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This is intentional behavior to deceive and falsify the record in one way or another. Preventing balance from being counted counting false balance manipulating the statistical figures that you turn out, whatever it may be. So this thing is a criminal case. And it's amazing to me that it hasn't been handled as a criminal case to begin with. AMC is telling us they're going to drop lists of enemies of the people. Any prominent person who supported Trump is going to be on a OCS list. Well, now you're talking about Neo Bolshevism. Right? That's exactly what the both worlds exactly what the Nazi did exactly what a totalitarian government does when it gets into power. It draws up a list of enemies, and then does bad things to them. So are we hearing this? Seriously, this isn't simply a matter of the the Nixon Kennedy problem, the abstract problem of Oh, my gosh, we will have a legitimate person and its president because he didn't really win the vote. Here, we're going to have an illegitimate person in this president, whose supporters are all demanding Bolshevik purges. And you will see even worse from the media. And you will see worse from the from big tech, big tech is certainly not going to be reined in. In terms of its censorship, and its manipulation. By a Paris Biden administration, it will be exactly the opposite. Same with a big media, if the systems of due process which already exist, can be sorted. Not to circumvent it, because normal vote for the circumvention is done secretly, and you really are supposed to never find out about it. This is, as I said before, in your face, there's no they predicted this was going to happen. They did it. And then I was saying too bad for you. We got away with it. Now, what is the due process system for dealing with that, when the people who got away with it then end up in control of the highest offices in the country, so there is no constitutional method specified for throwing these people out? If they get away with fraud, and nobody, the judiciary, the Congress, the state legislators, if they are all thwarted in overturning this criminal result? There is no due process provision in the constitution for dealing with it. The due process provision in the Declaration of Independence, we're dealing with it. But see, we go to a different we go to a different level of law here. Is it really that much in their interest in the short term to create this situation? in which all constitutional bets are now off? Where are those situations generally lead, they lead to some kind of political slash social slash economic crisis, in which there is a real honest to god coup by the military, the military steps into restore order? Usually temporarily, right? That's always their story, but just do it for a while. And then they never leave. And that's the danger hit. These people have played with fire because they want to cut the legitimacy of the entire bloody system.
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Welcome back to liberty and finance. We have a distinguished returning guest, Dr. Edwin Vieira is a constitutional attorney is here with us to discuss questions about due process for constitutional elections. And there's certainly enough to talk about in that regards right now. Today is Monday, November 9 2020. Dr. Vieira, thank you for joining us again.

03:51

My pleasure.

