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It is therefore no accident that the Bill of Rights in regard to the federal government, and the 14th Amendment in regard to the states, protects against the deprivation of our “life, liberty, or property” without due process of law. It is therefore no accident that the idea of one man owning another man was condemned by our Founders, some of them slaveholders themselves who were, and who knew they were, condemning themselves. Our right to our property, by their principles, stems from the same source as our right to all things that naturally belong to us, including our bodies, our conscience, and our relationship with our Maker. One man, said Abraham Lincoln famously, has no right to eat the bread wrung from the sweat of other men’s faces.

If this question of the ownership society is controversial today, it is another among many signs that we are in a time of fundamental dispute. If it has been engulphed for a moment by the Gulf of Mexico, it will come back nonetheless for two reasons: first, because it is engraven upon us by our first coming together; and second, because it is in jeopardy today.

The Direct Assault on Property Rights

This jeopardy is plain in several facts of direct relation to the right to property, and in several indirectly related, through their implications for constitutional government.

Start with the direct. The right to property stands now, after a generation of court rulings and political practices, upon a different footing. This is true at every level of government, from all three branches of the federal government down to the smallest tribunal in the smallest hamlet. Which property owner, wishing to build a house or expand a factory, does not fear exactions, delays and denials that may ensue anywhere and are bound to ensue wherever land is.

(Continued on Page 4: Dr. Larry P. Arnn)

What The Founders Would Say...

Some boast of being friends to government; I am a friend to righteous government founded upon the principles of reason and justice; but I glory in publicly avowing my eternal enmity to tyranny.

John Hancock (7)
Biographical Sketch: Fisher Ames ~ The American Demosthenes

Fisher Ames was a noted American politician and orator from Massachusetts. During and after the Revolutionary War, he played a significant role in Massachusetts politics. He was a representative to the Massachusetts legislature and was known for his defense of the state's rights against federal encroachment.

Ames was born on April 9, 1738, and his father, Daniel, was a physician, innkeeper, and almanac publisher. Fisher was educated in the inn and at home until he was able to attend Harvard University, where he studied law.

During the Revolutionary War, Ames was a supporter of the Continental Army and took an active role in the defense of his state. He was a member of the Massachusetts Provincial Congress and served on the Governor's Council. He died on July 4, 1808.

Ames was known for his oratory and his defense of the rights of the people. He believed in the importance of representative government and the role it played in protecting individual liberties.

Ames was referred to as the "American Demosthenes" due to his passionate orations and his defense of liberty and individual rights. His speeches, such as "Congress shall make no law establishing religion, or to prevent the free exercise thereof, or to infringe the rights of conscience."

Ames's legacy continued to be celebrated after his death. He was remembered as a man who stood up for the rights of the people and the importance of representative government.
Bureaucratic entities are like that snowball. They become engorged with hangers-on who appear not to be able to find useful work outside of the government. The federal Department of Education is a perfect example of that runaway snowball. It is distending and useless, becoming in its travels much like an evil monster from a horror movie. No matter how many times it is killed, it keeps returning to frighten you.

When the National Education Association used its bully pulpit to help elect Jimmie Carter, they received their plum award -- a monster from a horror movie. No matter how many times it is killed, it keeps returning to frighten you.

Under George II, through his program of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the DoE has been given a role in shaping the schools in this nation that even the Nea had never envisioned. The cost under Bush II, has reached obscene levels with no end to the gouging of taxpayers in sight. What is seldom mentioned is that the amount allocated to the NCLB debacle is merely the tip of the iceberg.

