http://www.beholdonline.info/essays/triune.html

TRIUNE REPUBLIC

Behold! Pamphlet - October, 1988

The purpose and intent of this discourse is to show the reader the whole picture of what has happened to our beloved nation.

"The Christian religion is the established religion by our form of government and all denominations are placed on an equal footing and equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty." Runkel v. Winemiller, et al, 4 H & McH. (1799)

"It is conceded that this inhibition applies exclusively to the state. But that term presents a complex idea. A state is a sort of a trinity; it exists, acts, and speaks in three capacities: legislative, executive, and judicial. What is forbidden to it in one capacity is forbidden to it in each and all. It may not infringe this article by legislation, but it may equally do so by its courts or its executive authorities." Ex parte Reynolds et al, Federal Case No. 11,720.

In the birth of America the "People" "Ordained" and "Established" a Christian nation, adopting the Christian common law as the supreme Law of the Land. The system of law and jurisprudence which they adopted was the common law of England, but only in so far as it was in agreement with the law of the Bible. The Founding Fathers, like their English and German ancestors, had a profound respect for the Holy Bible and the principles of liberty stated therein. They also had a profound hatred of "democracy".

In the view of the Founding Fathers, the political realm was regarded as a mere reflection or extension of the word of the Heavenly. For, religion is the great state-building principle. The American colonists created a new state because they were already a church and that church was the soul of the state it created. The fathers held as Divine doctrine that governments were made for the benefit of the governed, and not for that of the governors, who were to regard themselves as the servants of God appointed for the benefit of His people.

The prosperity and happiness of the Nation was seen to be a direct outcome of its religion and ruin was inevitably seen to follow vice and sin. It was their view that the first duty of a government was to support, teach, and practice the religion of the Nation, by public recognition and honour paid to it in the outward forms of its worship, and by using it as the groundwork of the education of the people; and by putting a social stigma upon all deviation from it. It was widely believed that failure to adhere to these principles would inevitably lead to the destruction of the nation.

This, then, was the prevailing view of history, law and religion at the time the American Republic was founded and subsequently during its first hundred years of existence. The organic law completely embodied these principles for it was wholly based upon the same authority that taught them, id est, the Christian Holy Bible.

"Next to the power of religion, a strict administration of justice is the best security of morals. Foreign influence will not greatly prevail, as long as morals remain uncorrupted. The British common law is, therefore, one of the bulwarks against that corruption of manners, which will invite foreign influence, in spite of all the frothy harangues that will ascribe it to the wrong causes. A people thoroughly licentious and corrupt, (and democracy will make them such), will be betrayed, and foreign states will reward demagogues for managing their passions to mislead them. It is by practising on their hopes and fears, that such men gain an influence over the people, and after they have gained, they have it for sale." Works of Fisher Ames, ed. W. B. Allen (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1983 (1854), pgs 297-98, Vol. I.

THE ANCIENT PRINCIPLES

The common law of England, in its purest and earliest form, was Germanic and Celtic in origin. Beyond that its roots go back into the mists of history. It appears over and over again in the records and traditions of all the Israelite (White) nations. In the ancient records it is always described and couched in the context of a fundamental law of divine origin associated with the governance of all nature. The founding fathers of the American Republic referred to it as "the law of nature and nature's God". This phrase is lifted directly from the "Lex Salica", the common law of the German tribes that over ran Europe as well as Scandanavia and eventually settled in large portions of what was then Britain, later to become England.

Both Franklin and Jefferson stated that the substantive principles of representative government upon which the American Constitution was founded were taken from two sources. The first was the system of constitutional government practiced by ancient Israel under the leadership of first Moses, and later Joshua.

