Peace, Commerce, Friendship With All: Entangling Alliances With None

CHAIRMAN'S CORNER

The Badge of a Just Nation: The Founders' Foreign Policy

Were the sages of Mont Vernon, Monticello and Montpeller here today, they would cringe in despair over where America’s foreign policy has gone. Central to what the Founders promoted as a sound foreign policy for America was succinctly expressed by Thomas Jefferson, 3rd President of the United States, in his first inaugural address wherein he avowed: “Peace, Commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none.”

Now, as common sense would dictate, the Founders did embrace other measures to round out their foreign policy. One additional consideration was military preparedness; however, this aspect of the Founders’ plan would never go so far, as some have today, to establish America as the world policeman. With the nation still in its infancy, Washington, Jefferson and Madison sought a greater level of safety in counseling the new government to mind its own business and to keep from meddling in the internal affairs of any other country. Said another way, the founding fathers considered it to be in America’s best interest to remain detached, as best she could, from the politics and wars of other nations, the prime example being Europe’s endless quarrels. Hence, the Founders’ prescription of an anti-war foreign policy, which stipulated that America behave toward other governments in a manner exemplary of a just nation. Jefferson affirmed as much in his second inaugural address: “We are firmly convinced...that with nations, as with individuals, our interests, soundly calculated, will ever be found inseparable from our duties; and history bears witness to the fact that a just nation is taken on its word, when recourse is had to armaments and wars to bridle others.”

Minding America’s Business: Isolationism or Separatism?

Being of no mind to have America dragged into Europe’s petty conflicts, the Founders were comforted by the knowledge that nature had positioned America in such an insulated state. As the great General Washington observed: “Separated as we are by a world of water from other nations, if we are wise we shall surely avoid being drawn into the labyrinth of their politics and involved in their destructive wars.”

Notwithstanding the tenor of Washington’s recommendation, it would be incorrect to paint him or (Continued on page 5: Chairman’s Corner)

American must reject the leader principle and re-establish popular self-government.

Patrick Henry admonished Americans to “guard with jealous attention the public liberty.” Every patriot in that era understood him. Today, Americans have threat at them the term “homeland security.” No contemporary patriot could complain if “homeland security” entails “guard[ing] with jealous attention the public liberty.” But does it?

During the 20th century America never enjoyed real “homeland security.” All of the military conflicts in which America participated were fought for reasons of “national security.” Yet every one constituted a defeat for true national security. For “winning” a war depends upon preserving, protecting, and passing on to future generations America’s political principles and institutions intact and vibrant. But what does the historical record show?

World War I was “the war to end all wars” and “the war to make the world safe for democracy.” Neither of these goals was achieved. America’s involvement as a belligerent, rather than a mediator, guaranteed the future instability of Europe. The collapse of Russia unleashed Bolshevism. The chaos that descended upon Germany led to Hitlerism. And the Treaty of Versailles generated revanchism throughout Central Europe, sowing dragons’ teeth for an even more destructive war.

The League of Nations was a success only for proponents of “world government.” As such, it was an attack on America’s national independence. For, if after “the war to end all wars” there would be no more wars, international disarma- ment, permanently enforced by a world superstate with irresistible police powers, would be required. Moreover, if “the war to make the world safe for democracy” brought “democracy” to the whole world, America would not be excluded. America, however, is a constitutional federal republic, and cannot become a “democracy” without destroying what is uniquely American. So, either the American proponents of this slogan did not understand their own country’s political nature and legal structure, or they intended to destroy them utterly.

In Europe, World War II started in 1939 when Hitler and Stalin allied for the partition of Poland. Yet America then sided with Stalin, one of the original aggressors. And, in the end, Stalin not only won his war against Hitler, but also kept everything for which he had bargained with Hitler, and absorbed a great deal more in Eastern Europe.

