



Patel Patriot

Part 4 - A Wartime President

How can this be real?

When January 20th came and Trump boarded AF1 leaving Biden as the president, I was devastated. Everybody knew the election was fraudulent. There was no possible way Trump was just going to walk away from a stolen election.

Then he did.

I honestly couldn't comprehend what had happened. Like many of you, I could feel it in my bones that this couldn't be how the story ends. I started searching for answers. The devolution theory was one of the only plausible scenarios I could see playing out but I always ran into the same question.

Devolution isn't meant to be permanent and certainly wouldn't be able to last for 4 years. How does President Trump come back before 2024?

The reality is, I don't think he ever "left".

Throughout his presidency, Trump has often spoken of our nations founding. Here are parts his September 17th, 2020 [remarks from the White House Conference on American History](#) *I removed some paragraphs*.

"Our mission is to defend the legacy of America's founding, the virtue of America's heroes, and the nobility of the American character. We must clear away the twisted web of lies in our schools and classrooms, and teach our children the magnificent truth about our country. We want our sons and daughters to know that they are the citizens of the most exceptional nation in the history of the world.

To grow up in America is to live in a land where anything is possible, where anyone can rise, and where any dream can come true — all because of the immortal principles our nation's founders inscribed nearly two and a half centuries ago.

That's why we have come to the National Archives, the sacred home of our national memory. In this great chamber, we preserve our glorious inheritance: the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights.

On this very day in 1787, our Founding Fathers signed the Constitution at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. It was the fulfillment of a thousand years of Western civilization. Our Constitution was the product of centuries of tradition, wisdom, and experience. No political document has done more to advance the human condition or propel the engine of progress.

We are here today to declare that we will never submit to tyranny. We will reclaim our history and our country for citizens of every race, color, religion, and creed.

America's founding set in motion the unstoppable chain of events that abolished slavery, secured civil rights, defeated communism and fascism, and built the most fair, equal, and prosperous nation in human history.

The narratives about America being pushed by the far-left and being chanted in the streets bear a striking resemblance to the anti-American propaganda of our adversaries — because both groups want to see America weakened, derided, and totally diminished.

The only path to national unity is through our shared identity as Americans. That is why it is so urgent that we finally restore patriotic education to our schools.

From Washington to Lincoln, from Jefferson to King, America has been home to some of the most incredible people who have ever lived. With the help of everyone here today, the legacy of 1776 will never be erased. Our heroes will never be forgotten. Our youth will be taught to love America with all of their heart and all of their soul.

We will save this cherished inheritance for our children, for their children, and for every generation to come.”

This speech is just one of many examples, but you can clearly see that President Trump cherishes our nation's founding, honors its founders and reveres its legacy. This is relevant to my theory for two reasons. First, a man that feels like this about his country would do anything and everything he could to defend it and protect it from those who seek to destroy it. Second, he would do so in a way that would be justified by the very legacy he is trying to defend.

The constitution has no method for rectifying a stolen election once the electoral college certifies its votes and a new president is inaugurated, yet everybody seems to be hung up by the thought that we need to decertify each state as the audits come out. The audits have their role, but I don't think it will be to decertify anything.

We need to be thinking bigger.

What I haven't seen anybody discussing yet is what if President Trump rectified the stolen election BEFORE the electoral college certified their votes. President Trump wouldn't leave the fate of our nation to something he couldn't control. He is courageous but he isn't stupid. Once he is no longer President, the viable options available to him become greatly diminished. We have already seen governors, judges, and election officials obstruct the audit process. There is no saying what else could go wrong.

Leaving everything to hinge on post election actions of others involves far too much risk considering what is at stake. Donald Trump is too calculated for that. I firmly believe he initiated Devolution prior to leaving office so it only makes sense to me that he also cemented his “return” prior to leaving office. The two go hand-in-hand.

My Theory

Sometime between December 7th (When Trump issued executive order 13961: Governance and Integration of Federal Mission Resilience) and January 6th, 2021, President Donald Trump used a Presidential Executive Action Document (PEAD) to suspend the counting of the electoral college votes.

