



The ŷŷCon-Conŷŷ Con-II

Toddy Littman, Friday 07 January 2011 - 14:46:18

This article is the second part in continuation of a discussion against a Constitutional Convention, the first article is located here, <http://changingwind.org/index/news.php?item.133.1> or can be found at <http://changingwind.org>, unless I posted them together with the previous article (4 pages) above.

We do not need a Constitutional Convention to Amend the Constitution *for* the United States of America, as this instrument is our property and belongs to us (That's what the document refers to itself as, not a Constitution "of," a Constitution "for," http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_transcript.html, images also available there.). We The People are the only ones with the Sole Sovereign Authority over Our Written Constitution, vested in each and every single one of us according to Supreme Court Justice James Wilson, who also is one of the 6 people who signed both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution *for* the United States of America: "Permit me to mention one great principle, *the vital principle I may well call it*, which diffuses animation and vigor through all the others. The principle I mean is this, **that the supreme or sovereign power of the society resides in the citizens at large**; and that, therefore, *they always retain the right of abolishing, altering, or amending their constitution, at whatever time, and in whatever manner, they shall deem expedient.*" James Wilson, Founding Father, Lectures on Law: Volume 1 Chapter 1 page 17."--Italic emphasis mine, original Lecture document images are linked at the following as well, <http://govote.avoicethepeople.com/quoting-the-founders/james-wils...> Benjamin Franklin, as well as the rest of the Founders, have stated similar things, and in particular, The Federalist Papers authors, Jay, Hamilton, and Madison, their personal writings throughout their lifetimes, are filled with statements of the same sentiment. Striking to me, is that this is consistent with the purpose and intention of the Constitution that President Obama questioned in his WBEZ interview: A charter of negative liberties in a non-exclusive grant of revocable specific limited powers from the States and the people by enumeration delineating the duties and limits government, that governs all members of that government by the specificity of enumeration, including specifics of each branch, to assure a government of administrators subservient to the People. In more recent interviews President Obama has noted this as a ŷŷfatal flawŷŷ to Our Written Constitution, always seeming to allude to implied powers granted to the government in the Constitution, powers government has been taking over the last 2 years by use of violenceŷŷmeaning the perversion of the meaning of wordsŷŷand the force of regulation. At the time of Our Nation's Founding, Honor and the cause of this new-found freedom, whose contrast to the feudal era and its enslaving oppression is fresh in the minds of all of the American People, is the paradigm of purpose, a consistent driving force to never again allow themselves to be oppressed, so much so, it is the focal point of comparison every waking day. For them it is their actual, in the moment, state of mind of which each had their own individual knowledge, and yet was the same due to the consistency of our oppressors: the Feudal States of Europe. On one hand, this state of mind is a persistent guard to make sure to never be in subject servitude again, very easily arrived at as a conclusion for most anything that is presented to them, and vigorously challenged when appearing to be found in whatever is before them. And today we'd view this as paranoia or an obsession, somehow unhealthy and thereby wrong. Lucky for us that, at that time, virtually everyone was experiencing this sensation, and, due to the masters we once had, and the war fought thereafter, keeping one's constant to guard their Individual Liberty is a healthy way to be; a healthy way to assure that Honor and Integrity, the Character of our purpose and founding, Freedom, is never lost, especially to us sleeping on our rights. This environment of their demeanor, of perspective and cause, and state of being, is vital to understanding the totality of the Constitution as not applying at all to the people, never granting, never providing for the people in any way. The Constitution is solely an administrative guide we drew up in pursuance of the principles of the unanimous Declaration of Independence: ŷŷWe hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--*That to secure these rights, Governments are **instituted among Men**,*



deriving their **just powers** from the consent of the governed, --That **whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to 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. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly **all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed**. But *when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism*, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security...*ŸŸ*

