Our nation was born a republic! Yet, to our own demise, Americans are of a nature to call their government a democracy! Intentionally or through ignorance, the term democracy rolls off the lips of elected officials, political hacks, and TV talking heads to describe our system of government. Its use is further endorsed by a government education system buttressing the fact that we “pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands!” But then, that might well explain the push to remove the Pledge of Allegiance from America’s classrooms, for it stands in stark contrast to what is being taught there today.

It was a Plan…Not a “Great Experiment!”

Though we often hear differently, America is neither a democracy nor something akin to a great experiment. To the contrary, many of the ideas the Framers instituted were not of their own creation and, most certainly, not experimental in nature. Our nation’s forefathers were avid students of history and well studied in all of the ancient governments. In their pursuit to craft a more perfect union, they stood on the shoulders of liberty oriented political theorists; those like Richard Hooker, John Locke, Montesquieu, Blackstone and many more. They scrutinized the various systems of government known to have operated in their time and before their time. They were careful to avoid the failures of both the Roman Republic and the Greek Democracy. As Benjamin Franklin explained: “We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those Republics…And we have viewed modern history for models of government, and examined the different systems to describe our system of government. Its use is further endorsed by a government education system buttressing the fact that we “pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands!” But then, that might well explain the push to remove the Pledge of Allegiance from America’s classrooms, for it stands in stark contrast to what is being taught there today. It was a Plan…Not a “Great Experiment!”

The Making of America

With the lessons of history guiding them, the delegates to the 1787 Constitutional Convention labored to craft a government that would not exploit the people, a government well suited to guaranteeing its citizens their God-given unalienable rights, the most important of which include life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To hedge the inherent risks of creating a more powerful central government, they modeled the American Republic in all of the ancient governments. In their pursuit to create a more perfect union, they stood on the shoulders of liberty oriented political theorists; those like Richard Hooker, John Locke, Montesquieu, Blackstone and many more. They scrutinized the various systems of government known to have operated in their time and before their time. They were careful to avoid the failures of both the Roman Republic and the Greek Democracy. As Benjamin Franklin explained: “We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those Republics…And we have viewed modern history for models of government, and examined the different systems to describe our system of government. Its use is further endorsed by a government education system buttressing the fact that we “pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands!” But then, that might well explain the push to remove the Pledge of Allegiance from America’s classrooms, for it stands in stark contrast to what is being taught there today. It was a Plan…Not a “Great Experiment!”

The Making of America

With the lessons of history guiding them, the delegates to the 1787 Constitutional Convention labored to craft a government that would not exploit the people, a government well suited to guaranteeing its citizens their God-given unalienable rights, the most important of which include life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To hedge the inherent risks of creating a more powerful central government, they modeled the American Republic

(Continued on page 3 - America Is a Republic)
The ratification of this Constitution is so repugnant to the Textors on which we are all bound to amend and alter the former that it became a matter of surprise to many that the proposition could meet with any countenance or support. Our present Constitution expressly directs that all the States must agree before it can be dissolved; but on the other hand it was contended that a Majority ought to govern—That a dissolution of the Federal Government did not dissolve the State Constitutions which were paramount to the Confederacy. That the Federal Government, being formed out of the State Governments the People at large have no power to interfere in the Federal Constitution. Nor has the State or Federal Government any power to confirm a new Institution. That this Government if ratified and Established will be immediately from the People, paramount the Federal Constitution and operate as a dissolusion of it.

So intensely did Luther Martin believe that the new Constitution was unlawful and contrary to the desires of the people that he walked out of the Philadelphia Convention before the debates were concluded. He did appear two weeks later but continued to oppose what he may have called a national usurpation of authority. His dogged determination to stop the Constitution led Thomas Jefferson to name him the ‘Federal Bulldog’.

Luther Martin was not greatly prominent at the outset. “This gentleman possesses a great deal of information but he has a very bad delivery, and so extremely prolix (verbose), that he never speaks without tiring the patience of all who hear him.” So James Madison describes him.

In defense of Madison, Martin did speak for 3 straight hours in opposition to the Virginia Plan. (That was sure to bore a Virginian.) But in the next few months and years, his reputation and legacy grew. How did Mr. Martin get here?