In Asia, the war started over the Japanese attack on China—“maintaining the territorial integrity of China”—was America’s goal. Also, the on-going Chinese civil war posed the second great threat of communism. At Yalta, however, Roosevelt invited Stalin into the conflict. With Stalin’s assistance, Mao Tse-tung conquered mainland China, driving the Nationalists to Taiwan—thus obliterating “the territorial integrity of China.” And another nation of the war’s “Big Four” became a totalitarian communist state.

The globalists gained the United Nations. Yet “united” in what, when one of the original aggressors sat in the Security Council? And what “nations” would the Dark Powers behind this scheme allow to survive its evolution into an appa- ratus of supra-national controls?

The Korean “police action” and the Vietnamese conflict arose from the loss of World War II in China. The results speak for themselves. Now, America is embroiled in a conflict in the Middle East—which its proponents promise will be an endless “war of civilizations”, with this country pitted against 1.5 billion Muslims until either Islam, or America, is destroyed. America’s “homeland security” has steadily diminished as a result of these conflicts. Woodward Wilson sold Americans the bill of goods that they must involve themselves in all the world’s quarrels, at whatever cost.

(Continued on page 4 - Leader Principle)

What The Founders Would Say...

“It should ever be held in mind that insult and war are the consequences of a want of respectability in the national character.”

—Thomas Jefferson

To James Madison, Ford 4:192 (1786)
Biographical Sketch: Pastor Peter Muhlenberg—A Time For War

Not too far from the intersection of US 250 and US 17 there is a concrete monument marking the old village of Cabin Point, Virginia. During the 18th century tobacco was shipped from this town to Europe. That’s not what makes the village notable. During the War for Independence it was necessary for Colonial troops to be stationed here. Neither is that fact extraordinary. In January of 1781 Major General Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben arrived here with 700 additional troops. They had come to ward off a suspected challenge from British forces led by Brigadier General Benedict Arnold. The British army did indeed set up camp just south in Portsmouth, Virginia. That brings some adventure to the small town. But for our report the reason this little hamlet has importance is none of those reasons.

When General von Steuben went off to get supplies for the anticipated British challenge he left the Colonial troops in the care of a remarkable man named Peter Muhlenberg. Peter Muhlenberg is who makes Cabin Point interesting.

Peter Muhlenberg

In 1774 he became a pastor, and in 1787 he trained at the University of Pennsylvania (now the University of Pennsylvania) he traveled to Europe to attend the University at Halle, Germany where his father had taught. He studied there from 1763-1766. After a brief stint in a German regiment of dragoons, which may have had some influence on his later decisions, he returned to Trappe, Pennsylvania and was ordained as a Lutheran minister.

As the colonies moved closer to war with Great Britain there was friction in the Muhlenberg family. Father Henry had been sympathetic toward the Crown. Believing that King George was a Christ-ordained monarch and to rebel against him was to challenge God. Peter’s brother Frederick, a pastor in New York City, was initially of the same mind. That left Peter in the middle. But it was this determination for liberty that proved to be his destiny. He began his pastoral life in small churches in southeastern Pennsylvania but soon went to the Virginia frontier, specifically the young town of Woodstock. He served in the Virginia House of burgesses in 1774. That experience acquainted him further with the need for colonial independence.

The tension between Great Britain and the Patriot cause grew greater during the next two years until, of course, war erupted. It was time for Pastor Peter to take a stand. He had been contending his bold venture for some time. His plan was well thought. A grand nephew, in 1849, gave the details.

"He stepped from behind the podium and opened his black robe. There he stood in the bright, blue uniform of a Colonial army Colonel."
One of the greatest flaws of the Articles of Confederation was the lack of ability of the sovereign states to formulate a cohesive foreign policy. It was necessary for the new nation to bring itself into interaction with other countries without losing its own sovereignty. Yet, the Articles did not provide for a unified method to deal with other, more developed, nations. This interaction was a vital component to the regulation of trade between the countries. And it was recognized that trade would be necessary for the growth of this trade between the countries. And it was recognized with other, more developed, nations. This interaction did not provide for a unified method to deal without losing its own sovereignty. Yet, the Articles prior violations of these treaties to be valid.