In order for states to receive money, they must apply. This means that the federal DoE must set up some kind of criteria. These guidelines are worked out by faceless bureaucrats in the government whose salaries are in reverse proportion to their value to the education of our children. The state must then hire its own bureaucrats to write grant applications, using a myriad of printed information developed by the people in DC. The application is then sent in and must be reviewed by overpaid pencil pushers. They must determine whether the state is willing to implement the various, useless programs that the educators and sociologists have determined are necessary to teach the chiselliddiddlylooicons. The voucher is then sent to the state which must begin to determine what the gobbled-goop people in Washington were talking about -- and what their grant writers had agreed should be the standard. In order to do this, the state must hire people who are familiar with the language of educators -- a mixture of nonsensical, psychobabble, and idiocy.

Once accepted, these people must then rewrite the guidelines so it is somewhat more intelligible to teachers who may or may not be able to actually read the directives -- depending on their knowledge of phonics. There are also endless reports to be sent to DC to prove that the state is in compliance with the goals of NCLB. (I suspect there is no need to be too careful about these because they are not understandable by any species in this world or Rozwzel.) People are hired in Washington to read these reports and chuckle or chuck about their effectiveness.

A short time later, after the state implements the nonsense programs required by the feds, they discover the money has dripped up. The full cost now relies on the taxpayers of the state whose property taxes go higher and higher with fewer and fewer results. But, never fear, the DoE has more interesting programs it wants the states to implement and the expensive process begins again.

At the state level, their own Department of Education attempts to justify its existence by issuing standard tests. It is proclaimed that the students are doing better and better under the “progressive” education they receive. Unfortunately, that education has nothing to do with knowledge, learning, or reality. It has everything to do about how effective the ineffective programs mandated are doing to dumb down our children.

If anyone doubts the growing twaddle in our schools, go to the want ads and look at the employment section. Find the jobs available in the schools and ask yourself how many are needed, how many are productive and how many even make sense. You might also wonder how any of these positions actually contribute to the expanded knowledge of the students rather than the expanded pocketbooks of educational bureaucrats. Look around and see how many young lives have been ruined by what is a passing for education in the classrooms of the US. How many graduates have the capabilities to do more than ask, “Shall I supersize your order?”

Make no mistake about it. These bloated schools will continue to demand more and more money with fewer and fewer positive results. And when the taxpayers can no longer afford the expanded taxes commanded by the schools, there’s always eminent domain which will turn their property into a WalMart or gambling casino.

Remember the old adage: Those who can -- do. Those who can’t do -- teach. And do that: Those who can’t do or teach -- work for the Department of Education and receive inflated paychecks.

Call your representative and senators. Ask them if they know that the Department of Education is unconstitutional and what they are going to do about it. We all know the answer. But we do have to be somewhat kind to them -- after all they attended government schools.

Romelle Winters is a Public Relations Director for NWEA.
turbred. I had the pleasant task of going to his apartment periodically and carrying each chapter to the post office to be sent back to headquarters. I always hesitated going because I never knew when he was "napping." Once in a while when he came to the door, I could tell I had awakened him, but he would welcome me in as though he was just expecting me, sit me down, offer me food and drink, ask about my welfare, tell me of some exciting thought he had written about, and share perhaps some personal insights which I have come to treasure. I cannot recall one time when he made me feel the time of my visit was inconvenient for him, even though I knew I had disturbed his routine. Those interviews have become precious memories for me.

A Grateful Person.

Dr. Skousen made many friends during his lifetime and some were closely involved with him in the work of teaching the Founding Fathers' formula for freedom, particularly after he founded the Freemen Institute. On several occasions, he would remark to me how grateful he was for those few people who really stuck with him through thick and thin. He said to me that he had seen a lot of people come into the freedom effort. Many were very talented. They would stay for a while and contribute greatly to the cause, then for whatever reason, would fade into the background and pursue other courses. He said that, for whatever reason, there are very few that had really stuck with him in this effort. For those he was particularly grateful.

I have seen Dr. Skousen in times of great disappointment, when those whom he thought were his true friends turned out to be lesser friends. Perhaps they were still supportive of the cause, but they were not as involved as perhaps they could be. Over the years, some people have made great promises to him, promises of financial support, promises of involvement, but as it is with human beings, sometimes performance does not always follow promises. But I never found him to be really very critical, just observant. One time he expressed to me the feeling he had that he was so grateful that the Lord had so blessed him so as to be able to be involved in this work on a full-time basis.