03:53

In the wake of the US presidential election between Donald Trump and Joe Biden, we've seen this swirl of controversy both before and now especially during an after the actual election, about the potential for inappropriate process being followed the potential risk of tampering or swaying of the vote, whether in fact, the results were prematurely announced or called by major media outlets. And even now, whether in fact, there is still another shoe that's going to drop whether people should keep their conclusions at bay as due process happens or whether this has gotten so muddled, that it's not going to be possible for the proper process. We'd like you to walk us through that in an orderly manner, at least understanding what the proper process is supposed to be. But in the face of that we've got a range of fairly high profile people weighing in on it. On the one hand, you've got South Dakota governor no am saying let's let due process take its course as it did previously with the bush gore election. We have judge Jeanine Shapiro who had a show canceled by Fox News, because evidently she was going to come out strongly pro Trump. questioning the validity of the election process. And she posted privately on social media yesterday saying it's not over till it's over. We've heard and seen a transcript circulating from Dr. Steve personick, saying that this whole thing was really a sting operation. And it's a double reverse stain on the part of the Trump team because they've done high integrity watermarking using blockchain traceable on every ballot out there. So they'll be able to tell where all their real ballots and not real ballots in they've got National Guard troops in place to enforce all this. So we've got just this range of responses. Could you bring us down to earth and give us your view of what the process is supposed to be by the Constitution, whether it's being followed, as far as we're aware of what remedies need to happen to get us back on track?
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Well, it might be a good idea to go back in history, to the Nixon Kennedy election 1960. And those people who were alive then and paying attention, remember that Nixon lost that election, my very close vote nationwide, and Illinois was the key state, Illinois went for Kennedy. And as a result of Illinois, Nixon lost or at least that was the perception at the time that of Nope, Illinois had gone the other way, would have been different shortly. And no doubt Nixon was importuned by some of his advisors to challenge the result in Illinois, because there was widespread suspicion that there had been a great deal of vote fraud, especially coming out of Chicago and the environs of Chicago, engineered by the mob. The claim was that john Kennedy's father, Joseph P. Kennedy, who had had some questionable business dealings during the 1930s had friends in the mob and had arranged for that election to be fixed, dead people coming up voting in Chicago was a classic example. Event Nixon took the position of bounding privately, and he didn't come on the air and say this, but the story was he took the position that no, it would be a constitutional crisis. If he challenged the election of Kennedy, supposedly like to Kennedy, on the basis of some kind of engineered fraud involving the mob and Kennedy's father or whatever. Okay, that's what happens next, let it go. And only in the sense of the cognitive scanty, we're aware of what was behind the scenes and all of that. And you think about that going back and say, well, which would be the worst constitutional crisis, challenging an election on the basis that Kennedy's entourage whether it was father or others, arrange for vote fraud and vote fraud, something is going on in the United States throughout its history, or allowing someone who was not legitimately elected to serve as president united states. In which case, everything that he did would be a legitimate because he wasn't properly elected. And one would think that it would be the latter rather than the former, you certainly don't want the precedent there than an illegitimately elected, or ill eligible person should be able to take over the office of president. Well, okay, here we are now. And we were in the same type of situation, except, Trump apparently is going to challenge this election on the basis of voter fraud. And go back a little politically. The Democratic Party and its supporters have been going after Trump. Actually, even before he was elected, but let's just say from the day after he was elected, and they've run one kind of conspiracy after another, they ran the Russia and interference election interference conspiracy, they ran the Ukraine telephone call conspiracy, they ran the impeachment farce. They ran the Moller investigation and on and on, we did, they ran the Flynn frame up. That was the first part of the Flynn frame up, they ran all of these things against Trump. And as a result of notwithstanding that they were exposed in one way or another during the course of the past four years. Nothing happened. Not a single one of those people in the FBI, the DOJ that ran this operation, not Hillary Clinton, not Barack Obama, not the other people, political figures that were privy to it or actually behind it. None of them has been indicted, let alone convicted. The only person who was indicted and falsely convicted was General Flynn. And even that hasn't been turned around notwithstanding that all of this exculpatory evidence was finally on earth by Sidney Powell, not by Flynn's original attorneys, but by Sidney Powell came in after the fact. And discovered what should have been discovered at the very beginning of the case, because that's one of the first motions than a defense counsel in a criminal case files, the so called Brady motion to the prosecutor saying, turn over all the information you have or that you're capable of collecting, which exonerates my client
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or potentially exonerates my client make what they call exculpatory evidence. If you have a new file, turn it over, if you know where it might be, or where you can search for it, go get it. That's a constitutional requirement. Okay, so we've seen four years of the Trump administration, orderly, feckless behavior, by everyone all the way to Trump himself, because Trump under the Constitution, has a duty to take care of the laws be faithfully executed article two, section three. So he left us all gone. So now we're looking at this huge fraud operation in the election. And I'm not going to say that who committed fraud or whether there's a huge amount of suspicion. And at this point, you don't need proof beyond a reasonable doubt. You don't need clear and convincing evidence. You don't need a preponderance of the evidence, you simply need reasonable suspicion to start an investigation if there isn't reasonable suspicion in this case, I don't know what reasonable suspicion might be. And what's happened? Well, thank goodness, Sidney Powell came in on this because she's a reasonably hard nosed and pragmatic person, she's not going to fool around. But the main thrust of everything that's been done coming out of the Trump administration has been, oh, we want to recount we want to mail in ballots disqualified as they came in after the the day of the election. And so what all of these classical civil remedies for vote irregularities, let's not even use the word fraud for irregularities. Because we start talking about fraud, you're not talking about criminal conduct. This is not mistake. This is intentional behavior, to deceive, and falsify the record in one way or another. Preventing values from being counted counting faults, ballads, manipulating the statistical figures, that you turn out, whatever it may be. So this thing is a criminal case. And it's amazing to me that it hasn't been handled as a criminal case to begin with. Because everything that's been done to Trump in the past was part of a huge criminal case. A huge conspiracy. Actually, this thing goes back to title 18, United States Code Section 241 242. If you if someone attempts especially on the color of war attempts to deny another person or succeeds in denying another person, the Civil War, constitutional rights, that's a federal criminal act 10 years in prison is the sentence for a single act of that kind. So what have they been doing to Trump for the past four years? Well, they've been trying to deny him his civil and constitutional rights as the person who was elected president, as the person who was in the office of president and now as the person who is trying to be reelected as President. They also trying to deny the the United States government, the legitimate individual, the officer president, not a conspiracy to defraud the United States. Obviously, as I lay to the United States Code Section 371. Every count, there is a five year sentence. Then we have such we've got what I would call run of the mill criminal charges with relating with relationship to elections, title 52 of the United States Code Section 20511. Part Two, subsection two, anyone who knowingly and willfully deprives defraud or attempts to private before the resident of the state, have a fair and impartially conducted election process. And then it goes through various things that could be done procuring false ballots, so forth, rose from voter registration, etc, shall be fined or imprisoned for five years. So let's just take one vote, one fraudulent vote, that someone under color of law because all of these local election officials are acting under color of law, one fraudulent vote would get you just under the these four statutes would get you 20 years in prison. Well, how about 1000 votes? That's 1000 times 20 to 20,000 years in prison. How about 5000 votes? That's 100,000 years in prison. You're talking about serious problems here, when a single individual could be sent to prison for 1000 years, based on what is now being bantered around as having been done. And we're talking about all the way down to the lowest individual, the one who slept those boxes of ballots in at 330. In the morning, the pictures to show these people coming in later, later, first thing in the morning. hauling ballot boxes of ballots in the vast majority is not 100% of the ballots for Joe Biden statistical impossibility, that fellow right there is facing just under these three statutes 20 years in prison.