Indiscreetly, stated that he felt the British claim of who was then the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, protecting their treaties with the Indians. John Jay, soldiers on its land. Britain also said they were under the Articles, to protect America from foreign seas. Also, the protection of the former mother country ceased, allowing for the growth of piracy on the seas.

In addition, even after the Treaty of 1783, many British troops remained on American soil south of the Great Lakes. This was to protect the free flow of the profitable fur trade. There was no way, under the Articles, to protect America from foreign soldiers on its land. Britain also said they were protecting their treaties with the Indians. John Jay, who was then the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, indiscreetly, stated that he felt the British claim of prior violations of these treaties to be valid.

The British-American Treaty of 1783 set the 31st parallel to be the southern boundary of the United States. The Spanish government disagreed and closed the mouth of the Mississippi to American shipping. However, special permission was given to shippers who pledged allegiance to the Spanish government. The British government offered protection to the American shippers when talk of a revolution brewed in New Orleans. This infuriated the shippers who asked from protection from their own government. They also demanded the right of navigation of the Mississippi.

John Jay and the eastern merchants convinced Congress to allow a trade of navigation rights in exchange for commercial concessions. Angered, the southern and western areas combined to oppose this treaty, causing negotiations to collapse.

France also became a problem. The United States was indebted to France for its assistance during the Revolution — knowing that without France, the war would not have been won. A treaty of amity and commerce was agreed upon which would have serious repercussions. It divided the authority of citizens in civil cases between French and American. The French council would have authority over the French citizens and the Americans over American citizens. It was the first international agreement made by the new Congress, but gave away much sovereignty.

These foreign agreements were but one part of the failure of the Articles of Confederation -- bringing about the necessity for the Constitution. This document allowed the emergence of a new policy affecting foreign relations. The Constitution offered few suggestions for the actual conduct of the government. It was, however, clear enough on objectives. In some areas such as control of commerce, the Constitution was quite explicit in voicing the distribution of power; in other areas the line was not as definitive. The persistent struggle between the legislative and executive branches began immediately. The recognition of the need for a strong executive branch was coupled with memories of life under an English king. A resolution of conflict was necessary and began under the first president, George Washington.

One of the most necessary powers of a government is to make treaties. The Constitution gave the Senate the right to approve treaties with 2/3 agreement of those present. The House was denied input since treaties are not related to the duties of the House -- execution of subsisting laws or the making of new laws. It was determined that treaties should be made privately, by one person -- the president. As explained by a contemporary, “Diplomatic negotiations, like a proposal of marriage, must be made in private even if the engagement is later discussed in public. The president can act secretly, Congress cannot.”

It soon became obvious that the presidential term of 4 years could invite corruption if he were the only one to make treaties. Thus, the power was divided between the president and the senate.

George Washington’s greatest gift to the country was his ability to set precedents. His wisdom and honesty allowed the country to grow and develop into a world power. His integrity, not always found in other presidents, created a path from subject colony to independent nation -- able to negotiate intelligently with other sovereign nations. His road to the development of foreign policy was not always smooth, but he set a shining example to those who followed.

Romelle Winters joined the Board of Directors of the Heritage Center for Constitutional Studies. She can be reached at RWinters@nhccs.org.
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cost in blood and treasure. And that Sirens’ song of interventionism and internationalism has remained the constant theme of every Administration since then. Wilson also oversaw the creation of both: (i) the income tax, which laid the subfoundation for the comprehensive national-surveillance state; and (ii) the Federal Reserve System, which erected the superstructure of the monetary and the long-fascism over America, without which her involvement in internationalist adventures could never have been financed.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt promoted more globalization through the United Nations. Although the Federal Reserve System had failed in 1932, he enhanced its power, using the collapse of the banks as an excuse to prohibit private ownership of gold and all “gold-clause contracts”. And he ushered in the national-dependency-state with the Pozzi scheme of Social Security. Roosevelt promised Americans “freedom from want” and “freedom from fear”—but now they suffer more fear than ever before will know increasing want.

