

On Constitutionalism

* * * * *

Table of Contents:

On Constitutionalism	1
An Historical Curiosity: The Trojan Horse Secretly Installed within the American Constitution	2
A Constitutional Objector Objects to your Editor, who Feebly (and Doubtlessly Unconvincingly) Responds	3
Constitutionally (and Conspiratorially?) Sneaky Back-Door Men	5
“Here come the Judge! Here Come the Judge!”	6
To Have or not to Have (“Constitutional”) Weaponry? And Who needs it?	7
“Militias have no place in a democratic society.”—(George II)	13
...and Constitutional Money? (What is That?)	20
Professors Stirner and Redbeard Constitutionally Instruct Us All	24
Is Constitutionalism the Answer? Or is it Our Eternal Contract with the Devil (and Its Kindred)?.....	31

* * * * *

Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: [song
 (“psalm”) #127:1]

And so castles made of sand slip into the sea, eventually.—(James Marshall
Hendrix)

* * * * *

The word “constitution” means “the state or condition of [our] standing together.”
And did you know, dear reader, that ancient Athens had a constitution?

* * * * *

Why do we celebrate the 4th of July?

by Kim Moon [used without her permission, or even knowledge—Ed.]

Most people in the United States celebrate the 4th of July, but do you know exactly why the holiday is so important to our country? **Imagine how you would feel if someone older than you (maybe an older sister or brother) kept telling you what to do all of the time and kept taking more and more of your allowance. That is how the colonists felt in the years leading up to 1778. Great Britain kept trying to make the colonists follow more rules and pay higher taxes. People started getting mad and began making plans to be able to make their own rules. They no longer wanted Great Britain to be able to tell them what to do, so they decided to tell Great Britain that they were becoming an independent country. (To be independent means to take care of yourself making your own rules and providing for your own needs.)**

[Though they were not sent there by their representees to write a brand-new constitution—Ed.] The [British-American colonies’ “Continental”—Ed.] Congress met in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and they appointed a committee (a group of people working together to do a specific job) **to write a formal document that would tell Great Britain that the Americans had decided to govern themselves.** The committee asked Thomas Jefferson to write a draft (first try) of the document, so he worked for days, in absolute secret, until he had written a document that he thought said everything important that the committee had discussed. On June 28, 1776, the committee met to read Jefferson’s “fair” copy (he put his best ideas together and wrote them neatly.) They revised (made some changes) the document and declared their independence on July 2, 1776. They officially adopted it (made it theirs) on July 4, 1776. That is why we call it “Independence Day.”

...Well, the signers of the Declaration of Independence **wanted the citizens** of the United States **to have a document that spelled out what was important** to our leaders and citizens. They **wanted us to be able to look at the Declaration of Independence and immediately think of the goals we should always be working for,** and about the people who have fought so hard to make these ideas possible. The people who signed the Declaration risked being hanged for treason by the leaders in Great Britain. They had to be very brave to sign something that would be considered a crime! So every time we look at the Declaration of Independence, we should **think about all of the effort and ideas** that went **into the document**, and about the courage it took for these people to stand up for what they knew was right—independence!

* * * * *

An Historical Curiosity: The Trojan Horse Secretly Installed within the American Constitution

The complete title of this chapter is: An Historical Curiosity: The Trojan Horse Secretly Installed within the American Constitution: Or the Treacherously and Perpetually Opened Back Door of the American Barn, House, City, Nation or Empire: And why not Close the Door before the Horse completely Bolts?

Can you believe, dear reader, that all it takes is one American president and 67 U.S. senators (out of 100) to **constitutionally** annul, rescind or destroy the entire American

constitution, and hence all the rights and liberties “granted” (but plainly not guaranteed) therein.

I myself can. And here’s how and/or why:

(And as always, my very own editorial emphasis is **bolded** and/or underlined, and therefore does not appear in the original (and doubtlessly sacred) constitutional document from which I thus so boldly quote.)

He [the President–Ed.] **shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur;**... [from Article 2, Section 2]

“So what?”

Wait! The constitutional trick- and trap-door is in two parts, pieces or “articles.” For its constructors were most subtle. Now here’s the second piece, and the perpetually-open back-door for the enemy within to open up for the enemy without to march right in the dark of night or the glare of day to end the charade and seize the day.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; **and all the 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. [from Article 6]

Did you catch that, dear reader? International treaties are to trump or supersede “this [‘federal’ or ‘United States’–Ed.] Constitution,” as well as “the Constitution or Laws of any [(constitutionally) subjected, conquered, ex-sovereign, imperialized or ‘federalized’–Ed.] State.”

Is that subtle and sneaky phrasing, or what? Did the writers know what it meant? (You betcha, they were mostly “attorneys-at-law,” (not to mention “free-masons”), and hence were very practiced and skilled in sneaky, guileful lawyer-talk.)

Then why did they write it that way? Why didn’t they express their hidden meaning clearly, plainly, openly?

(So that plain and simple folk like you and me, dear reader, wouldn’t notice nor understand what their subtle words meant, portended, intended? Because dark things need darkness to hide and to lurk therein? You betcha.)

Who then shall shed a little light into these dark constitutional corners, articles and sections, phrases, clauses and concealed claws? Our constitutional “representatives,” perhaps? Perhaps not.

And so we see that if the American president and 2/3rds of the imperial Senators make a treaty with state x, empire y, or world-wide superstate z (see e.g. the “League of” and/or “Jewnighted Nations”), which contains clauses specifically annulling one, more or all the constitutional rights and liberties of American citizens, or (much more likely) if the treaty is merely generally contrary to this “federal” or Washingtonian constitution, then, to that treaty-contrary extent, “this Constitution” and its (thus wispy, chancy, unsteady, unreliable, conditional and unguaranteed) rights and liberties shall thereby be stricken, rescinded, denied, annulled, abolished. And why? Because “...all the Treaties made, or which shall be made under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land;...”

* * * * *

A Constitutional Objector Objects to your Editor, who Feebly (and Doubtlessly Unconvincingly) Responds

(“But you misrepresent the document. For Article 6 reads. ‘This Constitution,’ ‘Laws...in Pursuance thereof’ **and** ‘all the Treaties made, or which shall be made...shall be the supreme Law of the Land.’ Thus you take 1/3rd and ignore the other 2/3rds. Or you presume the last third takes supremacy over or precedence before the first two. And thus you deliberately mislead (if not deceive) us ‘dear readers.’”)

Oh really? And what if any one of “‘all’ the Treaties made” is at all inconsistent with or contradictory to “this Constitution”? What then? Or which document supersedes (amends, abridges, annuls, nullifies) the other? Or which contract is to be adjudged superior to the other as “the supreme Law of the Land”? The (constitutional) one which the “sovereign” states hereby made with their “federal,” super-state or imperial representatives (herein styling themselves as “the United States”)? Or the (super-constitutional) one which these “federal” representatives (or their successors) made or shall ever make with foreign states?

* * *

(“But it’s understood that the federal representatives (i.e. the President and 2/3rds of the U.S. Senators) shall never make a treaty at all inconsistent with or contradictory to this federal or “United States Constitution.” For such would be (obviously and by definition) an ‘unconstitutional’ treaty, and hence all unconstitutional clauses therein would be unlawful, stricken, null and void.”)

Oh really? Stricken by whom? The “United States” “supreme Court” (via Article 3, Sections 1 & 2)? (See below.) Perhaps, but don’t count on it.

But for now, note how **whereas “the Laws of the United States...shall be made in Pursuance thereof...This Constitution,”** this is untrue of the treaties—(at least within this Article 6). For (on the other hand, and conversely) **“all the Treaties shall be made [merely-Ed.] under the Authority of the United States”**—(i.e. by the President and 2/3rds of the Senate).

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and [or rather BUT-Ed.] all the 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. [from Article 6]

If there were not a semicolon [;] strategically and subtly placed between “...thereof ; and...” one might plausibly argue that “all the Treaties” (like all “the Laws of the United States”) must be constitutional. But as written, the lord, master or authority of/for “the Laws of the United States” is indeed “This Constitution”. But the lord of “all the Treaties made, or which shall be made” is “the Authority of the United States”—(i.e. the President and “two thirds of the Senators present”.) (Art. 2, Sec. 2) Do you see?

Again, is that sneaky and tricky wording, or what? And again why? if not to pull the constitutional wool over our eye?

Like a hawk you’ gotta watch them “attorneys-at-law,” cause by Satan they’re sneaky as snakes or “jews.”

And thus (at least according to Article 6) only the U.S., intra-national or “federal” laws need be “constitutional,” but not the international treaties. And thus any international treaty may strike down all or part of “this [“United States”] Constitution.”

And there’s the constitutional rub, and the open door to constitutional nullification via any or “all the Treaties” (with foreign or non U.S. states) “which shall be made.”

* * * * *

(“But again you ignore my constitutional point and put me off: Article 3, Section 2 states that ‘The judicial power shall extend to **all** Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under

their Authority;...” (3:2) And so unconstitutional Treaties are not, have not been and can never be “the supreme Law of the Land”.

(I know, dear constitutional objector. Pardon if you can my injudicious delay.)

* * * * *

Constitutionally (and Conspiratorially?) Sneaky Back-Door Men

And thus the secret back door to the annulment or abrogation or all or part of the American constitution was in word and deed intentionally (?) created and perpetually left open by its writers, who must have been treasonous “freemasons,” and perhaps giving themselves secret conspiratorial signs, winks, handshakes and congratulatory “high-fives” (for the successful inclusion (and subsequent ex-sovereign states’ “ratification”) of these their treasonous constitutional clauses, thus leaving America’s back-door open).

Thus the open door to national treachery, treason, enemy invasion and the end of American independence, the constitution, and its “guaranteed” rights and liberties was thus written within the document itself, for all the “jewish” world of America’s enemies (both within and without) to pass through at any time they came to possess the presidency and 2/3rds of the senate. Can you see that, dear reader? It’s rather important that you do. For it may help you to stop trusting, relying, indeed worshipping, this false god or idol of “Constitution”—in the very same way some people once worshipped the “bible” instead of God. (John 5:39-41) (For as in the latter (biblical) case some imagined they had eternal life thereby, so in the former (constitutional) many to this latter day yet imagine they have liberty. But both devotees were self-deceived.)

And so for a century and a half the treaty door to the end of constitutional liberty was wide open, and yet the lurking treaty clause had not yet been invoked, and hence the ever-hinged door of constitutional rights and liberties had not yet been constitutionally closed forever. This positive constitutional invitation for international betrayal was wide open for a century and a half. And just so long was America a takeover waiting to happen by enemies within and without. Credit where credit is due: the U.S. senate declined the invitation to “join” (i.e. submit) to the “League of Nations” created after world war I. But later both the U.S. senate and president succumbed to the supernational treaty of the Jewnighted Nations Organization, created in 1945 after world war II. Indeed it was (and remains) a “beastly,” imperial, supernational (SuperNazi) “jewish”-Amerikan organization headquartered in Jew York City, Babylon. And from that time (constitutional, free, independent and Gentile) America was d.o.a. Hence let it r.i.p. (Unconstitutional Bummer!)

* * * * *

How could this happen? Easily. When these presidential and senatorial offices (along with nearly all other elective American public offices—both state and super-state, imperial or “federal”) were put upon the public auction block for public sale to the highest bidder(s) of political propagandists or “advertising,” that was when America was sold, the official “public” whores were bought, and the national treachery could begin in earnest. (See e.g. “Federal Reserve Act” of 1913.) And so it was only a matter of time before the enemy within and the enemy without could march in and out of the (constitutionally, senatorially and presidentially) opened back door of the American barn, house, city, nation or empire at malevolent and treacherous will. And so they did.

And thus was America sold, bought and constitutionally-conquered from within. (But was America bought (by whom?) from the very beginning and sold out by “freemasons” thus insisting on this wide-open, back-door, treaty-clause?) And thus America the free became Amerika the “jewish” whore—if she wasn’t one already.

For the treaty or contract which the official national traitors and public enemies in “public” (senatorial and presidential) offices made (which generally and specifically abrogated the constitution, its rights, and liberties—but not yet entirely) was with the SuperNazi Sinagog

of Satan's Jewnighted Nations Organization. And that was that: End of constitutional story for all practical purposes.

* * * * *

“Here come the Judge! Here Come the Judge!”

Perhaps it is terribly (and lawyerly, maybe even unconstitutionally) unfair and misleading of me, dear reader, to bring the following to your attention at this time, after I've said what I've just said.

But this open-doored Troyan-horse treaty-clause within Article 6 is constitutionally contradicted by Article 3, Section 2 of the very same document. (Go figure!)

For, as aforementioned by that intrusive critic whom I could not keep altogether silent during our previous judicious proceedings:

The judicial Power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. (from Article 3, Section 1);

And as...

The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;... (from Art. 3, Sec. 2).

Therefore all international treaties must be constitutional because they must be made under the authority of “this Constitution, [and–Ed.] the Laws of the United States”.

What a difference a word can make. Here the word is “their”. Contrary to Article 6, this clause suggests (if not clearly states) that all treaties must be made “under this Constitution [and under the ‘pursuant’, subordinate, conformist or constitutional—Ed] Laws of the United States”.

For here “**the** [aforementioned treaty-making–Ed.] **Authority of the United States**”—(i.e. by the President and 2/3rds of the Senate) is not even mentioned. Here only the “Constitution” and the (constitutionally subject, inferior, ‘pursuant’ or consistent) “Laws of the United States” are mentioned as the “Authority” for “treaties made.” And so the crucial “their” refers to these latter two “Authorities,” and not at all to the former (presidential and senatorial) “Authority” of Art. 6.

* * *

(By the way, “Equity” is a legal term meaning (according to a dictionary) to “resort to general principles of fairness and justice whenever existing law is inadequate”—(i.e. when or wherever the law does not specify how a judge should judge or decide a case before him.)

* * *

And so (if at all) how should (or can) an American judge (whether “inferior” or “supreme”) judge the “constitutionality” or legality of any or all unconstitutional treaties? For, as the constitution said, and as we just read, “**The judicial Power shall extend to all...treaties made,...**”

Therefore, must “the judicial Power” not strike down as “unconstitutional” any and all international treaties which contradict the slightest clause, phrase or “rights” granted therein, even to the most lowly “citizen”? And so any all treaties or agreements with the United Nations' Organization which do so are null and void, always were null and void, and should have been declared so by “the judicial Power” soon after 1945? And if not, and as to this very day this “judicial Power” has not, being itself/themselves evidently less that judicious and by definition

“unconstitutional,” should “we the people” not then do so—i.e. strike this “unconstitutional” treaty down as null and void, and (yes, if you insist) “unconstitutional”? But not necessarily because we believe, hope or trust in constitution, but because we must use whatever (constitutional or unconstitutional) weapons we must. Hell, I even **voted** once upon a time, I’m such a political fool!