"Liberty ... is the essential condition and guardian of religion; and it is in the history of the Chosen People, accordingly, that the first illustrations of my subject are obtained. The government of the Israelites was a Federation, held together by no political authority, but by the unity of race and faith, and founded, not on physical force, but on a voluntary covenant. The principle of self-government was carried out not only in each tribe, but in every group of at least 120 families; and there was neither privilege of rank nor inequality before the law. Monarchy was so alien to the primitive spirit of the community that it was resisted by Samuel in that momentous protestation and warning which all the kingdoms of Asia and many of the kingdoms of Europe have unceasingly confirmed." Selected Writings of Lord Acton, ed. J. Rufus Pears; (Liberty Classics, 1985), pg. 7, Vol. 1

The second source was the institutes of government of the Anglo-Saxons which were virtually identical to those of the ancient Israelites.

"The heroic age of Greece confirms it, and it is still more conspicuously true of Teutonic Europe. Wherever we can trace the earlier life of the Aryan nations we discover germs which favouring circumstance and assiduous culture might have developed into free societies. They exhibit some sense of common interest in common concerns, little reverence for external authority, and an imperfect sense of the function and supremacy of the state." Ibid, pg. 9.

Jefferson's historical studies brought him to the conclusion that ancient Israel was the first nation in history to have a representative government; he also discovered that 1500 years later the Anglo-Saxons were living under a system which was almost identical. Was there a connection? Were these two peoples so separated by time and geography related?

Franklin and Jefferson both proposed a national seal for our new nation which portrayed on one side the children of Israel in the wilderness led by a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. On the other side of the proposed seal was portrayed:

"Hengist and Horsa, the Saxon chiefs, from whom we claim the honour of being descended and whose political principles and form of government we have assumed." Richard S. Patterson and Richardson Dougal, The Eagle and the Shield: A History of the Great Seal of the United States, Washington; U.S. Department of State, 1976, pg. 16.

The motto which Jefferson and Franklin proposed to go on the national seal was

"Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God".

Jefferson wrote extensively at the time about the need for a renaissance of Anglo-Saxon primitive institutions on the new continent. He considered the American Revolution as nothing but the reclamation of the Anglo-Saxon birthright of which the colonists had been deprived by "a long train of abuses". On August 13, 1776, Jefferson wrote to Edmund Pendleton to convince him that Virginia must

abolish the remnants of feudalism and return to the "ancient principles":

"Are we not better for what we have hitherto abolished of the feudal system? Has not every restitution of the ancient Saxon laws had happy effects? Is it not better now that we return at once into that happy system of our ancestors, the wisest and most perfect ever yet devised by the wit of man, as it stood before the eighth century?" Julian P. Boyd, ed., The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, 20 Vols., Princeton University Press, 1950, Vol. 1, pg. 492.

Jefferson even studied the language of the Anglo-Saxons so that he might read their laws in the original tongue. In a letter to his old tutor, George Wythe, dated November 1, 1778, Jefferson wrote that:

"... the extracts from the Anglo-Saxon law, the sources of the Common law, I wrote in the original for my own satisfaction; but I have added Latin or liberal English translations." Ibid, Vol. 2, pg. 504.

THE BIBLICAL CONNECTION

The Anglo-Saxons originated in the area of the Black Sea in the 1st century B.C. and from there spread all across Northern Europe. This was the same area to which the northern ten tribes of ancient Israel had been transported by their Assyrian conquerors some 100 years earlier. The obvious implication of these historical facts is that the ancient Israelites and the latter day Anglo-Saxons are one and the same people. The two peoples share many of the same cultural practices and preserved the same unique institutes of government. The Anglo-Saxons organized themselves into units identical to those of the ancient Israelites described in the Old Testament. As called for by Biblical Law, their society was organized upon the foundation of the family and the tribal concept of clan, sept, kith and kin.

Like the ancient Israelites, the Anglo-Saxons considered themselves a commonwealth of freemen with certain inalienable rights and duties intended for the preservation of blood and soil. Just as in the Bible, their society was organized on the basis of units of 10:

a.The head of 10 families was called a tithing-man.

b.The head of 50 families was called a vil-man.

c.The head of 100 families was called a hundred man.

d.The head of 1000 families was called eolderman, later shortened to earl.

e.The territory occupied by 1,000 families was called a shire. All the families in a shire (soil) were usually of the same clan (blood). This was identical to the division of the land and the organization accorded to the tribes described in the Bible.

f.The administrative assistant to the earl was called the "shire reef", now called the sheriff.