“The Law Should Apply to Everyone Equally.

One of the interesting anecdotes which Dr. Skousen discussed with me one time was the way in which he solved the problem of fixing tickets for politicians when he was Chief of Police of Salt Lake City. In his book, Notes for the New Chief, he writes as follows: “Nothing destroys confidence in traffic enforcement faster than ticket-fixing. There was a time when politicians counted ticket-fixing as part of the spoils of winning an election. To be a ‘somebody’ at all, a politician had to be able to take care of tickets for personal or political friends. This corruption of the judicial process was not only demoralizing to police personnel but it also turned out to be bad politics. “Invariably those ‘insiders’ who got their tickets fixed bragged about it to show how much influence they had. As the word got around, the public set up such a howl of protest against these crooked practices that most states succeeded in driving such practices out of existence or greatly minimizing them. “One of the first things a new chief should establish with his mayor and city council is that every ticket must be cleared through court. If tickets are written in triplicate and officers are made to account for every ticket issued (appropriately explaining any which are canceled) it is possible to prevent the revival of the ticket-fixing bugaboo.

“Recently, one chief fired his mayor and city council to deliberately park their cars where they would get tickets. Each official then paid his ticket in due course and proudly displayed the receipt in his office with a sign saying: ‘The only way to fix it is to pay it.’ “The local press played up the incident with pictures and stories. The politicians found themselves praised for such unpatriotic behavior and it gave the chief the authority to say to his department: ‘Officials of our city expect no preferential treatment. Our mayor and city council support the department in its policy of impartial enforcement.’

“No Chief will miss the significance of this kind of announcement in raising the morale of a police department!”

An Honest Scholar.

One of the things I greatly admired about Dr. Skousen is that if his research produced a conclusion, he would not depart from it. Some people have been very critical of Dr. Skousen for drawing certain conclusions from his study of history. I have come to learn that those persons usually have certain agendas by which they are driven and want history to prove them right so badly, that they reject the literal meaning of historical fact and recognize. You will notice that Dr. Skousen's works are always very well footnoted. That's because some people, who have desired other conclusions, have accused him of poor research or drawing his own conclusions. As I personally have followed the footnotes which he has given, I have not only found them to be accurate, scholarly work, but I have realized, after reading those sources, that I would come to the same conclusion he did.

An honest researcher is always open to new ideas which will be developed by further and newer research. I have heard Dr. Skousen say on numerous occasions, that he has done it as good as he could; that perhaps others can do it better; and, if others discover new research or new facts he would welcome it, but he has done it as best he could from the research that was available to him. To me, that's an honest scholar.

Once in a while, as I move about the nation teaching the message of the Founding Fathers, I am confronted by someone who says, “Well, I don't agree with a Cleon Skousen.”

My response is usually: “What specifically don't you agree with him on?” The person usually can't come up with specifics, but don't you agree with him?” The person usually can't come up with specifics, but
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general. Ultimately, it is an assault upon constitutional government itself. To understand this, we must think for just a minute about the foundation of the right to property and our other natural rights.

**Why Limited Government?**

The key to understanding natural rights lies in the word “nature.” It means the essential attribute of anything, whatever makes a thing what it is. It also means, for living things, the process of begetting and growth by which they come to be and thrive.

The Founders were keen students of this subject. They located the nature of man above the beasts and below God. Being imperfect, partaking of the divine but not divine—man is capable of both good and evil. Free from the government of iron instinct, he must govern himself. Government is therefore necessary, and also natural, to the human being. But in forming governments, we must remember that those who hold the power of government are human, too. They, too, are capable of evil. And so for the same reason that government is necessary, it is necessary that it be limited. In Federalist 51 Madison writes:

“...what is government itself but the greatest of all reflectors on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern man, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. Madison is writing here about the organizing principle of the Constitution: separation of powers. That principle means simply that all the powers of government are not to be united in a single set of hands.