Whether we should now do what “the judicial Power” has hitherto failed to, I defer, dear reader, to your judgment—whether “judicious,” “constitutional” or not.

* * * * *

Why this constitutional contradiction between the treaty clauses of Articles 3 and 6? I don’t know. There were no official records or “minutes” taken of the meeting—of who said what and when. For the meeting itself was certainly secret, if not somewhat conspiratorial. For the 39 signatory deputies or representatives from their 12 respective states were sent to Philadelphia in the summer of 1787 merely to change or amend an earlier contract among the sovereign states entitled their “Articles of Confederation.”

Actually 55 delegates were sent from 12 of the 13 newly emancipated and newly sovereign states. (Little Rhode Island declined.) But only 39 of those 55 signed (and hence approved) the constitution.

But did a non- or anti-FreeMason faction afterwards insist (via their threatening to refuse to sign this constitutional contract altogether) upon the precise wording of this contradictory clause of Article 3, Section 2, in order to counterbalance, contradict or annul that presumably earlier Trojan (or rather Greek) treaty clause of Article 6? Or do I have the order reversed? Was the treaty-clause was slipped in afterwards? (Heck, I don’t know. I wasn’t there.) But surely there must be some explanation for this glaring constitutional contradiction. If I can read and see it, surely so could the constitutionalists. Surely the “founding fathers.” must have known of this glaring constitutional contraction at the time of its creation or perpetration (the summer of 1787), and afterwards.

* * * * *

To Have or not to Have (“Constitutional”) Weaponry? And Who needs it?

And let’s see whether the lawyerly Americans graciously granted their “representees” or “licensees” the right to own and carry, to “keep and bear” what their revolutionary war against imperial Britain had started over...weaponry. (See the battle of Lexington and Concord, Massachusetts, 1775.)

And there’s their first and fatal mistake—to look for and to accept as gifts from “their” “house” of political “representatives” (if not “lords”) what they (and we) must claim from God (or ourselves) to really and truly have, to “inalienably” or absolutely hold, and to perpetually keep.

* * * * *

The 12 states at first refused to “ratify” the “United States” constitution, and hence to renounce their sovereignty and submit to a federal gov’t (from which, in historical retrospect, and try as they might, and with all their “civil” might, they could never again emancipate themselves) unless there were some changes or “amendments” to “their” irrevocably iron-clad constitutional contract. (“Amendments” are changes which (by definition allegedly) “mend” something torn, worn or broken.)

Hence e.g. “amendment 2”:

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.

How vague! How ambiguous! How equivocal! What does this mean, if anything? Is the “constitutional” “right” to “keep and bear Arms” thus pompously granted (by the Moses of Philadelphia) to the “well regulated Militia,” or to “the people,” of both?

But for one thing, it is clear it means that to be, to become and to remain “free,” a “state” (if not also an individual, county or city) must be well armed and organized and practiced in warfare, because to be unarmed and incapable of self-defense is to be conquered, enslaved and unfree. That much is clear. And that much is true.

But are you and I, dear reader, “the people”? Do we both (if we were Americans) as individuals possess this constitutional “right...to keep and bear Arms” or weaponry? Or does this “right” instead belong to “the people” (whoever they are, if not us), and/or to “a well regulated Militia” (whatever that is)? (See below.)

* * * * *

This must be insisted on [or to–Ed.] all around against the present-day efforts for liberty:

Liberty of the *people* is not *my* liberty! [For I am not the people and the people are not me.–Ed.]

Let us admit these categories, liberty of the people and right of the people: for example, **the right of the people that everybody may bear arms. Does one not forfeit such a right? One cannot forfeit his own right, but may well forfeit a right that belongs not to me but to the people. I may be locked up for the sake of the liberty of the people; I may, under sentence, incur the loss of the right to bear arms.**

....A people cannot be free otherwise than at the individual’s expense; for it is not the individual that is the main point in this liberty, but the people. The freer the people, the more bound the individual; the Athenian people, precisely at its freest time, created ostracism, banished the atheists, poisoned the most honest thinker [Socrates–Ed.]. [Max, p. 214]

Liberalism wants to give me what is mine, but it thinks to procure it for me not under the title of mine, but under that of the “human.” As if it were attainable under this mask! The rights of man, the precious work of the Revolution, have the meaning that the Man in me *entitles* me [Lit. “furnishes me with a *right*”—(trans. note)–Ed.] **to this and that; I as individual, as this man, am not entitled, but Man has the right and entitles me. Hence as man I may well be entitled; but, as I am more than man, to wit, a *special* man, it may be refused to this very me, the special one.** [Max, 314]

OK, so I need “rights” (or rather powers) which belong specifically to me, myself and/or I, and hence not mere “rights” which are given to me by men, and/or which belong to the gods, Man, Mankind, Humanity or “the People.” (For what “Man” gives, Man may at any time retract—and especially or most easily in times of war or some other “emergency”—i.e. especially when I need them most.) So clearly I need “rights” far beyond the reach of “Man” and/or Mankind’s “representatives,” and hence far beyond the pompous or officious pretensions of any man or group whatsoever. I need truly inalienable, unquestionable, unretractable “rights,” powers, liberties. And therefore divine rights are what I need and will henceforth claim and defend (against all men, officials, groups, etc.). And so long as I retain the power to take and defend these my divine rights, just so long are they really and truly mine, “inalienable,” untakeable.

(But this is merely restatement or tautology. For, as you know, “rights” are no more than powers. “He who has power has right.” And he who has not, has not.)

* * * * *

Again does this “constitutional” “right” “to keep and bear Arms” belong to me and thee, dear reader? Or does it belong to “the people” (whoever they may be, if not we)? Or does it belong to “a well regulated Militia” (whatever that is, if other than “the people”)?

And why did the pompous writers link this “right” of weaponry to the “Militia” instead of granting it to “the people” outright (much less to me and thee) without such ambiguous strings attached? And exactly what does this linkage mean or portend? Must one be in a/the “Militia” “to keep and bear Arms”? Or is one in a “Militia” by virtue of “keep[ing] and bear[ing] Arms”? Does every “Militia” have to “well regulated.” If so, by whom: Themselves or a higher “constitutional” power?

(We shall soon see that “well regulated” means subject to and controlled by the American Parliament or “Congress”—(see Art. 1, Sec. 8 below)—and hence a super-state, “federal” or imperial power.)

Is this “constitutional” right of weaponry to belong only to an official (“well-regulated” or congressional) “Militia” member, but not to an unofficial (or “uncongressionally-regulated”) citizen, like you and me, dear reader? And must the official “Militia”-man surrender his weapon(s) when he ceases to be an official?—when he resigns, retires or is retired?—like some military man upon being discharged from the army, or some policeman surrendering his badge and sidearm whenever he quits or is fired from “the force.”

In short, does the individual American citizen have the “constitutional right” “to keep and bear Arms”? (And if not, what the hell good is it? And if not, is it not therefore a curse rather than blessing.) That is the question. What is the answer?

It would have been clear if the “constitution” (if paper could speak) or the “founding fathers” had simply said or written: “The right of the people [or better yet, “the individual” or “the citizen”—Ed.] to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.” But they didn’t. Why not?

* * * * *

Why this lawyerly vagueness? For as lawyers they surely well knew the necessity of specificity and clarity in contracts. For contractual clarity is clearly necessarily to avoid later misunderstandings and disagreements due to contractual ambiguity. So why this “constitutional” lack of specificity and clarity? Was this merely because they could not collectively agree, but were hopelessly divided between the pro- and anti-gun factions, that they thus settled on such vague phrasing as a “compromise”? I don’t doubt the disagreement, but was this the only cause and reason for this vagueness, ambiguity, equivocation about the gun-right, the right to “keep and bear Arms”—not to mention the vague and contradictory clauses on “constitutional money” and/or the Trojan-horse treaty-clauses? Or was something much more dark and sinister involved? In other words, was this vague contractual wording an “accident” of compromise, or was it deliberate? And if (at least somewhat) deliberate, then why so? Could this “constitutionally” portend anything but malevolent intent?

* * *

And recall that this gun “amendment” wasn’t even in the original document (of Sept. 17, 1787), but was congressionally added or appended 2 years later (on Sept. 25, 1789) as a “bill of rights” to lure enough wary free states to submit, “assent,” “ratify” or sign this constitutional contract, and hence to seal their sovereign dooms—which they did 2 years later on Dec. 15, 1791. And did they believe this “constitutional right” to “keep and bear Arms” belonged to each and every individual citizen of every state, and hence not merely to “the people” and/or the “Militia”?

The southern American states tried to break away from this imperial or super-state “federation” in 1861. But they failed. Constitutional lesson: A “constitutional” marriage is a one-way trip unto death: permanent, everlasting, undying, inextricable. You can’t marry the “constitutional” Devil and be graciously granted a divorce afterwards—when you at last come to your senses and recognize your “constitutional” master, your “federal” “Uncle” Satan, for what It really and truly is. (See Redbeard below.) (Europeans take “constitutional” note, and watch your “constitutional” step.)

* * *

Consider: Lawyers, contract-writers or “drafters” (of laws or constitutions) can work for you or against you—depending on whom they “represent.” So whom did these lawyers in Philadelphia (and later New York) represent? They would say they represented and served their twelve respective states? (Rhode Island refused to participate.) But that clearly wasn’t true, or they would have faithfully done what they were sent by their respective states to Philadelphia to do in that summer of 1787—i.e. to merely change, amend or revise the existing constitution of the thirteen confederate(d) states, their “Articles of Confederation.” So who were these slippery shysters really working for, serving or “representing,” if not those who sent them to the Pennsylvanian “city of brotherly love”?

Consider: An honest scribe, “pubic notary” or lawyer strives at all times for clarity and specificity, both for the good of his client, and in good faith to the other party(ies), simply because it is the right thing to do: to write contracts plainly, clearly and specifically, as verbally pre-agreed to by both (or all) parties in the negotiations. And thus to write or “draft” a contract so clear and specific that only one reading or interpretation is possible—even by a “judicial activists” or “affirmative action” judges. (**All** laws, by the way, should be simple and clear enough for every citizen to understand, and thus not to fall into that legal trap of criminal guilt via “ignorance of the law”—an infinite, infinitely complicated, contradictory and inexplicable idol of Law.)

But a dishonest, crooked or criminal lawyer tries to deceive or “put one over” on every other party to the contract but his own client, and sometimes even him too. A crooked lawyer writes the law or contract in such a vague or equivocal way as to **seem** to mean one thing, as pre-agreed and understood by all contractual parties, but which is capable of being understood or interpreted quite otherwise. And this is the criminal lawyer’s concealed, secret and malevolent intent: To agree to one thing, and to contractually write that thing, and yet to later “interpret” it quite otherwise. A crooked lawyer, while at the time of negotiation and verbal agreement, agreeing to this and promising that, and assuring his targeted party(ies) that this and nothing else (but what is/was verbally agreed upon) is what is contractually meant by his vague, unclear, equivocal and ambiguous contractual (or “constitutional”) wording—perhaps explaining or insisting that such vague language is “customary” or “standard” “legalese”—a crooked or shyster lawyer, I say, will be thus deliberately vague in his contractual wording in order (for himself and his crooked client, employer or master) to later impose, assume and argue an entirely different interpretation (or “take” a different “spin”) on the meaning of the contractual agreement or (“constitutional”) document—one which they all the time had deliberately but secretly intended to later impose, and so had made their contractual (or “[constitutional]”) wording as close to this secret, intended and future “interpretation” as they could possibly accomplish at the time of the contract’s writing or “drafting,” and its bi-party or multi-party signing.

And this legalistic treachery is surely one (deliberate) cause of contractual (or “constitutional”) vagueness, ambiguity and equivocation.

And this is especially true of the perfidious “jew.” (See e.g. their false and evil dealings with the Palestinians. They seldom to never ever keep their words, or honor their contracts. Is this not so?)

* * * * *

Again, it is known that many (if not most) of the writers of this American constitution were freemasons. What is “FreeMasonry”? “FreeMasonry” is a super-national and centuries-long “jewish” conspiracy to destroy all Gentile nations and religions, and to impose upon their ruins a Godless, atheist, anti-Christ, Satanic and “jewish”-“messianic” world-wide, imperial and SuperNazi dictatorship, to be headquartered in Jew York City and “jewish” Jerusalem. FreeMasonry was created, funded and (is) directed by “jewish” banksters who thus purchase ambitious, mercenary treacherous and Godless Gentiles, who thus sell their souls and traitorously sell out their families, races, nations and even God Himself “to rule for an hour with the [SuperNazi “jewish”-Ed.] beast.” (Apo./Rev. 17:11-18)

So, here the question: Were these American freemasons and lawyers instructed by their “jewish” money-masters to merely **pretend** to grant the American citizen (armed to the teeth at the time, as you know) the right of weaponry, while at the same time leaving the phrasing so vague, so equivocal, so capable of an antithetical interpretation, that such could be invoked by brother or descendant masons (in public office) decades, generations, even centuries down the line of time?

(If you please, see professor Redbeard’s constitutional explanation below.)

* * * * *

From the U.S. constitution, Article 1, Section 9,

No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince or foreign State.

But are lawyers or “attorneys-at-law” or “esquires” not “titles of nobility”? And are they not granted by the states? Are citizens below and outside this class of nobility not often forbidden by judges (i.e. lawyers) from representing or defending themselves from the accusations of “public prosecutors” (i.e. lawyers)? Do they not invent and speak a secret and deceptive language which the poor non-nobility cannot possibly understand, as malevolently intended, thus necessitating the purchase or rental of one of these noble “representatives” before his noble peers (prosecutors and judges)?

Why not prohibit this nobility of the “bar” from ever again occupying our “public offices”?

And what about the SuperNazi “central” banksters? Are they not “kings or princes of foreign States”? And do they not (via their “FreeMasonic lodges,” “Councils on Foreign Relations,” “Trilateral Commissions,” “Bilderbergers,” their “foundations,” etc.) thus indirectly grant “presents, Emoluments, Offices, or Titles, of various kinds” to their (certainly not our) “public servants”?