All laws, as well as the election of leaders, had to be by the common consent of the people. Authority granted to a chieftan in time of war was extremely limited and was taken away from him as soon as the emergency passed. Again, as in the Bible, their system of justice was based upon the principle of payment of damages (restitution) to the victim rather than calling it a crime against the whole people. They recognized all the capital crimes designated in the Bible and their punishments were the same.

For documentation as to the foregoing see: (1) Colin Rhys Lovell, English Constitutional and Legal History, Oxford University Press, 1962; and (2) Sharon Turner, The History of the Anglo-Saxons, London: Longman, etc., 1836, pgs. 221 - 225.

From the foregoing historical authorities, it is evident that the common law and the law of God are synonymous, the former having originated in the latter. It is also evident that these things were all part of our ancestral birthright long before the advent of the Roman Church in Europe and the Isles. In fact, these cultural, historical and genetic associations can be traced directly back to the time of the

classical civilization of ancient Israel and beyond.

"... 'in almost all cases, the common law was grounded on the law of God, which it is said was causa causans,' and the court cited the 27th chapter of Numbers, to show that their judgment on a common law principle in regard to the law of inheritance, was founded in God's revelation of that law to Moses." The State v. Chandler, 2 Del 553, 555, 556 (1837).

"... The eternal principles of natural religion are part of the common law; the essential principles of revealed religion are part of the common law; so that any person reviling, subverting, or ridiculing them, may be prosecuted at common law ..." Ibid, 555, 556.

Thus, as originally adopted in England from both the Celtic and Germanic influences, this common law embraced all the fundamental tenets of Biblical Law as to property and the rights of the individual.

"By the Common Law and by the Bible, which is the foundation of the Common Law ..." Wylly v. Collins, 9 Ga 223, 237 (1851).

JEWISH SUBVERSION

However, as early as the fifteenth century various jewish practices with regard to debt, usury, taxation of the land, inheritance of the land and mortgages (the death gage) had begun to creep into the common law of England via the influence of jewish money lenders attached to the throne. These principles of jewish law had their origins in the Babylonian Talmud and not the Bible. These practices were correctly perceived by the American colonists as alien and contrary to Biblical law and all the principles of liberty championed therein. For this reason the common law of England was considered by the colonists as defiled and corrupted everywhere the talmudic influence had touched it.

The American Founding Fathers utterly rejected and scorned these influences. They were well aware that the practices of the jews came not from the Old Testament, but rather from the Talmud and other spurious rabbinical sources. They knew that Christ had referred to the Babylonian teachings of the jews as "the traditions of the elders" and had condemned these practices as being not only contrary to the Law of God but of actually making God's Law of no effect.

The Talmud was considered to be the complete antithesis of Biblical law and, when adopting the common law for the new Republic, the Founding Fathers specifically rejected anything and everything that had the slightest odor or stench of jewish influence.

THE STANDARD OF JUSTICE

They removed everything that was contrary to the Christian understanding of God's law as set forth in both the Old and New Testaments and it was their stated intention that the justice embraced by the Constitution would be defined in terms of Christian morality and none other. They fully adopted and implemented the Law of God not only as the judicial standard for measuring and determining justice, but also for the very organization of the government itself.

"The people of this state, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of their faith and practice ..." The People v. Ruggles, 8 Johnsons NY Common Law Reports 290, 294, 295.

As a matter of law, Christianity was to be the foundational influence in all the social, political and economic aspects of the social compact and government formed; Christianity was to completely define and determine the very organization and structure of the

government.

"Christianity, general Christianity, is and always has been a part of the common law of Pennsylvania ..." Updegraph v. The Commonwealth, 11 Sergeant & Rawles Pennsylvania Supreme Court Reports 400.

