

The Coming of the 2nd Republic

Congressional Purge and Constitutional Reform

However you regard the Constitution of the United States, neither you, nor I is a signatory to it. Accordingly, it is a document imposed on us since birth and one that we are compelled to accept so long as we retain US citizenship.



This said, there are those among us who would argue that we are free, and that we may choose between rejecting or accepting our citizenship.¹

These same people would surely argue that we are also free to pay taxes, go to war, and incur debt on behalf of those who exercise authority over us or go to prison. Unfortunately, neither of these alternatives has little or anything to do with the exercise of political freedom. For, rejecting one's homeland in favor of another's, where you may or may not be accepted, is hardly a worthy choice. Similarly, going to prison, so as not to forsake one's homeland, is little better than committing suicide as an act of courageous defiance and then being labelled

1 Nancy Gibbs and John F. Dickerson. "America, Love It or Leave It". Time Magazine. 3 April 1999. [online document | reserve] (downloaded: 27 February 2011).

During the Vietnam War we were told "America, love it, or leave it!" In so many words, Americans were telling other Americans, "Submit to the atrocities that we support and lie about your freedom, or exercise your freedom, admonish yourself of our crimes, and we will perpetuate the lies without you." Since then, it appears to have become a recurring refrain.

a pitiful failure or an embittered idealist by most of humanity as a result.

Most disturbing in all of this is that the US Constitution is written in our name, "We the people of the United States of America ...". In other words, we either accept our Constitution as our own and become responsible for the atrocities that our government permits, abets, or otherwise engages in, or we reject our Constitution and become refugees without a nation, or alternatively, criminals unto our own. If these choices were not bad enough, our government raises the money for these despicable acts from the proceeds of our own labor and the sale of debt that we are finding ever more difficult to repay.

The principal on this debt is purchased primarily by our own nation's wealthy, the wealthy of other nations, and their governments. In contrast, the interest on this debt is serviced by *all* Americans through tax dollars. This debt, if you are at all unclear, is a legal claim on our national output -- namely, our labor! And, when our labor is no longer sufficient, then our property -- the very soil that we call our homeland. We are becoming a nation of indentured servants to our own wealthy and the wealthy and governments of other nations!

What is worse, these wars are being conducted in the name of individual freedom and world democracy while our own personal freedoms are shrinking and the common peoples of other nations receive the brunt of our government's aggression.

With the passage of time our government has become corrupt and sclerosed. How this has happened seems pretty clear, for after 222 years of congressional assembly, the same people that signed the document are still in power, and it was never "We the people!"²

Let us again be clear. No federal legislation ever becomes law without the approval of the US Senate. The

2 Lysander Spooner, "No Treason", Part I (1867), Part II (1867), and Part VI (1870). US District Court Clerk's Office, State of Massachusetts. [online document | reserve] (downloaded: 27 February 2011).

members of the Senate are elected for 6-year terms, but midterm and general elections occur every two. This means that in a given election only a third of the Senate is ever subject to change. In effect, newly elected Senators are outnumbered by two to one; and no matter the election results, those who dominate the key committees continue to determine legislative outcomes. As a result, the US Senate, rather than being a rudder of principle and keel of historical destiny, has become a rubber stamp of an unelected, wealthy elite who pedal their influence among individual Senators, and who utilize their wealth to manipulate the political process in their favor.

The problem does not reside only in Congress; rather, it permeates the entire political system. Under current conditions the American electorate does not and cannot choose wisely at the polls:

Firstly, the choices that the typical voter is provided are largely determined by the middle or the top and without the support of the top have little chance of gaining favor. What was once was a grass roots political procedure is no longer. Consequently, many of the 200,000 polling precincts of our nation's 3000 plus counties are lacking party precinct heads. Further, the people who occupy our counties' political apparatus are often as entrenched as their state and national counterparts. Rather than encouraging grass roots participation when candidates are being selected, each party waits until after the selection has been made before knocking on doors to get their candidates elected. As a result, the choice with which voters are eventually left is between different members of the same establishment. Finally, by the time it comes to choosing between a donkey and an elephant the ideological battles lines are drawn, and only those issues that can be neatly categorized as clearly right or left and do not pose a direct threat to the establishment are discussed.³