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And that's simply counting one, one ballot, how many ballots were in those boxes. So I looked at this, and I said, Wait a minute, the way you should have handled this way before, but I've been talking about this for years. When Trump realized he had this conspiracy on his hands, and it was going on across the United States. He should have gone to title 10, United States Code Section 253 and began to energize that, should it be going to energize that. And he could have done that and dealing with these various riots that went on throughout the country. This year, he chose not to he chose to let those people consensus do in their juice. And that was probably wise, in the long run, because it was a essentially a state and local problem. But he could have organized under that particular statute through a secret executive order or secret proclamation in anticipation of what he knew or should have known was coming forward in this line, because the democrats essentially announced it. They kept talking about Trump was going to produce some kind of fraud. And well, that's projection. They knew what they were going to do when they were trying to get people through the media to believe that it was Trump who was the bad guy here. And then if Biden won so called won the election, and a negative comments from Trump about fraud would be in fact, his attempt to overturn the legitimacy of the election. So you failed to set this up to begin with, which makes me wonder what the heck his advisors were doing what they were smoking while he was waiting for the past six months for this election. come on board. Well, now here it is. He has Sidney Powell, Sidney Powell came out the other day and said she did one point she had 400,000 votes. She said they could prove were eligible or fortunate, whatever, but shouldn't have counted. So one hopes that she'll put some backbone into these people. But I look at Giuliani. He was there the other day talking in Philadelphia, about how the pole watchers from the Republican Party had been kept out of the counting rooms at the convention center, I guess. I think that was the one where they showed pictures of the democrat people inside putting up taping pizza boxes to the windows so that the pole watchers could not look in and even from the great distance, could not see anything as to what was going on. Well, if that isn't enough to convince a court that there's some real Hanky Panky going on here. I don't know what it is that they would need. For you have a sufficient amount of suspicion for a criminal case and what was Giuliani talking about? They're standing in front of, I guess, the convention center in Philadelphia. He was talking about these, Paul watches, the civil metal we didn't have our Paul Walker now we have to go and follow these other civil remedies. Now Giuliani, if you remember his history, made his reputation legitimately as a hard nosed criminal prosecutor in New York. He went after in a broad sense of the mob. And they were talking about corrupt unions, corrupt public officials, money laundering, bribery, extortion, all of these crimes that are many ins is very difficult to prove. You get false bills of lading for construction materials or, or the construction materials that are actually provided and not the high quality ones or the low quality ones, and somebody else is raking off the difference. And this is going on multi millions, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of this kind of fraud going on in New York City, for instance, and all mob connected and he was going in and prosecuting people and being successful under the Rico statute. racketeer Influenced and Corrupt organizations act, right. So very familiar with highly complicated criminal activity, which of course, vote fraud engineered vote fraud. I'm not talking about just one person in one county who stuff in a couple of ballots in for his brother in law. We're talking about nationwide systematic load fraud. Right? This is on the level things that Giuliani was doing in New York because it requires statistical evidence, financial evidence, and a lot of other things. To really prove this, it's not enough to show that a couple of dead people voted in Arizona, or Nevada, wherever the dead people that they found were bowling. So what is Giuliani talking about? He's standing there talking about some civil remedies. That's why I look at this right now. And I said, these people are not realistic in the Trump administration.
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What they're facing here is a criminal conspiracy, a very high level criminal conspiracy to run a coup against the United States. And this is part five of the coup strategy that began at least the day after Trump was elected. So obviously, he's being advised by the same feckless bunch of nitwits that caused him to waste four years and not getting a single indictment against all those people who are running all the other. And Flynn, by the way, the first person who was framed in this operation, he's still wondering what's going to happen to him, because he's in front of that judge Sullivan, who's not going to accept the Department of Justice's request to have the case thrown out. It couldn't be Trump hasn't been able to save Flynn. After Sidney Powell proved that he had been framed. So I looked at this and I said, What is going on? How are they going to get control of this? Well, what happens if they don't get control of it in the sense that I'm talking about starting a first class criminal investigation, and by the way, this is what Trump should have said. And I told people at the time, as soon as people start talking about fraud in the election, he should have come out and said, just what I said here today, here are the statutes lays these just for you could probably put 15 or 20, various statutes, criminal taxes that would apply one way or the other, come out on nationwide as a nationwide broadcast and say, this is the problem. It says any voter fraud. These are the statutes that are going to be applied here from Washington, because they're all federal statutes. And we are going to go after every single person that we find engaged and vote for it, we're going to have an honest selection. Or we're going to spend a lot of people to prison for a long period of time. And all you folks down to lower levels, the ballot box stuffers, the ones who are filling in ballots, illegally, the ones who are tampering with the mail in postmarks, all of you, all of you low level people. Think about if you want to go to prison for the rest of your life, because somebody above you told you to do this. Because we will certainly find you. We will certainly find the people who were sitting in for tables where we have videotape of them filling in balance. We'll certainly find you where we have videotape of you hauling the ballots in and three o'clock in the morning. And we'll prosecute every last one of you. So you better think about it right now. I think if he had said that six months before this election, the amount of fraud here would have been so small, you wouldn't been able to detect it. Because any conspiracy of this kind depends upon the footsoldiers. Right. It's not the mafia dawn. It's not Don Corleone who goes out and commits the murder or robs the bank or sells drugs or whatever it may be. It's those footsoldiers at the lowest level of the system that make it work. Right. So those are the people you have to depend upon the ones who are hauling ballots in three o'clock in the morning, the ones who are changing balljointed, changing postmarked whatever they did, once you were putting up pizza boxes, so the bow waters can't walk through the window. Those are the ones and we know who they are. In every case, we know who they are, we may not know who gave them the order to do this. We may not know the chain of command all the way back to the top. But we know the foot soldiers and the foot soldiers know who gave them the orders. They didn't do this spontaneously. They know what the score is the guy who was taping, I remember seeing this guy taping up the pizza boxes in front of the window who told him to do that? Somebody did he didn't come up with that idea on his own. They locked the people out and then taped the pizza boxes over the window so we could look inside. Well, no, we took a picture of him. It should be pretty easy to identify him and bring him into an FBI investigation. If you could trust the FBI and say, Bill, is what you're facing. Oh, look at this. 5000 years in federal prison. Do you tell me Who told you to put those pizza boxes up? What do you think the answer will be? he'll sing like Luciano Pavarotti. Now they haven't they didn't do this because obviously this kind of investigation is not going on. They found in some places. I think it was Arizona, New Mexico. That number of people think was New Mexico because they were California. Or escape from California and they were illegally voting in New Mexico. So they found some number of legal holders of that kind. And they refer that to the Department of Justice. And I think there was some others, maybe in Arizona, some other states, whether it was these referrals were made. But I'm not talking about referrals after the fact. I'm talking about a situation where you would have been in before the fact
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which wasn't done. So now where we are, where are we? So let's say they go and they conduct these attempts to get recounts attempts to invalidate ballots because the postmarks were too late or whatever. And that doesn't work. Well, there you go. If all of this is done before the electoral college mates, then that's the end of the game. Because the states will have certified the electors. And the electrodes will be the 271 plus whatever the number turns out to be, for Biden, and Biden will be the titular president. Now you have all sorts of other scenarios by which this thing ends up going into the into the Congress. That's your other alternative. If you don't have a sufficient number of electors, then it goes to Congress to determine who the President is. And this happened before. I think it was Rutherford B. Hayes, that was the great reconciliation over reconstruction. Then there was the Jefferson Aaron Bureau. Lexan. So they've been there have been examples of this happening. And that is, quote, unquote, due process, by definition, because that's provided for in the Constitution, right? A lot of people are talking about what I would call extra due process. situations where the courts invalidate this or that in an unprecedented manner. And then what happens? Where are we do they do it before the electors after the electors have met? This is all extraordinary speculation. But the interesting thing comes down to what is this is going on in the civil side, and stuff is coming out on the criminal side. Then what happens? Is it conceivable that the civilians conceive? I don't think it's conceivable, I don't think it's conceivable the supreme court can stop the process. If there was if there is not a valid election of the President. Because of all of these elements of confusion, then what happens? Well, it goes Congress. Right? I don't see how you're going to have any of these extra constitutional remedies sold? Because already is one is a constitutional, there's a process. That's called a remedy. I don't know if it'll be a remedy, because it will not necessarily give us the answer that we would get if the fraud word totally exposed. But at this stage, you don't know because the matter of time. Now just give one example is that is the problem with Pennsylvania? Yes, that the Constitution requires that election law be promulgated by the legislature's of the states. And that's where the constitution uses its legislature. So in Pennsylvania, the legislature had provided in a certain way for mail in ballots, and along comes the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. And it rules as a matter of Pennsylvania law. That mail in ballots were going to be allowable, notwithstanding that the legislature had said something different. And went up to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court tried to dodge it, I guess, hoping that maybe the problem would be solved. By the way the voting turned out. So they actually already is a case in the Supreme Court, they didn't actually decide that case. Finally, they said we can't really decide it now would just send this thing back and let's see what happens. So it's not a matter of having to go through the whole process of petitioning for certiorari once again, going up through the federal system, they already have that case in the Supreme Court, and Alito just entered an order the other day about segregating these questionable ballots. So they could be, quote, unquote, recount, potentially all those ballots might be declared ineligible. So then we go. And so there's Pennsylvania lead, that the media claim for Biden could evaporate overnight. And then of course, you have challenges in Michigan and Wisconsin. And also a question Arizona. So depending upon whom you talk to, it's possible if the Biden lead electoral votes, evaporates, and Trump gains those electoral votes. And by the middle of December when the Electoral College has to me,