Lyndon Johnson peddled the snake oil that America could afford both the Great Society and "homeland security". He floated this childish swindle on the confidence that "the global war on terror"—constitutional British law, the "government" for leadership—that is, for political economy—"government" is merely a collection of W E THE PEOPLE as the sovereigns, with the exclusive authority to set up or to change the "laws of nature and of nature's God" and to ordain and constitute new "governments", and to alter them when their States become destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

Pillar 2 — We the People as electors, who choose individuals to administer the government from day to day.

Pillars 3, 4, and 5 — We the People’s agents for national concerns: Congress, the President, the Supreme Court.

Pillar 6 — We the People’s agents for local concerns: the States.

Nowhere in all this does the Leader Principle appear. Everything rests upon the People. Because the Second Amendment declares that “[a] well regulated Militia is a necessary and integral part of the security of a free State”, a Militia is an essential element of that “security”. Therefore, “a free State” is one with “[a] well regulated Militia.”

The Militia also appear in the original Constitution. Indeed, the Militia are the subject precisely as to which the original Constitution and an Amendment cover the same ground and reinforce one another.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 15 delegates to Congress the power “[t]o provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions”.

This builds upon the foundation of federalism, not centralism. Yes, Congress’s authority promotes general uniformity of the Militia. Yet ultimate command and control remain with the States, to which are reserved “the appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress”.

The Constitution did not jettison the Leader Principle, the form the Leader Principle took in the late 1700s. Under pre-constitutional British law, the King enjoyed exclusive control over war and peace, the army, the navy, and the militia. All of these powers the Constitution shifted from the Executive to the Legislative Branch, by delegating to them Congress in Article I, Section 8, Clauses 11 through 16—thereby withholding them from the President.

The Constitution did not jettison the Leader Principle by accident. First, as the Declaration of Independence recognizes, a true “government” can exercise only “just powers”—which derive, not from “leaders”, but from “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” that are superior to and control the actions of all “leaders”. Second, even a true “government” merely is a collection of WE THE PEOPLE’s agents. If the people cannot lead themselves, their agents can do no better. To look to “government” for leadership—that is, for political
any of the founding fathers as isolationists, for they were not. They were, however, separatists who, with respect to foreign relations, steadfastly adhered to a philosophy that all nations have a right to be governed according to their own common interests. They loved peace and knew the blessings of it; they also knew of war’s destruction having just come through their own struggle for independence. Thus, they looked upon the never-ending European conflicts as a malignity, which impoverished their citizens, destroyed private property, and drained their respective national economies. As Jefferson observed, these belligerents held nothing in common with American freedom principles; thus, to avoid wasting the energies of the people on conflicts would be to divert our energies from creation, and the American doctrine of personal liberty, surely had persuaded them to bind themselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe’s warring regimes. Among their greatest hopes was that their own struggle for independence and the American doctrine of personal liberty, which the Declaration of Independence announced to the entire world, would serve as an example of how every nation, no matter how small, could rise to free themselves of despotism’s shackles: “May [the Declaration of Independence] be to the world what I believe it will be to (some party sooner, to others later, but finally all to), the signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which monkish ignorance and superstition had persuaded them to bind themselves; and to assume the blessings and security of self-government.” Nevertheless, and key to note here, the Founders were not moved to send America meddling in the internal affairs of other nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness.” Thus, “to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.”

But, the issue at stake for them was how to implement military readiness without endangering the people’s liberties. Washington was among the Founders who advocated support for a professional standing army. Understandably so, given the hardships he was made to suffer leading the troops to defend themselves absent the professional standing army. Washington was exonerated; his motives for issuing the Neutrality Proclamation were shown to be in the young nation’s best interest. America meddling in the internal affairs of other nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness.” Thus, “to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.”

The Founders foreign policy was not developed in a vacuum; they wholly understood the extent of dangers facing the young republic and the consequences of isolationism. Their strategy was to build and maintain cordial relations with all countries augmented by military readiness. To be ready for war was an important aspect of the Founders’ policy, for as Washington observed: “There is a rank due to the United States among nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness.” Thus, “to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.”