I have considered that he may have actually suspended the constitution altogether. We don't know what that would look like but I believe it would involve a form of martial law, something I don't see currently. Congress is also still passing legislation which wouldn't happen under a suspended constitution. Anybody who was fraudulently placed into congress will be removed but I think that happens after President Trump makes his reveal. That is why I think he solely suspended the counting of the electoral college votes. He is still President, and we're in a state of devolution at the moment.

Don't worry I brought...

Receipts

[This document from the University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform](#) has some great information on Presidential Executive Action Documents (PEADs). It also discusses continuity of government (COG) and how PEADs play a role within COG planning. If you remember my Devolution part 3, you'll know why COG planning is important. Here is a good explanation of PEADs:

Presidential declarations of national emergency enable the president to use draft classified orders to exercise perhaps even more expansive powers, known variously as Presidential Emergency Action Documents or Presidential Emergency Action Directives (PEADs).¹⁷² The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) defines these documents as “[f]inal drafts of Presidential messages, proposed legislation proclamations, and other formal documents, including DOJ [Department of Justice]-issued cover sheets addressed to the President, to be issued in event of a Presidentially-declared national emergency.”¹⁷³ They originated as part of Eisenhower-era planning for continuity of government (COG) procedures, which were intended to maintain major government operations during and following a nuclear exchange with the Soviet Union.¹⁷⁴ The situations in which the Executive Branch plans to employ such procedures, however, now encompass a broad array of declared national emergencies.¹⁷⁵

One of the most interesting things I found in this document is an exchange between two members of congress, and Col. Oliver North that took place during the 1987 Iran-Contra hearings.

There appear to be no publicly available memoranda describing PEADs that are more recent than 1979. News sources and Congressional testimony, however, indicate that planning in a similar vein occurred throughout the Reagan years. A remarkable exchange between Representatives Jack Brooks (D-TX), Daniel Inouye (D-HI), and Iran-Contra conspirator Col. Oliver North during the 1987 Iran-Contra hearings illustrates this ongoing planning:

REP. BROOKS: Colonel North, in your work at the NSC [National Security Council], were you not assigned, at one time, to work on plans for the continuity of government in the event of a major disaster? . . .

SEN. [DANIEL] INOUE: I believe that question touches upon a highly sensitive and classified area so may I request that you not touch upon that, sir?

REP. BROOKS: I was particularly concerned, Mr. Chairman, because I read in Miami papers, and several others, that there had been a plan developed by that same agency, a contingency plan in the event of emergency, that would suspend the American constitution. And I was deeply concerned about it and wondered if that was the area in which he had worked. I believe that it was and I wanted to get his confirmation.¹⁹²

Representative Brooks was referring to a *Miami Herald* report that Col. North and FEMA developed a secret contingency plan that called for

suspension of the Constitution, turning control of the United States over to FEMA, appointing military commanders to run state and local governments, and declaring martial law during a national crisis. The plan did not define national crisis, but it was understood to be nuclear war, violent and widespread internal dissent or national opposition against a military invasion abroad.¹⁹³

[Here is the Miami Herald article from 1987 which was referenced above](#) and a screenshot below.

MIAMI -- Lt. Col. Oliver North helped write a plan in 1982 to suspend the Constitution and place the country under martial law in the event of a national crisis, The Miami Herald reported.

The plan, outlined in a June 30, 1982, memo obtained by the Herald, was a revised version of contingency plans for dealing with nuclear war, insurrection or military mobilization, the newspaper reported in its Sunday editions.

So in 1982, nearly 40 years ago, a PEAD was written for President Reagan to suspend the constitution. PEADs have certainly developed over the years as we have adapted our continuity of government planning but I can assure you if there was a PEAD for suspension of the constitution in 1982, then there was one for suspending it in 2020 and there could just as easily be one for suspending solely the electoral college vote (which would be a less drastic measure than suspending the constitution completely). You cannot convince me that Trump didn't have a PEAD prepared for this stolen election.

Sure they held a "vote" and an "inauguration" and right now Biden is in office. However none of it was real or constitutional. It was a charade. Just as Joe's entire "presidency" has been. Look at this 48 second video from Trump's CPAC speech.