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Trump has over 271. So that's certainly one possibility, because the other possibility is no, by the time the electoral college needs these questionable states, somehow or other will have certified their electors for Biden, and the electoral college will vote for Biden. And once again, you have a situation in Pennsylvania as well, that the legislature is talking about passing some new statute, under their authority to deal with the electoral vote coming out of Pennsylvania, which now raises another interesting constitutional question. Can the legislature negate what appears to be an electoral vote for a sufficient voting of the voters in Pennsylvania, to give the number of electoral votes from Pennsylvania to Biden, can the legislature come in and trains that result? Okay, these are all on essentially unprecedented situations. So who knows? Well, I think is the important part, he was going back to the Nixon Kennedy business. It was the greatest mistake in Nixon's life, I think that he made was agreeing not to look into the fraud in Illinois. And essentially, to allow this concept to be accepted that in a presidential election, at least, you didn't want to open up Pandora's box with respect to that question, because who knows, would know where that would lead, not recognizing the the other side of the coin. That is the worst Pandora's Box having a legitimate person and in the office, it's a it's a worst thing coming out of Pandora's box, and legitimate, illegitimate purposes. And especially in this situation, because let's look at Biden, Biden, surely have something wrong with him physically. And I say physically, because, you know, I'm not claiming that he's mentally ill, but it's some physical problem, which is affecting his ability, mentally and otherwise, to perform the function of President. So who are you really getting? If the Biden ticket is accepted as having won the like, what are you getting Kamala Harris? And where will that lead? Right, well, we already know where that will lead. Because already telling us AOC is telling us they're gonna drop lists of enemies of the people. Any prominent person who supported Trump is going to be on a OCS list, but what wipes down the list won't get a Christmas present. or something else is supposed to happen. Well, I talking about Neo Bolshevism. Right, that's exactly what the both worlds exactly the Nazi did this reactor winning totalitarian government does when it gets into power, it draws up a list of its enemies, and then does bad things to them. So are we hearing this? So you say this isn't simply a matter of the the Nixon Kennedy problem, the abstract problem of Oh, my gosh, we'll have a legitimate person and its president because he didn't really win the vote. Here, we're going to have an illegitimate person in this president, whose supporters are all demanding Bolshevik purges. And you will see even worse from the media. And you will see worse from the from big tech, big tech is certainly not going to be reined in. In terms of its censorship, and its manipulation. By a Paris Biden administration, it'll be exactly the opposite. Same with a big media. So you're gonna have probably the end is vestia. Probably being the big media and izvestiya being big tech or vice versa, you're gonna have the Bolshevik system of media, you're going to have the Bolshevik system of retaliation against your political enemies. And you're gonna have some of the wildest political proposals, green New Deal ever knows what coming out of Washington, I don't care what Biden says about his being a centrist. He's not going to be in control. Like I would wager that within a month, he'll be out of the office. He will resign because you're in good taste, he has to realize that he can't function properly, or they'll remove him out of the 25th amendment as being unable to function properly. So that's what you're really looking at this extraordinarily serious. This is much much worse than the Kennedy problem because at least Kennedy when he came in was not a radical Marxist, in principle or in practice. And many people said, Well, he was kind of left wing. And so well, maybe he was but he did some good things did some bad things, he would have kept us out of the Vietnam conflict. That was for sure he wants to back out of that.
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He gained the Test Ban Treaty with crew chef drama Test Ban Treaty, which is a valuable thing. So you can't say Kennedy was 100% of disaster, or the Nixon would have been 100%, better. But you're looking at this situation now. And once again, going back to Nixon and Kennedy, in certain places, the illegitimacy of the Illinois vote was broadcast, it was something that was there, but it wasn't made a big deal of this thing is in your face, vote fraud. And if this goes through, then the whole principle will be established that well, this is a government that can be obtained by fraud.
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That's one of the things we were really concerned about, in addition to all the direct effects, and all the policy effects that can flow from this is the degradation of the American people and our republic to third world status, the malaise that would fall upon us if we knew that our not only our votes really don't matter, but that we are just beholden to the powers that be people who have claimed that all along the way have been considered on the pessimistic side. But if that's just as you said, in your face, and it's there for us all to see then how can we how can we maintain any semblance of leadership and the international community or civil society domestically?
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Yeah, then then what is the recourse? Because you mentioned the beginning due process, if the systems of due process, which already exist, can be sorted, not just circumvented, because normal, both for the circumvention is done secretly, and you really are supposed to never find out about it. Right? This is, as I said before, in your face, there's no they predicted this was going to happen. They did it. And then I was saying too bad for you, we got away with it. Now, what is the due process system for dealing with that, when the people who got away with it then end up in control of the highest offices in the country, because certainly they're not going to throw themselves out are they? That's what becomes fascinating about this, because, of course, there is no constitutional method specified for throwing these people out. If they get away with fraud, and nobody, the judiciary, the Congress, the state legislatures, if they are all thwarted in overturning this criminal result, there is no due process provision in the constitution for dealing with it.
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There's due process provision in the Declaration of Independence for dealing with it. See, we go to a different we go to a different level of law here
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becomes a very dicey situation. And that's why you look at the Democratic Party, you say to themselves, don't they realize what they've done? Is it that much in their interest short term, because most of these people think only in the short term, right? Is it really that much in their interest in the short term, to create the situation in which all constitutional bets are now off where those situations generally lead, they lead to some kind of political slash social economic crisis in which there is a real honest to god coup by the military, the military steps into restore order, usually temporarily, right? That's always their story, but just do it for a while. And then they never leave. Because they're always at least in the background. There's always a threat coming out of whatever it is the defense establishment, military establishment, South American countries are this way all the time. Sure. They put in their military comes in, they back out, they put in some figurehead, civilian, but they're always lurking in the shadows. And if that's civilian or others in his administration get too far over the line. The military can always step back in on the pressure. Well, we did it before. And that CNS, the Roman Republic, right, that was so that was Marius, that was Caesar. That was Pompey, curry the history of the fall of the Roman Republic of Cosmo in modern times, and many more examples, but the classical world gives you the classic example. And that's the danger hit. These people have played with fire in a very little dangerous and even the word beyond dangerous and manner because they want to cut the legitimacy of the entire bloody system. So where does this lead well I said it's going to lead to going to a different level of law up or down, okay can go down to Venezuela, South American dictatorships under the cloak of elections, they've got a President Maduro is actually a dictator. Or the other alternative, which is the Declaration of Independence situations, overturning the whole damn system, and reestablishment of something that approaches, legitimacy. difficulty in this scary look at how many people actually voted for Biden. We don't know the percentage. I don't know, I don't know. But probably, it's probably about the same. who voted for Obama, two times maybe the same as voted different. Let's give it let's give it that that high. So it's it's the middle 40s? For sure. They're claiming he has over 50% right. But this is a little less given the middle 40s somewhere 40% of the population of this country is willing to accept an individual who gained office, probably maybe by fraud is that a governable society? With 40% of the population is because they are so ideologically driven? Or because they are so stupid, would actually accept knowingly accept someone for the highest office in the country who obtained that office to fraud?
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Or so dependent on handouts?
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Well, whatever it is, okay? They could have been bribed, they could, they could simply be ignorant, they could be ideologically driven, whatever it is, here's this group that will reproduce this system, again, and again, and again, this situation. They can depend upon 40 something percent of the population to quote unquote, vote, whatever vote means to vote for this candidate. With the expectation Oh, yeah, he'll win because the other 5% he needs to get by fraud. Which makes the whole thing fraudulent, right. Doesn't make the first 40% valid, the whole thing is fraudulent. So you have a society that is almost split 5050. On the basis of the willingness to accept a fraudulent government? Well, if you have a fraudulent government, they have law. Is there any law? Is there any legal theory in western history that says yes, fraud can be law?