Make yourselves sheep, and the wolves will eat you… Readiness

President George Washington on Foreign Policy

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world. So far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it, for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements ( I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs that honesty is always the best policy.) I repeat it, therefore: let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be wise to extend them. Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable alliances, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

President George Washington. Farewell Address
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The Militia are invested with constitutional authority. The Militia are permanent establishments. The last two of the seven pillars of the Constitution declares to be "necessary" for "security"—are not carrying their share of the load of constitutional checks and balances. This has happened for several reasons:

- ignorance—which points up the need for public education. But even with education, Americans misinterpret with apathy—all too many people assume that nothing can be done to retard, let alone reverse, America's decline;
- sloth—all too many people are content to be bystanders to self-government, rather than active participants;
- irresistible-all too many people refuse to recognize the personal duty to their communities that self-government entails;
- avarice—all too many people are economic collaborators who feed at the trough of global big business, which soon leads to their political collaboration as well; and, worst of all,
- malign political interest—almost all present-day politicians and their controllers in special-interest groups want to thwart the constitutional check and balance on their misbehavior that the Militia would provide.

This was necessary even if someone such as Representative Ron Paul were elected President. For a constitutionalist President, he would know the boundaries the Constitution sets to Presidential authority, and would stay well inside them. Within the General Government, he would promote separation of powers and the propriety of the General Government and the States, he would promote federalism, not centralism. And overall, he would promote popular self-government, not the Leader Principle—by securing: (i) the Power of the Purse in the People's hands, not in the hands of a fascist banking cartel; and (ii) the Power of the Sword in the People’s hands, not in the hands of “standing armies” or para-militarized professional forces. 

Under present political conditions, Congress, the Judiciary, and the General Government’s bureaucracy would oppose such a constitutionalist President. So he would have to turn for support to the States and to the People: First, through his duty to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed”. Second, through the responsibility and authority of “the Militia of the several States”, “to execute the Laws of the Union”. And third, tying them both together, through the President’s authority as “Commander in Chief * * * of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States”.

Thus, even with someone such as Ron Paul as President, to establish constitutional “homeland security” will require revitalization of the Militia:

- The Militia are essential for popular self-government: With the Power of the Sword always in the People’s own hands, they refute the Leader Principle
- The Militia are permanent establishments.
- The Militia are unifying forces, aimed ultimately at “the security of a free State”—America needs to reject the Leader Principle.
- The Militia are permanent establishments.
- The Militia are permanent establishments.

In this installment we present Article 6: “Morbidity and Piety. As Morality and piety, righteously grounded on a high principle, will give the best and greatest security to government and will lay, in the hearts of men, the strongest obligations to due subjection; and as the knowledge of these is most likely to be propagated through a society, therefore, the several parishes, bodies, corporate, or religious societies shall at all times have the right of electing their own teachers, and of contracting with them for their support or maintenance, or both. But no person shall ever be compelled to pay tithes or contributions of any sect or denomination. And every person, denomination or sect shall be equally under the protection of the laws, and no subordination of any one sect, denomination or persuasion to another shall ever be established. June 2, 1784.”

It is necessary at this point for the student of the Constitution to see the original form of Article 6. In the Bill of Rights, only Articles 6 and 11 have been so extensively altered in their intent, and to understand their intent is necessary to understand the intent and definitions of other Articles. Art B 5:3: “A morality and piety, rightly grounded on an Evangelical principle, will give the best and greatest security to government, and lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to due subjection and as the knowledge of these is most likely to be propagated through a society by the institution of the public worship of the Deity, and at public profit; in the morality and religion therefore, to promote these important purposes: the people of this State have a right to an education: and do hereby fully empower the Legislature to authorize from time to time the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies within this State, to make adequate provision at their own expense, for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality.

Providing notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies shall at all times have the exclusive right of electing their own public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance teacher or teachers of another persuasion.