Luther was born in New Brunswick, NJ, February 9, 1748. Like many of his fellow convention lawyers he was trained at the College of NJ Princeton. Relocating to Queens-town, Maryland, he studied law and was eventually admitted to the bar of Maryland and Virginia. His practice in Somerset became extremely lucrative, the largest law office in the state. Before the court in Williamsburg, Virginia, in one term he defended 38 clients- 29 were acquitted. He was a busy man.

His reputation for bold, consistent speech led to his appointment on a commission to oppose the claims of King George regarding the Colonies. As Maryland State Attorney General, he hounded Loyalists, bringing as many to trial as he could.

During the War he showed his patriotic zeal by joining the Baltimore Dragonis. His fervor for the independence of the states was never doubted. That may be why he opposed the direction of the new Constitution.

If the states had coalesced so generously to gain freedom from an oppressive power, why should that open association be locked up by a far stronger, central power. Luther Martin saw that as wrong. But in spite of his strong oratory and passion the Constitution was ratified. (His own state, Maryland was several that were in ratification.)

One of the areas about which he was most passionate was sovereignty. He submitted what eventually became Article VI as a construction for states to maintain their voice at the national level. Compared to his proposal, the final copy is clearly ‘big government,’ Martin’s words. Resolved, “that Legislative acts of the U.S. made by virtue of and in pursuance of the articles of Union, and all Treaties made and ratified under the authority of the U.S. shall be the supreme law of the respective States, as far as those acts or treaties shall relate to the said States, or their Citizens and inhabitants—That the Judicatures of the several States shall be bound thereby in their decisions, anything in the respective laws of the individual States to the contrary notwithstanding.”

The final copy read: “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.”

It may seem like a minor adjustment, but exchanging the supreme law of the states to the supreme law of the land is a sea change in authority. Martin intended to keep maximum power at the state level. The Constitution invests that control in Congress. This is but one example of how that contract decimated a question of power. Does the term ‘law of the Land’ carry the same significance as ‘laws of the respective states?’ Where does the power lie?

It was Luther Martin’s belief and contention that the States were supreme. And he spent his life fighting for the rights of states. “He lamented the ascension of the national government over the states and condemned what he saw as unequal representation in Congress. Martin opposed including slaves in determining representation and believed that the absence of a jury in the Supreme Court gravely endangered freedom. At the convention, Martin complained, the aggrandizement of particular states and individuals often had been pursued more avidly than the welfare of the country.” And what did this term ‘Federal’ imply?

Among his notable cases are his defense and acquittal of Aaron Burr in 1807, and his friend, Supreme Court Justice Samuel Chase, in 1805. But, in regard to his championing of states’ rights, McCullough vs. MD, 1819, must take priority. In a grueling 3-day long argument, he contended that Congress did not have power to grant charters to incorporations; and that, if they did, the states had power to tax the same. He lost this case to the plaintiff, ably defended by Daniel Webster and David Pinckney. That ordeal took its toll on Martin physically. He eventually suffered a severe stroke and a resulting paralysis. Penniless, he was taken in by Aaron Burr and spent his remaining years as a guest in Burr’s home. He died July 10, 1826.

During the days of the Convention, Luther Martin said to fellow Delegate Daniel Jenifer about the Constitution: “I’ll be hanged if ever the people of Maryland agree to it.” Mr. Jenifer responded, “I advise you to stay in Philadelphia lest you should be hanged.” To the contrary, in 1822 the state of Maryland passed a law, an unprecedented mandate, requiring every lawyer to pay an annual tax of $5.00 in support of Luther Martin. Hanged indeed!

Luther Martin 1748—1826

How's Your Constitutional IQ?

1) Certain huge cities have become larger in population than a number of states. Some want their own representatives in Congress and the Senate, even though they are not necessarily asking for full statehood. Could this be achieved by an amendment to the Constitution?
2) What is the one offense the President cannot pardon?
3) Name two reasons why the Founders were so strongly opposed to direct taxes, especially income taxes.
4) Which amendment deals with warrants of arrest?
5) Name the two most unpopular amendments to the Constitution.
6) Benjamin Franklin said that most people have a “natural inclination” to drift toward what kind of government?
7) In what city was George Washington first inaugurated as President of the United States?
8) When the President nominates a person for a high office in government, what portion of the Senate must confirm the nomination?
9) According to the Constitution there are two kinds of treason. What are they?
10) Who was the only President to serve in Congress after being President?

