

## SCOTUS Showdown Over Stolen Election 2020

By [Stephen Lendman](#)

Global Research, December 10, 2020

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#)

In-depth Report: [U.S. Elections](#)

*Well planned in advance brazen fraud decided US Election 2020 — not voters.*

*The manipulated outcome for Biden/Harris over Trump was the latest example of US fantasy democracy, the real thing prohibited throughout the country's history by its ruling class.*

Throughout new millennium years, Grand Theft Elections have been facilitated by corporate owned and controlled electronic voting machines.

Cyber security expert Stephen Spoonamore earlier explained that they're "brilliantly designed (to) steal elections."

Losers can be declared winners and not just for president.

Time and again, US dark forces get away with election theft because corporate-controlled establishment media conceal it.

The 2020 process was a fantasy election, a coup d'état by other means — losers Biden/Harris selected over winner Trump to deny him the second term he won.

When losers are declared triumphant over winners, democracy is a mirage, the real thing nowhere in sight.

Make no mistake. If it ever emerged for real in the US, it would be banned.

As long as corporate-controlled electronic voting machines are used in the US, dark forces will decide elections, not the will of the people.

On Tuesday, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton sued swing states Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin in the US Supreme Court.

Calling results in these states "unconstitutional," he argued that these states "flooded their people with unlawful ballot applications and ballots while ignoring statutory requirements as to how they were received, evaluated and counted."

They "destroyed...trust in the integrity of (the) election" process in their states by unlawful shenanigans.

They breached "statutes enacted by their duly elected legislatures, thereby violating the Constitution."

Rules governing absentee ballots were changed by "non-legislative actors."

By so doing, they “preclude(d) knowing who legitimately won the 2020 election and threaten to cloud all future elections.”

Paxton called on SCOTUS “to correct this egregious error (aka brazen fraud)” by ordering the above scofflaw states to suspend their electors until nine High Court justices rule on this issue.

Seventeen (17) states joined the Texas lawsuit: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, and West Virginia.

When disputes between or among states occur, SCOTUS has original jurisdiction to rule on them under the Constitution’s Article III, Section 2, Clause 1.

It gives the Supreme Court exclusive judicial power to rule on “controversies between two or more States...between a State and Citizens of another State; between Citizens of different States...between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.”

The Texas complaint argues that Pennsylvania Secretary of State Kathy Boockvar “without legislative approval, unilaterally abrogated” PA statutes that require “signature verification for absentee or mail-in ballots.”

The same complaint applies to Georgia, Michigan and Wisconsin.

SCOTUS original jurisdiction power is why it accepted the Texas lawsuit without first having to be ruled on at the district and appeals court levels.

According to Paxton, the above four states breached Constitution’s Article II, Section 1, Clause 2 — the Electors Clause.

It vests “state legislatures with plenary authority regarding the appointment of presidential electors.”

Other state political and judicial officials have no constitutional authority to circumvent legislatively enacted state laws.

The Texas complaint also accuses the above four states of treating voters in their counties differently.

It states that “more favorable treatment (was) allotted to votes (in areas) administered by local government under (Dem) control.”

In so doing, Paxton argued that these states breached the 14th Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause.

In 2000, the Supreme Court ruled for Bush over Gore, citing the 14th Amendment that “prohibits the use of differential standards in the treatment and tabulation of ballots within a state.”

In addition, the one-person, one-vote principle “requires counting valid votes and not counting invalid votes.”

In its High Court complaint, Paxton argued that Texas was damaged because in “the shared enterprise of the entire nation electing the president and vice president, equal protection violations in one state can and do adversely affect and diminish the weight of votes cast in states that lawfully abide by the election structure set forth in the Constitution.”

Paxton also claimed that the above four states breached “substantive due process” requirements, saying:

They “fail(ed) to follow state election law(s)” enacted by their legislators.

“(U)authorized acts (were engaged in) by state election officials and their designees in local government (to the extent) of patent and fundamental unfairness.”

The states “acted unconstitutionally to lower their election standards...with the express intent to favor their candidate for president.”

Their unconstitutional actions changed Election 2020’s result by circumventing their own laws.

The Texas suit joined by 17 other states calls on the High Court to order the above four states to “conduct a special election to appoint presidential electors.”

If already appointed in one or more of these four states, the Texas lawsuit calls for the Supreme Court to order their legislatures “to appoint a new set of presidential electors in a manner that does not violate the Electors Clause and the Fourteenth Amendment, or to appoint no presidential electors at all.”

Paxton’s lawsuit is unprecedented in US history, his arguments strong and persuasive.

As things now stand, it appears that nine High Court justices will have final say over Trump v. Biden in Election 2020.

Will they uphold the rule of law or swim with the tide, most always following the latter practice.

Momentum at this stage favors leaving things as they now stand, regardless of how unfair and contrary to the rule of law.

If a High Court majority rules for Trump over Biden/Harris — and by its action changes the election’s result — perhaps a national convulsion could follow, what the justices clearly want avoided.

At the same time, failing to reverse brazen fraud will virtually assure that open, free and fair US federal elections no longer exist.

As things now stand, that’s the disturbing reality about US fantasy democracy — the real thing prohibited.

Election 2020 is Exhibit A.

A Final Comment

I’m not encouraged about what’s likely coming.

My sixth sense suggests no change in longstanding dirty business as usual, no High Court ordered reversal of brazen election fraud.

I surely hope the rule of law will triumph over the illegitimate Election 2020 result.

Explaining long odds against things turning out this way, Law Professor Jonathan Turley said the following:

Trump is "running out of runway." Turning things around in his favor would be like successfully "land(ing) a jumbo jet on a postage stamp."

\*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

*Award-winning author Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at [lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net). He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG)*

*His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."*

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html>

Visit his blog site at [sjlendman.blogspot.com](http://sjlendman.blogspot.com).

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Stephen Lendman](#), Global Research, 2020

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Stephen Lendman](#)

#### About the author:

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at [lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net](mailto:lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net). His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html> Visit his blog site at [sjlendman.blogspot.com](http://sjlendman.blogspot.com). Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)