Twitter Thread by J.B. White



J.B. White
@RattlerGator



1 of 52

As our national civics lesson continues to unfold on its march toward our 59th Presidential Inauguration on January 20, 2021 and Donald Trump's second term, 45's unmasking exercise (that's a large part of what his first term had to be) continues toward its big climax.

2 of 52

In his 2017 Inaugural Address, President Trump proclaimed on behalf of his administration, "we are transferring power from Washington, D.C., and giving it back to you, the people."

3 of 52

From my very biased vantage point, here's how I like to think of that sentence.

It likely was the announcement of his two-pronged military campaign.

The first prong is obvious; it's against foreign interference.

4 of 52

As we now clearly see, nothing short of a military campaign would suffice when global influencers have totally co-opted elements of our two major political parties.

5 of 52

The other prong has an internal focus: Washington, D.C.

6 of 52

Yes, D.C. has long since stopped working for we the people and was damn near fully purchased by a corporatist elite with

interests often more closely aligned with Germany, France, England or even the Chinese Communist Party.

7 of 52

This military campaign is designed in no small measure to unmask public servants across the three branches of government who have an incorrect comprehension of what it means to preserve, protect and defend our Constitution.

8 of 52

For me, presuming I'm correct, a primary focus is the United States Supreme Court.

Foreign interests have co-opted elements of the Democrat Party along with elements of the Republican Party.

This Uni-Party mindset has partially co-opted the Supreme Court.

9 of 52

The Trumpian unmasking exercise scored a counterintuitive "victory" in the Texas v. Pennsylvania lawsuit when multiple judges failed their civics test.

10 of 52

Only two Justices passed the most obvious of tests.

Yes, that would be Justice Clarence Thomas and Justice Samuel Alito.

11 of 52

As I've noted before, Justice Thomas has asked where does the Court derive the authority to deem it has discretionary power to decide whether or not to hear a case or controversy between two or more states?

12 of 52

There is of course but one correct answer: they quite obviously and explicitly have no such authority.

Because it needs to have been explicitly granted.

Tomorrow I will explain why.

13 of 52

Championed by the Federalist Society, and based upon their recommendation, the GOP as well – Gorsuch, Kavanaugh & Barrett – somehow failed this most obvious test.

Their collective 7-2 decision was blatantly absurd and we need not blink at this fact-based observation.

14 of 52

They failed this test, apparently, based on some sense of “standing” the USSC generated themselves based upon some precedent they themselves created.

That’s a neat trick.

For imperial authoritarians.

15 of 52

It is most definitely not a neat trick for public servant Officers of the Court who stand before the nation and take an oath to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States of America.

16 of 52

So, count Texas v. Pennsylvania as another component of the Great Trumpian Unmasking Exercise.

17 of 52

And here, perfectly positioned on the question of standing, is an example of the inverted logical box lawyers and judges find themselves in.

An inverted box surreptitiously being utilized to create a credentialed class to rule the nation.

18 of 52

It’s also a window into how they, Supreme Court judges specifically, but American judges in general, could incrementally go down a road that has totally screwed up the country and allowed wrongdoers unquestioned access to national levers of power.

19 of 52

What’s inverted about the USSC logical box?

The Supreme Court overlooked a fundamental question.

If you’re going to ask the question – Standing, that is – of a Sovereign state of this nation . . . must you not ask it of your damn self?

20 of 52

Me thinks you do, public servant.

21 of 52

So I’m asking it: where do you, Justices Gorsuch, Kavanaugh and Barrett, or your peers, have standing to *not* hear the Texas v Pennsylvania case?

22 of 52

I hope my point here is clear.

It goes back to my prior thread.

First principles.

23 of 52

Justice Thomas is locked in on the First Principles confluence of [1] the need for authority granted by the Constitution and [2] respect for grants of authority or constraints imposed by statutory law.

24 of 52

Grants and constraints imposed on the United States Supreme Court . . . by their masters.

25 of 52

Question: who, pray tell, are the masters of the United States Supreme Court?

26 of 52

Answer: that would be we the people.

27 of 52

Now, quickly . . . how has this situation occurred ???

To answer this question quickly and superficially on Twitter calls for more of the Question and Answer back and forth.

I’ll leave the deeper exploration up to others.

28 of 52

Question:

Is, [a], an individual citizen of the United States engaging in the risk vs reward decisions of everyday life existing as an individual in service to judicial or other governmental masters?