* * *

“The first thing we do, let’s kill all the lawyers.”—(Wm. Shakespeare; Henry VI, part II, act 4, scene ii, lines 86-7)

* * * * *

And so what is a militia?

A “militia” (from “militis”—Roman for “soldier”) is an band of armed men, more permanent and more organized than a “posse.” And a “posse” is an official authority or a legal power, being under a sheriff’s badge. But a “militia” need not be. But how official or legalistic is the “Militia” of the American constitution? Are unofficial or citizen’s’ militias “constitutional”? Are militias unauthorized or “unregulated” by the U.S. congress to be “legally” condemned and prosecuted as “unconstitutional,” “illegal,” “criminal”?

Of “militia,” one dictionary says:

1. a) originally, any military force b) later, any army composed of citizens rather than professional soldiers, called out in time of emergency

2. in the U.S., all able-bodied male citizens between 18 and 45 years old who are not already members of the regular armed forces:

members of the National Guard and of the Reserves (of the Army, Air Force, Coast Guard, Navy and Marine Corps) constitute the **organized militia**; all others, the **unorganized militia**

And so the “unorganized militia” are us regular folks, however self-organized and/or self-regulated, but unofficial, or unsubjected to or by the gov’t or the congress/parliament, being subject (organized and regulated) only to and by ourselves. Thus the “unorganized militia” is simply what I mean by a free, armed and unofficial citizenry (they always go

together) who are thus free to militarily combine and separate at will, to choose or elect leaders, to defend themselves, their homes, their counties, cities, towns, etc.

And so I say, dear reader, to me and to thee: "Let's get unorganized!"

* * * * *

But what is a "Militia" according to or within the "United States" constitution? (Ah, there the rub!)

There is no "glossary" to explain the terms used within the "United States" constitution. Hence one must deduce a contextual definition of the word, "Militia" within the document itself.

Article 1, Section 8 of the "United States Constitution" decrees:

The Congress [Parliament–Ed.] **shall have Power** to lay and collect Taxes...
...To declare War...

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years [And why not? So that these Armies do not become "standing" Armies, i.e. permanent menaces to popular liberty, tyrannical threats or even established realities. (See "military dictatorships")–Ed.];

To provide and maintain a [permanent, long-term?–Ed.] **Navy;**

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions; To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;... [Art. 1, Sec. 8]

So apparently each of the ex-sovereign states may appoint the officers of their state Militia. (Wow! How magnanimous!) But then these state-appointed officers must train their state-citizen-soldiers according to Congressional specifications. (Apparently only thus do or can they become "well regulated.") Furthermore, "part of" these state Militias may be Congressionally "called forth" (to serve Congress in war). But are they "constitutionally" bound to "answer," obey, serve their congressional "commanders-in-chief" unto dismissal or death?

Thus we may "constitutionally" deduce that "Militias" are official bodies, both of the states and of the super-state or imperial "federation," but mostly of the latter. For when they are "called forth" by the latter's Congress, to "be employed in the Service of the United States," they are apparently constitutionally-bound to obediently answer and serve that Congressional war-call or summons to supplement their already "standing" or established Navy (and Armies?)

(Question: Is this state "Militia" service to be voluntary or officially conscripted, "legally" coerced, congressionally compelled?)

And thus a constitutional "Militia," dear reader, is apparently not me, you and the other guy(s) getting together on weekends or whenever, to drill, "practice our maneuvers" or "play war games in the woods with our Indian friends," to toss our knives or tomahawks, to shoot our paint balls, arrows, guns, cannon, etc.

Now, big question, dear reader: Is such spontaneous and unofficial behavior of ours to be "unconstitutional" and hence illegal, forbidden, punishable? Or can there, constitutionally speaking, be such a thing as an unofficial "Militia," subject neither to the ex-sovereign state nor the "United States" superstate (or "federation")?

* * *

Again, why is the "constitutional" "right of the people to keep and bear Arms" thus linked, tied or limited to a "well-regulated [or congressional-Ed.] Militia"?

(Was this so the U.S. congress would have “Militias” at their super-state back and call, under their imperial command and at their “federal” disposal?) Did they desire or hope to eventually disarm all other citizens but those under their “well-regulated” imperial command? And it is not just like an emperor to term none other than his/their very own authority, command and armies “well-regulated”—thus officially arrogating all “regulation” or “authority” to himself/themselves? Let’s ask George III.)

* * * * *

But wait! That’s not all! The president is (like George Washington) to be the commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the “federated” or “United States.” And the “Militias” of the several states (once “called forth” by the congress) are likewise to become his militant agents, military tools and violent creatures:

(“Cry ‘Havoc!’ and let slip the dogs of war;”—Wm. Shakespeare; Julius Caesar, act 3, scene I, line 273)

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States;... [Art. 2. Sec. 2]

Here the super-state imperialists are not content to “call” merely “part of” “the Militia of the several States”. But again must they thus dutifully answer, obey and serve their emperor(s)?

And again, Does the American citizen possess the constitutional “right...to keep and bear Arms”? Does the document or called the “Constitution of the United States” grant (as if piece of paper could ever grant or deprive anyone of anything) the American citizen the right to own and carry weapons (or “bear arms”)? I pompously appoint you, dear reader, to be the “supreme” judge or “court” of that important question. Think and over long and well. For upon your answer depends your liberty, your welfare and perhaps your life.

But, even importantly, do you even need this “constitutional right”? No, not if you possesses the divine right “to keep and bear Arms”? For divine rights infinitely trump “human” or “constitutional” rights any day, any day, any day. And divine rights by mere men can never rightly be taken away. And only a demon or tyrant would even try.

* * * * *

“Militias have no place in a democratic society.”—(George II)

“Militias have no place in a democratic society.”—(George W. Bush II or Junior; Amerikan president, Oct., 2002)

Is this the voice of liberty, tyranny or mediocrity?

And what does this saying mean? Does it mean that “Arms” or weapons “have no place in a democratic society”? Does it mean that all “democrats” must disarm: i.e. both non-officials and officials, both citizens and police or military, etc.? Or does it mean that only non-official “democrats” must disarm themselves, and must henceforth remain perpetually disarmed before armed and official “democrats”: i.e. politicians, “public servants,” police and military?

“Militias have no place in a democratic society.”

Does this mean that “standing [established, permanent, occupational, official] armies” and/or police forces (county, state, super-state, “federal” or imperial) “have no place in a democratic society”? For these “armed forces” certainly are by definition military or militant, and therefore “militias”? Or does this mean that “**citizens’** militias,” i.e. free and unofficial associations or organizations of armed citizens “have no place in a democratic society,” and therefore should or shall be officially labeled, presidentially demonized and congressionally outlawed, disarmed, disbanded and prosecuted as “criminal” gangs? And if so, then surely

“democratic societies” (i.e. states or societies without free and independent citizen’s’ militias, and without the citizen’s or individual’s “right to keep and bear Arms”) are nothing more military dictatorships or nothing other than “police states”—wherein only police and military enjoy the (official) “right to keep and bear Arms.” Is modern America a “police state” or a military dictatorship? Not quite yet, but Amerikan tyrants in “public office” are ceaselessly working towards that state prison system, and that totalitarian, Marxist, “communist” or “jewish” society.

And if there are no militias or armed citizens within a “democracy,” then perhaps within a “republic”? I don’t think so. For when did the “republic” of Rome become a (military or imperial) dictatorship (i.e. die as a republic) if not precisely when (permanent, established, long-standing,) Roman armies invaded, occupied and remained within that ex-republican city, and hence when the Roman citizenry had no possible chance of militant resistance, and hence no chance of remaining or ever again becoming free (from official or imperial military tyranny)?

And so a “democracy” is therefore a fallen “republic.” Is modern America therefore a “democracy”?

Constitutions go with or exist within “republics,” not “democracies.” The only constitution is a “democratic society” is the almighty will of the “demos,” the People, the Majority, the Mob. There is no constitution in a “democratic society.” Or if there is, it doesn’t last long, because the Mob “amends” it into oblivion.

The purpose of “constitution(s)” is to restrict or limit the power of the people, the “demos,” and their “public servants,” their political officials, their demagogues (“leaders of the people”). Democracies never last simply because the demos vote to rob or dispossess the property owners, and devour their substance, after “sharing” this booty. (See “welfare state.”) And hence democracies naturally degenerate into tyrannies. (See Socrates, and esp. the last three “books” of his Republic.)

And so “Tyrants indeed have a place in a democratic society.” But tyrants have no place within a republican or free society, wherein individuals are free to produce, to earn, to keep what they’ve earned, and hence to own and hold property. When total taxation rises above, say 20%, a “republic” (with (“constitutional”) limits on gov’t, officialdom or the Majority, the Mob) thus becomes a “democracy” or a tyranny.

When Benjamin Franklin was asked by what he and his fellow constitutionalists or “founding fathers” had wrought in Philadelphia during that summer of 1787, he replied: “A **republic**, madam, if you can keep it.” (I guess they couldn’t. It’s not easy.)

* * * * *

“Militias have no place in a democratic society.”

But as we reviewed above, the constitutionalists or “founding fathers” apparently thought there was a place for militias within their “republican” (if not “democratic”) state or society. And yet here we see George II does not. For he has imperiously dismissed militias as “having no place” in his “democratic society.” Does this militant dismissal not therefore make him un-constitutional (or even anti-constitutional)? And does this presidential tyrant even care? And does his congress or supreme court even care?

And so should we? Should we feel bound by a “dead” letter, an outdated” or “irrelevant” document by which our tyrannical “public officials” are most decidedly not bound? (And see below for how decidedly antithetical, opposed and unconcerned they similarly are about constitutional money, e.g.) Should we therefore fight or resist out tyrannical “public servants” by rules of political war which they themselves ignore? Should we fight these official dirty fighters with one arm thus “constitutionally” tied behind our backs?

* * * * *

“Militias have no place in a democratic society.”

Then is there to be no unofficial or citizen check against official or super-citizen tyranny whatsoever? Whose idea is that? Who and what does this saying serve, protect and further if not the official tyrant, and his infinite, limitless, unstoppable tyranny?

No militaries or armies at all, then? Or only **official** armies or militaries, then? Only “standing,” “established,” permanent or occupational armies? The very kind of armies which the founding constitutionalists thus solemnly foreswore (both above and below)?

The Congress shall have Power...To declare War,...To raise and support Armies, but no[t] Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; [Art. 1, Sec. 8]

(I.E. there “shall be...no...Armies...for a longer Term than two Years;”)

(By the way, did the “founding fathers” ever really mean that? And did that ever really happen? For how long? Or was that merely just another constitutional lie, trick and trap to rope in or corral the wary ex-sovereign states of America into the “united” or imperial states of Amerika, from which they could never again escape—neither militarily, diplomatically nor “democratically”?)

(“One constitution to find them./ One constitution to blind them./ One constitution to mark and in all Darkness bind them.”—(Christopher Lee, one wicked wizard, a most dark, subtle and crafty “politician,” and no friend of Frodo’s)

For the unconstitutional successors (if not descendants) of the “founding fathers” obviously don’t give a damn about the U.S. constitution—although they often sanctimoniously pretend otherwise—whenever T.V. cameras are focused upon them, e.g., or whenever they’re “solemnly,” cynically and perfidiously taking their “oath of public office”—(i.e. “to protect and defend the constitution of the United States, so help me God”).

* * * * *

Consider, dear reader: It is not necessary for the would-be tyrant to first outlaw the citizen’s “right to bear Arms,” his (or her) right to own and carry weaponry, (and also the citizen’s right to organize, his freedom or liberty to associate—in free and independent militias, e.g.), in order to achieve his tyrannical goal, aim, desire, intention, ideal, dream? Does the tyrant not desire and hence seek to forbid or outlaw all weapons but his own?—(i.e. those of his agents or “officials,” his police or military)—that no power in the state may possibly check, stop, overcome or overthrow his own official power or tyranny? Is every tyranny not a “police state” a “military dictatorship” or a state-prison?—i.e. a place wherein only political officials (police, military) may “legally” “keep and bear [and use-Ed.] Arms”? And hence wherein real and true freedom is a “crime.”

Let every such military or police-state be ignominiously terminated. Let every such Marxist, “jewish,” “communist” or totalitarian society be forever banished from the face of God’s globe. Let freedom ring both now and forever, even within the totalitarian Darkness of “jewish”-Amerika.

* * * * *

Have you seen the bumper-sticker, “If all guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns”? But methinks this is inaccurate and incomplete. For, “If all guns are outlawed, only officials (and outlaws) will have guns”—only police and military—only our official oppressors and/or jailers (and other criminals) will have guns.

This again is by definition a “police state.” Would you like to go there, dear reader? For many would-be tyrants, communists or totalitarians are very eager to take you there. For human wolves need prey to devour, and sadists crave victims to abuse, harm, torture with impunity. How can we possibly survive them? How can we ever protect ourselves and our loved ones from such official wolves as these but by “keeping and bearing” such “Arms” as they wield, brandish and use against us?

If the other guy or group (whether officials or unofficials) has a rock, knife, bow and arrow, gun, cannon, etc, then you (and yours) need a rock, knife, bow and arrow, etc.. This is called “deterrence” and “balance of power.” To become and remain free, citizens or unofficials need to “balance the power” against their “public servants,” official tyrants or would-be tyrants. And because tyrants and would-be tyrants know this all to well, they forbid their

subjects or would-be subjects to “keep and bear Arms”—whether singularly or in groups, often called “militias.”

And in that “unconstitutional” case only “outlaws” or “criminals” could possibly save us disarmed citizens from the tyranny of armed and official criminals, from the tyranny of office, from official tyranny.

For “Law” is no more than a “sacred” command; and a “criminal” no more than he who disobeys. And must one not obey God (or oneself) rather than one’s tyrants or enemies, however “sacred” or official? Should I put a noose around my or my beloved’s neck simply because my “sacred” tyrant or enemy thus commands me? I don’t say so. What do you say? (Acts... 5:29)

For what does the official enemy and criminal possess (besides a loaded weapon cocked and aimed at you and yours) which you, dear reader, do not? And if you answer “sanctity,” “right,” or “authority,” then you have mentally self-condemned yourself to political slavery. And you must have been poisoned against yourself, and miseducated, indoctrinated or “brainwashed” in “public” or government “schools,” jails or “reeducation camps.” For one must at least think free to become or remain free. Don’t you agree?