"The distinguished commentator on the laws of England informs us, that upon the foundations of the law of nature and the law of revelation, all human law depends, 1 Bl. Com. 42. The municipal law looks to something more than merely the protection of lives, the liberty, and the property of our people. Regarding Christianity as part of the law of the land, it respects and protects its institutions; and assumes likewise to regulate the public morals and decency of the community." Bell v. The State, 1 Swan (Tenn) 42, 44 (1851).

The moral, ethical and spiritual force of Christianity was so interwoven into the fabric of the Republic that one could not be separated from the other without destroying both. Thus, the ancient common law adopted as the foundation of the American Republic, being fully predicated upon the Christian revelation of the scriptures and the divine commandments therein, was rightfully referred to as "Christian common law".

"Every system of law known to civilized society generated from or had as its component one of three well known systems of ethics, pagan, stoic, or Christian. The common law draws its subsistence from the latter, its roots go deep into that system, the Christian concept of right and wrong or right and justice motivates every rule of equity. It is the guide by which we dissolve domestic frictions and the rule by which all legal controversies are settled." Strauss v. Strauss, 3 So 2d 727, 728 (1941).

THE REPUBLIC AND THE FAITH

Thus, the colonists "Established" their state constitutions within the principles of the common law (as measured against the Bible) to assure that the nation would be a Christian Republic.

"The Christian religion is the established religion by our form of government and all denominations are placed on an equal footing and equally entitled to protection in their religious Liberty." Runkel v. Winemiller, et. al., 4 Hc. Mch.

What does Justice Chase mean "The Christian religion is the established religion by our form of government?"

Isn't it true that Christians believe that our Father is composed of three co-equal parts in one whole: the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost? Isn't this a major tenet of the Christian faith? The constitution of Delaware (1776) clearly points out that this is a part of the Christian faith embraced by our forefathers. It requires that the following declaration be made before taking a seat in the legislature, entering upon the execution of an office, or occupying a place of trust in the Delaware government, to wit:

"I, A B, do profess faith in God the Father, and Jesus Christ His only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed for evermore; and I do acknowledge the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration." Article 22, Delaware CoGnstitution (1776).

Thus, the oath requires three fundamental declarations:

a) A belief in the divinity of Jesus the Christ;

b) A belief in the divine origins of both the Old and New Testaments; and,

c) A belief in the triune nature of our God; the principle of three in one.

Upon these three points the founding fathers defined what was and was not "Christian" and organized our government.

The government in a Christian nation must be fashioned after its head, i.e., the one true God declared in the Delaware Constitution and in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Thus, we find the source of three co-equal branches of government in a Christian republic. Now you understand why Mr. Justice Chase said that "the Christian religion is the established religion by our form of government" (a Christian Republic). Obviously, if Christianity is the established religion, then it is also the protected religion. Consider that the nature of the sovereignty determines the nature of the government both as to structure as well as function. This is so because the form of government must follow the form and practice of the religion that created it and gave it birth. And don't you doubt for one minute that absolutely ALL governments are founded upon and find their origins in religion! Even that of the Soviet Union! It follows then that a system of government and law founded upon the principles of Christianity is fundamentally duty bound to protect and nurture Christianity. Otherwise it has no reason to justify its continued existence.

A government which acts contrary to its own founding principles and pollutes the wellsprings of its own creation must decline into chaos, anarchy and destruction. It is impossible for such a government to bring about order and harmony in anything. It is an abomination! And the people of the land shall know the same end as the government they tolerated and supported. The law of nature and divine justice will not be defied! We SHALL reap all that we have sown.

"Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." Gal. 6:7

In Leviticus 26:22, the penalties for flouting the commands of the Everliving God are clearly set out.

"I will also send wild beasts among you, which shall rob you of your children, and destroy your cattle, and shall make you few in number, and your highways shall be desolate."

A REPUBLIC WITH NO FAITH

As a means of contrast, let's review the constitution of the Soviet Union. There we find that only one branch of government holds the governing power. The USSR, being officially un-Christian or an anti-Christ nation, does not depend upon the design embodied in Christian doctrine for the establishment of their nation and government.