Continued from Page 4—Leader Principles
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threat associated with large standing armies to per-sonal liberty: “The Greeks and Romans had no standing armies, nor did they ever defend themselves. The Greeks by their laws, and the Romans by the spirit of their people, took care to put into the hands of their rulers no such engine of oppres-sion as a standing army. Their system was too make every man a soldier, and oblige him to repair to the standard of his country whenever that was required. This made them invincible, and the same remedy will make us so.”

Madison also favored the idea: “As the greatest danger is that of disunion of the States, it is neces-sary to guard against it by sufficient powers to the common government; and as the greatest danger to liberty is from large standing armies, it is best to prevent them by an effectual provision for a good militia.”

Some 22 years later, during his First Inaugural Address, President James Madison would again remind the people to always remember that: “...an Armed and trained militia is the firmest bulwark of liberty can never be in danger; nor with large ones...”

But to be clear, the Founders’ version of military readiness meant being ready to defend America’s borders, not those lying in some other hemisphere. Hence, it bears repeating here, whether they stood on the side of provisioning a professional standing army or that of the state militias, at no time did they envision a military so large that it could be deployed around the globe.

But today, America’s ill-advised advocates of a standing army or that of the state militias, at no time did they envision a military so large that it could be deployed around the globe. This made them invincible, and the same remedy will make us so.

Madison wrote of the scape tactics used by gov-ernments to mislead the people: he said these tac-tics were as old as the concept of government it-self: “The management of foreign relations ap-pears to be the most susceptible of abuse, of all the trusts committed to a Government, because they can be concealed or disclosed, or disclosed in such parts and at such times as will best suit particular views, and because the body of the people are less capable of judging and are more under the influ-ence of prejudices, on that branch of their affairs, of any other. Perhaps it is a universal truth that the loss of liberty at home is to be charged to provisions against danger real or pretended from abroad.”

“Madison would later reinforce this same position: “The fetters imposed on liberty at home have ever been forged out of the weapons provided for defence against real, pre-tended, or imaginary dangers from abroad.”

And so, this begs the question, just where do our personal liberties stand today in view of the fact the Founders’ foreign policy has been aban-doned by modern American government? In a nutshell, this being the tip of the iceberg only, we file through metal detectors to board airplanes or to enter public buildings built and maintained by the fruit of American labor; and, we now await the dawning of the National ID card among other congressional schemes that legislate away our liberties under the guise of keeping us safe. In view of all this, there is yet another question to be asked: “How much better off, that is safer, might we be had we adhered to the prophetic wisdom of our 18th century he-roes?”

“Peace, Commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none.”

The Framers were extremely sensitive to the delicate nature of foreign relations and of the dire ramifications that could result from foreign pol-icy gone awry. Our founding fathers hated war, their fondest hope was that America would co-exist in friendship with all nations to forever pre-cede any need for the bread earned by labor, or the fires that would destroy nations in war. In his Farewell Address to the people, President Washington made one last plea for America to cultivate habits of peace and friendship and to behave toward other governments in a manner befitting a just nation: “…just and amicable feel-ings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual ha-tred, or an habitual kindness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affec-tion, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest.”

But today, America’s ill-advised advocates of one-world-government will never fail to remind us of how we now live in a different, more dan-gerous world; one our forebears could not possi-bly envision. To listen to them spin their faulty logic, one’s head spins in wonder at the audacity of their deception. Our forebears could not possibly envision a day like today.
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Article 5 states that the State can not infringe upon religious freedom. This codifies the personal relationship between each man and God.

Article 6 states that the fundamental principles of the Constitution are Evangelical principles and outlines the necessity to teach them to our children.

Article 7 states that the State is sovereign and independent. Where the Evangelical churches and Article 3 and 4 put personal sovereignty first, before the State, and Article 7 puts State sovereignty before national sovereignty. Therefore, personal sovereignty also precedes national sovereignty. This is reflected in Part 3 Article 3 and in the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Article 8 states that all of elements of government are accountable to the people. This is the embodiment of servant leadership.