Answers:

1) 12th Amendment
2) Treason
3) Because taxes are impossible to collect fairly without invading the privacy provision. 2) Impeachment 3) Direct taxes such as the income tax. 4) Fourth Amendment 5) 18th Amendment 6) A strong central government, such as a government with a king. 7) New York City which was the capital of the United States at that time. 8) A majority of those present. 9) Waging or income tax. 6) A strong central government, such as a government with a king. 7) New York City which was the capital of the United States at that time. 8) A majority of those present. 9) Waging or income tax. 6) A strong central government, such as a government with a king. 7) New York City which was the capital of the United States at that time. 8) A majority of those present. 9) Waging or income tax. 6) A strong central government, such as a government with a king. 7) New York City which was the capital of the United States at that time. 8) A majority of those present.
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In Pursuance of the Laws
Law vs. the Color of Law

If our Founding Fathers were here today, they would be appalled at the number of laws Americans are made to live under currently. Much of what is commonly referred to as Federal Law would not be considered law at all by the Framers of the Constitution. But, because these bad pieces of legislation are passed by a vote of the Congress, they take on the color of law. Our Founding Fathers detested that all laws passed by the Congress must conform to the Constitution; otherwise these so-called laws are void and unenforceable. The Framers expressed the confounding rule as Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution: “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; ...shall be the supreme Law of the Land...”

“I do not know a word in the English language so good as the word pursuance, to express the idea meant and intended by the Constitu-_..._ When Congress makes a law in virtue of their constitutional authority, it will be an actual law... every law consistent with the Constitution will have been made in pursuance of the powers granted to it. Every usurpation or law repugnant to it cannot have been made in pursuance of its powers. The latter will be nugatory and void...”

— Thomas Johnston

“What is the meaning of this, but that, as we have given power, we will support the execution of it?... It is saying no more than that, when we adopt the government, we will maintain and obey. Then, when the Congress passes a law consistent with the Constitution, it is to be binding on the people. If Congress, under pretense of executing one power, should, in fact, usurp another, they will violate the Constitution... The question, then, under this clause, will always be whether Congress has exceeded its authority. If it has not exceeded it, we must obey, otherwise not.”

— James Iredell, Delegate from N.C.

“(I)t is said that the laws of the Union are to be the supreme law of the land—it will not, I presume, have escaped observation, that it expressly confines this supremacy to laws made pursuant to the Constitution.”

— Alexander Hamilton, Federalist Paper #33

“This Constitution, as to the powers therein granted, is constant to the supreme law of the land... It is not the supreme law in the exercise of a power not granted. It can be supreme only in cases consistent with the Powers specially granted, and not in usurpation. If you grant any power to the federal government, the laws made in pursuance of that power must be supreme and uncontrolled in their operation.”

— William Davie, Delegate from N.C.
But... Don't We Have to Pay Sufficient Salaries to Attract Good People?  

Franklin had an answer for those who worried that not paying high salaries would de-pri-ve our country of its best leaders. He used the example of George Washington but he did not use his name so as not to further embarrass him who was presiding at the Convention:  

To bring the matter nearer home, have we not seen the greatest and most important of our affairs, that of general of our armies, executed for eight years together; without the smallest salary; by a patriot whom I will not now offend by any other praise; and this, through fatigue and dis-tress, in common with the other brave men, his military friends and compatriots, and the constant anxiety pecu-liar to his station? And shall we doubt finding three or four men in all the United States, with public spirit enough to bear sitting in peaceful council, for perhaps an equal term, merely to preserve our civil concerns, and see that our laws are duly executed? Dr. I have a better opinion of our country, I think we shall never be without a sufficient num-ber of wise and good men to undertake, and execute well and faithfully, the office in question.  

A modern-day comparison will bear out the truth of Franklin’s statement. In the state of New Hampshire, the state legislators receive no salary. There is also no state income tax in the state of New Hampshire! In California, state legislators are paid an annual salary of $72,000 per year. California has one of the highest state income tax rates in the nation. The conclusion is self-explanatory.  