Separation of powers is one of the two chief safeguards built into the Constitution against unlimited or despotic government. The other is enumeration. This principle means simply that certain things are delegated to the federal government to do. There are many of these things, and they are important. They make, and they are meant to make, a powerful government. That principle means simply that all the powers of government are not to be united in a single set of hands.
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Dr. Skousen was always a person who never wanted to hurt or disparage another person. He would go out of his way to make another person feel good, even a person who didn't agree with him. I always thought it interesting, and perhaps to him it was a little difficult, that while it was not in his nature to spread gossip about others and to try to cast others in a negative light, still, as an honest researcher, he had to sometimes conclude that there had been some very unscrupulous characters, even ones in places of great influence, who had worked tirelessly to destroy our God-given freedom.

Always Teaching.

One of the remarkable things I learned and observed from Dr. Skousen was that, of the many times I was with him, I always came away having learned something. Whether it was an encounter for just a few minutes or if it was a time I was with him for several hours, I do not recall a time when I didn't come away having learned something. I don't know whether it was intentional on his part or whether it was just the way he was, but he was always teaching. I remember feeling on many occasions that, even though he wanted to hear my opinion on things, he always wanted to hear from him, because it seemed that what I had to say was always so trite. And I knew that if I listened intently to what he was saying, I would always learn something much more interesting.

We could all benefit by implementing this characteristic in our own life, but I have a long way to go to make my teaching as interesting and appealing as what I found Dr. Skousen's to be.

Moderation and Softness in His Teaching.

Even though the subjects he taught were based on solid principles and to him were “cut-and-dried”, so to speak, his approach to teaching them was so soft and moderate that he endeared his students to him as they learned. In the subject of politics, it is easy to take fixed, immovable positions, especially when one believes his opinion is based on solid, timely principles. Many times I observed Dr. Skousen's masterful art of influence in bringing people around to his conclusions without appearing to overbear.
almost 60 percent; spending on higher education has risen more than 200 percent. What do we get for this money? Not learning. It is notorious that college graduates today know little to nothing of the history of our country or its constitutional meaning. If you doubt this, ask a senior a few questions about the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution.

Nor does the money buy political support for the party that has voted these massively increased subsidies. It is notorious that the beneficiaries of federal aid to higher education, namely those who work in colleges, support the other party by embarrassing margins.

Nor do we get patriotism. In fact, a consensus of colleges is suing the federal government right now because they object only to the requirement that military recruiters be admitted to their campuses as a condition of receiving federal aid. Already these colleges are abiding thousands of pages of regulation. They object to this specific one. Perhaps they have forgotten that Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution—which enumerates the powers of Congress—mentions defense eight times. Education is not mentioned at all.

A good word is due here about many in government today. President Bush introduced the idea of private accounts in Social Security, and it has lately founded. But the cause has been taken up by a group of young members of Congress. They are proposing variations on the powerful idea, expounded by the American Institute for Full Employment, that the portion of Social Security taken directly from a worker’s pay should be placed in a private account. The other half could be used to pay benefits to those now on retirement or soon to retire. This idea would be a massive step back toward the ownership society in its full meaning.

Likewise, one wonders why those who make law today would not simply emulate the Founders in providing education. If you want to subsidize education, why not find a constitutional way? Why not a tax deduction or even a credit? Anything would be better than the current top-down bureaucratic control of matters that are essentially local or private or both.

It was well known to those who built the United States that education, food, and medicine are important. This importance has been known to nearly any fool, for as long as there has been civil society. The question is only how these things should be provided. Our Founders practiced the art of constitutional government, under which government is limited and people have the right to provide for themselves. Under this system one gets more food, and more medicine, and more education than under bureaucratic rule. Also, he gets his liberty under the law.