42:40

A law is fraud or fraud is law? Oh, you want to express it? this contradiction in terms? Right, right. So here's the this is the problem. I'd look at this, I say, my God,

42:53

this thing is so serious. The long term consequences, you know, maybe won't happen the first year of the Campbell Harris administration, and take them two or three years to really do something bad, I don't know. But the principle has now been set. And so I look at these Trump people, and I say what in heaven's name are you doing? This has nothing to do ultimately with Trump. Right? It has to do with the future of this country, they wasted four years, they've they've allowed it to be accepted by the vast majority of the people, that hidden elements within the bureaucracy, DOJ, FBI, CIA, whatever hidden elements within the bureaucracy, could fort, the elected president, the United States and attempt to destroy him, and nothing could be done about it. So we've already accepted that proposition. Right, then any president comes in, and he's and he's subject to deep state manipulation, and he can do nothing about it.

43:52

Some voices have been all along and prior even to this most recent administration, that when you see this baffling and competency or unexplicable actions on the part of those in charge, that does not seem to be in the best interest of the people or the country. People say, well, we're just really unfortunate that they're that they don't understand what to do. Others say no, it reveals that things have gone much farther than is publicly admitted. And this is actually just controlled opposition, that there's a higher level scheme at play. And that this team you thought was all on your side that's acting and competent, was never actually supposed to be capable in the first place.

44:27

Yeah, that's even that's even worse situation. situation I had in mind was a simple one of here's the thing going on. And it turns out that, that Mr. Trump was simply incompetent to deal with it. Right, he brought a bunch of people in with him who were incompetent to deal with it. Oh, they were appeasers when they didn't want to really rock the boat. They didn't want to create a real constitutional crisis. Right along the lines of what Nixon did. I can understand Nixon, but I can understand this. I can't I mean, Nixon would never have accepted this situation was going on for the past four years. But you notice the progression first as well as some bureaucrats are going to stand up against Trump. This deep state, it's hard to get them out, because you know, they were appointed, they're appointed and elected. They're professionals, bureaucrats, blah, blah, blah, have all these excuses for that. Right? And so he's doing other things to get around them. And he never was successful. But then they go to the next step. And they say, Oh, well, by the way, we have enough power through fraud to put some figurehead in is the president. You'll see, you'll have a figurehead president. And you'll have the deep state running the agencies. And we don't, of course, know who's behind all of these people pulling the strings, but then we can accept that something like that is going on. And they come right out and do it. That's why I find the amazing part of all of this is that on the other side, on Trump's side, he never came out and made the what I would call the fireside chat approach of Franklin Roosevelt. And Franklin Roosevelt, when he came in, he had something along the lines of the worst possible world facing him there was a depression or there just been a huge bank collapse. He was what in 1932, it was a bank collapse the end of 31, going into 32, went into 33, etc. And people have pictures and see people lining up around the block trying to get their deposits out of these banks, which are failing. And so you had bank closures, bank holidays, they call them in those days. And what was the first thing that Roosevelt did? He held a hat he had a fire what he called a fireside chat. This was the beginning of that process, where he went on nationwide radio and television. And he explained to the people in this first fireside chat, why he was supporting the closing of the banks. When he told them all, ladies and gentlemen, you have to realize when you deposit money in the bank, the bank doesn't put that money in a shoe box and keep in the back room for the safe one, they loan that money out to other people. And returns from that loan. That's how they're paying you. So you have to wait. The banks have loaned us money out and they need to get it back. You can't take all your deposits out of the bank, so you don't actually have the money. explain to them how fractional reserve banking actually worked. Okay, it was a crisis. That was the theory of this. This was this crisis. He was taking executive control or getting this crisis under control, through legislation, through proclamations, various things he did, which were considered extraordinary at the time. But the first thing he did was he went to the American people explain why he was doing this. Now, he didn't, he didn't excoriate the bankers for being criminal conspirators. So this is one of those things that happens every now. And then in economy and banking, we've had a lot of instances of major bank failed failures in this country. Over the years in the 1800s, and early 1900s, this was just another one, the biggest of all, but it was still just another one. But now, Trump is in the interesting position of well, this is not just a normal phenomenon that's happened here. This is the most extraordinary series of events over a four year period of history, the United States. At no time, has he ever done what Franklin Roosevelt did. And at no time is the other component said, you know, the Constitution empowers me to impose a duty on me to take care of the laws be faithfully executed. And in the final analysis, I am not required to depend upon bill Barr, or Jeff Sessions, or any of these people in the FBI, the DOJ or the CIA or whatever. I have a constitutional authority here. And I'm going to exercise it. And if I have to do that through these extraordinary statutes, which gives me these special powers under

49:10

so called emergency situation, that's what I'm going to do. And that's what I'm wondering now, if all of this turns out to be a real chaotic situation in which somehow the electoral college doesn't can't function or it's challenged, the result of the electoral college challenged. And then the thing is, well, what will happen in January when there's supposedly going to have the inauguration before that, will Congress have to step in? Will Congress claim to step in to do something so you have you have rival interpretations? One interpretation says, well, the electoral college actually voted for Biden, because there are enough stated and certified this other person knows the electoral college was a legitimate what they did. And, you know, Congress has action It shouldn't have taken the action it took because the electoral college did what it did legitimately, or vice versa, you know, so you have the permutations and combinations of problems. And then of course there is a Supreme Court in this. What are they going to do? What if you have not clear cut majorities? But you have a case where it's a plurality. And then they also have someone with a concurring opinion on a different a different theory. And you've talked to lawyers about what those cases mean? Well, you don't have a five to four. But it's four, one and four, or four, one and one and 30, or whatever is some, some combination, permutation combination that doesn't work out to an actual majority. What does that mean? So that's what I find that this is one of those situations somebody has to grasp. And this is Alexander the Great, and the Gordian knot. You can't be sitting in front of the Gordian knot trying to take it apart, strand by strand. Because no one had ever accomplished that supposedly it was it couldn't have become It couldn't be accomplished was Alexander the Great deal. He comes along with a sword, he just cuts it. And that's what Trump really needs to do at this stage. I think that the due process element here is of most consequence is were these elections in the various key states at least, conducted in a fraudulent manner, criminally fraudulent manner. And you've got to prove that. And he's got to prove that at least to the level where he could convince the Supreme Court to enter some kind of peremptory relief injunction. mandamus prohibition is various extraordinary remedies that can stop a process. So there will be time to clear up whatever the controversial aspects of it are. Well, he's running out of time. They're all running out of time, because when the electoral Electoral College meet in December, right, yep. Okay, we've got a month to figure this all out. And meanwhile, the states are going to be vying internally for certification of the electors. So it's got 30 days, let's just say it's a be rough 30 days to get this sorted out in some way, shape or form. That's the problem. And what the end the thing is what he will never sorted out unless, unless there are criminal investigations. And people not just a guy hauling the the the ballots in the 330 in the morning, he certainly goes to jail. But the ones higher up as high up as you can go until that is done. This cloud is going to hang over the country indefinitely. No one is going to believe in the integrity of elections. If they could get away with this. And then that undercuts what all of the the use the cultural Marxist proposition that undercuts all cultural optimism. Right? Oh, my God, we're in a situation where the future is dark and dire and damned, and so forth and so on. And you know, that that was the whole point of the cultural Marxist theory of attacking society. They said, Mark said,

