



Infamous Obama AG Holder Makes Fast And Furious Attempt To Pass Election Takeover

P. Gardner Goldsmith

March. 25. 2021

The Senate Democrats Wednesday, March 24, trotted out infamous Obama Attorney General Eric Holder in their fast and furious attempt to pass S. 1, the Senate version of election-sabotaging bill H.R. 1.

Somehow, it seemed fitting.

After all, this is Eric Holder, the legendary man known for achievements such as his well-deserved 2012 “Contempt of Congress” award, which he was given after repeatedly skirting legislators’ questions related to his involvement in the illegal and hypocrisy-revealing “Fast and Furious” operation conducted shortly after Barack Obama appointed him chief “law enforcer” in the nation.

This is Eric Holder, well known in 1995 for telling a salivating, slobbering audience of leftist ideologues that the federal government should get public schools to “brainwash” kids into supporting political attacks on the natural right to keep and bear arms.

Yes, Eric Holder who, as Investors Business Daily noted at the time, saw Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) connected arms smugglers “walking” 2,000 semi-auto rifles and pistols from Arizona into Mexico, whereupon many of the weapons were snatched up by violent drug cartels, brought back to the US, and found at murder scenes:

Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry was killed in December 2010 at the hands of an illegal immigrant working for the Sinaloa Cartel just 10 miles from the Mexico border near Nogales, Ariz. Two AK-47 assault rifles found at the site of the Terry shooting were traced back to a straw buyer allowed to smuggle guns into Mexico with the blessing of the ATF and Eric Holder's Department of Justice.

Holder is the “honest” man whom the Dems called on Wednesday to fire off rhetorical nonsense, all in support of S.1, attacking the constitutional rules on elections.

Overusing the rhetoretician’s “rule of threes”, Holder delivered a sentimental, ahistorical monologue likening our era to that of the Jim Crow south, and depicting S. 1 as similar to Reconstruction, calling the bill part of “the greatest pieces of civil rights advancement since 1965.”

Given Mr. Holder’s tenuous hold on veracity, this deserves study.

In fact, Holder doesn’t even have a firm grasp on the kind of political system the Constitution established.

To the Senate, he chattered:

Events of the past few months have brought into stark focus what has been true for too long. There is a large, powerful faction in this country intent on retaining power, and will bend or break the rules of our democracy in order to do so.

Indeed, there are many factions in this country intent on retaining power, because too many people like Eric Holder – people from both major parties, and a few other parties that have popped up in US history – have expanded the claimed “power” of the federal government to smother state prerogatives and personal liberties, completely contrary to the Constitution that was supposed to keep them in check.

Many of us citizens understand that Holder and his ilk are using S. 1 and H.R. 1 to do precisely what he decries: “bend or break” the Constitutional “rules,” to let Dems retain and expand power.

Indeed, it’s power he seems to want, and the Constitution he appears to forget.

In his “testimony” Wednesday, Holder ignorantly described the US government as a “democracy”, when, in fact, as Aristotle stated and the Founders understood, rule by “democracy” is a danger to individual rights. Instead, the United States system is a constitutional republic, with limited democratic voting procedures lodged in the elections for “Representatives”, and with very limited, enumerated “powers” granted to the feds. The rest are left to states and the people therein.

One of those reserved to the states is the manner in which state electors are chosen for Presidential elections. This is explicitly laid out in Article Two of the Constitution and attacked by S. 1.

But Holder long ago displayed contempt for the Constitution and truth, so why stop there? He eagerly added to the nonsense, claiming:

The attack on our system of government did not begin or end with the insurrection at the Capitol on January 6th.

Which is a statement that presents a couple false dichotomies.

First, it again insinuates that only the “evil” opposition in the GOP has attacked that magical “democracy” he erroneously believes is the operating system of the US, when, in fact, a majority of DC Democrats opposed the 1964 Civil Rights Act and Dems far outnumbered Republicans in opposing the subsequent 1965 Voting Rights Act in DC.

Next, the very bill Holder promoted is a threat to state prerogatives over their Presidential elections.

And this paladin of “civil rights” Wednesday danced past the fact that S. 1 establishes federally coerced funding for elections through a levy attached to corporate settlements of federal suits.

But that’s okay, evidently, because he’s set up a straw man with the bogus narrative of “insurrection,” falsely portraying the rabble that entered the Capitol in early January as “insurrectionists” when not one of them was charged with such a crime. Indeed, Holder

Wednesday portrayed opponents to S. 1 as part of a dark tradition in America, a racist gang of overlords who would silence his vaunted “people’s democracy.”

This is the guy who said government schools should brainwash kids about guns.

Holder was so laughably deceptive during his Wednesday fantasy fest, one felt as if, perhaps, it was 2012 all over again, and the guy was “testifying” about “Fast and Furious.”

As the Cato Institute’s Walter Olsen notes about provisions of H.R. 1 that are included in S. 1:

(This) is a sprawling omnibus measure that would assert federal control over a broad array of areas of American life related not just to elections and campaigns but to the dissemination of opinion about politics and policy, as well as a range of matters yet further afield...

So much for civil rights and the Constitution.

Olsen also observes:

Seeking to strike back against the Supreme Court’s Citizens United decision, the bill would require disclosure of the names of many persons who donate to organizations that engage in policy-oriented speech that falls far short of electioneering.

He adds:

Notwithstanding the status of the Article III judiciary as a separate and independent branch of government, the bill presumes to order the drawing up of a Supreme Court ethics code. Not a voting rights issue.

And, in addition to banning or revoking state Voter ID requirements, Olsen notes that:

Various provisions of the bill that do relate to voting procedure would require states to do things like adopt early in-person voting, liberally permit so-called ballot harvesting, and create independent redistricting commissions. Election Day would be made a public holiday. Whether good ideas or bad, these venture into areas of electoral reform that until recently were distinguished from voting rights as such, as well as (formerly) being left to local option under our system of federalism.

This is the kind of oppression Holder promoted Wednesday, but, given his shameless behavior during the Obama Presidential nightmare and his double-standards on guns, Holder’s sad appearance pushing S. 1 while spouting nonsense about "civil rights" perfectly fits the pathetically ugly, deceptive mindset behind the bill.