

The Question All Republican Politicians Fear

Patriotic Americans all across the nation are continually amazed and deeply disappointed at the acquiescence of the Republican party to the endless expansion of federal government power & control, (and deficit spending) by the socialist elites occupying the Congress, the White House, the federal bureaucracy, and the courts. They not only do not always attempt to block or nullified the expansionist-statist agenda and actions but instead often join the neo-socialists in expanding ever-larger unfunded government. They are fellow members of the same club and are often loath to condemn the actions of their colleagues and call them what they are; namely the constitutional treason of oath-breaking traitors to our foundational American charter of government.

One of the most glaring examples of the failure of the Congressional Republicans to hold the Democrats accountable for their corruption and constitutional treachery is in regard to the background and documents of someone who holds the office of the President. Not one single Democrat nor Republican in Washington will dare to raise the issue of Barack Obama's unconstitutional usurpation of the office of the President. They all are solidly in the three-monkeys mode of see-no-evil, hear-no-evil, speak-no-evil in regard the his violation of the constitutional requirement that the President be a natural born American and not an alien-born American. Every office of the United States government is constitutionally open to naturalized citizens, and native-born children of foreigners, except the office of the President and its attached position of Commander in Chief of the U.S. military with all of its nuclear weapons.

None will speak the truth if they know it, and most don't even want to know it because such knowledge would be attended by the obligation to speak out about the most egregious abuse of the Constitution in U.S. history as related to the presidency. Their silence is not without reason. It is because they see no up-side to pointing out that the U.S. emperor has no constitutional clothing to cover his naked half-foreign origin. Having no up-side is accompanied by a very fearful down-side. They know that if they raise the issue, that they will be subject to either an

accusation of being racist, or subject to the question that every Republican politician wants to never hear addressed to them, namely the question thrown in the face of Senator Joseph McCarthy: "Have you no decency, sir?"

Every abuse of power, every unconstitutional act and executive order issue by Barack Obama, and every question raised regarding them, (as well as an impossible Social Security number, and a nine-layer counterfeit birth certificate image) are stifled by the very real fear of having that foul, disrespectful, ostracizing question directed at the person who dares to raise such issues. Who dares to stick his head up and get it shot off? What non-flush nail wants to get hammered? -to get smacked down to a flush, conforming, non-threatening position when one can simply stay flush with all of the other silent floor-board nails and not get hammered?

What Congressman wants to be the one to suffer being the target of the most damning question in modern political history? "Have you no decency, sir?" Which means that you have no decency or else the question would not need to be asked. It implies that one is without shame when one should be ashamed to ask about things that bring disrespect to the target of one's questions. What importance is attached to the respectability of the person questioned by McCarthy's questions, or his modern day counterpart?

In McCarthy's day, the subjects were "honorable public servants" with distinguished careers serving their country. In today's world the subject is the guy who got himself elected to the office of president.

More than one of McCarthy's targets, it has been learned, actually *were* either communists or communism sympathizers and willing collaborators with the Russian Communist Party and government regardless of their sterling reputations as American public servants. In other words, they were frauds. They were closet betrayers of America and her values. President Roosevelt had encouraged hiring such communism sympathizers during WWII in order to facilitate coordination with our allies the communist Russians. After the war ended, hundreds of them found jobs inside the State Department. So McCarthy was not barking up an imaginary tree after all. His "indecent" questions were apropos after all.

In today's world, they are the neo-socialists, aka: Progressives. Is that a bad thing in and of itself? No and Yes. It's "No" because political beliefs & goals are something that everyone is free to hold and work for. It's "Yes" because those goals are in direct opposition to the freedom that our founding fathers and every generation since have fought and died to protect and secure. Those goals are in direct opposition to the United States Constitution & Bill of Rights, and the values that it and the Declaration of Independence convey, which are individual liberty, equality, and justice.

Barack Obama does not embrace those American values nor the United States Constitution which he violates everyday that he retains his hold on the presidency. But will the Republicans ever even timidly raise their hand and echo the request of Oliver Twist; "I'd like some more, please."? -as in "some more answers", -some more actual truth, -some more transparency, some more release of significant sealed, buried, and hidden facts and records.

No, they will never individually nor collectively ask for more because the light that would be shined would fall not only on the liar-in-chief but on them as well since they were guilty of misfeasance and dereliction of duty for not vetting him, beginning with asking the obvious questions as the only body that has the option to find an elected President to be "not qualified" for the office. Instead of being the watch dogs for America, the Democrats in Congress were the Obama lap dogs, and the Republicans were their fellow running dogs.

But they were ok with that because at least no one would be asking them: "Have you no decency, sir?" No one would shine a spotlight in their face and impugn their reputation with the implication that they were boorish, uncouth, redneck simpletons with no sense of respectability and civility toward the American chief executive and the dignity of his high office. Fear of being shamed insured their silence. Cowardice assured the triumph of constitutional treason, and falseness over truth, openness, and fidelity to the only thing that binds us together as a nation. We are not bound together by race, ethnicity, religion, language, royalty, nor philosophy,

but by common values and our fundamental law, a document written in stone which every elected official in the land is sworn to defend and protect even though almost all of them are hypocrites to their sworn oath, -and violate it on a frequent basis.

If you were the one in the line of fire of those who seek to defend the indefensible, your answer to the question: "Have you no decency, sir?" should be: "Yes, I do sir, and it compels me to ask the questions that our founding fathers would have asked, -the kinds of questions that they asked regarding his Imperial Highness the King of England. Thank God they weren't "too decent" to asks those questions and raise those issues. Thank God they weren't too "decent" to be willing to die before giving in to being intimidated and shamed into silence. Silence, like the silence of the lambs as they are led to the slaughter, is never a good thing when it comes to the issue of the defense liberty, the pursuit of truth, and the quest for justice. Unfortunately, we will be seeing nothing but such silence because there are few to none with the courage to ask the questions that will antagonize the loyalists to the socialist cause, and thus elicit from them the question that every politician fears.

a.r. nash august 2012 obama--nation.com