"The highest organ of state power in the USSR is the Supreme Soviet of the USSR." Ch. III, art. 30, (1939).

"In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the USSR is separated from the state, and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens." U.S.S.R. Const., Ch. X, art. 124, (1939).

Apparently there must be more than one type of republic. The U.S.S.R. is a "republic". The United States of America is a "republic". But, by their respective forms of government, they are clearly differentiated as two contrasting types thereof. We're told that the U.S.S.R. is becoming more like the U.S.A. This is a lie; just the opposite is true. The truth is that America today is, by the process of legislative fiat, being transformed from a Christian republic into a socialist anti-Christ republic, both in law and in fact. Why do you think that in America today "May day" is celebrated as "Law day"? The answer is because what was done in Russia through wholesale murder is being accomplished here through the process of statutory legislation. They are both revolutionary processes; one is just quieter than the

other and has the advantage of stealth.

How is this being accomplished? First, the socialists in this nation had to convert the constitutions of the several states from their common law (Christian) form to the socialist (anti-Christ) form of republic:

1. By removing the indivisible "nation" principle; that is, the recognition of free whites as a the citizenry, thereby destroying the principle of one race indivisible and unmixed; and,

2. By removing the common law jurisdiction from the courts which: (a) gave particular recognition to and enforced the rights of that citizenry; and (b) recognized Christian doctrine as the standard whereby justice was to be measured and decreed; and,

3. Neutralize the common law jurisdiction of the counties and cities/towns; and,

4. Remove all State militias; and,

5. By bringing state government under the full power of one branch and making it the "highest organ of state power."

The socialists, if they believe in any thing at all, believe in Satan's form of government; one master with sole control. Satan's government demands total centralization of all power, authority and responsibility. But that isn't all. It also demands wholesale miscegenation; mixing of the races. Satan's government always demands the destruction of that which God has created and separated and it is always based upon the egalitarian principles of internationalism; especially where the white race is concerned. Satan loves confusion. Our Father loves order. Our Father says that miscegenation is confusion and an abomination.

"Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son." Deut. 7:3.

"I am the Lord your God, which have separated you from other people." Lev. 20:24.

"... So shall we be separated, I and thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth." Exodus 33:16.

Satan's form of government will not and cannot tolerate individual responsibility and liberty, nor will it tolerate their mandatory correlaries: purity, cleanliness and obedience to YAH. A citizen in Satan's government has no responsibility and no liberty; only the duties of a slave under compelled performance.

By way of contrast, our Father's form of government is founded upon the principle of total decentralization with complete individual responsibility and self-government; that is, unfettered liberty with corresponding responsibilities and duties, but no compelled performance except by contract. Our Father's government demands complete separation of the races. Satan's government demands mixing of the races. Satan's government also allows, encourages and finances the destruction of your children and would-be grand children through abortion. Think about the contrasts in that. Satan is the destroyer and he persuades you to exercise your own free will and destroy yourself by going after "strange flesh" and "evil practices". What is abortion if it isn't ritual murder and child sacrifice? The principles of the Father's Word demand separation in all things as a prerequisite to achieving order and harmony. Satan demands the mixing of all things as a prerequisite to achieving confusion and ultimately your destruction. One of Satan's ancient names is "the chaos monster". The name perfectly describes his nature and purpose. But the choice is always yours and it is always couched in terms of whether you will or will not obey the Father's Law.

In other words, your free will is still intact and the test of it is the willingness of your heart to adhere to and obey the Father's Law as the focal point and guide for your life. For it is our own disobedience to the Father's Life Law that has allowed the socialists to dismantle our Christian Republic.

The Socialists are accomplishing the implementation of Satan's form of government and all the necessary steps thereto (listed above) through their understanding and manipulation of Article IV, Section 4, of the Constitution for the united States of America.

"The United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence." Article IV, Section 4, Constitution for the united States of America (1787).

Notice that our constitution does not say what kind of "republic" Congress must guarantee. Obviously that was left to the several states to establish. But our constitution did organize and establish the government upon the principle of three co-equal branches thereby indicating that our republics were to be Christian in both form and function.

