



## America's Sovereign Challenge

Toddy Littman, Monday 14 December 2015 - 16:51:39

I love the lack of PC of Donald Trump, his promoted ideas are as American as you can expect, but...He speaks to controlling the Internet, the letter *i* there capitalized to recognize it as a separate jurisdiction, something not a part of Congressional Authority or some public property. I submit to you to consider, that every good negotiator I've met uses words with more than one meaning, words that are meant to convey what the other person wants to hear while they may not necessarily be saying what we think they are saying. Obama did this to America once via Liberals who follow blindly, examples...

Or

Or let's try Occupy folks,

So, now, consider please, as you consider these people: What if someone does this to what is now, in our review of these examples and laughing at them, the voice of sobriety, the patriotic Americans, the Conservatives (those who understand government is to act in accordance with the limits of the Constitution and never to act beyond these limits as then it is a government of oppression, Tyrannical and will never again cease trespass on Individual Liberty)? Apologies, but had to define Conservative since many think it's just carrying on nostalgic traditions, a liquidating of the meaning, purpose, and weight of America's Founding that began the end of Feudalism; liquidating of the Principles of the Declaration of Independence as effectuated by the Constitution's Enumerated (limited) Powers granted to government by Article I, Section 8 alone through our ratification (Consent of the Governed), [http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution\\_transcript.html](http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_transcript.html). Oh, and my apology is for demonstrating the Divine Spine of the American People, our resilience in the face of adversity. I know many want to believe Mr. Trump, and I don't blame them for wanting a hero after Obama's failure to deliver one, save for the Progressive Left and their goal of destroying America. But, I must explain what I am laying out here because it is a moral imperative for America to have a Constitutionally wise President who isn't placating us by appeasing statements (i.e. red meat) that we want and long to hear. I mean, isn't that exactly what Barack Obama did? Who voted for the first black President on the grounds he'd declare war in the name of climate change against all who remember science isn't here to prove anything is true but to prove what hypotheses are false? Well I guess you voted for Obama to rewrite the purpose of our institutions and their history as well (see, <https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/a/alberteins100017.html>). Have I yet documented how we too easily follow our emotions, fall in the trap of what we want to believe versus what's actually occurring? Well then, let's see:

First, consider the woman in the first video link above, and see if there's a mirror there representing you. I say this because, it is no secret why they passed Obamacare without reading it, knowing it would fail:



Weigh whether Healthcare is an entitlement or a Right. That's the debate being framed by the two frontrunners Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump via the Progressive media, as Obamacare is meant to be affirming a right to healthcare, while Donald Trump has said healthcare is an entitlement. Tell me who will win that debate as it is framed right now, which, in both cases assumes the worst of the oxymorons one could ever hear regarding money: government savings. Understand that the savings is a fairy tale of mis-management by government right now. Doctors get 40-60% of their bill paid by government generally. Of course, many doctors have discounts if you pay cash, but that's at their discretion. With government running healthcare, even before Obamacare, the difference for the doctor was that he got paid same day for cash as he gave service to the patient. Government generally strings doctors along at least 90 days and usually 180 or even more before paying them 40-60% on the bill it's called cascading as they downgrade each service going down the bill and can go to 80% of the amount, which is why the usual and customary amount for service is hiked in the first place and why docs can give cash discounts. What does the doctor do with that situation? They raise the price and often are screwing up your medical records, not to make them inaccurate but because some bureaucrat rejected the payment as submitted for the last 6 months and the doctor, who just wants to get paid, to cover their costs of office, staff, etc, and receive their desired profit from what is often a laborious education, keeps re-submitting the bill to get the bureaucrat to sign-off on it. **Remember: The bureaucrat signs-off on it eventually, meaning they know that this is the game and this is the government's method of negotiating the bill with a doctor.** Of course, now with the Obamacare electronic medical records mandate government blames the doctors... Er... Healthcare Providers for errors in medical records, (that's government taking a stand against doctors to uphold the law for insurance companies while never doing anything about government and/or insurance bureaucrats who created the situation). So... Setting aside that Donald Trump wants to control the Internet like China or other country's governments... I guess I should mention North Korea here, and, as Hillary Clinton wants to control the Internet, as well as the Government wanting it to become a tax generator... Ummm... One last thing. We're erroneously hearing about Gun Control over San Bernardino. Well, consider how absolute the 2nd Amendment is, its language not limiting infringement to any branch of government but denying all government, as ratified by us and the States (capital S denoting the governments of the States): Article the fourth... A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed. -- 2nd Amendment language from original Bill of Rights, [http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill\\_of\\_rights\\_transcript.html](http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html) Compare and contrast to the record of Gun Control, originating in the Dixiecrat South over fear of negroes with guns, and explaining the NRA's existence with little effort, <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/516676/posts>. Yet what makes that so interesting is what happened under FDR in 1938, The Federal Firearms Act of 1938 began the firearm dealer licensing system. Everyone understanding this? The Federal Government's *desire for more revenue* was their entire purpose and means of getting involved with firearm ownership, but not directly, instead through a backdoor of claiming and creating a jurisdiction by imposing a national licensing program on gun dealers. Gun Control has never had a place in our Society, our American Culture and, as with so many things done since the 14th Amendment, government is all about the money... Can anyone say Obamacare? Especially as a tax enforced by the IRS isn't it all about the money? And while we all know Mr. Trump has said he's for the *lawful* right of citizens to own a gun, **where's the recognition it's not up to the government at all but is something even the Supreme Court of the United States isn't given any authority to make any determinations on by the very language of the 2nd Amendment?** Point being that the Right to Bear Arms is no different than the Right to Self-Defense, and trusts you to know your use of a weapon, to know when to use it or not, and self-responsibility is the point to it all. Yet, eventually, licensing schemes for government's revenues, usually riding on the coattails of SCOTUS whose claimed authority is their word for



their claim and of no constitutional authority at all, because it cannot by assertion violate the Constitution, which the 2nd Amendment is the Constitution as an Amendment: **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. -- Emphasis mine, [http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution\\_transcript.html](http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_transcript.html) Which means: The Constitution must be upheld, pursuant to the enumerated powers (Article I, Section 8) and the further declaratory and restrictive clauses added to it (i.e. 2nd Amendment, pursuant to the preamble of the Bill of Rights, [http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill\\_of\\_rights\\_transcript.html](http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html) ). So SCOTUS can't violate the Constitution to claim, well, anything about it, period!But hey, let's talk to the Progressives in Silicon Valley, California and Bellevue, Washington to determine controlling the Internet... To me this is an omen of things to come when a man who claims to be Conservative, doesn't honor the Constitution and wants to get Progressive advice to solve the problem.May Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords, Bless you and I thank you for reading and sharing this, Toddy LittmanP.S. Never forget they still have Clinton's Echelon right now, <http://www.duncancampbell.org/content/echelon> and if interested, here's the UKUSA agreement they're talking about (wonder what constitutional power the President made this agreement under), which 1956 amendment to, incidentally, created the NSA, [https://www.nsa.gov/public\\_info/declass/ukusa.shtml](https://www.nsa.gov/public_info/declass/ukusa.shtml). Choose wisely, deliberately, in 2016.