Or . . .

29 of 52

Or . . . [b], are the branches of government and their entities operating in service to their masters, the citizenry of the United States?

30 of 52

The answer, quite obviously, is b.

Do you see the inverted box?

Do you ???

I've thought long and hard about this Godless theology (Communism) masquerading as an ideology (Socialism) and how, although anathema, it sneaks into Americana.

31 of 52

Here is what I've determined.

It's in the transition from our individuality as an American to our collective being as the citizenry of the United States where the secular (and Communistic) "conflation to serve obfuscation" occurs.

32 of 52

Surely you've noticed this "conflate in order to obfuscate" move as one of the leftwing's favorite tricks.

There is no more fertile ground to do so than in that transitory, simple blink of an eye, movement from "I" to "we" . . . or so it seems.

33 of 52

It is precisely that movement from "I" to "we" that has tripped up the United States Supreme Court.

Stay with me now.

I think they've forgotten it's the *British* who say the United States *are* . . . x, y or z.

34 of 52

In our linguistic tradition, *we* say the United States *is* . . . x, y or z.

No to the collective. No, no, no to the collective.

That's the American way, subject to no one in this realm but God Almighty.

35 of 52

For it is in the collective where one is confronted with the temptation to move from public servant to . . . God-like master.

And in the United States, the land of individual liberty, there can be but one *Earthly* master in this realm -- we the people.

36 of 52

America was founded upon escaping the suffocating “we” power of the English Parliament, an institution that had already wrested the suffocating power and real control of their Empire from the English King as a result of *their* Civil War (1642–1651).

37 of 52

From an American perspective, the only collective master in this world is God Almighty . . . as defined by oneself of course, because from an American perspective, amongst human beings, the individual reigns supreme.

38 of 52

No Godless theology (Communism) masquerading as an ideology (Socialism) will suffice for it is anathema, by definition, to the American experiment protected by God Almighty.

I repeat this because it is so shockingly, and casually, glossed over these days.

39 of 52

Such glossing over doesn’t happen by chance.

That’s not to say the Supreme Court has made this mistake on purpose.

No, the insidiousness of Communism and communistic thought is its ability to hide in broad daylight as you’re looking directly at it.

40 of 52

It’s a shapeshifting theology perfect for lying liars and the thieves who need it.

41 of 52

Still, the confusion in our Supreme Court with respect to standing could likely have been negated through a proper comprehension and acknowledgment of the constitutionally acknowledged hierarchy governing the United States.

42 of 52

[First]

We have no choice but to acknowledge the Master of the Universe, through whom we are provided our inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

As the State Motto of Florida says: In God We Trust.

43 of 52

[Second]

It is from this *acknowledged* subjugation, not to Crown or Government but to God Almighty, working in concert with the First Amendment establishment clause and First Amendment free exercise clause, that the next element of our hierarchy comes into play.

44 of 52

[Third]

Here stands (do you see what I did there?) the citizenry of the United States, living in the various sovereign states of our nation, for whom the Constitution was created as a tool to keep in check the encroaching power of government.

45 of 52

[Fourth]

The Constitution as personal contract mandates that our public servants are beholden to the citizenry of the United States, and all public servants are purposefully shackled with a duty to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution.

46 of 52

So, no matter what the shapeshifting serpent whispers in obedience to its Communistic master, whether cloaked as precedent or settled science, all innocent American public servants who have fallen prey to the shapeshifter, must pay heed.

47 of 52

And when an entity such as the Supreme Court forgets who their master is in this realm, we as American citizens are duty-bound to remind them that yes, certain branches may be first among equals in certain areas . . . .

48 of 52

. . . however, there is only one operational master in this realm: we the people.

49 of 52

Here’s a friendly reminder to the USSC.

You start *any* decisionmaking, Supreme Court justices, from *that* vantage point.

Not your precedents.

50 of 52

To conclude where I began, in his 2017 Inaugural Address, President Trump proclaimed on behalf of his administration, “we are transferring power from Washington, D.C., and giving it back to you, the people.”

51 of 52

Let it be so.

Take heed, Supreme Court justices, take heed.

Tomorrow . . . more on the United States Supreme Court.

Because we have to get our understanding, and their understanding, in sync.

We do . . . not them.

We are their masters.

52 of 52

Make no mistake about it; lawyers and judges all across this great nation are deathly afraid of this fact.

We *are* their masters.

@threadreaderapp unroll.