



Recognizing American Sovereignty

Toddy Littman, Friday 04 December 2015 - 22:27:27

As the medium is the message, where today numbness is the norm as the overwhelming amount of information from overwhelming forms of media overwhelms the senses and results in delegation to Siri, or some other digital assistant (communicating that the age of those without the means of affording assistance now have one), the base problem with sharia and islam is being, for lack of a better term, overlooked (see this video to understand radical is a political correctness term of no import whatsoever, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KXGE2eBUdlQ&feature=youtu.be>). Verbose man (yours truly) just made every effort to overwhelm your senses, knowing likely you just went to scanning this article, likely deciding from the first paragraph to send, read, or discard and ignore it (unless you're one of those Evelyn Wood speed reader types). Yet this all takes us to why all these oppressive systems, oppressive economic systems like Socialism and Communism, some in England wanting to return to Royal government, and such an easy acceptance of having some expert tell us that we are responsible for changes in Earth's environment by what car we drive -- while America's government funded military experiments through the 1990's HAARP project whose effort was to punch a hole through the Ionosphere and see how long it takes to heal without blinking an eye -- Politicians, a generally affectionate term for those who seek authority over others, see every bit of our relinquishing self-responsibility and, using many forms of the ultimate power of government, force, to legislate and swallow our Freedom up like a blackhole of Progressive oppression sucking up every scintilla of power we hand them by **any** form of grant. For brevity (Surprise!) I'll use the idea of contracts and how one can give actual consent by signing off on something, yet knowing most are well aware of the variety of forms of *implied consent*. This simple understanding that we all apply to a variety of situations every day in dealing with other people is a good starting point to understand how those politicians, those political parties and their agendas, have built Progressive Oppression on the backs of what we believe, subversively using our delusion to lie to us with a straight face knowing we'll blame ourselves, and not them, later. To illustrate (which shouldn't be required after the IRS showed a willingness to suppress Freedom of Speech and Political Expression so easily by mere bureaucratic delays, same tactic used for Keystone, same tactic used by George Soros to keep Rosia Montana Romania from working their gold mine), let's look at the FBI's site regarding their historical origins: The FBI originated from a force of special agents created in 1908 by Attorney General Charles Bonaparte during the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt. The two men first met when they both spoke at a meeting of the Baltimore Civil Service Reform Association. Roosevelt, then Civil Service commissioner, boasted of his reforms in federal law enforcement. It was 1892, a time when law enforcement was often political rather than professional. Roosevelt spoke with pride of his insistence that Border Patrol applicants pass marksmanship tests, with the most accurate getting the jobs. Following Roosevelt on the program, Bonaparte countered, tongue in cheek [sic], that target shooting was not the way to get the best men. "Roosevelt should have had the men shoot at each other and given the jobs to the survivors." **Roosevelt and Bonaparte both were Progressives.** They shared the conviction that efficiency and expertise, not political connections, should determine who could best serve in government. Theodore Roosevelt became President of the United States in 1901; four years later, he appointed Bonaparte to be attorney general. In 1908, Bonaparte applied that Progressive philosophy to the Department of Justice by creating a corps of special agents. **It had neither a name nor an officially designated leader other than the attorney general. Yet, these former detectives and Secret Service men were the forerunners of the FBI.** Today, most Americans take for granted that our country needs a federal investigative service, *but in 1908, the establishment of this kind of agency at a national level was highly controversial.* **The U.S. Constitution is based on "federalism:" a national government with jurisdiction over matters that crossed boundaries, like interstate commerce and foreign affairs, with all other powers reserved to the states.** Through the 1800s, Americans usually looked to cities, counties, and states to fulfill most government responsibilities. **However, by the 20th century, easier transportation and communications had created a climate of opinion favorable to the federal government establishing**