As you can see the Constitution is an *ŸŸ*institution among Men.*ŸŸ* and that by following Our Written Constitution, *ŸŸ*deriving ~~their~~ powers from the *consent of the governed*.*ŸŸ* further that, besides we alone having sole authority to institute government to serve our own purposes of securing our unalienable rights, we can *ŸŸ*institute new Government,*ŸŸ* withdrawing the powers granted. There is no doubt of the purpose and intention of the Constitution being drawn up as a guide for the administrative servants in Washington DC, a guide owned and operated by their master, the Sovereign, We The People. Now, to illustrate how far we are from having Honorable leaders, Bill Clinton once said, *ŸŸ*government is just people doing the peoples' business,*ŸŸ* and immediately showed his lack of knowledge of the role of servant, that our public servants discard the mantle of Sovereign when they volunteer to be magistrate:*ŸŸ* It seems to have been imagined by some that the returning to the mass of the people was degrading the magistrate. This he thought was contrary to republican principles. **In free Governments the rulers are the servants, and the people their superiors & sovereigns.** For the former therefore to return among the latter was not to *degrade* but to *promote* them*ŸŸ* and it would be imposing an unreasonable burden on them, to keep them always in a State of servitude, and not allow them to become again one of the Masters.*ŸŸ* *ŸŸ* Benjamin Franklin, Remarks in Framing Convention, 1787, as summarized by Madison in his record. Bold and underline emphasis mine; the underline as Franklin expresses that the people impose term limits out of compassion for their servant in government. And also...*ŸŸ* Liberty and security in government depend not on the limits, which the rulers may please to assign to the exercise of their own powers, but on the boundaries, within which their powers are circumscribed by the constitution.*ŸŸ* With us, the powers of magistrates, call them by whatever name you please, are the grants of the people. . . The supreme power is in them; and in them, even when a constitution is formed, and government is in operation, the supreme power still remains. A portion of their authority they indeed delegate; but they delegate that portion in whatever manner, in whatever measure, for whatever time, to whatever persons, and to whatever conditions they choose to fix.*ŸŸ*-- U.S. Supreme Court Justice James Wilson, Lectures 1790-1791 And it is worth noting George Mason never argued against Mr. Wilson's points made above, nor did Mr. Mason ever claim Benjamin Franklin was wrong in his analysis stated above during the framing convention, and that's because Mr. Mason didn't see government and the people as the same thing either, be it State or Federal. The Bill of Rights Mason had to have to ratify the constitution, including its last two articles, demonstrate this well:*ŸŸ* Amendment I *ŸŸ* The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.*ŸŸ* Amendment ~~ŸŸ~~ 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.*ŸŸ*-- http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html It is rather obvious that the government being created, *ŸŸ*State.*ŸŸ* or National as referenced by the term *ŸŸ*Congress*ŸŸ* in Article V, is not the same as *ŸŸ*the people,*ŸŸ* and as the State governments were, at the time, republics to be created by their own constitutions, intended so each is on equal footing to the National D.C. government (to assure they have a voice in check and balance through more than the pre-17th Amendment Senate) our *ŸŸ*federal government*ŸŸ* establishes, by Our Written Constitution, a compound republic, and therefore the term *ŸŸ*State*ŸŸ* means *ŸŸ*State governments*ŸŸ* and not what is meant by *ŸŸ*the people.*ŸŸ* We need to get these significant points consistently right or we'll easily be deterred from asserting and using our Sovereign authority in the myriad ways possible to re-claiming our great nation. Regarding George Mason in Particular There's an old adage, *ŸŸ*be careful what you wish for,*ŸŸ* and George Mason was so certain the government would become abusive that



his action's unintended consequence became the means. I'm not saying he wasn't a man for Individual Liberty and Freedom, he most certainly was. He merely lacked the cool-headed reasonable mind necessary to foresee how his solutions could, and would, be abused. The Bill of Rights today, as the cornerstone of social justice, and the assumption that adding "convention language" to Article V, is to constitutionally protect the Sovereign's right to do as the Sovereign pleases, are perfect examples of the unintended consequence of Mr. Mason's excellent intention. Apparently Mr. Mason's blind spot was to never think there would be people in the future that would look to his concerns, and the words that went with them, for support of how to expand the government's reach, Saul Alinsky's Progressive movement knows no bounds.

Thank you for reading,

Toddy Littman