Long before the Constitutional Convention, when Franklin had no salary for modest salaries, Pennsylvanians had put the following provision in their State Constitution. It in-cluded a solution to the problem of many people wanting the same office:  

“As every freeman, to preserve his independence, (if he has not a sufficient estate) ought to have some profession, calling, trade, or farm, whereby he may honestly subsist, there can be no necessity for, nor use in, establishing offices of profit, the usual effects of which are dependence and servility, unbecoming freemen, in the possessors and expectants: faction, contentation, corruption, and disorder among the people. Wherefore, whenever an office, through increase of fees or otherwise, becomes so profitable, as to occasion many to apply for it, the profits ought to be less-ened by the legislature.”  

Hopefully, through the work of freedom-loving people and with the grace of God on our country, [last year’s elections will begin to produce the kind of elected officials the Founders envisioned...  

…The state constitutions should be the guar-dians of our domestic rights and interests; and should be both the support and the check of the federal government.  

Melancton Smith  
New York Ratifying Convention 1788
Little by little, they began tearing down the pillars that the Framers had erected to undergird the safety of the republic: “...from the very beginnings of the whole design, to convert our republican form into a democracy was in two parts. The part was to make our people come to believe that we had, and were supposed to have, a democracy. The second part was actually and necessarily to be changing the republic into a democracy.”

Can the Framers’ Republic Be Saved?

The founding fathers established a Constitutional republic. They did so in order to provide the highest protection possible for our God-given rights. To that end, the Framers incorporated the freedom principles embodied by the Declaration of Independence into the Constitution itself. In other words, these principles were made “...part of the very foundation of our republic. And [their principles] said, that man has certain unalienable rights which do not derive from government at all.” Considering that, both the government and citizens of our republic. And these principles were made Constitution itself. In other words, these principles were made into levels of government in between himself and manageable groups for the purposes of electing their own leaders...a democracy.  The second part was actually and necessarily to be changing the republic into a democracy.”

Prophetic Words...

Our country is too large to have all its affairs directed by a single government. Public servants, at such a distance [WASHINGTON, DC], and from under the eye of their constitu- ents, must, from the circumstance of distance, be unable to administer and overlook all the details necessary for the good government of the citizens; and the same circumstances, be rendering detection impossible to their constituents, will invite the public agents to corruption, plunder, and waste. And I do truly believe that if the principle were to prevail in the United States in which the general government possesses all the powers of the state governments, and reduces us to a single consolidated government, it would become the most corrupt government on the earth. You have seen the practices by which the public servants have been able to cover their conduct, or, where that could not be done, defu- sions by which they have vanished it for the eye of their constituents. What an augmentation of the field for jobbing, speculated, plundering, office building, and office hunting would be produced by an assumption of all the state powers into the hands of the general government!

I Liked It Better When...

Children in 4th grade were reading material beyond 12th grade level rather than adults having to write at a 4th grade level in order for other adults to understand.

The strength of the President was re- flected by his character not by his abs.

Christ and the Ten Commandments were welcomed in school and condoms were not.

The citizenry heard Harvard University’s famous motto: “Veritas pro Christo et ecclesia” (Truth for Christ and his Church) rather than hearing the words America is “no longer a Christian nation.”

People were more concerned about placing virtuous character into each student rather than money.

People turned to the truth to face reality rather than relying upon myths.

People understood America is a Constitutional republic and did not speak of her as a democracy.

Government proclamations were about fasting and praying rather than eating and having fun. (See: http://www.michigan.gov/gov/1,1607,7-168-25488-232493--,00.html)

People got their doctrine from church rather than their indoctrination from the public schools.

People understood that ultimate authority was in the hands of the people and not in the government.

People made decisions based on facts rather than by mere feelings.

A day of humiliation meant submission to the Divine Will not being groped by a TSA agent.

Although I liked it better “when,” I do look forward to tomorrow! I look forward to even more Americas appreciating their heritage and the phrase “a shining city on a hill” as in Matthew 5:14-16: “You are the light of the world: a city set on a hill cannot be hid.”

And, better still... when the people come to understand that America is free only because our Constitutional Republic was established upon a solid foundation of unchanging Biblical principles.

Arline Helms Sr. Advisor NHCCS Michigan

Sound Bites...