53:38

in the sequence of historical determinism, you would get to the point where the two can conflicting classes with the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the workers and the employers, capitalists. And they would struggle for control the proletariat would win, it would establish its own dictatorship that would eliminate the bourgeoisie and we would be in the final stage of history after which nothing would ever change, we will have socialism slash communism and everything would be perfect. Okay. And what happened? Well, the proletariat, instead of following the Marxist pattern of historical determinism, said, Well, we can work within the political process, we can obtain what they call labor legislation, workplace safety, limitation of hours, minimum wages, overtime pay. And we can also engage in collective bargaining through unions and so forth, all sorts of things we can do, that we don't need to turn to violent revolution. And so the Marxist now so they were out of business, because the proletariat, which was supposedly, the force it was going to lead to communism has now turned on us become part of the bourgeoisie. This is no good. So they came up with a cultural Marxist theory, Gramsci, Antonio Gramsci, the Italian communist was the one who's always quoted for the phrase, the long march to the institutions. And the communist rule is what we have to do is to get our people into all of these institutions, economic, political, social, cultural, and use our influence to criticize bourgeois society, modern Western, bourgeois society in every possible way. So that eventually, people come to look at their own culture, their own economy, their own political system with disdain and hatred. We want to it was really, really Munson Berg, who was the head of the common turn, who said Our goal was to make Western civilization stink, turn people against their own cultures in every way possible. So that what would happen, instead of being optimistic about the future, people would become extraordinarily pessimistic about the future. We're living in a society that can't function properly. Oh, this is terrible, what mommy's, what must we need do, we must need to turn to Marxism, this was the theory. A pretty stupid theory. But this was the theory. And the interesting point is they've succeeded. And this election, this Rajan election is one example of doing precisely that, whether this was the intention of the Democratic Party, the republican party or the media, whatever, this is the result that they have now put us in a position where we are going to look at the electoral process with despondency. This doesn't work anymore, because it's all fraudulent. And there's no way we can know that it's fraudulent because the media is covering them. And you put all these things together, and the average person looks at the Trojan shows and he goes into a kind of cultural despair. Will he then turn to Marxism, I don't know, he'll turn to whatever is given to him, which will probably be something along the lines of Marxism, because that's the ideology that is apparently in control of the universities apparently, it's in control the media boundaries control the Democratic Party. And like check with the republican party to I would say they don't understand it, but that's what they are. So the thing has worked out beautifully. And this is the final nail in the coffin, when you look at the legal system, and you say the legal system cannot run legally. Or the other side of the coin, the legal system can be run through fraud, which is the same way of saying that it can be run legally can be run through fraud. You think illegal, legal, action, fraud vitiates all contracts. If fraud is involved, you throw it out. If some of your evidence is fraudulent in a case, the judge can instruct the jury that the jury doesn't have to believe any of your evidence. Because you wouldn't have put up fraudulent evidence, if you believe in evidence was any good. That's called the spoliation of evidence doctrine. Okay. So you look at the legal system in this country looks upon fraud and says, well, fraud is the one thing that undermines everything. If fraud is involved, forget it. So here, we now have a electrical system, which apparently, you're gonna get away with it. Unless, unless, what? Unless I shouldn't say Trump is not Trump. It's the legal system itself. It's Trump. It's the Department of Justice it supports it's the state legislatures, unless they stand up and say, No, we will not tolerate fraud. And this we're going to, we're going to root this out. And if that means that the top honchos in both parties have to go to jail, well, that's what it needs.

58:43

Now I have it all I'm saying I haven't seen that determination coming out of it certainly not coming out of the Democratic Party, because they're very happy with the vote count just the way it is. But certainly not coming out of the Republican Party. The Trump people other than maybe, Sidney Powell, who was came out the other night and said she knew a 400,000 votes that were highly questionable. But you're looking at Sidney Powell. Sidney Powell came in at the tail at the tail end of the Flynn debacle. And did were any good lawyer should have done and were successful and pulled out all of this evidence that had been withheld. Whereas Flynn has he been exonerated is he, you know, walking free, with his head held up high ready to sue all these people in the DOJ who ran this frame up against him. Now he's still being persecuted by Solomon the judge. Right, even with Sidney Powell proving the existence of the frame up, the victim is still being persecuted. So you wonder, did the cultural Marxists succeed? And I would say yeah, pretty much so because I look at this and I say if I didn't have No stubborn streak, and maybe I would despair Personally, I would expect, nothing can be done here. This is impossible. We've lost, it's gone. But terminal illness.

1:00:09

You mentioned terminal illness. The Elisabeth Kubler Ross grief cycle of five stages of death and dying. And a lot of what you've been saying make me think, are we in the denial phase? Still? Certainly, some people are in the anger phase. Some people are in the bargaining phase, but you're talking about the goal is to get us to the depression phase, and then the acceptance phase and just go Yeah, I guess I'll just go with go with what these powers are gonna be hope I get something, some gravy out of it.

1:00:32

Yeah, well, that's that's basically it. It's as simple minded psychological assessment. If you drive people to a certain point, and they'll shrug their shoulders and say, Yeah, do to me whatever you want to do. I'm not going to resist it anymore. I'm simply going to accept it. Right? And the communists understood this, and how do you do it? What do you undermine the faith that people may have in the stability of the systems that exist. And you show them there's no way out within these systems, that's important. But there's no way out within the system, ha, you have to opt for some other system that we are going to give you we the manipulator is going to present to you, it's not enough for us to criticize, and hopefully

1:01:13

you won't remember the Declaration of Independence option, which you had already proven.