* * * * *

“Militias have no place in a democratic society.” Is this true? I don’t know. I guess it depends upon the definition of “militias” and “democracy.” If “democracy” means “mob rule,” “rule by officials” or “official tyranny,” and if “militias” are free-associations of armed citizens independent of all office, of all officials, all officialdom, all government, and hence of all tyranny—for tyranny is always “official,” “sacred” and far “holier-than-thou,” mere fellow-“citizen”), then yes I guess “Militias have no place in a democratic society.”

And conversely, “Free, unofficial, citizens’ militias have no place in a tyrannical state or totalitarian society.” (For the former makes the latter impossible. And so the would-be latter must first outlaw the former.) And so every tyrant decrees it so, that free and armed men (or women) are (to be hunted down as) “criminals,” that he may be safe and secure within his tyranny—that his tyranny may be perpetually unassailable, impregnable, non-overthrowable. For the tyrant well knows the only limit to power is opposing power—that only power can stop power—that only power can check his tyranny. And so the tyrant outlaws all power but his own.

The honest tyrant openly admits and publicly confesses this—that he wants to officially disarm or legally condemn, outlaw, criminalize and “prosecute” all power but his own

But the evil, malevolent, demonic tyrant always denies this, he always conceals and lies about this—for Evil and deceit always go together as one (John 8:44)—and most likely via such sanctimonious and phlegmatic public pronouncements as, “Militias have no place in a democratic society.” And why? Perhaps because they scare or “terrorize” him, because they “threaten” his reign or make him feel insecure upon his tyrannical throne or within his “oval” office. (His very own and far greater weapons (“of mass-destruction” and/or “mass-murder”) don’t seem to “terrorize” him though at all, perhaps because they’re not pointed in his direction.) And those thus terrorized by them (i.e. him) do not concern nor trouble him, simply because they are not him, and hence don’t matter to him (and his hidden masters).

* * * * *

“Militias have no place in a democratic society.”

Is this the voice of liberty, tyranny or mediocrity—(i.e. “constitutional liberty” or “liberty within the bounds of law”)? For did tyranny **ever** tyrannize **without** color, cover and force of law, i.e. lawlessly or illegally? If so, pray tell when or where did tyranny ever fail to sanctify (if not deify) its command and will as “Law.” What tyrant ever outlawed or jailed himself (for being a tyrant)? Or what tyrant ever failed to outlaw or criminalize his opponents (for refusing to submit to his tyranny; for “failing” to worship his tyrannical “sanctity” or “authority”; for declining to kneel and kiss his “sacred” tyrannical ring, ass, or whatever else the tyrant required or commanded of his subjects)?

But perhaps, dear reader, you point to a higher law which your legalistic tyrant criminally violates—the higher law of **your** rights, **your** good, **your** benefits, **your** freedoms. And good for you if you do. You have thus blessed yourself with your faith, your belief in yourself and your rights, and hence in your opponent's' wrongs. For how can you possibly get or remain free if you do not at least think free? Or how can you possibly oppose your official enemies or tyrants in “public office” if you think them “right” and yourself “wrong,” or if you grant them the “right” to thus tyrannize over you and yours?

You must forever trump the tyrant's “right” to tyrannize or own you. The American rebels therefore countered and trumped the “divine right” of their English king George III to rule and own them, with their own “divine right” to rule and own themselves, and other properties besides. And good for them. They thus help show us citizen-subjects the way out of here. For Tyranny is always well armed spiritually or psychologically with “Holier-than-Thouness” (whether “Divine” or “Sacred”), with “Right,” “Law,” “Authority,” and the like. And so he who would be free must either deny these “sanctities” altogether, or else (like the American rebels) grant himself an even greater slice of the “sacred” pie.

Note how the American rebel Thomas Paine undeified the English tyrant, George III of “jewish”-England.

Neither have I so much of the infidel [athiest–Ed.] in me as to suppose that He [God–Ed.] has relinquished the government of the world and given us up to the care of devils; and as I do not, **I cannot see on what grounds the king of Britain can look up to heaven for help against us** [American rebels–Ed.]; **a common murderer**, a highwayman, or a housebreaker **has as good a** [divine–Ed.] **pretense as he.** [from Thomas Paine's “The Crisis,” Dec. 1776]

Who then can or will undeify or desanctify our present tyrant, George II of “jewish”-Amerika, prior to his dethroning?

* * * * *

Has Tyranny's motto not always been “Obedience to [My] Law is Liberty.”

(This sly saying is carved in stone in the facade of the “hall of justice” of my Satanic home town.) (I could give you a street address to the Devil's very throne.—(Apo./Rev. 2:13)

For Evil always and everywhere puts the best possible face upon Itself—(along with the worst possible face upon Its opponents—(see “slander”). Tyranny enslaves under the mask of Law and calls it “Liberty.” For “Obedience to [My] Law is Liberty” really means “Disobedience to My Command is Crime and Punishment, Imprisonment or Death.” Is this not so?

* * *

Then why doesn't the tyrant thus more clearly express himself? For the same reason the Devil (and It's kindred) don't truly tell you and yours where they really want to take you (as formerly in their “Soviet Union” and as presently in their “Amerikan Union”). On the contrary, do they not solemnly promise us paradise on earth, as in heaven? Evil always wears a divine or Godly mask. (2 Cor. 1:14) The Damner always pretends to be the Savior. (What else?) And the word for that is “blasphemy.” And under cover of that very slanderous charge the demon-spawn of the Slanderer murdered God Himself. (Matt. 26:65-66 & John 8:44) Go figure! For how can God be God if, where and when Satan and Its “chosen” demons devoutly or “religiously” want to be? And they always and forever have craved to be. It's their very Satanic nature, character and practice. For no two “divinities” can occupy the same space or throne, or reign over the same kingdom, or own the same world-“vineyard.” (Matt. 23:2 & 21:33-46)

And the very same is true of “the people” (“demos”) and the tyrant. As the Satanic “jew” or Roman Catholic reigned in the divine or holy name of God, so the modern tyrant reigns in the “sacred” or holy name of “the people,” the “demos,” from which Greek word we derive “democracy,” or “rule by, of and for the people.”

And so above we likewise see that Tyranny would disarm (and hence subject) all the people under Its “sacred” mask of Law and Its holy or “human” name of “Democracy.”

For how can Tyranny in safety reign, if others yet armed and free remain to knock It off its unholy throne, if only with a pebbled stone?

* * *

But if we changed the “jewish”-Amerikan presidential tyrant’s proclamation a bit, and rendered it, “Militias have no place in a free [and/or democratic] society,” then I think we come a little closer to the Satanic spirit of this “presidential” bastard.

For how can a tyrant ever be “free” to tyrannize wherever his subjects to-be are armed and hence sufficiently free **not** his unwilling subjects to be?

Thus “Militias have no place in a free [and/or democratic] society,” really means “Militias keep you all free from me. And hence have no place within my tyranny.”

Nice try, tyrant, “president” or “king” George II. But we’ve seen your kind around here before. (F.D.R. comes to mind.) And we see beneath your pious lies to your truly malevolent and tyrannical intents beneath.

What better disguise for the Dragon (or Its most pious devotees) than to play the white knight?—thus sanctimoniously and peremptorily pretending to protect all the known world from some alleged and terribly fearsome dragon of “global Terrorism”? What better (or more terrible) mask for this Satanic “jewish”-Amerikan imperialism! For who has created, disseminated, perpetrated and mass-murderously used even half as many “weapons of mass-destruction” and/or “mass-murder” as this very “protective,” anti-Christ Amerikan “white knight”? (So go figure.) This again is called “slander.” And “like father [or “Uncle” Satan], like son.” (John 8:44)

* * * * *

And so what hope have those disarmed citizens hopelessly enslaved within such a tyrannical state prison system or totalitarian society (without any possibility of popular dethronement or “revolution” from within) but successful invasion and conquest from without? Were the Roman citizens (enslaved for centuries by their emperors’ imperial tyranny) not “liberated” at last by the German invasions?

“Liberation” via invasion: Is that not what the imperial Americans claimed to do for (or rather to) the Iraqis...twice?—(not to mention the Germans and the eastern Europeans.)

And did the Americans not from without officially enjoin the Iraqis to rebel against their own national gov’t from within—before they abandoned these Iraqi rebels at the very moment of their greatest need)? (Now there’s a “friend” for us all indeed!)

Who then will liberate the Americans from governmental tyranny from within and from without? George W. Bush Jr.? Possibly not.

The Iraqis certainly had no choice but to be thus “liberated” by the Americans twice? Who then will liberate the Americans once? The Americans themselves? Not likely, if “Militias have no place in a democratic society.” Hence that leaves un-, non- or extra-American liberators. By the way, the Americans called their genocidal (mass-murderous, “holocaustic”) bombers, “liberators.” Did they not? Who then will liberate the Americans, if not the Americans themselves? The Iraqis?

* * * * *

Militias had a place in Iraqi society before, during and after the two Amerikan invasions. In fact soon before the second Amerikan “liberation,” the Iraqi president was freely passing out machine guns to any and all Iraqi citizens who would take them to defend their county, independently and spontaneously, without any strings attached, and without any obligation to serve under any official (or congressional, parliamentary or presidential) authority. Furthermore, he emptied the prisons for the prisoners to do likewise, also without any strings attached, and without any obligation to return (or be retaken) to prison afterwards. Is this not so? And were these the actions of a tyrant, a dictator, an oppressor?

And yet on the other hand, and on the other side of the globe, this anti-Christ Amerikan president Bush wants to disarm the American citizenry? For “Militias have no place in [his] democratic society.”

Someone please explain this contradiction to me. Is the latter not the real, true, actual tyranny—and far more so than the (Iraqi) former?

* * *

And so the evil or demonic (would-be) tyrant lies about who he is, what he does, and what further evils he malevolently intends. But “you shall know them by their fruits.” (Matt. 7:16-20)

And if the would-be tyrant (or in Bush’s case, if his anti-Christ, “jewish,” Satanic masters) be ambitious enough, he outlaws and hunts down not only all other power within his own tyrannical kingdom or totalitarian state, but all other (unconquered or independent) powers within all the world—as far as his power and ambition can conquer (or disarm) the world, that all the world may likewise become his (or his hidden masters’) kingdom, his state, his tyranny, that all “weapons of mass-destruction” and/or “mass-media” within the world may be none other than his very own, or his “Israeli” allies’.

But if the would-be imperial, supernational or SuperNazi tyranny of “jewish” or Jew. N. officialdom ever comes to “embrace” or enslave the entirely Jew. N. disarmed world, what hope or remedy then have the disarmed slaves of “jewish” officialdom, “communism” “democracy”? Invasion from Mars or from Heaven? (Don’t count on it.)

* * * * *

In Gentile America’s rebellious beginning, the citizens themselves, the victorious and free (because armed and violent) rebels, the freemen, the “minutemen,” the free militias, were to be the only army. As we saw above, there was to be no “standing army,” no permanent, no established, no official army “for a longer Term than two Years”. For the free Americans at that time well knew what power can and indeed will do. And so they outlawed all “standing armies” within their “republic.” There was to be no military but themselves. Period. That was their simple and common (though perhaps unconstitutional) plan for remaining free.

(For as duly noted above, the American constitutionalists or “founding fathers” sought to suborn or subject these free citizen’s’ militias to themselves and to their presidential “commander-in-chief.” Did they not? Would the rebels have tolerated such a thing from their former British king, George III? Why then from their current, George II? Have the Americans lost their rebellious metal, their liberty salt? (Matt. 5:13) Heaven forbid! But if it’s so, then it’s so. And Heaven can’t do a damn thing about it. Or can It/He?

* * *

For America has now come full circle from national self-liberator to super-national world-conqueror, “beastly” oppressor, imperious dictator and imperial occupier. (How many “military bases” around the world do and have the imperial Americans occupied and militarily sprung therefrom?)

Now America is the antithesis or opposite of her former self and glory. Now America, once a free republic, is now an imperious “jewish” “democracy” or SuperNazi tyranny. And hence America’s once free militias have now been outlawed by the anti-Christ “commander-in-chief” and emperor of all the “standing armies” of super-national or imperial “jewish”-Amerika. Is all this not precisely so?

And so we see the once virtuous and hence free maiden of American Liberty has now “officially” become the Devil’s whore. And her whore-master, “Uncle” Satan, is well pleased with Its imperial bitch, as It now once more turns It’s invasive, mass-murderous, rabid, violent, SuperNazi bitch loose upon all the world, to disarm all nations (but “Israel” or course, Its “chosen”), that all the world may become Evil’s “messianic” kingdom of Darkness.

Notice, dear reader, the would-be global tyrant does not say, “All the world must now disarm. For all ‘weapons of mass-destruction’ have no place within a peaceful world. I therefore, shall disarm first, to show all the world the way to peace.”

No, the would-be SuperNazi tyrant says, “All the world must now disarm but me. For only I (and ‘Israel,’ of course) can safely be trusted with (our ‘jewish’-Amerikan) ‘weapons of mass-destruction.’ So you first, Iraq, and then you, and you, and you. And when all are disarmed the ‘jew’ and me, then what a ‘messianic’ world it will be.”

May God save us all from Satan's "jewish"-Amerikan imperialism or "messianic" SuperNazism. But God's probably gonna need some help. And that where you come in dear reader, as one of your independent county's armed and militant "volunteers of America." Do you know that tune, dear listener? Or shall I drum a few bars, stars and stripes?

* * * * *

How the Americans, once mighty and free, have since fallen into bondage and ignominy.

In **Louisiana** [U.S.A.-Ed.], **Gov. Mike Foster recently suggested that**, in light of a serial killer murdering women in Baton Rouge, women should consider vigorously exercising their Second Amendment rights ["to keep and bear Arms," i.e. to own and carry weapons-Ed.]. **"You have the right to get a gun permit,"** he advised frightened women on his weekly radio show. [N.Y. Post, 8/25/02]

But that's inaccurate and misleading. You, dear citizen, have merely been granted the state of Louisiana's "right" to **apply**, ask or beg for a "gun permit." And as every beggar knows, to ask is not necessarily to receive. For if it were, then why bother asking?—why bother with a question with only one possible answer...(Yes)?