“The best argument against democracy is a five-minute conversation with the average voter.” —Winston Churchill
A Commentary on the Constitution of the State of New Hampshire
The People’s Liberty

This article is in continuation of the series of documentaries on the New Hampshire Constitution. The following five articles deal with the administration of government. They work to define the relationship between the people and their government. Though they contain fundamental principles, in many ways they go beyond the general statements of principle and give instruction on how certain powers are to be delivered.

Art.11. (Elections and Elective Franchises.)

All elections are to be free, and every inhabitant of the State of 18 years of age and upwards shall have an equal right to vote in any election. Every person shall be considered as an inhabitant for the purposes of voting in the town, ward, or unincorporated place where he has his domicile. No person shall have the right to vote under the Constitution of this State who has been convicted of treason, bribery, or any willful violation of the election laws of this State or of the United States, but the supreme court may, on notice to the attorney general, restore the privilege to vote to any person who may have forfeited it by conviction of such offenses. The General Court shall provide by law for voting by qualified voters who at the time of the biennial or State elections, or of the primary elections thereafter, are of city elections, or of town elections by official ballot, are absent from the city or town of which they are inhabitants, or who by reason of physical disability are unable to vote in person, in the choice of any officer or officers to be elected or upon any question submitted at such election. Voting registration and polling places shall be easily accessible to all persons including disabled and elderly persons who are otherwise qualified to vote in the choice of any officer or officers to be elected or upon any question submitted at such election. The right to vote shall not be denied to any person because of the non-payment of any tax. Every inhabitant of the State, having the proper qualifications, has equal right to be elected into office.

June 2, 1784

Amended 1803 to provide that in order to vote or be eligible for office a person must be able to read the English language and to write.

Amended 1827 to prohibit these convicted of treason, bribery, or willful violation of the election laws from voting or holding elective office.

Amended 1842 to provide for absentee voting in general elections.

Amended 1855 to provide for absentee voting in primary elections.

Amended 1868 to provide for right to vote not denied because of nonpayment of taxes. Also Amended in 1868 to delete an obsolete phrase.

Amended 1876 to reduce voting age to 18.

Amended 1884 to provide accessibility to all registration and polling places.

Article 11 describes the qualifications for the right to vote. It is important that originally this Article had only the first six words and the last sentence. The intervening language consists of specific causes for which the suffrage can not be denied and must be denied. It is interesting to note that these all constitute qualifications for suffrage which have been generally covered in Part 2, Article 28 (repealed 1976). Unfortunately, by that point, understanding of the parts of the Constitution was being lost. Mixing elections with voter qualifications has caused confusion. In reference to the recent controversies, it states the equal right to office and establishes exclusive jurisdiction over absentee ballots to the General Court. The obsolete phrase removed in 1968 is not delineated, and as the Article still contains all of the original language, it is probably the qualification of reading English, added in 1903, that was removed. The positive qualifications for franchise are inhabitancy and age. The concept of free elections flows out of the Magna Carta and is reiterated in the English Bill of Rights 1689.

The meaning of inhabitant as a qualification for the right to vote (suffrage) is being questioned and is being defined in law such that it alters the Constitution; which is unconstitutional. In order to understand the true intent of the founders, the definitions of the words as they understood them are important.

Following are definitions from Thomas Sheridan’s, “A Rhetorical Grammar,” London, 1780:

- 

Inhabitant: Dweller, one that resides in a place.

- 

Dweller (v): to inhabit, to live in a place, to reside, to have a habitation.

- 

Habitation (n): place of abode, dwelling.

- 

Abode: Stay; continuation in a place.

Since these definitions are hardly exclusively, we can look for guidance in Webster’s 1828 "Dictionary of the American Language." This is especially important as Sheridan’s does not include the word domicile, but Webster's does.

INHABITANT, n. A dweller; one who dwells or resides permanently in a place, or who has a fixed residence, as distinguished from an occasional lodger or visitor. One who has a legal settlement in a town, city or parish. The conditions or qualifications which constitute a person an inhabitant of a town or parish, so as to subject the town or parish to support of different governments or states. Inhabitant is defined in Part 2, Article 30 as being an inhabitant of where one is domiciled. This is a higher level of definition than can be achieved in a statute.