Trump "white house" Video

Is White House Capitalized?

Whether "white house" is capitalized depends on whether it is being used as a [proper noun](#) or a common noun.

For instance, consider this sentence to understand when is white house capitalized.

My brother works in the white house.

This sentence is quite different from

My brother works in the White House.

The second sentence with a capital "W" and "H" means that his brother works in a specific place that is the U.S. President's residence [THE White House]. The first sentence with lowercase "w" and "h" refers to a general white house where his brother works.

The next sentence with capital W' and H' means that his brother works in a specific place that is the U.S president's residence the White House. The previous sentence with lower "w and "h" refers to a general place known as the white house where his brother works.

One of the reasons why word capitalization matters are because the meaning of a word can change significantly depending on whether it has been capitalized or not. Whether a name is lowercase or uppercase determines its purpose in a sentence.

Trump is giving us an English language lesson by telling us that Joe Biden is not the president using capitalization. He explicitly draws attention to it. I can't come to any other conclusion than Trump is still the President by issuing a suspension of the electoral college vote.

Let me dive into this even further.

Remember what I have been saying the entire Devolution series. We are at war. [President Trump has told us that himself.](#)

What did President Trump say?

Speaking to reporters in the Oval Office of the White House on Wednesday, Mr Trump said: "We went through the worst attack we've ever had on our country, this is worst attack we've ever had.

"This is worse than Pearl Harbor, this is worse than the World Trade Center. There's never been an attack like this.

"And it should have never happened. Could've been stopped at the source. Could've been stopped in China. It should've been stopped right at the source. And it wasn't."

He said the attack was "the worst attack we've ever had". "Worse than pearl harbor, this is worse than the World Trade Center". That is a powerful statement but so important for my theory. Both the attacks on Pearl Harbor and the World Trade Center we're responded to by congress declaring war, and a President at war is a President with a multitude of war powers.

Campbell v. Clinton

[Campbell v. Clinton](#), 203 F.3d 19 (D.C. Cir. 2000) was a case holding that members of Congress could not sue President Bill Clinton for alleged violations of the War Powers Resolution in his handling of the war in Yugoslavia. It's certainly an interesting case but what I found most intriguing was this concurring opinion by D.C. Circuit Judge Laurence H. Silberman:

Even assuming a court could determine what "war" is, it is important to remember that the Constitution grants Congress the power to declare war, which is not necessarily the same as the power to determine whether U.S. forces will fight in a war. This distinction was drawn in the Prize Cases, 67 U.S. 635 (1862). There, petitioners challenged the authority of the President to impose a blockade on the secessionist States, an act of war, where Congress had not declared war against the Confederacy. The Court, while recognizing that the President "has no power to initiate or declare a war," observed that "war may exist without a declaration on either side." Id. at 668. In instances where war is declared against the United States by the actions of another country, the President "does not initiate the war, but is bound to accept the challenge without waiting for any special legislative authority." Id. Importantly, the Court made clear that it would not dispute the President on measures necessary to "repel foreign aggression. The President alone

must determine what degree of force the crisis demands. The proclamation of blockade is itself official and conclusive evidence to the Court that a state of war existed which demanded and authorized a recourse to such a measure, under the circumstances peculiar to the case.

If our election was attacked and our presidency about to be hijacked, President Trump was bound by his oath of office to meet the crisis with whatever degree of force the crisis demanded.

Why didn't he say anything prior to leaving office. I think there are a multitude of reasons. If you haven't noticed, we seem to be approaching a political boiling point. Think of all the different situations that appear to be coming to a head.

- **Results from the Arizona forensic audit (and other Audits getting started)**
- **Durham Report**
- **Big tech lawsuit**
- **The defector**
- **The failed policies of the Biden administration (Economy)**

Trump has clearly started ramping up his public statements and he's not mincing his words. Trump left office and let Biden play pretend because we the American people needed to wake up and take a stand to the corruption that has become the status quo. We needed to see for ourselves the infestation that has taken hold of our government. Not just us MAGA republicans, but nation as a whole. I personally think when the AZ audit is revealed, the dam breaks and Trump announces what he did.

