

What Would Patrick Henry Do? pb

COURAGE VS. COWARDICE

by Joseph DeMaio, ©2012



Are there any members of Congress who will uphold Article II, Section 1, clause 5 of the U.S. Constitution and submit an objection to the certification of electoral votes for an apparent usurper to the presidency?

(Dec. 31, 2012) — To exponentially understate the matter, the nation’s future in large measure now lies in the hands of the 535 members of the House and the Senate. Stated otherwise, these people now have the opportunity to put an end to the continuing catastrophic disgrace known as the Obama regime, or instead shirk their responsibility to “uphold and defend the Constitution” by allowing Obama to again be inaugurated into the presidency, thus ensuring that things will get worse.... much worse. It is that simple.

Mind you, things may get worse no matter what the Congress does this coming Friday, January 4, 2013. But if there is the same lack of will and courage that has characterized that body in the past, rest assured, the nation is in for a tough four-year haul under a second, Obama “got-nothing-to-lose” blitzkrieg.

Pursuant to federal law ([3 U.S.C. § 15](#)), Congress is now required to assemble in joint session to “...meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives at the hour of 1 o’clock in the afternoon on [January 4, 2013], and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer.”

The purpose of the meeting is to count and verify the accumulated electoral votes which the various electors from the states have cast for president and vice-president. At that

point in time of the proceedings when the reading of the certificates of said votes is made, the presiding officer – one Joseph A. Biden – is then required by law to “... call for objections, if any.” The statutory mandate is not discretionary or permissive: the law states that the presiding officer (the aforementioned Biden) “... *shall* call for objections, if any.”

As previously discussed [here](#) and elsewhere, if but a single Representative and a single Senator shall have determined to articulate, in writing, an objection to the certification and validation of the said electoral votes, a process is then initiated to resolve the objection. As will likely be the case even *if* a member of the House and Senate lodges an objection, Mr. Biden will steamroll the process and declare the Obama-Biden ticket to have again won the election. Move along... nothing more to see here.

Let us be precise: there is *far* more than enough evidence to challenge and question whether Barack Hussein Obama is now or has *ever* been constitutionally eligible to serve as president. Indeed, each day the mountain of evidence continues to grow that not only is he ineligible because he is not a “natural born citizen” as required under the Constitution, a separate mountain of evidence rises that he and/or apparatchiks under his influence or direction have engaged in a conspiracy to defraud the nation with documents purporting to prove that he was “born in the United States,” as if that were determinative of his constitutional eligibility.

It is not.

An image of a forgery posted to the Internet is proof of nothing, other than that a felony likely has occurred. And even *if* he was born in Honolulu, as he claims – but has not yet proven – because his father was never a U.S. citizen, he is by definition *not* a natural born citizen as required under Art 2, Sec. 1, Cl. 5 of the Constitution and by existing U.S. Supreme Court precedent.

He is, accordingly, a usurper of the office, the contrary deceptions of the Congressional Research Service and *ipse dixit* (“it is so because I say it is so”) blathering of MSNBC and Chris Matthews notwithstanding.

But if objection was raised at the joint session on January 4 and by Biden, of course, overruled, at least there then would be “standing” in the members to bring the matter immediately before the Supreme Court. And then, at long last, perhaps the issue of presidential eligibility under the Constitution, and in the context of a very live “case or controversy,” will be “ripe” for presentation to the Court. No more “evading” of the issue by the [Justices](#).

And perhaps then the regime and its lawyers will be required to explain – or explain away – the mountain of evidence supporting the conclusion the Monsieur Obama is *not* eligible to hold the office of president. That mountain, perhaps better described as a “range,” consists of numerous evidentiary peaks, including evidence of forged birth certificates,

forged social security documents, forged Selective Service documents, just to name a few.

And, of course, there will then be an opportunity for Congress and/or the Senator(s) and Representative(s) parties to the suit to raise the question of why the Congressional Research Service on at least two separate [occasions](#) and actively [misled](#) the Congress through the alteration of the words of a U.S. Supreme Court decision it was purporting to quote in order to drive the pre-determined result it sought, *i.e.*, that Obama is a natural born citizen under Art 2, Sec. 1, Cl. 5 of the Constitution.

Not only has Obama's citizenship status not been proven by competent evidence, the accumulating reliable evidence points to exactly the *opposite* conclusion: he is an ineligible usurper. But until the Supreme Court is presented with a "live" case putting into issue the question, we will not know. And Justice Thomas's observation that the Court is evading the issue will continue.

And, by the way, does anyone seriously believe that the Supreme Court would not have long ago taken up the question of presidential eligibility at the behest of the Democrats and their operatives in the mainstream media had the claimant to the office been a white, Christian Republican burdened with the same albatross flock of evidentiary forgeries?

Get... a... grip.

On the other hand, if no objection is made at the January 4 joint session gathering, or if the objection has not been made in writing to the presiding officer (*i.e.*, Biden), then the process will take a different course: the customary faux collegial shaking of hands, adjournment and back to Beltway "business as usual."

The result, of course, will be the catapulting of the nation onto a trajectory even more cataclysmic and economically devastating than the one that began in January 2009, when a person purporting to be eligible to serve as president – but having completely failed to prove that status – was first inaugurated.

And, speaking of that prior inauguration, the same Chief Justice of the Supreme Court – one John Roberts – is slated to again administer the oath. With Roberts' tie-breaking vote on the Obamacare individual mandate issue under his belt – discovering that the mandate was actually a "tax" rather than the "penalty" it was defined as being in the [law](#) – do not be surprised if he again votes for the "nation of men over nation of laws" approach to jurisprudence now in vogue. And, of course, there is always the "political question" dodge which Roberts and the Court's liberals can interpose. Only in America.

So, it boils down to this: is there even one Senator or even one Representative prepared, in the face of all odds, including going before John Roberts, to stand up and pose the question? While this is my question, it could well be the question posed, if they were here, by the folks who intended to establish this Republic, but admonished "... if you can [keep it](#)."

The issue now before the Congress is not whether they *can* do things to keep the Republic: of course they can. Rather, the issue is whether they even *want* to keep the Republic and, if so, whether they have the *courage* to do so.

The tally of the number of objections raised on January 4, 2013 during the joint session proceedings will give a true indication of how many contemporary Patrick Henrys we have as well as how many present-day Benedict Arnolds we have.

Memo to America: Do not bet the farm that the Patrick Henrys will outnumber the Benedict Arnolds.