RESIDENT, n. One who resides or dwells in a place for some time.

DOMICIL, n. [L., a mansion.] An abode or mansion; a place of permanent residence, either of an individual or family; a residence, animo manendi.

DOMICIL, DOMICILIATE, v.t. To establish a fixed residence, or a residence that constitutes habitancy.

DOMICILED. Having gained a permanent residence or habitancy. Clearly, at least in the American context, the fundamental qualification for voting and holding office was to be a permanent resident. Domiciled is used to define inhabitant in Part 2, Article 30. Domicile is clearly defined as a place of permanent residency. Furthermore, it is the qualification for being elected a Representative or Senator.

We’re So Sorry Mr. Franklin...

Romelle Winters

One evening, on the O’Reilly Factor, Rep. Anthony Weiner (D.NY) told the story about Ben Franklin. After the Constitutional Convention, Franklin was asked by a woman, Mrs. Powell, “Mr. Franklin, what kind of government have you given us?” Franklin responded, “A democracy, if you can keep it.” Whoa. That’s not right. Franklin never mentioned democracy but told Mrs. Powell that we would have a Republic. Though, it appears we haven’t kept it.

Congressman Weiner seems not to know what kind of government the Founders, in a speech, gave us, but also misreads and misquotes History.

Congressman Weiner? That’s right. A man who -- under oath -- swore to uphold the Constitution apparently does not understand the government he has been given. And, he is not alone. Mr. O’Reilly, who claims to have been a History teacher didn’t correct him.

Newscasters, newshounds, talking heads, commentators and the rest of the sniveling sycophants, who attempt to enlighten us, also appear to be totally clueless. No newscast or congressional speech is complete without hearing our government called a democracy. The Cabinet, the Supreme Court members, and even Presidents appear to be unaware that the Constitution gives us a Republic.

The question arises: Do our elected representatives not know what kind of government we have or are they trying to ingrain the concept of a democracy into our oatmeal-filled brains? Do they not know that different forms of government must be treated differently in order to retain their character? How can any one with a functioning conscience and minuscule intelligence not know a society cannot fulfill its responsibilities to a nation when it is controlled by an ignorant and misadjusted leadership?

Unfortunately, our present crop of officials doesn’t know; and, they are trying to change the form of government we’ve been bequeathed by minds far greater than our own. They don’t know what they are changing from or what they are changing to. The voters have little choice in options on the ballot and speak of “picking the lesser of two evils.” How sad that the dreams of men with superior minds and values are being undermined by the nightmare goals of small minds and smaller ideals.

School textbooks insidiously tell students that our democracy is governed by a “living document.” That is an outright lie fostered by the misguided philosophy of the spoiled brats allowed to run free during the 60’s. President Obama, sounding like the typical child of the 60’s, speaks of the wave of revolution and unrest in the world, when he praises the
undisciplined actions of the “youth” as they attempt to change the world. Doesn’t he know that maturity is an important factor in shaping the lives of billions of people? Does he wish to encourage immature behavior and promote the thought that youthful ideas are the best? Does he want to continue to support unrestrained energy? When will he learn that in time his authority will be questioned? Hasn’t he noticed that his hair is getting a little gray?

Unless you are standing on a firm foundation you cannot function properly. You will flounder like an aardvark in quicksand. That is no way to run a government. Our Constitution is the guide to good government; and, when coupled with properly educated leadership, it offers a rocklike foundation from which to govern fairly and intelligently.

What in the world is going on in our country? It is quite obvious. Some people know that we have a Republic and don’t like it. The prime example of this is our President. He claims to be a Constitutional expert, but obstructs the Constitution at every opportunity. We must realize that he doesn’t like the Constitution but doesn’t like it. Why? The thought of getting into his mind is a truly scary concept. It is unexplored territory. One can only surmise that he doesn’t like the Constitution because his communist/socialist friends don’t like it. His left-wing mother probably infused that concept into his mind at an early age. His beatnik grandparents probably reinforced it. Obama is a genetic Constitution hater.

The Founders would never have believed that the populace would be so ignorant. In their day, most of the citizens owned and read the Federalist Papers. Today, that book is only skimmed by History majors in college. It’s a little difficult to read and understand by today’s undereducated scholars. We wouldn’t want their squishy minds to have to work, would we?