Article 9 states that there shall be no hereditary offices. This is the repudiation of the divine right of kings.

Article 10 states that when government is perverted from its original purpose, for which it was set apart, that it shall be reformed or replaced. This is the supremacy of the people over the government.

The supremacy of scripture would also lead to the premise that all State laws must comply with scripture. Exodus 21:22 requires the death penalty of anyone who hurts a woman with child so that the child dies. Therefore, one can rightly extend the enjoyment and defense of life to extend to the unborn child. While the term Evangelical has been replaced with religious, the phrase extends the life and liberty has been unaltered, and therefore, retains its original meaning.

It is also important to realize that the removal of the word Evangelical does not change the connection that our Constitution has to Evangelical principles and the Geneva Bible. Though the identity of the principles is cloaked it does not change their identity. No other world view (Budd, Isla, Cath, Protestant, or Humanist) would result in these principles. They all embrace or at least allow for caste societies.

Only Evangelical principles result in legitimate government originating with the people, the Governors being subject to God and to the governed, unalienable natural rights, no divine right rulers, and the right to throw off a government that supplants God. A rose by any other name, or no name at all, is still a rose.

It is important to note that it was Article 6 which gave the Legislative power to authorize public schools in the towns and protected local control of those schools. The primary purpose of those schools was to teach Evangelical principles so that the people would recognize and preserve good government.

In order to best understand how the 1968 amendment changed the nature of public education in New Hampshire it is useful to see the actual changes to the article. This is shown below. The language removed is in red and the language added is shown in bold.

As morality and piety, rightly grounded on Evangelical high principles, will give the best and greatest security to government, and lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to due subjection; and as the knowledge of these, is most likely to be propagated through a society by the institution of the public worship of the Deity, and of public instruction in morality and religion therefore, to promote these important purposes, the people of this State have a right to empower and do hereby empower the Legislature to authorize in time to time, the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies within this State, to make adequate provisions at their own expense, for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality.

Forbidding unwarrantably the the several town parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies, shall at all times have the exclusive right of electing their own public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance. And that no

The article was changed without complete forethought. That is to say the motive was not in what was added, but in what was removed. There is no definition of what constitutes high principles. At least in the Constitutions of the other states they use the term “fundamental principles of the Constitution” as ours does in Part 1, Article 38. The first sentence becomes incomplete with the first portion ending in a dangling participle. There is no longer any statement of how to propagate these principles though a society. One is left the sense that some how right of the legislation and religions to contract with their own teachers is somehow integral to the propagation of high principles.

When the Constitution was amended in 1968 the power of Legislature to authorize schools was removed. This could probably be construed to prohibit them from authorizing charter schools. In understanding the effect of the 1968 amendment on local control of education, the definitions of the terms is needed. Following are the definitions from “A Rhetorical Grammar”, Thomas Sheridan 1768.

British - the particular charge of a secular priest a particular division or district, having officers of its own, typically a church town - any walled collection of houses, any collection of houses greater than a village.

corps, bodies corporate - body - body politic?

corps - united in a body or community
township - the corporation of a town

It can be seen that the original intent was very broad. By excluding the term township, the entities which could have a school was not limited to incorporated towns or cities, but was meant to include any collection of houses greater than a village.

bodies corporate - body - a corporation (a body politic)
corporate - united in a body or community
township - the corporation of a town

The inclusion of local control in our Constitution constitutes a positive reservation of rights relative to the Tenth Amendment of the Constitution for the United States of America, not only for our State, but for all States. The presence of the protection of local control of education is inconsistent with the federal department of education. An important question would be whether or not other States provided for local control of education? If so, did it survived when? Of the 14 original States, only Massachusetts and New Hampshire had such a provision. Maine, also a daughter of Massachusetts, has no mention. Massachusetts and New Hampshire removed their protection of local control in their 11th amendment adopted in 1832. This means that New Hampshire’s Constitution is the only apparent impediment to the nationalization of education.