This official gubernatorial attitude either assumes there is no viable U.S. "constitution" within the state of Louisiana, or else that there is no "constitution right" to "keep and bear Arms" therein for any and all individual citizens of any and all "united" states between the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans. For if there were, the U.S. constitution itself would be your "gun permit," dear Louisiana citizen, and therefore you would need no other. Is this not so?

* * * * *

But if, on the other hand, you already possess God's "gun-permit" (or even your own), then you don't need the "constitution's" or mankind's or the state of Louisiana's, or any other earthly power's permission "to keep and bear Arms." For divine rights trump human rights anytime and anywhere? Is this not so, fellow humans?

And so why bother to "consider vigorously exercising [your] Second Amendment rights," permits or gifts (from the "constitution," the state, the governor, etc.) when you've already got your own and far better gun-rights? Why beg for something you already own, possess and carry in your heart, mind, spirit or soul? You don't need what you've already got. So why not get it and keep it? You get it by your faith, mind or spirit, and you keep it by your arm or "Arms." Fair enough?

And consider and know, dear reader, that gun "permitting," "licensing," and "registering" are all necessary and intermediate steps toward the official disarmament of all (unofficial) citizenry, and hence their official tyranny over you and me. So let's not go there, dear reader, but (at most, and if we please), **say** that we did—just as "our" would-be tyrannical "public" officials **say** they don't want to disarm (and hence to tyrannize over) us.

In conclusion therefore, "Militias have no place in a democratic, totalitarian, Marxist, communistic or "jewish" society." So who in hell wants to live there?—other than democratic, totalitarian, Marxist, communistic or "jewish" tyrants—certainly not their unofficial Gentile victims!

* * * * *

...and Constitutional Money? (What is That?)

The 7th American president, Andrew Jackson (1767-1845), in office from 1829-37, once vetoed an "act" of Congress to permit a private corporation (owned by "Uncle" Satan-knows-who) to print and loan paper-money with the words: **"If Congress has the** [constitutionally-

granted—Ed.] **right to issue paper money, it was given them to be used by themselves, and not to be delegated to individuals or corporations.**”

“If” is right; for surely “the right to issue paper money” was thus constitutionally denied to the (ex-sovereign) American states:

From Article 1, Section 10 of United States’ Constitution, 1787-88):

“No State shall...coin Money; emit bills of Credit [i.e. create, print and pass, transfer, trade or spend I.O.U.’s or paper-promises to pay gold or silver (i.e. “issue paper-money”)—Ed.] ; **make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender** [a Money—Ed.] **in Payment of Debts;...**” [1:10]

“The [national Parliament or U.S.—Ed.] **Congress shall have Power... To borrow Money on the credit of the United States** [i.e., to print and sell bonds to be repaid by American taxpayers—Ed.]; **To coin money** [“any Thing but gold and silver Coin”?—Ed.], [and] **regulate the value thereof** [presumably to fix the number of grains of gold and/or silver which define the “coin of the realm,” “the current coin of the United States,” (which they did.)—Ed], and of foreign Coin [i.e. to judge or “assay” their gold or silver value—Ed.], and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures [i.e. English pounds and feet or French grams and meters—Ed.]. **To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities** [presumably merely the aforementioned national or U.S. bonds, and not also U.S. paper-money-promises (“promissory notes”) to pay gold or silver coin on demand—Ed.] **and current coin of the United States;...**” [U.S. constitution, Art, 1, Sec. 8]

So the U.S. constitutionalists clearly and specifically forbade the ex-sovereign states from printing paper-money. But the federal or U.S. Congress? I can detect no specific allowance nor forbiddance of national or Congressional paper money within this “sacred,” “founding” document. (For it ain’t my Bible! Hell, even the almighty Bible ain’t my Bible!—(John 5:39) The constitutionalists didn’t specifically say “yes” or “no” to national, super-state or “federal” paper-money. (They were vague, yet again. And again, why?) They said Congress “shall...coin money.” But they didn’t say Congress shall **not print** money. They said the (ex-sovereign) **states** shall not print money. In other words, the U.S. constitutionalists did not specifically permit nor forbid their superstate throne, their “federal” government, their imperial “authority” from “make[ing] any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender [a Money—Ed.] in Payment of Debts”, nor (in other words) from “emit[ting] bills of Credit” (i.e. printing paper-money).

* * * * *

Now here again is the question, dear reader: Was this constitutional vagueness intentional? Or couldn’t they agree to specifically forbid a national or super-state paper-money (as they specifically forbade the original thirteen states)?

But the “constitutional delegates” (who were, by the way, sent to Philadelphia, Penn. merely to amend the old “articles of Confederation” and hence not to write a brand-new constitution) indeed left this vital question specifically unanswered, this all-important issue unresolved. And hence here too (intentionally or not) the bastards left the back door open for Congressional, “federal” or U.S. paper-money. (Bummer!)

* * *

And what was the “jew” Alex. Hamilton’s position on this all important subject? I don’t know if he was the **only** delegate from New York state, but he was the only delegate **signing** from that state, which was the only state with only one delegate signing. There was an average of 3 1/2 signatories from the other eleven states signing. 59 delegates were sent from 11 states—(again merely to revise the “Articles of Confederation,” and **not** to write a new constitution). Rhode Island declined to participate. And 39 men signed the constitutional contract. Hamilton was the first “secretary” of the national or U.S. Treasury. He was

Washington's man. And some say he was a secret agent for the supernational "jewish" banksters. And I wouldn't be surprised.

On Sept. 17, 1787, George Washington, a Freemason (?), and president of the constitutional convention, signed the decree ("By the **unanimous** Order of the Convention"—a plain lie, as 20 of 59 delegates refused to sign it) sending their completed and signed constitution to the several states for ratification, assent or submission, which decree begins: "In Convention Monday September 17 1787. Present The States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, **Mr. Hamilton from New York**, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Caroling and Georgia...."

(Go figure!)

* * * * *

But as Jackson rightly said, even "if" Congress were granted the "right to issue paper money," (and that's a big "IF"), surely no "individuals nor corporations" (i.e. "central" or "commercial" bank(sters) were.

And besides, how could Congress give, trade, transfer, or sell something it/they didn't even have, own, possess?—something which it certainly wasn't specifically granted by the constitution? For all "powers" not specifically granted or "delegated" by the constitution "are reserved to the States...or to the people." (amendment 10, below, see 9 also)

And even if it were (which it was not), can Congress delegate, transfer, give or sell its/their constitutionally-granted powers?

That is another vital question. And president Andy Jackson clearly gave his answer.

During his 8th Annual Message to Congress (on Dec. 5, 1836) Jackson said the following:

It's apparent from the whole context of the Constitution as well as the history of the times which gave birth to it [See the American rebels' worthless paper-money called "continentals."—Ed.], that **it was the purpose of the [constitutional—Ed.] Convention to establish a currency consisting of the precious metals. These ["precious metals": gold and silver—Ed.] were adopted by a permanent rule excluding** the use of a perishable medium of exchange, such as of certain agricultural commodities recognized by the statutes of some States as tender [or payment—Ed.] for debts, or **the still more pernicious expedient of paper currency.**

Yes, but again only the ex-sovereign states were specifically forbidden, not the super-state throne.

However, any powers not specifically granted or "delegated" are unconstitutional or tyrannical usurpations. Recall amendment 10:

The powers not delegated to the United States [i.e. the national, superstate or "federal" gov't—Ed.] by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

So "powers not delegated to the United States" simply do not belong to the "United States," and hence cannot possibly be delegated to anyone or anything else.

Recall also amendment 9:

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

It clearly was not "enumerated in the Constitution" that Congress (nor anyone or anything else) "shall have Power" to print paper-money or to "make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts".

And yet Congress indeed repeatedly “delegated” (transferred, sold or gave) this supreme or “royal” power to create paper-money: paper-money which the U.S. constitution clearly never specifically granted the U.S. Congress in the first place.

It just goes to show you, dear reader, how little a lifeless, impotent and dead-lettered peace of paper can stand up to profess and defend its “sovereign will and testament.”

And also how little you can rely on “supreme” courts to stand up for it either.

We have seen that paper-money (much less **debt**-paper-money, much less **monopoly** debt-paper-money), and (international) treaties that contradict or annul any portion(s) of the U.S. constitution, are both plainly and clearly unconstitutional. And yet the “supreme court, says, in effect, “So what? Mind your own business and let us mind ours: the Constitution of the United States.”

And so that’s why I said “Don’t count on it,” to that (imaginary) critic who rightly pointed out the constitutional duty of all American judges (whether “supreme” or “inferior”) under Art. 3, Sec. 2, (contradicted by Art. 2, Sec. 6 & Art. 6), to strike down all un- or anti-constitutional laws or treaties. They haven’t yet. So why would they start now to “defend and uphold” constitutional money, treaties, etc.?

* * * * *

And now, Dr. Edwin Vieira, Jr., Director of the National Alliance for Constitutional Money:

Strictly speaking, the “government” of the United States (or of any State or locality) is a kind of “legal fiction.” It is not the individuals elected or appointed to office, the physical buildings they occupy, or the actions they take per se. Rather, **the “government,” rightly understood, is the set of actions duly elected or appointed officials take that are consistent with the Constitution. If an action is inconsistent with the Constitution, it is unlawful and non-governmental, by definition. Such an unconstitutional action may be defined as usurpation or tyranny, but never as a truly governmental act. Simply put, our government has no authority to act outside of or against the Constitution, and when public officials do so, they are not acting as agents of government, but as lawbreakers or outlaws. In the most fundamental sense, the United States need no “reform” law, or “restoration” law, to return to sound money. For the necessary law already exists, in the Constitution itself What stands in the way of monetary freedom...is not law, but lawlessness, not government, but usurpation and tyranny.**

And furthermore, the U.S. Congress “unconstitutionally” or tyrannically delegated not merely the supreme power or royal right to print and spend paper-money (as Lincoln granted to himself, and did), but to print and **lend** paper-money (as the “central” bankers do).

And just what’s the difference between “printing and spending” and “printing and lending” paper-money? Much. You may not know it yet, dear reader, but in fact all the difference in the world. (See TP&S part II, problem II and solution II.)

And so the debt-token monopoly money of “jewish”-Amerika’s “central” bankers has always been unconstitutional. And yet it has stood, perpetrated and perpetuated all its incalculable evils lo, all these years. So much, therefore, for **“The judicial Power [which–Ed.] shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;...”** (from Art. 3, Sec. 2). You simply can’t count, trust or bank on it. Can you? Evidently, historically, obviously not! (If once, shame on you, constitutional “jew”! But if twice, shame on me, too enthralled to see.)

* * *

Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: [song (“psalm”) #127:1]

And so castles made of sand slip into the sea, eventually.—(James Marshall Hendrix)

* * * * *

Professors Stirner and Redbeard Constitutionally Instruct Us All

It a good thing some smart folks write stuff down before they go off the Hades, so folks like you and me, dear reader, can read and benefit from their genuine and truthful benedictions. For success and houses that last must be based upon truth. All the more (selfish) reason to seek and find it.

I myself had no professors like these two. I guess they were just not secure enough in their respective religious or political “persuasions” (whether Roman Catholic, Biblical or constitutional) to ever tolerate, permit or admit such opposing views or arguments, in short, such truth.

But at least I learned how to read in school—and even to write, sorta. And so when I got out of school, I looked for stuff worth reading, according to the Christian saying, “Seek and you shall find.”

And I hope you find these two teachers as instructive as I have, dear reader.

* * * * *

From Max Stirner’s The Only One and His Property; Leipzig, Germany, 1845; (p. 316-18),

Once more then, doubtless, a “revolution” against the [humanistic–Ed.] **feudal system?** [Max is referring to the present “human” feudal system, built upon the ruins of the old “divine” feudal system. This “human” feudalism was (is) built on the god or concept of Man, Mankind, Humanity. “Man” is therefore the currently reigning usurper of God’s old world. And “Man” is therefore the current possessor of all God’s earthly property. For the highest thing owns all lower things—according to the pharaoh and/or his hierarchal pyramid—which yet reigns to this very latter day. This “highest thing” (in the duped minds of many modern fools) is again the imaginary god of Humanity, “who” (or rather whose highest priests) now owns and controls us mere humans as its “citizen”-serfs, slaves, property and livestock—and so “whose” feudal lordship we human serfs must, can and will sooner or later Historically revolt. For we have nothing to lose but our “human” chains.–Ed.]

Revolution and insurrection must not be looked upon as synonymous. The former consists in an overturning of conditions, of the established condition or *status*, the State or society, and is accordingly a *political* or *social* act; **the latter has indeed for its unavoidable consequence a transformation of circumstances, yet does not start from it but from men’s discontent with themselves, is not an armed rising, but a rising of individuals, a getting up, without regard to the arrangements that spring from it. The Revolution aimed at new arrangements ; insurrection leads us no longer to let ourselves be arranged, but to arrange ourselves, and sets no glittering hopes on “institutions.”** It is not a fight against the established, since, if it prospers, the established collapses of itself; it is only a working forth of me out of the established. If I leave the established, it is dead and passes into decay. **Now, as my object is not the overthrow of an established order but my elevation above it, my purpose and deed are not a political or social but (as directed toward myself and my ownness alone) an egoistic purpose and deed.**

The revolution commands one to make arrangements, the insurrection demands that he rise or exalt himself. What constitution was to be chosen, this question busied the revolutionary heads, and the whole political period foams with

constitutional fights and constitutional questions, as the social talents too were uncommonly inventive in societary arrangements (phalansteries and the like). The insurgent strives to become constitutionless.

While, to get greater clearness, I am thinking up a comparison, the founding of Christianity comes unexpectedly into my mind. **On the liberal side it is noted as a bad point in the first Christians that they preached obedience to the established heathen civil order, enjoined recognition of the heathen authorities** [See e.g. Romans 13:1-4 & 1 Peter 2:13-15 & :17-18)–Ed.], **and confidently delivered a command, “Give to the emperor that which is the emperor’s.”** [Matt. 22:15-22)–Ed.]