Let’s face it; our government can succeed only with informed voters and officials. We have seen worse. How can we expect to put intelligent people into office when we do not recognize intelligence, or when our colleges don’t teach truths, and when our people have been misled by teachers and textbooks?

Do you have your children in a private school? Don’t expect their knowledge to be greater than the public school students. Teachers are trained in the same dumbed-down universities, available textbooks are inaccurate, and no one seems to know better, or to care.

Since the rush of women into the workplace, the best and brightest of the population is no longer going into teaching – one of the few jobs once available to educated women. The draft-dodgers, running away from the unconstitutional war in Viet Nam, began to infiltrate the easy “A” classes in education and sociology. Voila! Teachers are no longer the best and brightest, but rather a haven for the many that would have been, at one time, deemed “not college material.” If your teachers are not the best, how can they challenge those students who are?

Colleges and universities became filled with ideologues that, in the 60’s, protested not because they thought the war to be unconstitutional, but because they were spoiled brats who objected to being told what to do. They believed in the left-wing command to “challenge authority” – unless it was socialist authority.

They questioned the authority of their parents, their government and even God. They wanted no one to tell them what to do except those who gave them their marching orders. They took to marching in the streets with fists pumping in support of Communism, Socialism, Nazism, or any other ism which upheld their need to be independent. Their lack of Science and morality blinded them to the stronger reins of their beloved ism. So they, and we, will be enslaved by what they have chosen for us.

Many of these mis-contents flocked to higher education and became PhDs. Thus, we have a plethora of young people being educated by the hippie generation, which has never dropped its philosophy of big government. It is odd that those who don’t want to be ordered around by those in authority have fallen for extreme authoritarian philosophies. Students joined by their sandaled and bearded professors with gray pony tails, riot with thugs and mob bosses against the freedom that the Constitution offers its people. They have been propagandized and lobotomized into believing that an ignorant government can provide the authority they strive to avoid.

Yes, Mr. Franklin, we had been given a Republic, but our hazzard has taken it from us. We could not keep it. We have had to fall to the acceleration that will be increased and soon we will be mined in the depths from what we and the other Founders attempted to protect us. The fall began with the downfall of education. No nation that prizes freedom can tolerate ignorant leaders who encourage their own replication. Will parents reverse this trend and bring our nation back to its once-great height?

Sadly: The more things change, the more they remain the same. Welcome King George, Hitler, Stalin, Marx and Weiner. We have seen our future and it is you.

(Continued from page 6 - Sorry Mr Franklin)

Cicero: Treason from Within...

“A nation can survive its fools, and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treachery from within.”

An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and carries his banner openly.

But the traitor moves amongst those within the gate freely, his sly whispers rustling through the halls of government itself.

For the traitor appears not as a traitor; he speaks in accents familiar to his victims, and he wears their face and their arguments, he appeals to the baseness that lies deep in the hearts of all men.

He rot’s the soul of a nation, he works secretly and unknown in the night to undermine the pillars of the city, he infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to fear. The traitor is the plague.”

Marcus Tullius Cicero

The Referendum... It’s Not Quite Republican!

The Fourth Article of the Federal Constitution states per clause 4: “The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution theforementioned Constitution. For the most part, they opposed the practice of direct democracy setting up instead, a representative republic where the views of the people could be refined through a body of elected officials assembled for just that purpose.

Moreover, in a free society, there are some issues that should never be put to a vote, especially when the outcome of that vote has the possibility of trumping the people’s inalienable right of conscience, for example.

Pat Sulliff
Finance Chairman, NHCCS

1) Based on the writings of Dr. W. Cleon Skousen, pp 639-640

Appeals and the United States Supreme Court: “This provision gives the United States government the right to intervene in the affairs or any state whenever the right to freely elected representative government has ceased to exist or is in jeopardy of being destroyed.”

Dr. Skousen goes further to define the term republican government: “A republican form of government is one in which the people are governed by freely elected representatives and (not) presumed to be one in which political power is divided and limited, much as in the arrangement set forth in the United States Constitution.

But, what of those states whose constitutions “allow the people themselves to make laws by voting on an initiative referendum”? Dr. Skousen questions..."whether or not this is 'un-republican' and in violation of this clause.”