³ Jimmy Carter, 39th President of the United States. 2006. Palestine: Peace, Not Apartheid. New York: Simon and Schuster. [online document] MSNBC's Hardball Interview about the President's book. See also, Roddy A. Stegemann. "It is not what you say, rather what you do not say that counts - An exercise in reverse logic." Viewpoint. [online document] 28 September 2003. These are both examples of the near ab-

Secondly, both political parties and the media assume that voters have little time for politics, that they are primarily interested in what their government can do to improve their individual buying power, and that they vote only for candidates that can project a popular *persona*.

Indeed, what needs to be discussed is often too complex for any of us to understand well in the time that we are willing to spend on it. As a result, we yield this understanding to media experts who filter out what we need to know in favor of what we would like to hear, see, and watch. Further, important discussion is reduced to simple opposing views from among which listeners, readers, and viewers can then decide. Moreover, with an upcoming national election always on the horizon, the analytical framework for these discussions is invariably ideological in nature. This means that issues that cannot be neatly molded into two opposing views, one from the conservative right and the other from the liberal left, are often neglected in the mainstream media.



Invariably each of us takes a stand, some of us with more confidence than others, but few of us very well informed about anything. What we do not know we automatically replace with explosive speech, poignant *ad hominem*, and ethnic, racial, religious, and sexist bigotry. For in the end, we do not really want to become too involved, but want to feel that our opinion counts, and that we know what we are doing. Nearly half of us even bother to participate.

Thirdly, it is not that our politicians are not attentive to our needs, because they are. Simply, they are not listening for the reasons that we might believe. For, in the end, the better they listen, the better they are able to mold public opinion, get elected, and serve the bidding of those already in power. Alas, their motivation for entering public service, however well meant at the outset, is inevitably corrupted by whatever they find when they enter office. In short, what they promise to do before they enter and what they are able to achieve thereafter are often contradictory, for there is little that can be done

sense of rigorous public debate regarding the six-decade-long occupation of Palestine by the Israeli government and the US government's undaunted support of the occupation.

without the power to achieve it. Briefly, newly elected representatives, senators and presidents are confronted with the same dilemma that a new member to any established group is faced. In order to be accepted, you must accept.

This means that anything they introduce, represent, or otherwise promote must be approved by the standing majority that greets them when they enter. Their only leverage is their vote that is actively sought by those with established agendas who are willing to grant certain privileges in exchange for support. By the time these newly elected members to congress and the president have finally established themselves, they have conceded so much of what they came in with, that they are indeed part of the establishment.⁴



ing crime-ridden inner cities, drug cartels, illegal immigrants, GMO infested crops⁶, toxic dumping grounds, endangered species, disappearance of the extended family, marital musical chairs, air and water pollution, and the more recently discovered phenomenon of global warming. For, in order to create wealth we must induce, gather, coordinate, and exploit large numbers of people and resources. These actions uproot, uncover, dislocate, transfer, mobilize, and otherwise transform what was already in place. In this regard it is the role of the entrepreneur to excite people into sacrificing what they already have in an effort to obtain more. Unfortunately, this incitement is often achieved with little understanding of the true value of what is being sacrificed. In many cases this sacrifice is coerced through war and market deception.



The Establishment

So, what is the establishment? In brief, it is those with wealth and power who have spent their entire lives working hard to achieve their fortunes at the expense of others who -- many times willingly, and many times with no other choice -- have followed in their footsteps in pursuit of personal fortune, albeit often several orders of magnitude smaller. In short, neither the wealthy and powerful, nor their followers are eager to surrender what they have earned.

And, who can blame them?