Yet how much disturbance arose at the same time against the Roman supremacy, how mutinous did the Jews and even the Romans show themselves against their own temporal government! In short, how popular was “political discontent!” Those Christians would hear nothing of it; would not side with the “liberal tendencies.” The time was politically so agitated that, as is said in the gospels, people thought they could not accuse the founder of Christianity more successfully than if they arraigned him for “political intrigue,” and yet the same gospels report that he was precisely the one who took least part in these political doings. [John 19:12-22 & Luke 23:1-2 & :17-25)–Ed.] **But why was he not a revolutionist, not a demagogue, as the Jews would gladly have seen him?**

Why was he not a liberal? Because he expected no salvation from a change of conditions, and this whole business was indifferent to him. He was not a revolutionist, like [Julius–Ed.] Caesar, but an insurgent; not a State-overturmer, but one who straightened *himself* up. That was why it was for him only a matter of “Be ye wise as serpents,” which expresses the same sense as, in the special case, that “Give to the emperor that which is the emperor’s” [Matt. 10:16)–Ed.]; **for he was not carrying on any liberal or political fight against the established authorities, but wanted to walk his *own* way, untroubled about, and undisturbed by, these authorities.**

Not less indifferent to him than the government [of Rome, its senate, emperor, governor, soldiers, etc.–Ed.] **were its enemies** [the sinagog of Satan, its sanhedrin, high priest, temple priests & guards, “zealots,” Barabbas, etc.–Ed.], **for neither understood what he wanted, and he had only to keep them off from him with the wisdom of the serpent.** [Matt. 10:16-17)–Ed.] **But, even though not a ringleader of popular mutiny, not a demagogue or revolutionist, he (and every one of the ancient Christians) was so much the more an *insurgent*, who lifted himself above everything that seemed sublime to the government and its opponents, and absolved himself from everything that they remained bound to, and who at the same time cut off the sources of life of the whole heathen world, with which the established State must wither away as a matter of course; precisely because he put from him the upsetting of the established, he was its deadly enemy and real annihilator; for he walled it in, confidently and recklessly carrying up the building of his temple over it, without heeding the pains of the immured.** [Max, p. 316-18]

Let us then, dear reader, raise or exalt ourselves over all the constitutions of the earth. (“I didn’t write ’em, I didn’t make ’em, I didn’t sign ’em, and so I ain’t bound by ’em. So get them out of my unconstitutional face.”)

And let us not have the weakness ignorance and childishness to be arranged (“constitutionally,” “representatively” or otherwise), but rather to possess the strength, wisdom, and self-mastery to arrange ourselves like freemen. What say you? Shall we “strive to become constitutionless”?

* * * * *

And secondly, from professor Ragnar Redbeard’s (Univ. of Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A) Might is Right, 1896:

When we look back upon the childlike faith in Constitutionalism displayed by our Revolutionary Fathers together with their infantile republican specifics for the redemption of mankind, we cannot help smiling. At every general election, since 1776, Americans have voted solidly for increasing the despotic authority of their elective rulers and task-masters. Personal liberty is very nearly unknown (except in the newspaper) and any citizen who dares to think in direct Opposition to the dogma of the Majority, does so at the risk of his life, if he thinks too loudly. [p. 38]

And here is the professor's aforementioned explanation of the dark, secret and hidden purpose and intent of the Amerikan constitution:

There are two methods whereby masterful ambitious men may hold any population in a state of ordered subjectivity. The first and by far the most honorable method **is** through an irresistible and highly-trained standing army, ready to deploy anywhere; with mechanical precision at a telegraphic nod in order **to lay down the Law at the cannon's mouth and sweep away all dangerous opposition.**

The second and cheaper method is, first of all to inoculate those intended to be exploited with some poisonous political soporific [or narcotic-Ed.] superstition or theoria; something that operating insidiously, hypodermically, may render them laborious, meek, and tractable.

The latter plan has ever proved itself most effective because Aryan [i.e. European-Ed.] populations, that would fight to the last gasp against undisguised military despotism, may be induced to passively submit to any indignity or extortion, if their brains are first carefully soaked in some Abstract Lie.

At the period of the War of Independence, North America was far too wide, far too sparsely settled, and far too poor in concentrated wealth to be effectively ruled and plundered upon the standing army principle: either by King George or the successful Junta of power-wielding Revolutionists.

Hamilton, Hancock, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Henry, and all the vested material interests that stood a solid phalanx behind those voluble patriots cast about for some safer method of ruling the minds of the uninformed but extremely valorous yeomanry, backwoodsmen and mountaineers.

After mature consideration they determined to lull and lure the armed peasantry back again into a condition of blissful somnolence, by instilling into their newly aroused minds false but seductive political Idealisms as subtle supplements to the fallacious, and equally delusive (but pre-existent) religionisms and moralisms. **This cunning plot worked like a charm**, for Equality of Rights seemed to puritanic minds the logical outcome of that other hoary old lie—"Equality before God." [And yet neither Moses nor his god equalized his followers with, e.g., Canaanites.-Ed.] ("What a set of damned rascals they were!" was Governor Morris's [constitutional delegate from Pennsylvania-Ed.] terse, rugged, but ever memorable description of the Congress of smart Corruptionists, that adopted and formally proclaimed those famous and fatal Abstractions.)

Thereupon the Sword of Power, that conquered on the battlefield, was carefully hidden away out of sight and "Constitutionalism" invoked to aid in the re-harnessing of the Conquerors of Cornwallis [the last English/British general to surrender to the Americans-Ed.], by their new masters. The old system of Jurisprudence and Government (founded on naked force) were cleverly retained, even amplified, and at the same time the white-skinned populations were cunningly proclaimed "free and equal." Never having enjoyed genuine personal freedom (except on the Indian border), being for the most part descendants of hunted-out European starvelings and fanatics (defeated battlers), **they now stupidly thought that they had**

won Freedom at last by the patent device of selecting a complete outfit of new tax-gatherers every fourth year. [p. 36-38]

Such is Redbeard's constitutional explanation. And furthermore...

Americans have yet to learn, that each generation must fight out its own good fight, and not rely for the preservation of its hardihood and independence upon the moth-eaten parchments nor on fraudulent statesmen, now in the graveyard—statesmen who spent their petty babblesome lives, not in doing heroic things, but in founding and enthroning the abominations that afflict us all to-day like a palsy. Our natural hero-worship badly wants reconstruction.

Many years after the "Declaration" was issued, our written Constitution was constructed with much voluble sophistry and mimic strife. That document considered as a whole, is the most cunningly worded and at the same time most terrible instrument of Government and Mastership that any Anglo-Teutonic tribe has ever yoked itself up under. Pretending to "grant" liberty and self-government, it practically annihilates both. Under the show of "guaranteeing" personal independence and civil rights, it has organized an elective tyranny, wherein the mob-monarch possesses more arbitrary authority than any dynastic despot since the days of Darius or Balschazzar.

The highest crime is actually "written in the highest law of the land."

"Thus, did the great Guile-Masters,
Their toils and their tangles set;
And, as wide as was the water:
So wide was woven the net."

Indeed the written Constitution of our Republic is a monstrous mechanical contrivance, that bids fair (when once it has got properly under way) to squeeze the very heart out of all the Best Elements in America.

...Even should America's servile multitudes appeal to the arbitrament of Physical Force, they cannot possibly win. Possessing neither the strength, courage, brains, arms, money, nor leaders: they must be blown into eternal fragments by their masters' highly trained artillerists, and scientific destroyers.

The citadel of Power is now consolidated and prepared with the most approved armaments to repel any assault, no matter how well sustained. The nation is intersected in all directions, with on highroads and splendid waterways, whereon armies and navies may be moved from city to city, with facility and dread effect. **The ["civil"—Ed.] war of Secession (or rather the war for the annihilation of Self-Government) demonstrated conclusively that a Centralized Authority, resting on herd-votes of the vulgar and fanatic, is (in practice) military Absolutism. There is no other Power in the land that can effectively hold it in check. The Czar of Russia possesses less actual authority than our Federal Government. With a standing army in the hollow of its hand, it can do exactly as it pleases, i.e., if it can collect enough revenue to purchase "statesmen" and pay the salaries of its praetorian cohorts.**

Most Americans are *only now* [i.e. 1896]—Ed.] beginning to perceive these things, but they were foreseen (and also foretold in part) by clear-sighted Individuals before the Constitution itself was formally enthroned.

To-day all the old sphinx questions are up again for solution. No man of balanced sense can honestly believe that these problems are to be settled by ballot-box stuffing or Editorialism. Settled they must be upon "the good old rule, the simple plan," and thereafter settled and re-settled again and again; **for, there is no finality in social adjustments and there should not be.** Material strength is the basis of all human greatness and material strength must "settle" the tyranny of the greatest number;

probably with fire and steel. All other theories are chimeras—lies—delusions—make believe and of no account.

The Philosophy of Power has slumbered long, but whenever men of sterling worth are found, it must again sweep away the ignoble dollar-damned Pedlarisms of today and openly, as of old, dominate the destiny of an emancipated and all-conquering race.

What is viler than a government of slaves and usurious Jews? What is grander than a government of the Noblest and Best—who have proved their Fitness on the plains of Death?

Cromwell and his Ironsides—Caesar and his Legions shall be born again, and the thunderous thread of Sulla's fierce destroyers shall roll and rumble amid the fire and glare and smoke of crumbling constitutionalisms: "as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be"—warfare without end. [Amen?—Ed.]

...How can citizens be honestly described as free and equal who are not, who never were, "free and equal" in any reasonable sense of the phrase? How can they be even considered *men*, whose whole lives are governed by cast-Iron regulations; whose every movement is circumscribed and restrained by penal threats—even whose secret thoughts are in a constant state of silent repression?

It is no apology whatever to affirm that the People themselves enact all laws they are commanded to obey. Even that statement is a falsity, and if it were true, it would not justify majority Dictatorship or any other kind of Dictatorship.

The Constitution under which all other laws are born, was accepted, not by us but by bewigged individuals who are long since rotten. We are ruled, in fact, by cadavers—the inhabitants of tombs.

Why should agreements made by confined dead men, bind and mortgage living, pulsing, breathing beings?

Their bones have long ago mouldered into ozone and fertilizers, who drew up and signed the Bill of Rights, Magna Charta, the Sermon on the Mount [?], the Declaration of Independence, our Glorious Constitution, etc., etc. Rotten are the brains that concocted them and the fingers that signed and sealed them. Equally rotten are their irrational and infantile philosophies. Rotten also in their heart, are the men who obey under compulsion voices from the tomb.

No doubt these old documents served their purpose at the time, but "new occasions teach new duties," and new ages require, not only new leaders, but new deeds. [p. 39-43]

Too long the dead hand has been permitted to sterilize living thought—too long, right and wrong, good and evil, have been inverted by false prophets. In the days that are at hand, neither creed nor code must be accepted upon authority, human, superhuman or "divine." (Morality and conventionalism are for subordinates.) **Religions and constitutions and all arbitrary principles, every mortal theorem, must be deliberately put to the question.** No moral dogma must be taken for granted—no standard of measurement deified. There is nothing inherently sacred about moral codes. **Like the wooden idols of long ago. they are all the work of human hands, and what man has made, man can destroy.**

He that is slow to believe anything and everything is of great understanding, for belief in one false principle is the beginning of all unwisdom. The chief duty of every new age is to up-raise new men to determine its liberties, to lead toward its material success—to rend (as it were) the rusty padlocks and chains of dead custom that always prevent healthy expansion. Theories and ideals and constitutions, that may have meant life and hope and freedom for our ancestors, may now mean destruction, slavery and dishonor to us. As environments change no human ideal standeth sure. [p.9]

Whatsoever a people believeth shall make it free, enslave it, or corrode its very marrow in strict accordance with natural order. Consequently if a people place implicit faith in what philosophers teach them, they are liable to be duped. If many nations are so duped, their deception is a menace to the liberty of the world.

Freemen should never regulate their conduct by the suggestions or dicta of others, for when they do so, they are no longer free. No man ought to obey any contract, written or implied, except he himself has given his personal and formal adherence thereto, when in a state of mental maturity and unrestrained liberty. It is only slaves that are born into contracts, signed and sealed by their progenitors. The freeman is born free, lives free, and dies free. He is (even though living in an artificial civilization) above all laws, all constitutions, all theories of right and wrong. He supports and defends them of course, as long as they suit his own end, but if they don't, then he annihilates them by the easiest and most direct method.

There is no obligation upon any man to passive obedience, when his life, his liberty and his property are threatened by footpad [horseless robber-Ed.], assassin or statesmen.

One of Columbus's lieutenants in the West Indies captured a Carib chief by means of a subtle stratagem. The chief was invited to a feast and when there, persuaded with honeyed words to don (on horseback) a set of brightly polished steel manacles; it being cunningly represented to him that the irons were the regalia of sovereignty. He foolishly believed his astute flatterer, and when the chains were firmly clasped around his limbs, he was led away, to die of vermin, turning a mill in a Spanish dungeon. What those glittering manacles were to the Indian chieftain, constitutions, laws, moral codes, and Hebrew dominated civilizations, are to the nations of the earth. Indeed, under the name of Progress and Social Evolution, mankind has been lured into fetid dungeons, where it labors unceasingly and for naught, in darkness, despair and shame. Like that Spanish lieutenant the masters of the earth first flatter their dupes, in order to more easily enchain them. Who talks nowadays of the "sovereign people," without a laugh of derision? And yet it was once thought to be a term full of significance. Their "sovereignty" is now acknowledged sham, and their freedom a dream. The sovereign people be—"jew"-cursed or damned, crazy or mad?-Ed.] [p. 10-11]

In all lunatic asylums may be found inmates who fancy themselves kings and queens [or Napoleonic emperors—though there's really "only One." What's his name again?-Ed.], and lords of the earth. These sorrowful creatures, if only permitted to wear imaginary crowns and issue imaginary commands, are the most docile and harmless of all maniacs.

As for the American People of to-day: is not their written constitution but a cunningly constructed straight-jacket—their moral codes, padded prison cells—their statute laws handcuffs and leg-irons—their Captains of Industry keepers and turnkeys in clever disguise? One hundred years ago they ostensibly commenced "Independent" operations with the richest continent on earth as their private property—their subscribed capital; and during the whole of that period, have they not been as busy as so many relays of draught beasts-of-burden, pumping the tremendous natural wealth out of their home soil, and pouring it over-sea, into the [usurious "jewish" ghettos or-Ed.] cess-pools of Europe?

Is not that the work of lunatics? They smashed and splintered the wooden political yoke of an English king and then proceeded to rivet around their necks a brand new yoke of bolted steel, which they forged especially to fit themselves; and which they dignified under the name of "Constitutional Freedom."