1:01:17

Well, that's the next stage. So that was the status of the founding fathers. And they say this is a well, in the declaration, they say, well, we petitioned right, we went to the king, we went to his ministers, we even went to the British people themselves, in an attempt to get them to see things from our perspective, and to maintain what we believe were the rights of Englishman here in the colonies, which we would believe we were being deprived of. And all of those petitions fail. That is, within the British system. The British legal system, there was no recourse after a certain point is the king and his ministers and even the the average Britain weren't going to pay any attention. And quite the opposite, they want to send hessians over to conquer the colonies. Then what was the alternative when you stepped outside of that system, that was a declaration of independence. The old system didn't work. And we got to declare independence on that system set up our own system, which supposedly will be better. Although one wonders now looking at. And what we're seeing today is it hasn't really turned out that way, when any event that was a theory. So it's a constitutional system is essentially destroyed as a result of these practical steps. Because underlying the whole bloody system is the legitimacy of the elections. We have a bunch of usurpers in eligible individuals in office than what's going on? Well, they can't exercise these powers, but they're in office exercising these powers. So you have this contradiction. So what does one do? Well, either you correct it within the system. But you can't correct it within the system. If the highest offices in the land and all the bureaucracy is controlled by the usurpers, you have to step outside of the system, you go to the Declaration of Independence situation, as I like to call it. We've done everything we could do within this system, they've destroyed our ability to control through the system, well, then we have to step outside of the system. And then all bets are off, who knows what comes out of that. We had one example was, of course, the founding fathers and what happened with them. But there's no guarantee that that same thing would happen again, that you'd go from a bad system to a better system. You go from a bad system to a worse system, that's also possible. That's why I said the democratic Democratic Party People who have this very, very short term, this is childishness, this is my two year old, was only interested in what's happening in the next five seconds in his life. Because he has no long term vision. And that's what these people are doing. They have a very, very short term vision, leave aside the ones who may be really nefarious individuals. The average politician is situated very well, we got to win this election in any way possible. Even if that's your results in, you know, tainting the legislature training the courts, whatever, training electoral officials, we got to win this election. They don't think about what the consequences it's the two year old doesn't think about the consequence day after tomorrow. Or even maybe this evening. If he drinks a whole bottle of cough syrup, which has, you know, the nice cherry flavor. So that's what we have. We have a bunch of two year old and control the situation now by happenstance, and they're working their will. And Father, the father figure, who is Trump, apparently is completely feckless. And this advice don't want don't want to bite the bullet, they don't want to come face to face with the Gordian knot and say, well, we have to cut this thing. Because we don't get control of it. Now, then we've lost control of the whole system for the future, no one is going to be able to, to regain control within this system. Now, I would just like someone to come forward and give me an example of what say, some of these South American democracy. So even European countries, where they once gone to a violent change of the government, or a fraudulent change of the government. And they then reverted to a legitimate government without going through some horrendous crisis, maybe a civil war, maybe an international war, whatever. And, of course, we have, you know, terrific potential conflict with China, internationally. And now they've elected someone who may be compromised. By having taken Chinese money and his family, or who knows what else mean, we know about the Chinese money. What else was said there.

1:06:30

And this is the guy you're going to put in as president, because of your short term view, as a member of the Democratic Party, and you want the Democratic Party to be in control. You want to put in a guy who has perhaps have Alzheimer's or some other mental condition, and he has, you know, he's compromised because of connections with Chinese money. Are you gonna put him in as president, just so that you can get Trump out? Destroy the country? That's what the word treason comes into play here, right? Giving comfort, aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States? I mean, I'm not, I'm not looking to go, well, the democratic bar is engaged and treated. I'm just looking at the long term consequences of this thing. You start thinking through what what, what about this? What about this? What about this? What about this in a chain of events? They say, Oh, yeah, they're all of these very dire possibilities. And that's why when you see a 12, a two year old child with a bottle of cough syrup, cough syrup, what do you do? Take it away, you go over and you yank the cough syrup out of his hand before he drinks it. You don't say, well, Billy, go ahead and drink and see how well you feel tomorrow morning. As if that would be a lesson to a two year old child, they could make the connection, logical connection. No, go away and take the culture pose and you impose a kind of legal system on him. Right, the superior figure in the political process within the home a searches authority. And so who is the superior in the political process here under these circumstances? What is Trump himself? Right, Article two, Section three, take care of I'll take care of the laws be faithfully executed on the laws being faithfully executed, just from the federal level, because the federal level, of course, is the only one he can actually control? And the answer is, Well, no. We've got all of these federal criminal problems. And if you look at some of these state problems, we look at the state problem in Pennsylvania where the legislature said one thing about mailing ballots, and the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania claimed the authority to say the opposite. Well, that's a violation of US Constitution, because US Constitution puts into the hands of the legislature's of the states, not the courts, the authority within the electoral process. So even that he could step in on he doesn't have to wait for the Supreme Court, the United States. He told me that he can't directly enforce the constitution under number of statutes. The couple that I mentioned earlier in this discussion they have, and that's what's amazing. That's what Rosen Franklin Roosevelt did, quite obviously. He stepped forward to the earliest days of his administration, especially dealing with the banking problem. And he said art and I have this authority. Here's a statute that says so and I have the authority execute the laws and there is a proclamation that I'm writing to close the banks. When you look at value selling, now, that seemed to be rather radical thing for him to do, but he had the authority to do it, which no one has ever said he didn't have the authority to do in principle now is that more radical is a banking crisis, which we eventually got over an economic crisis, a more radical situation than on electoral fraud. that destroys the legitimacy of the entire bloody government. So one would think that some people in the Trump administration would remember Franklin Roosevelt. He was elected president four times, as I recall, he wasn't a minor figure in American history. But certainly not they haven't thought about that. So here we are. And I look at this and say, Oh, my God, this is like the last days of the Roman Republic, if it goes in one direction, if it goes in the other direction, when we may fester on for a while, we'll have to see. But unless it goes in the third direction of stamping this out. And the I shouldn't say stamp, you're not gonna stamp it out evil in the hearts of men is always there. But in this particular instance, making an example then that's the end. But they get away with this and get away with anything. every election will be like this. And then that's the end of the constitutional system has nothing to do with overthrow of the Constitution. It has to do with you know usurpation,

1:11:26

constitution still there, but it's a, you know, it's a fig leaf covering up this criminal conduct. And then half of it and to get back to my other point that half of the American people do not accept this. All the people who voted for Trump, I think, clearly do not accept this. So now you divide the country in a manner that is irreconcilable. Where does that lead?

1:11:59

Some say the Civil War?