The downside of this process is of course social, biological, and physical environmental destruction⁵ includ-

4 Dwight D. Eisenhower. Farewell Speech. 17 January 1961. [online document | reserve] (downloaded on 21 February 2011). Establishment in this context refers to the financial, military, industrial complex that controls congress and most of Washington, D.C through its relentless and costly lobbying efforts. The term military-industrial complex (MIC) was coined by Dwight D. Eisenhower in his final speech as 34th President of the United States.

5 The notion of creative destruction was advanced by Joseph Alois Schumpeter in 1942 in a book entitled *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. In his book Schumpeter argues that wealth creation is an essentially destructive process driven by

Human beings tend to take for granted what they already have, and often do not appreciate it until they no longer have it. The social, biological, and physical environments into which we are born are exactly this sort of thing. Important is that they are much more easily destroyed than we are capable of rebuilding them. Our market system is centered around the individual, and this focus coincides well with our notion of individual liberty and personal freedom.⁷ Unfortunately, what is good for the individual is not always good for the collective.⁸ Accordingly, in our zeal to improve our own situation, we neglect our social, physical, and biological

competition and the need for innovation.

6 *Monsanto Canada Inc. v. Schmeiser*, [2004] 1 S.C.R. 902, 2004 SCC 34. [online document | reserve] (downloaded on 4 March 2011). Monsanto claimed stolen profits from a Saskatchewan farmer whose harvested plants contained genetically engineered material created by Monsanto, but acquired by the farmer's plants through natural fertilization. Monsanto lost in a Supreme Court ruling. Percy Schmeiser [online audio clip] courtesy of interview with Andrew Wood.

7 In 1957 Ann Rand argued in her epoch work *Atlas Shrugged* [online document | no reserve] that human beings are by their very nature selfish and self-serving.

8 In economics the fallacy of composition refers to economic activity that begins as a boon for the one, but finishes as the bane for all when others behave as does the one. Environmental pollution, overcrowded cities, and the break-up of the extended family are all examples of this phenomenon.

environments until they become so painful to dwell in that we finally cry out. Unfortunately, there is no one to listen to our cries but others who are suffering the same or similar plight. So, we look to each other and wonder what has happened. Eventually, we begin to notice that someone is missing -- the entrepreneurs whom we followed down the path of environmental self-destruction and wealth creation. For, they have fled to nicer environments that are sometimes close and sometimes distant, but in nearly every case clearly separate and different. They are environments that most of us cannot afford, and we become justifiably angry.

We know that we must clean up the mess, but find it difficult to do. Ironically, we have focused so long on the acquisition of personal wealth, that self-sacrifice in the absence of direct tangible benefit now appears an alien concept. So, we turn to government to provide us with the collective discipline required to restore what we have individually ruined. Government, however, is not only reluctant, but often incapable.⁹

So once again, our shrewd and industrious entrepreneurs step in with their lobbies and back-door enticements so as to secure special favors and privileges that are, of course, used to generate even greater wealth and more tax dollars. Though some of these tax dollars are used to clean up our sagging social, biological, and physical environments; most of them are used to expand our military machine, pay the interest on our ever burgeoning debt, and create even more environmental destruction.



The Dilemma

Obviously government has something to offer everyone, but just like those who fill our market place our government officials cater to the highest bidder.

In order to solve this dilemma we must refocus our government's attention on us, the people. In order to do this

⁹ Stacie Thomas. A River Ablaze - Cuyahoga Revisited. PERC Reports: Volume 17, No.2, Summer 1999 [[online document](#) | [reserve](#)] (downloaded on 4 March 2011).

we must sever the closely cultivated ties between our politically elected government officials and our highly placed, often hidden, commercially elected entrepreneurs upon whom we have bestowed so much power through our dollar votes at the cash register. For if we do not, our plight as a people and the plight of other peoples over whom our national government has wreaked and continues to wreak so much havoc will continue.¹⁰

At some point our ever rising national debt and trade deficits will no longer be sustainable, the interest that we pay on our borrowed money will be so high that it cuts into our government's discretionary spending. This means that government will have to choose between cutting services to us, the people, or renegeing on our overseas military commitments. Either way it will spell disaster for our nation. For in the first instance our social, biological, and physical environments will become even more unbearable, and in the second instance a power vacuum will occur that is filled by nations that may or may not be friendly toward our own life-style and values that we hold so dear.¹¹