a strong investigative tradition. -- Emphasis mine, <https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/history/brief-history> Now, I am sure even those of the "Progressive" philosophy, especially those well versed in the Chicago Way patronage system, can see the above FBI definition of Progressive is, at best, political spin. There'd be no bundlers of funds, no Bill Clinton Clinton Foundation Speeches receiving \$500,000 etc., and one cannot claim efficiency and professionalism are the dominant qualities of the excessive cost of government and its Progressive programs... But, just like Obamacare being a tax not passed by Constitutional process (see Sissel v. United States Department of Health & Human Services info, <http://www.pacificlegal.org/cases/Sissel-3-1374>, and detailed explanation at the time by yours truly, <http://changingwind.org/index/comment.php?comment.news.121>), the FBI here admits without fear or hesitation it exists without any constitutional authority. Please note last paragraph of FBI history above as most important to this article as well. With the truth of the lack of a constitutional authority for the FBI as admitted by their website, please see this gem of the audacity of power corrupted absolutely: **they could be dismissed as a nuisance, a loose network of individuals living in the United States who call themselves "sovereign citizens" and believe that federal, state, and local governments operate illegally.** Some of their actions, although quirky, are not crimes. The offenses they do commit seem minor, including regularly false license plates, driver's licenses, and even currency. -- Emphasis mine, <https://leeb.fbi.gov/2011/september/sovereign-citizens-a-growing-domestic-threat-to-law-enforcement>. In relation to the FBI's admitted lack of any constitutional authority under Federalism for them to exist, is it wise for the FBI to claim Sovereign Citizens "believe that federal... governments operate illegally?" And to what degree does the FBI's continued operation and existence without any constitutional authority subtract weight from trusting ANY government agency?... from trusting politicians? From trusting government? Isn't the FBI vehicle with "government plates" using false license plates? Isn't their Drivers License identification that's used in a Law Enforcement computer falsely identifying them as a Federal Government Employee? Isn't FBI officer pay and their Federal Officer's Union Pension Fund a direct stealing from the United States Treasury when their agency has no constitutional authority to exist? Now I've known these Sovereignty folks, the Sovereign Citizen Movement, in fact, this movement started in Progressive/Liberal California. At the time it was called the State Citizenship movement. I researched much of what they claimed and found a large portion of it true. However, they were also steeped in conspiracy theory, claiming, "it's the banks and the Rothschilds... The income tax is to pay interest on the debt we owe to them... The Federal Reserve is just a Rothschild bank lending every single dollar to the U.S. Government" which is entirely false Progressive Leftist anti-Capitalist Looneyism (I must note they wanted to not pay income taxes, sometimes even as employees of the Local and State government, while demanding help getting their disability/social security, and/or welfare checks). I am making these ideological affiliation points to begin closing out this article with a Progressive media example of effort to politicize the Sovereign Citizen movement as "Right Wing Extremists" at this link, <http://www.cnn.com/2015/02/19/politics/terror-threat-homeland-security/index.html>. **The idea of limited government is objective application of Freedom to every American** and isn't a Left/Right anything and is instead a Constitutional fact, that the limits imposed on government are the self-executing point of the Constitution to assure greater freedom for every Individual American, limitations executed upon the office holder the moment they take their Oath of Office as the limits they agree to act pursuant to and not in excess of, limits also noted in full by the FBI in the paragraphs pasted from their brief history page above on this December 4, 2015 where the FBI is explaining Federalism. This means that ideology is merely a method of agitation, a wedge, to assure Americans, as the beginning of this article explained, will relinquish more and more of their Freedom for Politicians to steal or claim by "legislation" the tool of alphabet agency "regulatory interpretation" in making every effort to justify their existence, which is most dramatically done by asserting government's ultimate power: the use of force. Consider that the budget is legislation passed by Congress, yet the FBI who exists without (and thereby in excess of) any constitutional authority is included in those budgets, appropriated money to carry on what are essentially unconstitutional and illegal activities, that is all paid from our tax dollars and anyone can see how the Sovereignty Movement has a point in questioning the legitimacy of government no matter how looney the Sovereignty Movement's assertion of conspiratorial purposes and claims for it. But, to punctuate the sheer abuse of power by government, a reminder: **article the twelfth... 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. -- Emphasis mine, 10th Amendment language directly from the Bill of Rights (where it was the 12th article) as Amended to the Constitution, http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html. And to be clear these amendments are limiting clauses: THE Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, **in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added:** And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution. -- Emphasis mine, Preamble to the Bill of Rights/bid. Thus the entirety of the first 10 Amendments are to be read in this context of declaratory **and** restrictive (together, a declared restriction, a limitation). These Amendments are not a declaration of the rights of Americans under a nationalized State, and, if you pay close attention to the context of this Preamble to the Bill of Rights, you'll notice they aren't creating something new but are making an effort to *further* knowledge and certainty of the already declaratory and restrictive (limiting) enumerated powers over certain and specific objects delegated to the National Government. Supreme Court Justice James Wilson probably explains the farce of claiming the threat of a Sovereignty Movement best: 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. [yy] James Wilson, Founding Father, Lectures on Law: Volume 1 Chapter 1 page 17, <http://deila.dickinson.edu/cdm/ref/collection/ownwords/id/14067>. The mere idea of yySovereigntyyy asserted by an American is an absolute and certain political expression (why American Citizenship is so precious), to which government is barred from any encroachment, including any notion of criminality, and for government to do so is government in violation of the First Amendment yy And now for the round robin yy Thus, having an agency, like the FBI, without any constitutional authority, claim such a movement to be a threat (not a crime) only further proves the point of the Sovereignty Movement. And all of this is because, as said earlier, Politicians and their parties want to take from you whatever you'll relinquish of self-responsibility, as that is relinquishing... Pardon me... Abdicating, your Sovereign Authority yy Your freedom, at least according to Justice James Wilson, one of few who signed both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. I applaud every Sheriff, of any political affiliation, who has asked that their armed Citizens carry their guns and be ready to use them should they be in the presence of a terrorist attack. These *Shire-reefs* recognize who they serve, who their Oath of Office is to, and, when overwhelmed, know to turn to and appreciate the Sovereignty of the American Citizens they serve. Might explain why the 2nd Amendment doesn't open with limiting one branch of government, as the 1st does, to instead proscribe any and all government interference with the Right to Bear Arms. It is a travesty that there is an effort to make a gun not a weapon by legal manipulation of what a bullet is, as though not part of the weapon when absolutely necessary and integral by design for a gun to be a gun, a device invented to use bullets, not invented to throw at attackers, nor to be used for pistol whipping but as a last resort when out of bullets, that, of course, assumes you survive and aren't killed by the attacker, and the gun which isn't designed to be used this way easily kicked from your hand. But hey, I've bored you all enough with my verbosity and shall take my leave.... Merry Christmas and Happy New Year! (Should I not happen to produce another article before then.) May Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords, Bless you and I thank you for reading and sharing this, Toddy Littman P.S. Terrorism is bad, but the remedy for the nation isn't to have the government attack and divide the People on the issue of the Sovereignty of the American Citizen.