It was no small achievement to build the first ownership society known to man. Those who built it thought it fragile. It could be sustained only under the right principles, embodied in and practiced through the right constitutional structure. If we lose that, we will find ourselves in a condition of poverty too deep to measure in money terms.

Larry P. Arnn

Study History or Be Doomed to Repeat It.

**Advice on Education from America’s First Schoolmaster**

Noah Webster

Every child in America should be acquainted with his own country. He should read books that furnish him with ideas that will be useful to him in life and practice. As soon as he opens his lips, he should rehearse the history of his own country; he should instil the praise of liberty and of those illustrious heroes and statesmen who have wrought a revolution in her favor.

A selection of essays respecting the settlement and geography of America, the history of the late Revolution and of the most remarkable characters and events that distinguished it, and a compendium of the principles of the federal and provincial governments should be the principal textbook in the United States. These are interesting objects to every man; they call home the minds of youth and fix them upon the interests of their own country, and assist in forming attachments to it, as well as in enlarging the heart.

Two regulations are essential to the continuance of republican governments: (1) Such a distribution of lands and such principles of descent and alienation as shall give every citizen a power of acquiring what his industry merits. (2) Such a system of education as gives every citizen an opportunity of acquiring knowledge and fitting himself for places of trust. These are fundamental articles, the sine qua non of the existence of the American republics...

...children should be taught the usual branches of learning, submission to superiors and to laws, the moral or social duties, the history and geography of America, the history of the late Revolution and of the most remarkable characters and events that distinguished it, and a compendium of the principles of the federal and provincial governments. They should be instilled with the sentiments of one and all...

A good word is due here about many in government today. President Bush introduced the idea of private accounts in Social Security, and it has lately founded. But the cause has been taken up by a group of young members of Congress. They are proposing variations on the powerful idea, expounded by the American Institute for Full Employment, that the portion of Social Security taken directly from a worker’s pay should be placed in a private account. The other half could be used to pay benefits to those now on retirement or soon to retire. This idea would be a massive step back toward the ownership society in its full meaning.

Likewise, one wonders why those who make law today would not simply emulate the Founders in providing education. If you want to subsidize education, why not find a constitutional way? Why not a tax deduction or even a credit? Anything would be better than the current top-down bureaucratic control of matters that are essentially local or private or both.

It was well known to those who built the United States that education, food, and medicine are important. This importance has been known to nearly any fool, for as long as there has been civil society. The question is only how these things should be provided. Our Founders practiced the art of constitutional government, under which government is limited and people have the right to provide for themselves. Under this system one gets more food, and more medicine, and more education than under bureaucratic rule. Also, he gets his liberty under the law.
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Study History or Be Doomed to Repeat It.
men who lead with love, not lashes, and who excel in service, not suppression.

From earliest times the Lord has endeavored to promote this kind of leadership and this type of society. In the days of Enoch, God’s revealed plan for happy living became the most dominant force on earth, but at other times it often dwindled to a mere shadow and was not allowed to have any significant influence among mankind whatever. Nevertheless, whether accepted or rejected, God’s society has always constituted the one and only way to achieve a lasting pattern of universal peace and universal prosperity.

Those who are willing to concentrate their total energies and resources to the building up of such a society are called God’s “chosen people.” He calls them “chosen,” not because he would exclude the rest of mankind from the same blessings; but simply because there are those who choose to accept God’s call to service. With the Lord, a call to leadership means a call to service, and therefore his chosen people are really his ‘muster servants.’

To me, W. Cleon Skousen was one of God’s master servants, who became so because of his actions and his character. His memory gives us great hope to also be anxiously engaged in such noble causes, to carry on the work of spreading the message of freedom which he so magnificently packaged, and to bring about much rightings, but simply because these are they who chose to accept God’s call to service. With the Lord, a call to leadership means a call to service, and therefore his chosen people are really his ‘muster servants.’