¹⁰ Richard Gage, AIA, Founder, Architects and Engineers for 911 Truth. 9/11 Blueprint for Truth: The Architecture of Destruction. [[online document](#) | no reserve] (downloaded: 27 February 2011). The 11 September 2001 attack on the World Trade Center and our nation's capital was not an accident, and we still do not know who is responsible for the towers' destruction. What we do know is that the event was used as an excuse to invade two nations that posed no direct threat to our own security. In his President and the Press Speech recorded on 27 April 1961 at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City before the American Newspaper Publishers Association [[online document](#) | [reserve](#)] (downloaded: 26 February 2011) John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United State of America, warned of the dangers of excessive government secrecy and the obligation of national and local press corps to keep the American public accurately and timely informed.

¹¹ Niall Ferguson, "Complexity and Collapse: Empires on the Edge of Chaos". *Foreign Affairs*. 26 February 2010. Information Clearing House [[audio_clip](#) | [online document](#) | [reserve](#)] (21 February 2011). Niall Ferguson is an accomplished historian who understands well the nature of empires and the important role that improper finance plays in their collapse. See also Roger W. Garrison. 2001. *The Macroeconomics of Capital Structure*. London: Routledge. The following PowerPoint presentation [[online document](#)] (downloaded on 4 March 2011) outlines a solid counter argument to the unsustainable growth model on which our economy is currently based. The presentation requires a solid background in undergraduate economics.

In anticipation of the inevitable we must reject our current path, rise up as a people, and interrupt this process, so that we can start over on the one hand, and preserve the ideals with which we started on the other.

Although most Americans sense that there is something wrong, they do not want to be bothered, for they know that their voice means little in Washington, are mistakenly convinced that their system is the best in the world, and want to get along with their individual lives as best they can. Other Americans participate in elections year after year in the belief that their active participation will make all the difference. These latter do not seem to understand that voting left or right, up or down, or back and forth inevitably leads to the same or similar outcome.¹² Still other Americans view the system to be an incurable monster that must be destroyed at all costs and actively pursue to undermine it.

The Solution

There is, however, a sane and middle course, that I believe can secure our future and bring about the requisite changes. I hereby propose the formation of a second republic and strongly urge that we, the people, march on Washington peaceably, together, and in large number to demand the following:

1. The resignation of both houses of Congress and the Supreme Court.
2. A thorough and open review of our current constitution whose purpose would be a redrafting of the old document to take into account the important demographic, social, technological, environmental, and economic changes that have taken place during the past two centuries and more.
3. A nationwide referendum that would decide the legitimacy of the new document, and
4. Pending the document's acceptance, new elections that would take place unencumbered by the current state of the national press and political apparatus.

Finally, I propose that we do not leave Washington until our demands are met or we perish in the spirit of our forefathers.

¹² Roddy A. Stegemann, "My Christmas Wish: An End to America's Political Disease - Bipolarism". Viewpoint [online document]. 24 December 2010.

Let us provide our current president with the opportunity to achieve his election promise of *real change*. Let us provide him with the opportunity to go down in history as our nation's greatest freely elected president or most despised constitutional despot.

That he would shed our blood with twice as many people at his doorstep than when he was inaugurated, or that he would reject our help to bring about the fulfillment of his own campaign pledge is simply inconceivable, lest he be the biggest charlatan and scoundrel in the history of our nation.



Ours are the powers "not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States".¹³ As far as I can tell, none of the above four demands are denied us by the Constitution of the United States or any of our States.

It is time, and it is upon us to return our government to the voice and the will of the people. Let us not follow the paths of other empires that have gone before us.

¹³ The Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States ratified on 15 December 1789 as the final two amendments of the Bill of Rights. In full, the IX Amendment reads: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people". And, the X Amendment reads in full: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people". [online document | [re-serve](#)] (downloaded on 26 February 2011).