1:12:00

Well, yeah. But the the war that occurred in 1861 was possible, because there was a clear with geographical division. That were the slave states. And then there were the non slave states. And then there were the border states, some went one way some went the other. So you could see that what would it be today mean that these divisions are within cities, counties, towns, families? Yeah. What would it look like? I think Virginia is kind of a classic example of this, because you can actually draw some geographical lines. If you draw a line down from DC, along the coast of Virginia, Atlantic, coastal Virginia, you pick up most of the heavily democratic areas, all of the bedroom communities outside of DC come down to Richmond, which is a capital go down towards the big naval bases, Hampton Roads, and so forth. And then there's the rest of Virginia. And so you have this little blue strip that runs down the coast. And then you have the rest of Virginia, which is all red, other than a few cities, you'll have Roanoke and a couple of other cities, small areas that are urban Democrat, Sanders. So you could imagine dividing Virginia up. You'd have Eastern Virginia. And then you'd have middle Virginia. And then we have, of course, West Virginia, which already exists. And there could be a couple of little enclaves that would be connected to Eastern Virginia. That would be in the center of middle of Virginia. So I can see that. Because outside of the blue strip, to the south of Washington, DC, Virginia was very solidly in the other camp. But I don't know about other states, and certainly that isn't true of Maryland or whatever, Kentucky, Tennessee, I would divide those geographically, I have no idea that that that's even conceivable. So we have this difficulty. You have within the society, all of these groups, are these two, two big, antagonistic groups. And how do you reconcile? How do you reconcile a group that says we're perfectly willing to engage in electoral fraud if it obtains our short term interest? And another group is or no, we don't want electoral fraud. Okay, I don't care about that guy. I don't care. I don't think you care about Trump and Biden.

1:14:34

That's not the overall. Yeah, this is much bigger.

1:14:39

Yeah, there's a big, much bigger principle than Trump. Well, Biden, actually could reverse those people and put Trump on the Democratic side and Biden on the Russians, I wouldn't make any difference to the principal. So nothing to do with personalities. It even has nothing to do with their policies, politically speaking or economically speaking. It has to do with the survival of the underlying system of the foundational system. You destroy the foundation, the whole edifice collapses with it. And that's what they're doing

1:15:06

in that hypothetical that you propose of what do we do as a people divided? Is if it's true that the halfs are half who believe in the rule of law and half who do not adhere to the restrictions of the Constitution or the restrictions of orderly society, the restrictions of rule of law?

1:15:23

Well, yeah, certainly, especially if public official drum, which is supposed to be on the side of the rule of law, either stands aside, or sides with the people who are against the rule. What do you look at all of these Portland, Portland, Seattle, in New York, LA, and in all sorts of cities that are engaged in these riotous events, in which What happened? The local officialdom, stood down. Maybe they didn't exactly side with the rioters, but they certainly didn't protect the local businessmen and so forth from the looting and destruction that went on. So now, what do you say about that kind of a situation if it develops across the country? Oh, my goodness, how how do you correct that situation? That's why I say these are unprecedented events? Because not only do we not did we not have them in the past, we really don't have any idea how to deal with them if they occurred in the future. Well,

1:16:27

I think they're not entirely unprecedented, because you pointed out that there have been some really horrific stories of either Central or South American countries and other empires in the past, which has fallen,

1:16:38

we're not correcting them. They've been hurt. That's exactly right. Demographic stories, these things went bad. And they went bad to a destructive end. Yes. And they still haven't corrected them. Right? Look at all the South American countries, they need one major South American country that has a stable constitutional risk government in favor of human rights. They want? Well, there you go. You can't name it. They've gone through all this turmoil. Left is governments right wing governments, military coups, military hunters back and forth, up and down, and they're still in that mess? Whatever kind of government they may have, in principle, and name, they're still in that mess. And so I look at this say, well, we are in like, on the edge of the precipice. You go over the edge of the precipice, and it's a long drop down, down, there's no bottom. Because look at the South American countries with no bottom there, clearly.

1:17:41

I was hoping you could give us some suggestion of what an ordinary person who is gravely concerned about this highly motivated for the good of their family, their children, their grandchildren, our nation can do at this time?

1:17:56

Well, I think you've got to go back to and I don't want to put this in the kind of militaristic and civil war context, you've got to go back to the principles of here in Virginia, it's Article One, section 13. In the US Constitution, Second Amendment, what does it say? What, what is necessary for the security of a free state what is necessary for the what is the natural defense, natural, proper and safe defense of a free state the way the Constitution of Virginia, well organized militia? well organized militia, were not simply talking about people with guns, we're talking about people organized in a in a political structure, recognizing that they have the ultimate power in society. And when public officials get out of line, and there's no other way to correct them, the people have to act directly. And we will come to that that'll be the choice eventually this goes down that road. The public officials don't correct this situation by returning to real constitutional principles and suppressing the anti constitutional antics of others in public office, then the people themselves are going to have to speak out just the way they did under the Declaration of Independence. And I think if anyone wants to look at the history of this as an example, forget Massachusetts, because that's the example most people think of look at what happened in Virginia from 1773 onwards. Gives Virginia gives a classic example what goes on when the governmental apparatus at the highest level turns against the people refuses to listen to the people's just petitions for redress. Now turned out successfully in that instance, historically speaking. But that's from all.

1:19:51

In addition to that, do you see you've mentioned feckless examples of people who are in positions of authority by Right, but are not exercising it Are there any standouts whom we can throw our support behind who are fighting the good fight currently?

1:20:10

Well, no, we're gonna have to see it, we're gonna have to see what Trump does. He's unfortunately, he's the fighter we have in the ring. That's my problem we had, thank goodness, he's apparently accepted someone like Sidney Powell, who, you know, who showed her ability with the Flynn case. But she's only one person. I hope she can influence some others who are already there and maybe cause Trump to bring some more people in at this late date. It's just it's a good sign that finally he listened to her. Yes, probably because of our success in the Flynn case. But once again, is only one person. So there's no sign of a sign of hope there. It's a little flicker. But it's better than nothing. And she has been successful with Flynn up to this point. And certainly someone who's not going to simply roll over and play dead for them. Well,

1:21:04

it's proving to be a extraordinary and eventful time in our the lives of all of us and in our republic. And we would like you to continue to be there for us giving us clarity, and helping us to see with the eyes that you bring to that what's unfolding. So we'd like to have you back at your nearest availability as we move forward, because sounds like things are going to be happening a lot in the next month to two to three months.

1:21:29

All right, well, whatever.

1:21:30

Very good. We've been speaking with Dr. Edwin Vieira, constitutional attorney Dr. Vieira, thank you very much for joining us on behalf of our viewers on liberty and finance.

1:21:40

Okay, thank you.

1:22:00
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