We are not likely to learn the answer any time soon. “So far, the Supreme Court has refused to rule on whether or not the referendum process is an unlawful delegation of legislative authority under the republican system of government...” Although, the Court did decide, in Luther v. Borden, "that questions arising under the section are political, not judicial, and that it rests with Congress to decide what government is the established one in a state...as well as its republican character.”

Nevertheless, the practice of referendums is flawed; for, as Dr. Skousen points out, it has also allowed the legislature of referendum states to “sometimes shirk its responsibilities on delicate issues by using a referendum at the next election to have the people make a determination of a legislative issue. Unfortunately, referendum issues are sometimes deliberately prepared so as to confuse the public. For example, if one is opposed to a proposal it is sometimes written so that in order to reject the proposal one must vote yes, or to ratified the proposal one must vote no.

Then too, “it has also been observed that the referendum is an unsatisfactory legislative procedure when the issue is too complex and will require too much study time for the general public to understand it or vote on it intelligently.”

It is for reasons like these that the Framers gave the referendum no role in the American Constitution. For the most part, they opposed the practice of direct democracy setting up instead, a representative republic where the views of the people could be refined through a body of elected officials assembled for just that purpose.

In a free society, there are some issues that should never be put to a vote, especially when the outcome of that vote has the possibility of trumping the people’s inalienable right of conscience, for example.
that one be an inhabitant of the District. An 
absentee is an inhabitant who is residing else-
where temporarily. However, they still vote 
where they are a permanent resident, not 
where they are a temporary resident.

Art.12a. [Power to Take Property Limited.] 
Every member of the community has a right to be pro-
tected by it, in the enjoyment of his life, liberty, and prop-
erty; he is therefore bound to contribute his share in the 
expense of such protection, and to yield his personal ser-
sic when necessary. But no part of a man’s property shall 
be taken from him, or applied to public uses, without 
his own consent, or that of the representative body of the 
people. Nor are the inhabitants of the State controllable 
by any other laws than to which they, or their repre-
sentative body, have given their consent. June 2, 1784.

Article 12 ties the protection of one’s lib-
erty and property to the expense and execution thereof. 
This principle was used in the origi-
nal apportioning mechanisms for the two 
chambers of the Legislature. The first cham-
ber, the Senate, represented those who paid taxes. 
The second chamber, the House of Representatives, 
represented the people who were to be protected. 
The last phrase in the first sentence establishes justifica-
tion for mandatory service in the Militia. This imprims 
the one of three duties imparted to the people by 
the Constitution: financial and military sup-
port of the State in return for protection of 
natural rights (Article 2). Of course, accord-
ing to Article 3, if the protection is not ren-
dered, the taxes and service are not due. 
The second sentence is the protective state-
ment of eminent domain, and as it uses the 
term property, not real estate, or estate; there-
fore, it extends to protection of chattel and 
money. This second sentence flows out of the 
Magna Carta.

The last sentence in Article 12 is one of the 
most elegant in the Constitution. It prohibits 
anybody other than the Legislature from mak-
ing any law (or requiring any law to be made). 
This principle is restated in Article 28 in re-
gard to taxes and in Article 29 in regard to 
general laws though with more emphasis than 
in Article 29 as it refers both to the inception 
and cessation of laws. The fact that these pro-
tections are stated twice as fundamental liber-
ties underscores the importance that the peo-
ple can only be subject to laws that the Legis-
lature enacts and eliminates the capacity of the 
Judiciary to write or eliminate law. This con-
cept flows directly out of the English Bill of 
Rights of 1689.

Art.12. [Protection and Taxation Reciprocal.] 
No part of a person’s property shall be taken by eminent 
domain and transferred, directly or indirectly, to another 
person if the taking is for the purpose of private develop-
ment of other private use of the property. Nov. 7, 2006.

Article 12-a was added in response to the 
Kelo Decision in Connecticut (2005). It clari-
ifies the purposes for which eminent domain 
can be used, and substantially limits legisla-
tive prerogative. It states that eminent domain 
can not be used to transfer property between 
individuals or private parties. However, a 
strict reading of Part I, Articles 1 and 10 
would have arrived at the same result. 

Art. 13. [Conscientious Objectors not 
Compelled to Bear Arms.]