is now serving (at least as far as we know...) a life sentence at the Butner federal correctional institution in North Carolina for his role in the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center parking garage.

Morsi had already made it clear to the United States that he wanted Abdul-Rahman released. Under the theory, a week or so before the election, the regime would “reluctantly,” and after much “hand-wringing” and “soul-searching,” bow to the demands for Abdul-Rahman’s release, out of a “genuine fear that otherwise, Ambassador Stevens would die.” And, since Morsi would “guarantee” that Abdul-Rahman would be “confined” in Egypt (not to be confused with “imprisoned” in Egypt), the interests of the United States that he would not again “enter the fight” against us would be satisfied.

It would be a “win-win” trade... and one which, by the way, would have nothing... **NOTHING** to do with trying to make the usurper look like John Wayne on Election Day. How could those evil Republicans even *suggest* that the president was politically motivated in saving Stevens’ life? Those dogs.

Fast forward to today. The House Select Committee is gearing up to bore down into what really happened at Benghazi on September 11, 2012... and, more importantly, *why* it was *allowed* to happen.

Against this new development, what if – hypothetically speaking, of course – there were any “loose strings” still out there in Egypt, Libya or elsewhere? And what if those strings were ones which could lead back to the White House and discussions or “understandings” about the faux “kidnapping” or any “oh-dark thirty” meetings with “facilitators” of the scheme? In light of these “what-ifs,” might it be prudent for the regime to revisit the issue of Abdul-Rahman’s continued incarceration at Butner in exchange for, say, some scissors in Egypt, Libya or elsewhere to cut those pesky – not to mention “smoking” – strings?

If this theory ever sees the light of day before Congressman Gowdy’s committee, it will be a miracle. On the other hand, if it gains traction with documents, testimony and, say, contemporaneous audio intercepts of radio and/or cell phone chatter during the Benghazi attack (hello... anyone at the NSA paying attention here...?), it could go a long way to explaining why the regime “left behind” four Americans.

Those abandoned Americans included U.S. Ambassador to Libya Stevens; Foreign Service Information Management Officer Sean Smith; and former Seal commandos and CIA contractors Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods. In refusing to obey the “stand-down” orders they received from “up the chain of command” – which, if obeyed, would have allowed the “mission” to proceed as planned, without incident – the unexpected resistance to the attack by the abandoned Americans and the refusal of the regime to allow a rescue operation to even *begin*, contributed to, if not directly caused, their deaths.

The tragic irony of this regime's mindset is that it apparently sees no problem with invoking the "leave no one behind" meme in the Bergdahl "trade," but continues to dissemble when it comes to explaining why four Americans in Benghazi were not only left behind, but were specifically abandoned in the face of their pleas for help and rescue. Umm... has anyone seen any reports that Bergdahl *wanted* to be rescued?

So, perhaps one of the first questions Congressman Gowdy should ask as he pursues the truth is: where is the Blind Sheikh right now? Is he still at Butner? If not at Butner, where is he? Cairo?

Recently, a noted law professor, Jonathan Turley – and left-leaning, no less – ominously [lamented](#) the morphing of the executive office now sullied by Obama into an "imperial presidency," adding that Obama had become "the president Richard Nixon always wanted to be." When leftist law professors start talking that way in public, can House-drafted Articles of Impeachment be far away? Let us hope not, because there is not much time left.

In the meantime, the electorate needs to think very seriously about who they want representing them in the Congress for the remaining period of time – however long or brief that time might be – that the regime remains at the helm. A good start would be to boot from office in November any and all politicians, from either side of the aisle, who have assisted in the squatter's reign. Enough already.