



## The Supreme Court's – Day Of Reckoning – Is Coming

### Description

USA: The election of 2020 is going to lay bare the dereliction of the Supreme Court for all to see. The COVID-19 pandemic gave numerous state election officials an excuse to implement far-reaching changes to our election processes. Those changes obviously made our systems vulnerable to fraud. States implemented massive mail-in balloting at the same time they relaxed ballot security and voter identification. They even extended the voting periods — to give the criminals more time to commit their fraud.

All these changes were unconstitutional. The Constitution clearly gives the various state legislatures the authority to define how their elections will be conducted — not state election officials. Election officials are only empowered to conduct elections within the rules set forth by their respective legislatures — except, apparently, during a pandemic. There must be a pandemic emanation hidden in a penumbra of the Constitution we didn't know about. Alarmed that the changes would invite fraud, various organizations filed lawsuits to stop the changes.

The Supreme Court declined to get involved. It ruled that the plaintiffs lacked standing because nobody had been harmed — yet. Since the election hadn't happened, nobody was damaged, and there was no case to be heard. They were thinking like a civil court, not the defenders of the Constitution they are sworn to be. It was a cowardly way to stay out of the political controversy. Unfortunately, it also missed an opportunity to defend the Constitution, which was clearly under attack.

After all the ad-hoc changes had been allowed to stand, the election of 2020 saw an unprecedented number of irregularities — too many to ignore. Election observers were banned from observing the election. Counting stopped in the middle of the night and then restarted after boxes of ballots were mysteriously found. There are reports of ballots being driven across state lines — by the truckload. There were even precincts that counted more ballots than there were registered voters! A number of states filed lawsuits against the states in which these irregularities occurred.

Even though the Supreme Court is supposed to be the arbiter of cases between states, it again refused to get involved. They ruled that Texas couldn't sue Pennsylvania because Texans had their

votes accurately counted and therefore were not harmed by Pennsylvania. Apparently having the wrong president crammed down the throats of Texans is not considered “harm.” Given the flood of illegal aliens President Asterisk has invited — and the crime that has accompanied them — would the justices consider Texas “harmed” now?

A number of other cases were dropped because the court considered them “moot.” The election had been certified and nothing was going to change that — hence no need to look at the evidence. In the immortal words of Hillary Rodham Clinton, “At this point what difference does it make?”

The court seems to have three distinct voting blocs:

1. The oath keepers — These are the justices that are willing to stand up and defend the Constitution even if it means they’ll have to endure attacks. Justices Thomas, Alito, and Gorsuch make up this bloc.
2. The jellyfish — These are the justices that lack the spine to face controversy. They’re more concerned about defending the court than the Constitution. Justices Roberts, Barrett, and Kavanaugh make up this bloc.
3. The subversives — These are the justices that have been using penumbras and emanations to rewrite the constitution in pursuit of social engineering. Justices Kagan, Sotomayor, and Breyer make up this bloc.

It’s rumored that only three justices wanted to hear the 2020 election lawsuits. Does anyone doubt that it was those who comprise the “oath keepers” bloc?

Now, Chief Justice Roberts has placed his court in a trick-box. By choosing to stay out of the election controversy, John Roberts has bet the court’s reputation that the mysteries of the election would remain mysteries. As wagers go, it was not a particularly smart one. The election involved millions of ballots, tens of thousands of election workers, and thousands of counties. If there was fraud, there is too much evidence, in too many hands, to stay hidden.

Tellingly, the Democrats are scrambling to [keep the truth hidden](#), but it’s slowly coming out. State sponsored [forensic audits](#), as well as private investigations, are turning over the stones. We’ll likely know the truth by the end of this year. If it turns out that the election was stolen, the Supreme Court will be exposed as derelict, weak, and useless. It will all be because the jellyfish bloc doesn’t understand the psychology of bullies.

The Supreme Court avoided involvement in the election because they wanted to stay out of the controversy — they didn't want to be bullied by the Democrats or the media. There are other possible motives, but they're even more disturbing. Cowing to bullies will not avoid conflict. Bullies prey on weakness. One has to either stand up to them eventually or accept servitude. Every kid on the playground has learned that lesson by the 8<sup>th</sup> grade. Apparently, John Roberts hasn't. Each time Chief Justice Roberts has acceded to the bullies, he's made the court's future challenge greater.

Ruling that last minute ad-hoc election changes were unconstitutional would have been relatively straightforward — but the court didn't. Hearing the election fraud evidence and adjudicating the result would have created a political crap-storm — but it would have been the right thing to do. What will become of the court's reputation if it becomes obvious that the election was stolen and rather than stand up, it sat down?

An April poll by [Rasmussen Reports](#) found that 51% of the population believes that fraud affected the election outcome. Does Roberts grasp the significance of that number? It's the percentage of the population who believe the Supreme Court was derelict in defending the Constitution. If John Roberts wanted to defend the court, perhaps he should have considered pursuit of the truth rather than avoidance of controversy.

A recent Ipsos poll found that 63% of the public thinks it's time to impose term limits on Supreme Court Justices. The public isn't stupid. It recognizes that the Supreme Court needs to be taken to the woodshed. The next few months will say a lot about the Supreme Court. Will it correct course, or will it embrace servitude to the mob?

By: John Green

**Date Created**  
06/19/2021