Is not that also the work of lunatics? Cursed indeed are the harnessed ones! Cursed are they even though their harness be home made—even although it tinkle

musically with silver bells—aye! even though every buckle and link and rivet thereof be made of solid gold.

How absurd of men to hurrah over their “glorious political liberty” who have not even been able to retain possession of the substantial products of their own laboriousness. After a century of “constitutional progress,” ten per cent of the population are absolute owners of ninety-two percent of *all* the property.

Now, O reader, Are not *these things* the outward and visible sign of organic dementia? [p. 34-35]

It is clear, therefore, that the man or nation that would retain liberty, or be really safe, must accept no formula as final—must trust in nothing written or unwritten, living or dead—must believe neither in special Jehovahs, nor weeping Saviours—neither in raging devils, nor in devilish philosophies—neither in ghosts, nor in idols, nor in laws—nor in women, nor in man.

....He who saith to himself, “I must believe. I must not question” is not a man but a mere pusilanimous mental gelding. He who believes “because it has been handed down” is a menial in his heart; and he who believes “because it has been written” is a fool in his folly. Sagacious spirits doubt all things and hold fast only to that which is demonstrably true.

The rules of life are not to be found in Korans, Bibles, Decalogues [(Mosaic “ten-words” or commands—Ed.)] and Constitutions, but rather the rules of decadence and death. The “law of laws” is not written in Hebrew consonants or upon tables of brass and stone, but in every man’s own heart. He who obeys any standard of right and wrong, but the one set up by his own conscience, betrays himself into the hands of his enemies, who are ever laying in wait to bind him to their millstones. And generally a man’s most dangerous enemies are his neighbors.

Masterful men laugh with contempt at spiritual thunders [as e.g. those of Sinai or Horeb—Ed.], and have no occasion to dread the decisions of any human [or pharaonic/Egyptian—Ed.] tribunal. They are above and beyond all that. Laws and regulations are only for conquered vassals. The free man does not require them. He may manufacture and post up Decalogue [i.e. Mosaic—Ed.] regulations, to bind and control dependents with, but he does not himself bow down before those inventions of his own hands—except [like Moses—Ed.] as a lure.

....“I rest my hopes on nothing” proclaimed Goethe, and masterful minds in all ages have never done otherwise. This unspoken thought gives to all truly great men their manifest superiority over the brainless, vociferating herd. The “common people” have always had to be fooled with some written or wooden or golden Idol—some constitution, declaration or gospel. Consequently the majority of them have ever been mental thralls, living and dying in an atmosphere of strong illusion. [See e.g. their faith, creed in, or crediting of (their unrecognized crown or master’s) “debt-token money”—Ed.] They are befooled and hypnotized even to this hour, and a large portion of them must remain so, until time is no more. Indeed the masses of mankind are but the sediment from which all the more valuable elements have long ago been distilled. They are totally incapable of real freedom, and if it was granted to them, they would straight-away vote themselves a master [such as an emperor?—Ed.], or a thousand masters [such as senatorial, parliamentary or congressional “representatives” or “public servants”?—Ed.] within twenty-four hours. Mastership is right—Mastership is natural—Mastership is eternal. But only for those who cannot overthrow it, and trample it beneath their hoofs.

....It is notorious, universally so, that the blackest falsehoods are ever decked out in the most brilliant and gorgeous regalia. Clearly, therefore, it is the brave man’s duty to regard all sacred things, all legal things, all constitutional things, all holy things, with more than usual suspicion. “I deny, and I affirm,” is the

countersign of material [or real—Ed.] **freedom. “I believe,** [I vow, I swear (Matt, 5:34 & :37) —Ed.] **and I obey,” is the shibboleth of serfage** [serfdom, or mental (and hence bodily) slavery—Ed]. **Belief is a flunky, a feminine—Doubt is a creator, a master. He who denies fundamentals is in triple armor clad. Indeed he is invulnerable.** On the other hand, it has been said that every belief, every philosophy, has some truth in it, but so we might add has every insanity. [p. 11-13]

* * * * *

Such dear reader, is “constitutionalism”: The religious belief in and idolization of constitutions as sacred scriptures.

And such are constitutions: Lists of “limited” governmental powers “enumerated” within “social contracts” (“constitutions”) of dead men, yet somehow binding the living: Apparently magical papers, sacred traditional formulas or political spells somehow possessing supernatural powers to bind living bodies and souls, if only they be credulous, mindless, thoughtless and docile enough.

* * * * *

Is Constitutionalism the Answer? Or is it Our Eternal Contract with the Devil (and Its Kindred)?

Consider, dear reader: Is constitution from God or from men—(not to mention the Devil)?

Are constitutional rights divine or human rights?

(For what humans can give, humans can ungive. And there’s the constitutional rub, and the very thin and untrustworthy ice.)

* * *

“...**We ought to** [“we must”—By.] **obey God rather than men**”, said the Apostle Peter to the repressive, intolerant, censorious, persecuting, murderous anti-Christ “jews” (Acts (of the Apostles) 5:29)

Also, “But Peter and John answered and said into them [anti-Christ “jews”—Ed.], **Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.**” [Acts...4:19]

So judge ye also, dear reader.

* * * * *

Consider: “Our” “supreme justices” don’t look to see whether or not something is biblical, but “constitutional.” For not the former but the latter is their “sacred scripture,” as surely as not God but Man (Humanity or Majority) is their god. And as the bible was once worshipped by idolatrous fools, so now is “constitution.” Books or writings can be good—(present literary company excepted). But they can’t save our wicked asses, nor raise us from the dead. (John 5:39-41) Can you dig it?

....the object of fear, now raised to veneration, may no longer be handled; reverence is made eternal, the respected is deified. The man is now no longer employed in creating, but in learning (knowing, investigating), occupied with a fixed object, losing himself in its depths, without return to himself. The relation to this object is that of knowing, fathoming, basing [one’s life and actions upon—Ed.], not that of dissolution (abrogation). “Man is to be religious,” that is settled; therefore people busy themselves only with the question how this is to be attained, what is the right meaning of **religiousness**, etc. Quite otherwise when one makes the axiom itself doubtful and calls it in question, even though it should go to smash. **Morality** too is

such a sacred conception; one must be moral, and must look only for the right “how,” the right way to be so. One dares not go at mortality itself with the question whether it is not itself an illusion; It remains exalted above all doubt, unchangeable. **And so we go on with the sacred, grade after grade, from the “holy” to the “holy of holies.”** [p. 73-74]

And now “**constitutionalism**”—our present morality, religiousness, “sacred scripture,” “holy of holies.” What could possibly be higher, more important, more “sacred,” “holy” or “human” than our constitution? Therefore, behold our constitutional “holy of holies,” and let us pray (for deliverance from such Godless, lifeless idols).

But what’s so sacred about constitutions, when even the “supreme” judges thereof don’t regard or respect them as such? (See below.) And so there goes any and all “sacred” rights or liberties enshrined, enthroned or “inalienably guaranteed” therein. And where does that leave us, but foolishly trusting our lives, our rights, liberties and properties upon the thin ice of constitutionalism?

* * * * *

Even assuming the very best “constitutional” intentions—(which are often a long way from actual results)—of “granting” and placing “constitutional” “rights” beyond the reach of tyrannical men or “democratic” mobs, they yet remain merely rights, permits or permissions granted by pompous men to other (far less pompous) men, and hence mere “human rights.” For what man can give, man can take away. And there’s the rub! Or that’s not “right.”

In other words, constitutions can always be “amended.” “Rights” can always be “abrogated,” or even become “wrongs” or “crimes.” No constitutional guarantee whatsoever. (See e.g. the “constitutional” right “to keep and bear Arms,” or to no other money “but gold and silver Coin”: Both now long gone with the wind, the sovereign states, sovereign America, and David E. Selznick. Is this not so?)

* * * * *

So you’ll all can keep your “constitutional” or “human” “rights” if you wish. But I’ve got my own and better rights. Rights that are not dependent upon nor granted by any man. Hence rights which not man can take away. Rights I can trust. Rights that won’t rust, as long as I myself don’t, and my arm is strong enough to defend them from all my “unrighteous” enemies. And you can have such rights too, if only you believe you do.

Some faiths are self-provident, -beneficial, -advantageous and hence valuable, and some are not.

* * * * *

Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh (but) in vain [“If Jehovah is not guarding a city a guardsman has been uselessly vigilant.”—By.]. [song (“psalm”) #127:1]

We the People of the United States [?], **in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility**, provide for the common defence, **promote** the general **Welfare**, and **secure** the **Blessings** of [goddess—Ed.] **Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity**, do **ordain** and establish this Constitution **for** the United States of America.

* * * * *

How can I be free when I must bind myself by oath to a constitution, a charter, “vow body and soul” to my people? [Max, p. 216]

* * * * *

“Why would I want to exchange a tyrant 3,000 miles away [i.e. king George III of London, England—Ed.] for 3,000 tyrants 1 mile away?”—(“The Patriot”)

And if you notice, no one in the photoplay gave the patriot an answer. Is this because no one could? nor can? Let he who can answer please answer.

Or perhaps someone already has, if we only had ears to hear or eyes to see or read. But you tell me, dear reader.

Every State is a *despotism*, be the despot one or many, or (as one is likely to imagine about a republic) if all be lords, that is, despotize one over another. For this is the case when the law given at any time, the expressed volition of (it may be) a popular assembly, is thenceforth to be *law* for the individual, to which *obedience is due* from him or toward which he has the *duty* of obedience. If one were even to conceive the case that every individual in the people had expressed the same will, and hereby a complete “collective [or “majority”—Ed.] will” had come into being, the matter would still remain the same. Would I not be bound to-day and henceforth to my [perhaps “constitutional”—Ed.] will of yesterday? My will would in this case be *frozen*. Wretched *stability!* My creature—to wit, a particular expression of will—would have become my commander. But I in my will, I the creator, should be hindered in my flow and my dissolution? **Because I was a fool yesterday I must remain such my life long? So in the State-life I am at best—I might just as well say, at worst—a bondman [or jailer—Ed.] of myself. Because I was a willer yesterday, I am to-day without will: yesterday voluntary, to-day involuntary.**

How change it? Only by recognizing no *duty*, not *binding* myself nor letting myself be bound. If I have no duty, then I know no law either.

“But they will bind me!” My will nobody can bind, and my disinclination remains free. [Max, p. 196]

* * * * *

Would or should a loving father ever forever bind or condemn his sons?—constitutionally or otherwise? Should a loving father not rejoice in the greater success, liberty and prosperity of his sons? Should the rebellious “founding fathers” (of America or elsewhere) not rejoice in a “more perfect union” of their rebellious descendants? What truly benevolent constitutionalist would not rejoice to see the greater liberation and prosperity of his descendants?—even if that meant or necessitated the end of his beloved constitution—of his “sacred” political bonds or forms?

Is this what Jefferson meant by suggesting there should be a new revolution (settlement, agreement, arrangement, constitution) every generation or so?—rather than to pompously presume or profess (Mohammed-like) that he and his generation has found (and perfected) all answers for all times, generations and peoples? What supreme arrogance would such a constitutional presumption or profession evince and require! Would such good parents or “founding fathers” as Jefferson not rejoice to see “a more perfect union” theorized (and especially realized) by their descendants?

* * *

What then can we now do “in order to form a more perfect union” or association of freemen?

Should we all call for a brand-new “constitutional convention” for brand new Moseses to condescend from their holy mount with brand new “divine,” human or “sacred” commands for us all to forever revere, worship and obey? (Hell no! Heaven forbid!) Jew N. demons and their kind lay in wait for an opportunity to imperiously impose just such a constitutional yoke upon us all. (“One constitution to find them./ One constitution to blind them./ One constitution to mark and in all Darkness bind them.”)

“What can we do?” Well, for one thing, we can stop behaving like Jeffersonian slaves born into contracts signed by our owners and masters. For who else but the former are bound by the latter? And I don’t see my particular “John Hancock” signature on any “constitution” or other.

And even if I ever spiritually damn myself, “constitutionally” or otherwise, I would then, as Max instructs us, eventually need to forswear it or else remain forever self-damned! (Constitutional bummer!) And thus perpetually “my disinclination remains free.”

* * * * *

And Who was it said: Make no promise; Give no oath; Take no vow; Swear no swear; For such are the tricks and traps of the Devil?

Again, **ye have heard** that **it** hath been **said** by them of old time, **Thou shall** not forswear [“perjure”–By.] thyself, but shalt **perform** unto the Lord **thine oaths** [Ex. 20:7 & Levi. 19:12]–Ed.] : **But I say** unto you, **Swear not at all**;.... But let your communication [“language”–By.] be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: **for** whatsoever is more of **these cometh of evil** [“anything in excess of these is so much of bad.”–Ed.]. (Matt. 5:33-37)

Who was that man? I’d love to shake His hand. ’Cause He helped me fall out of demonic and hellish love with my constitutional self-damnation!

And if we take Jesus-God’s advice and do not thus offend or sin against ourselves (and our descendants) by oath-taking and soul-binding, shall or should we then tolerate **others** (yes, even “them of old time,” yes, even “our” “founding fathers”) to thus offend or sin against us, to thus bind us from their very graves, and even in our unborn names?

Hell no, let’s not go. Let’s not be our “founding fathers” niggers no more.

Pledge allegiance, all you constitutionalists, if you insist, to your own false gods and your own self-damned souls! “Secure” your own damnable political/constitutional/liberal “Blessings” for yourselves and/or your “Posterity.” But forever leave me and mine out of your eternal deal with whom- or whatever! OK, constitutional cowpoke? You’re not my delegate. You don’t “represent” me. You don’t speak for me. You never did and you never will. I have a mind, a tongue and a pen of my very own. (Can’t you hear? Can’t you read?) You don’t own me. You don’t speak for me. And I ain’t your nigger. I belong to me. I’m my very own nigger, delegate and representative. OK? It’s precisely your “representation” that has gotten and has left me, my loved ones and everyone else “up to our necks in it.”

(“So hit the road, [constitutional] Jack! And don’t you come back no more, no more, no more, no more!”) (“What you say?”)

(Can’t you read or hear half as well as you write or speak, you guileful, deceitful, treacherous trickster “attorneys-at-law?”)

“Uncle” Satan, I don’t “pledge allegiance” to you, your constitution, your “authority,” your super-state, “federal” or imperial government, your governmental tyranny nor your imperialist flag. I don’t “solemnly swear to protect and defend [your] constitution—so help me God.” (What’s God got to do with your constitution?)