A few years ago when I heard the news of the Old Man falling from his lofty perch, I wondered what natural causes had made this happen. I listened like most people in New Hampshire to the radio and TV and newspaper reports and the different reasons that were given. Some made sense, some were a bit on the crazy side if you were to ask me, although most people wouldn’t.

I listened to people saying we should try and rebuild him, make memorials to him, there were all kinds of ideas. I thought, “sure he symbolized New Hampshire and it was sad that he was gone; but, he was a natural phenomenon so let’s get on with life.” Besides, anything done to rebuild or memorialize him was sure to come out of the taxpayers’ pockets and the State is already taking enough. Why give them reason to take even more? So I was happy when then Governor Craig Benson approved an inexpensive way to remember the Old Man, and with that I stopped dwelling upon it and moved on.

Since all of that happened, I have moved my family to North Carolina. That done, I have since reflected upon my former home State and the way it has changed over the past few decades. I started thinking about the Old Man again and why it was that he symbolized New Hampshire; that is, the New Hampshire I knew upon first moving there from the Socialist Republic of Massachusetts. I came to conclude the connection was in the way he symbolized a once rock solid conservative New Hampshire at one with its volunteer Legislature and known for its strict adherence to a philosophy of low or no taxes, its respect for private property rights, local control and funding of public schools along with other conservative and time-tested Yankee ideals.

But in more recent years, the Old Man was made to watch New Hampshire’s conservative culture slowly erode away. He saw her citizen Legislature take on the character of the professionaly paid Legislatures of other States; its members voting to keep themselves in office, doing what they “think” is right for the State rather than to follow the State constitution which they took an oath to uphold. He must have thought: “How could they lose sight of why they are there? Don’t they know their job is to represent the interests of the whole people not just a powerful few? What about their obligation to ensure the citizens’ constitutionally protected rights and to maintain New Hampshire’s long standing culture of low or no taxes?”

He must have felt great remorse at the steady stream of liberals emigrating to New Hampshire, most in an effort to escape the cultural mess in the Socialist Republic of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, and Vermont etc., from which they hailed. They embraced a different culture, one which embodied liberal tax and spend ways, the notion of State control rather than local control over education. They came seeking the social services they left behind, They drove up taxes on those already here.

Then he watched as New Hampshire’s “Live Free or Die Motto” lost its thrust, its original meaning. He was saddened by all of these changes and preferred to think about happier days when only Indian tribes inhabited the land beneath him or when New Hampshire became a State. He never felt sad then, only now as he watch New Hampshire being transformed into the northern extension of the Socialism.

In retrospect, I think what happened to the Old Man was perhaps a blessing. The good Lord upon looking down and seeing the Old Man’s deep sorrow, His being a merciful God, felt the Old Man had endured enough. So it was, in the early hours of that fateful morning, the He reached down from the Heavens into Franconia Notch and cupping the Old Man’s tear stained face in His loving hands said: “You will suffer no more.” At that, He took the Old Man from his home high on the mountaintop, and laid him to rest on the mountainside below no longer having to watch the cultural debasement of his beloved “Live Free or Die State.”

_ Earl Taylor, Jr._
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**A Constitutional Gem:**

_By Donald Conley_

“A constitution should be structured to permanently protect the people from the human frailties of their rulers.”

Dr. Skousen reminds us “Every constitutional action has usually been justified by one or several ‘good cause.’” Every illegal transfer of power from one department to another has been excused as “necessary.” The whole explosion of bureaucratic power in Washington has been the result of “trusting” benign political leaders, most of whom really did have good intentions. Thomas Jefferson once wrote “that confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism; free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence; it is everywhere the parent of despotism; free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence; it is everywhere the parent of despotism; free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence; it is everywhere the parent of despotism; free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence; it is everywhere the parent of despotism; free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence; it is everywhere the parent of despotism.”

_ James Madison to George Thompson, 1825_
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