Closing

There is a brilliant article written by James M. McPherson entitled [Any Measure Which May Best Subdue The Enemy](#). It covers how during the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln assumed numerous presidential powers now specified in the U.S. Constitution. It's worth a full read but here are the highlights. I know it's quite a few screen shots but it's too powerful and relevant not to include.

Lincoln replied, "That is the point on which I doubt the authority of Congress to act." Chandler was indignant. Alluding to the Emancipation Proclamation, he said, "It is no more than you have done yourself." Quite true, responded Lincoln, but "**I conceive that I may in an emergency do things on military grounds which cannot be done constitutionally by Congress.**"

This breathtaking assertion of presidential prerogative left Chandler almost speechless. It should not have. From the outset of the Civil War, Lincoln had exercised unprecedented powers as commander in chief. Two years before this conversation with Chandler, the president had told a delegation of antislavery clergymen from Chicago that he could, if he judged it necessary, proclaim emancipation in Confederate states because, "**as commander-in-chief of the army and navy, in time of war, I suppose I have a right to take any measure which may best subdue the enemy.**"

Whether the measures he took exceeded his constitutional authority was much debated at the time and is still controversial today. What remains certain, however, is that Lincoln vastly expanded presidential war powers and established precedents invoked by several of his successors in later wars.

Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution states simply that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States." But the Constitution does not define the functions and powers of the president as commander in chief.

Lincoln made no secret of these actions, which he justified on the grounds that "existing exigencies demand immediate and adequate measures for the protection of the National Constitution and the National Union." A year later, in response to charges of dictatorship, Lincoln insisted that "it became necessary for me to choose whether, using only the existing means, agencies, and processes which Congress had provided, I should let the government fall at once into ruin, or whether, availing myself of the broader powers conferred by the Constitution in cases of insurrection, I would make an effort to save it with all its blessings for the present age and for posterity."

Lincoln did not define those "broader powers conferred by the Constitution." At other times, however, he cited the commander-in-chief clause and the constitutional mandate that the president "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed" (Article II, Section 3). Later presidents also invoked these vague provisions to justify far-reaching executive actions—in some cases drawing on Lincolnian precedents. Lincoln believed that "by these and other similar measures taken in that crisis [of April– May 1861], some of which were without any authority of law, the government was saved from overthrow." Lincoln had taken an oath to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." This larger duty overrode his obligation to heed a lesser specific provision in the Constitution—or, as a modern constitutional scholar, Michael Stokes Paulsen, expressed in an article in the Spring 2004 *University of Chicago Law Review*, "a part cannot be supreme over the whole, to the injury or destruction of the whole."

When Congress did convene on July 4, Lincoln sent a message explaining what he had done and why. After summarizing the events leading up to the firing on Fort Sumter, the president explained that this attack left him with no choice "but to call out the war power of the Government; and so to resist force, employed for its destruction, by force, for its preservation." Lincoln had written "military power" in the first draft but changed it to "war power" in the final version. Whether he did so because "war power" seemed stronger is unclear. Later in the message he again used the phrase: He had employed the "war power" as the only alternative to yielding "the existence of the government."

Looking back in 1864 to events three years earlier, Lincoln asked in a letter to Albert G. Hodges: "Was it possible to lose the nation, and yet preserve the constitution? By general law life and limb must be protected; yet often a limb must be amputated to save a life; but a life is never wisely given to save a limb. I felt that measures, otherwise unconstitutional, might become lawful, by becoming indispensable to the preservation of the constitution, through preservation of the nation."



Trump often compared himself to Lincoln. That comparison will only grow stronger. Both did what they had to for the sake of the nation they loved.

The Best Is Yet To Come

Patel Patriot (<https://t.me/patelpatriotchat>)

Tip Jars

Paypal Link: [@PatelPatriot](#)

or

Venmo Link: [@patelpatriot](#)

PS: I don't have a way to contact you individually but I want to say THANK YOU to those who have contributed to the "Tip Jar". Means more to me than you know. Thank you so much.