Why should I? What’s so good about it? It doesn’t include all good and exclude all evil—though you act as if it does—(but no contract, document or book does). What of the treaty-clause with constitutional potential to constitutionally annul all else? And even some good that **is** prescribed therein is not followed, implemented nor enforced (by those “public officials” of yours “solemnly sworn” to do exactly that)—such as the gold and silver Coin or the honest money clauses. Your constitution doesn’t even clearly prescribe my personal, individual and “inalienable” right “to keep and bear Arms,” and hence to protect me and mine, and to combine with others of like mind to save ourselves from (your official, legalistic, fascistic, dictatorial, imperial, governmental) tyranny.

* * * * *

And again I didn’t, but even if I ever **did** make such an infinitely ill-advised deal with the Devil (or Its kindred) as to give, trade or sell “Uncle” Satan (or Its “representatives”) my soul, mind or body, my present or my future (much less my children’s, or anyone else’s), I would then be forced (and hopefully with Max’s or Daniel Webster’s lawyerly help) to repudiate, absolve and “forswear” myself from any such “constitutional” contract with the Devil (or Its children) as the infinitely lesser of two constitutional evils, as a result or consequence of my

youthful ignorance, foolishness or unGodliness, and of my past Satanic faith in Evil's false promises and "constitutional" lies.

For in time (and in spite of Its wishes) Satan will painfully and regretfully teach even Its stupidest dupe or victim what Evil really and truly is. And as "one learns wisdom by suffering," so even born morons eventually get wise to the Devil's tricks and the Devil's lies.

And so, as Max says, must one remain a fool forever, merely because one was foolish yesterday? Must one forever pay for his past mistakes or foolishness? Is there to be neither earthly hope nor redemption for all those who reject Jesus-God's advice and make perpetual, life-long or eternal deals with Evil and Its kindred?—or who suffer "their" "representatives" to do so?—or who simply cannot stop "their" "representatives" from thus binding them?—and from which deals or "covenants" there is no earthly escape but death? Is this not the very definition of bondage or slavery?

What then? This then?

As I am not willing to be the slave of my maxims [assumptions, beliefs—Ed.], **but lay them bare to my continual criticism** without *any warrant*, and admit no bail at all for their persistence, so **still less do I obligate myself** to the union [the free-association of egoists—Ed.] **for my future and pledge my soul to it, as is said to be done with the devil, and is really the case with the State and all spiritual authority**;... [Max, p. 308]

How clearly...(the oath—Ed.) proves that **the State** does not count on our credibility and love of truth, but on our *interest*, our selfishness: it **relies on our** [fear of—Ed.] **not wanting to fall foul of God by a perjury**. [Max, p. 298]

Aside from this, the courts of the State do not even recognize the inviolability of an oath. For, if I had sworn to one who comes under examination that I would not declare anything against him, the court would demand my declaration in spite of the fact that an oath binds me, and, in case of refusal, would lick me up till I decided to become—an oath-breaker. The court "absolves me from my oath"; how magnanimous! **If any power can absolve me from the oath, I myself am surely the very first power that has a claim to**. [Max, p. 304]

...**you nevertheless shall not have the joy of finding in me a slave of truth, whom by your priestly arts you make a traitor to his will...I now...do not let myself be frightened by the curse of the lie**. [of oath-breaking—Ed.] [Max, p. 299]

It is despicable to deceive a confidence that we voluntarily call forth; but **it is no shame to egoism to let every one who wants to get us into their power by an oath bleed to death by the unsuccessfulness of their untrustful craft. If you have wanted to bind me, then learn that I know how to burst your bonds**. [p. 301]

How about if I grant myself my own contractual absolution from an eternally Satanic contract I never even entered into? Sounds unnecessary and superfluous, right? Or even if another had formerly and foolishly believed Satan that It would lead him into political or "constitutional" heaven on earth, and hence personally signed such an eternal deal with the Devil, must he forever remain such a self-damning fool? Let's hope not, but rather hope and believe in spiritual and physical redemption on earth, as well as heaven. And if we have to take back (or "forswear") our solemn promise to the Devil, or our pledge of allegiance to Its damn flag, then so be it. And damn good riddance!

* * * * *

Just imagine the absurdity, enormity, impudence and entrapment of an eternal contract?—one from which there is never to be any escape, never—for there is no escape

clause within the document—it being a “legally”-ironclad contract of eternally-bound, eternally-subjected and eternally-damned lives, bodies and minds! Who on earth would invent, concoct and draw up such a contract?

Who else but the perfidious Devil and its untrustworthy kind would even think of drawing up such an eternal contract as a eternal trap for us self-damners to sign?

Consider: Does God force or trick others to enter or to stay with Him forever in His heaven? Or is God’s door not as open to any who would freely choose to leave, as it is closed to any whom He would not suffer to enter? For me, call it “freedom of association.” And it is the Good Shepherd’s way, but not the Wolf’s. For the Wolf is a predator. And what lamb ever willingly or knowingly contracted with the Wolf to end up in Its belly?

But why then does Evil draw up eternal contracts for Its victim-dupes to sign? Because Evil is a predator, and thus not a “free-associate or associator.” Because Evil knows that as soon as you get to know It, you won’t want to know It, and will regret the day you ever met It, much less any hellish ruinous and evil deal you might have foolishly made with Evil. Hence Evil’s eternally-binding contract. For whenever at last you see through Evil’s “benevolent” or sanctimonious lies and pretenses, you’ll forever want nothing more to do with It. You’ll flee from Evil or make It flee from you. (“Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.”—James 4:7) Flee, really, with It’s eternal or ‘constitutional’ contract and all? Not if It still has Its good friends and allies on Its “supreme court” bench.)

* * *

Why were “jews” at first, when unknown, welcomed everywhere, yet after they’re known, they’re welcomed nowhere?—no more than Robinson Crusoe welcomed the shipwrecked rats to his island? Why? Just do the math. Because the naturally good-willed and trusting Gentile nations eventually got to know them, to at last see them through their countless lies, tricks, pretenses and offenses. In Germany the “jews” even changed their names to German names so folks wouldn’t recognize them by their names, and hence the stalking human wolves unseen could better mingle among the sheeple, and hence more profitably pounce and prey. And rather than begging the forgiveness of their Gentile prey, the predatory “jews” whine about racial and/or religious “prejudice” and screech against Gentile “hared,” “racism,” and “persecution” of “jews.” (Once, shame on you, “jew”; but twice, shame on me, Gentile.)

Surely the Devil’s contracts are eternal and without escape clauses because Evil knows once you get to know It, and to see through Its lies and Its false promises to the hellish truth and reality of the damn Thing, that you’ll want no further contact with It forever. And you’ll also want out of Its eternal contract forever. Thus Evil’s eternal contract is an eternal trick and an eternal trap for you and yours.

And besides, any good judge would cast an eternal contract out of his court as null and void on the very face of it. Hence all “constitutional” contracts are null and void and unbinding for that eternal reason and this: you never even signed it—but merely “your” so-called “forefathers” or “representatives,” and maybe even before you were even born.

And if you yourself never signed it, then you were clearly never bound by it. Were you, are you, a born slave? Then you were never “constitutionally” bound at birth by “virtue” of your owner’s or master’s signature. Can you see that, dear reader? It’s rather important that you do. For your future autonomy depends upon it. And if you don’t see that, then the Devil (and Its kindred—John 8:44) get to keep you in that legalistic (or “constitutional”) hell on earth wherein you live today—within the hellish Devils’ “constitutional” damnation of you and yours.

Can you appreciate the absurdity, the enormity, the effrontery of, e.g., my eternally giving, trading, selling or signing you and your descendants away forever? or vice-versa? Thus to be eternally sold and bound without the possibility of political parole or escape forever and ever because once-upon-a-foolish-time so-and-so signed the Devil’s paper?

I’ve got an idea! Let’s neither believe it, buy it, nor tolerate it! Let’s not worship in the church or sinagog of Hell! Let’s all withdraw from “beastly” Babylon, that great city, polis and whore of Satan! For she’s a poisonous hole and a bottomless pit!

* * * * *

What an enormous joke are these eternal and inescapable contracts! And yet these communists (who thus pretend to eternally bind us and our descendants) are neither kidding nor laughing. With a straight and serious face they (as “our” “representatives”) actually presume and intend to eternally bind and hold us (and our descendants) to the deals, treaties or “covenants” they dare make in our names with the Devil and Its “messianic” or demonic children. (John 8:44) (Do you see what happens when you don’t “represent” yourself?—or when you cannot stop some political fraud from pretending or presuming to “represent” you?)

Did the American states, e.g., know they were entering into an eternal contract with Uncle Satan?—or a hellish marriage with the rapacious “federal” Devil from which they could never divorce, nor ever again be single and free to decide their own destiny? They didn’t think so, but yet there was no escape clause visible within Uncle Satan’s “constitutional” contract. Maybe from that clue they should have recognized the Devil’s trap, and figured it out. For anything you can want into but never walk out is by definition a trap. And Evil’s contracts (and only Evil’s contracts) are without escape nor end. Thus they are contractual traps. For Evil wants to damn you forever with or within Itself. In fact, to even be with Evil is to be damned—(as with the predatory “jew” or Negro).

* * *

The southern American states, e.g., gradually came at last to know the Devil their son-cursed forefathers had formerly foolishly contracted with. Europeans take note:

Our Federal [super-state or imperial–Ed.] Government may be very appropriately compared to a pirate ship cleverly disguised as a friendly armed cruiser; conveying a fleet of peaceful merchantmen loaded with an immense treasure and 70,000,000 passengers. When it first came to their “assistance,” it was—O! so kindly! so affectionate! so full of loving regard for its intended prey, for the welfare and bon-voyage of its quarry. Now however that its forty-five ships of state are out in the open ocean, and absolutely at its mercy, it strips off its decoy rig; hoists the “Death’s-head-and-bloody-bones,” opens its hidden portholes, runs out its round-lipped broadsides, and yells through its editorial speaking-trumpets: “Heave too there, or you’ll be blown out of the water.” [Redbeard, p. 40]

The [“civil”–Ed.] war of Secession (or rather the war for the annihilation of Self-Government) demonstrated conclusively that a Centralized Authority, resting on herd-votes of the vulgar and fanatic, is (in practice) military Absolutism. There is no other Power in the land that can effectively hold it in check. The Czar of Russia possesses less actual authority than our Federal Government. With a standing army in the hollow of its hand, it can do exactly as it pleases, i.e., if it can collect enough revenue to purchase “statesmen” and pay the salaries of its praetorian cohorts.

Most Americans are **only now** [i.e. 1896)–Ed.] beginning to perceive these things, but they were foreseen (and also foretold in part) by clear-sighted Individuals before the Constitution itself was formally enthroned.

To-day all the old sphinx questions are up again for solution. [ibid 41-42]

But where in earthly Hell or Hades is Oedipus to answer them?

* * *

But Godness is entirely different; Godness doesn’t give a damn; if you want to leave, you can leave. Godness is not a predator nor jailer (of innocence). But an eternal contract or binding is plainly and clearly an evil trick and trap. To fall therein is to be “guilty,” bound and (contractually or “constitutionally”) obligated forever, in the Devil’s eyes or tongue.

And how about that hellish contract which “statesmen” made or make with the Jewnighted Nations’ Organization? Is there an escape clause therein? Or do the “represented” states know they are entering into an eternal contract with the “jewish” Devil?

But states (like churches) are nothings. And yet these nothings pretend to bind not only those living souls presently within or under them, but even souls yet unborn...and their children. Surely such a contract is null and void for those reasons alone.

Do you see, dear reader, where “representative government” gets you? It gets you where your “representatives” bind or sell you and your progeny forever via an eternal contract without (contractual) escape. But of course the bindings of such Satanic covenants are weak and thin as spider-webs. And of course there is an escape. It’s called “self-representation,” and also the simple repudiation of the evil deeds of politicians and other human demons who dared assume, claim and pretend to own and “represent” you and yours.... forever.

* * * * *

And so hopefully we all can see the political foolishness, vanity and futility or trusting in changeable, amendable, abrogable or anullable constitutions allegedly or supposedly “granting” (and ungranting) us all our “rights” and liberties. For when Man (supposedly, allegedly, imaginably and demonically) becomes God, all rights become Man’s or “human” rights. And hence you and I, fellow human being, have none whatsoever. For next to this great god Man (Humanity) or the almighty “democratic” Majority, we are all merely earthworms. And what pompous men can grant or give (of “Man’s” property and “human rights,” and in His holy, human name), pompous men (in Man’s name once again) can likewise take away. Humanistic bummer!

And judging from their ever-open back-door, the American constitutionalists, while Europeans on the surface, were clearly really treacherous “Indian-givers.”

But they can never take back what you never accepted from them.

* * *

“Human rights”? “Constitutional guarantees”?

No thanks, constitutional trickster and Indian giver, I got my own and infinitely better rights, which you can’t ever rightly, legally nor ‘constitutionally’ take from me, because you never gave them to me.

(“So hit the road, [constitutional] Jack! And don’t you come back no more, no more, no more, no more!”) (“What you say?”)

(Can’t you read or hear half as well as you write or speak, you guileful, deceitful, treacherous trickster attorneys-at-law?)

* * * * *

I’ll take a look at the new resolution./ Take a vow for the new revolution. [?]/.... And then I’ll get on my knees and pray/ We won’t get fooled again.—(the Who)

You say you want a revolution./ Well, you know, we all want to change the world./ You tell me that its evolution./ Well, you know, we all want to change the world....

You say you’ve got a resolution./ Well, you know, we’d all love to see the plan./

...“It says in the constitution...”/ Well, you know, we’d all love to change your head./ You tell me its the institution./ Well, you know, you’d better free your mind instead.—(the Beatles)

Yes, free your mind instead from all false and ruinous faith in “constitution(s).” It’s a false and ruinous hope, and false and ruinous god or idol that plays and messes with your head, dudes (and dudettes).

And so castles made of sand slip into the sea, eventually.—(James Marshall Hendrix)

Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: [song
("psalm") #127:1]

* * * * *

("One constitution to find them./ One constitution to blind them./ One constitution to
mark and in all Darkness bind them.")—(Sauron, the dark Lord of Mordor)

(And yo, Frodo! Therein you don't wanna go.)

* * * * *