To assume the voting public would not be concerned about "apparent" cheating of a national election is so disingenuous it lowers those with educated minds, to useful idiot status.

When looking at how different people reacted to the January 6th situation, you must first look at factual precursors of the event. Those involved (skin in the game) and just what they did (Sin of the Moment).

The Skin

Across the land, the nation watched on TV as the vote was unfolding. It quickly became apparent "vote counting" was an issue. As the night grew so did the issues, to a point they "stunk". Not apparently widespread, but in slim margin states that made the contest even closer and gave skin in the game to *those spectators/voters* who paid with votes. We watched as clerks, election officials, judges and even Governors contort and bastardize voting rules. The media obfuscated the moment by not pursing with "who", "what" and "where".

Frustration became an understatement as the blatant cheating continued to occur right in front of our eyes. Make no mistake. Those that voted (paying spectators) knew the rules and knew they were not being followed.

We know the 2020 election was the biggest turnout "draw" ever. Why? We were "told" by the media it was an anti-Trump vote. But little was mentioned or discussed about the hatred of democrats, not necessarily Trump. Many scholars and talking heads miss-judged that critical point. If it was 35+ million were voting "against" democrats, then you have added emotions into the "skin" of the spectators.

We were "told" by the media Trump could never win. There was the "skin". Why? Americans love underdogs because of their commitment to effort and its potential reward. Even when the underdog loses, it is human to live with, if not to accept, defeat. However, neither flourish when it was achieved by cheating.

American spectators are not alone in their reactions to cheating during sporting events. The very perception of cheating occurs like a ritual in competitive contests. Like a "fan" reaction when a home plate umpire calls a runner out, and the catcher never had the ball. The level of disgust intensifies when it meant winning or losing the game. Watch "spectators" anger when the referee lets the other fighter win after the other beleaguered fighter could not finish due to low blows. Football "fans" react when the winning touchdown is interfered with and no flag is thrown and the game ends. Or soccer, when a penalty shot is not called and causes a goal. The "spectators" tear down the bleachers, rush the field and even attack the referees <u>because the loss is perceived as cheating</u>.

In all cases the focus of the cheated fans and spectators alike, was <u>anger towards the</u> <u>referees</u>, not the players. Hmmm.

Was that happening on January 6th? Were the voters (spectators) upset because they knew the rules <u>and</u> they weren't being followed? Did it go further than that? Was the rule breaking so apparent, the lack of enforcement so egregious and all so widespread, that spectators (those who voted) believed there was cheating going on? That ritual reaction to contest-cheating should not surprise anyone. Not even the useful idiots.

The Sin

Now, the 2020 election had a distinct difference of finality. Unlike most contests where time or accomplishments stop the contest and let cooler heads prevail, our presidential voting process continues for some time after voting day activities. The Electoral Vote determination by the State, and subsequent counting by Congress. A unique American Institution. Ballots instead of bullets. The very essence that makes our America different.

People forget. In 1960, Kennedy won over Nixon BECAUSE Hawaii changed their Electoral Votes AFTER already submitting them to Congress. Illinois sent in TWO sets of

Electoral Votes to Congress. Bush beat Gore in 2000 because Congress discarded Electoral Votes from Florida and Arkansas. Trump won congressional challenges to Electoral Votes cast in 2016. So, challenging the Electoral Vote count process is not unusual. In fact, Federal law makes Congress the referee to all such challenges and the determination to be done <u>in</u> the House of Representatives in DC. So, the contested vote <u>continued</u> until January 6th where the referees had assembled to make the final determination of who won.

At that same time the appearance of cheating had not subsided. The spectators were upset that the rules were not followed, and the contest was unfair. In fact, that perception had intensified since November 3rd. So much that thousands and thousands assembled at the Capitol. Many simply to attend a speech by the president and many to protest the vote. Were they allowed to be there?

The first amendment says it all "...the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances". Did they have the right to protest the cheating at the Capitol? Yes, there were six different permits issued that permitted "assembly to protest" at the Capitol on January 6th. In fact, three permits specifically allowed "<u>ingress</u>" into the Capitol. That means they had permission to enter the public areas of the capitol buildings.

So, at noon on January 6th, people carrying signs, chanting, and picketing had assembled at the Capitol. They were there "to promote their grievance". They had permission (permits) and the right (Constitution) to do so. How could anyone who passed the 8th grade say this was an "Insurrection"?

Like so many sporting events that start peacefully, disputes occur in the stand. Usually dedicated to shouting, beer throwing and sometimes fisticuffs. Usually, the end result has the perpetrators being thrown out, or arrested and the surrounding spectators continue watching (participating) the game. That's an altercation between spectators. That is not "Insurrection" by any stretch or means.

3

Then there are events where spectators disagree with the referring. Sometimes it is so apparently egregious, the spectator are compelled-by-ritual and focus their grievance toward the referees. Sometimes throwing things, sometimes breaking things and sometimes "taking to the field" and even accosting the referees (but rarely the players). Those actors are wrong. They were few. Their actions are criminal. Like the beer throwers or one who do property damage or those that disregard the police, must be held accountable. But on January the 6th, they were in a small minority.

The vast majority of those at the Capitol on January 6th, were protesting the <u>cheating</u> that occurred during Election Day. They brought signs, marched and chanted their very clear grievance. They arrived with permission to assemble and enter the Congressional buildings (public access). <u>Not one shot was fired</u> that day except by a Capitol policeman, who without warning, murdered an unarmed veteran female protester. One man was arrested for carrying a gun on Capitol grounds at 7:00pm (hours after the protest had cleared). He also had a valid concealed carry permit. No other gun charges have been leveled

However, several were not peaceable. They broke things and disregarded the police. They should be prosecuted no different than the belligerent drunk that throws beer at the ball game. However, hundreds and hundreds who demonstrated and remained on the grounds have been arrested and held as political prisoners. They had a grievance, were protesting and wanted Congress (the government) to fix it. They had every right to be there and make their grievance heard. Those that spout insurrection, do so out of ignorance or malicious intent.

America is unique in world history. It is a country ruled by laws, not of men, and laws determined by ballots, not bullets.

The United States Constitution, first amendment says it so clear

Insurrection or

Just Pissed Off Fans

"... the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

TwoSmartFarts.com (Sept 2022)