"Indeed, in a republic, there would seem to be a peculiar propriety in viewing the Christian religion, as the great basis, on which it must rest for its support and permanence, if it be, what it has ever been deemed by its truest friends to be, the religion of liberty. Montesquieu has remarked, that the Christian religion is a stranger to mere despotic power ..." Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, Joseph Story, Vol. III, De Capo Press Reprints (1970) 724, 725.

The Christian foundations of our Republican form of government are further attested to by the fact that (according to Justice Story and numerous other authorities) the First Amendment only protects Christianity.

"The real object of the amendment was, not to countenance, much less to advance Mahometanism, or Judaism, or infidelity, by prostrating Christianity; but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment, which should give to an hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government." Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, Joseph Story, Vol. 1, De Capo Press Reprints (1970) 443, 444.

"Nor are we bound by any expressions in the constitution, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately the like attacks upon the religion of Mahomet or of the Grand Lama, and for this plain reason, that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines of worship of those imposters." The People v. Ruggles, 8 Johnsons NY Common Law Reports 290, 294, 295.

And to that list of "imposters" you can add the jews and all their talmudic filth and mayhem.

Thus, we come to two points. Firstly, in order to claim the protection of the Amendment, the sect in question had to be Christian. The Amendment extended no protection whatsoever to any other religion. Secondly, in order to substantiate the claim to being "Christian", the beliefs of the sect had to be founded upon acceptance of the divinity of Jesus the Christ, had to be grounded in both the Old and New Testaments, and had to adhere to the principle of "three in one". The logical implications of the latter fully presupposed the first two. Therefore, a professed belief in the Christian principle of a triune God was the basic test as to religious conviction and the right to hold office.

What of the numerous denominations within Christianity with so many varied tenets and beliefs? How do we take their measure and ascertain whether or not they may be cloaked with the protective mantle of the Constitution? Let's look at the definition of the word "denomination":

"A class, society or collection of individuals called by the same name; as in a denomination of Christians ..." American Dictionary of the English Language, Noah Webster (1828).

Here is the point: as a matter of constitutional law, the word "Christian" can only refer to those denominations that hold and adhere to

the basic doctrine of one God in three persons and find the authority for their faith in the Old and New Testaments of the Holy Bible. Thus, if a sect calls itself "Christian" but does not hold to the doctrine of the trinity, then it does not qualify for protection and can claim no guarantees under the First Article of the Bill of Rights. In other words, without the doctrine of three in one, such a sect is not a Christian denomination within the eyes of the law because their tenets are contrary to the constitutionally professed doctrines of faith which established our form of government and gave it life! Of course interpretations of the Bible might vary from denomination to denomination but they must, in order to be accepted as Christian in terms of constitutional law, hold to that one fundamental belief and all the implications that logically flow from it.

Go back and look again at the confession of faith required by Article 22 of the original Delaware Constitution. Read carefully these words: "... in God the Father, and Jesus Christ his only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, One God, blessed for evermore ..." This is the testimony of our forefathers as to the path they followed. The evidence of their faith and discipline is all about us. We need but open our eyes and look.

"It (Christianity) was part of the common law 'so far that any person reviling, subverting or ridiculing it might be prosecuted at common law,' as Lord Mansfield has declared; because, in the judgment of our English ancestors and their judicial tribunals, he who reviled, subverted or ridiculed Christianity, did an act which struck at the foundation of their civil society, and tended by its necessary consequences as they believed, to disturb that common peace of the land of which...the common law was the preserver...To sustain the soundness of their opinion, their descendants point us to the tears and blood of revolutionary France during the reign of terror, when infidelity triumphed and the abrogation of the Christian faith was succeeded by the worship of the goddess of reason, and they aver that without this religion no nation has ever yet continued free. They insist too, that all history demonstrates that no nation without the light of their common law, has ever been able to preserve any system of rational and well regulated liberty." The State v. Chandler, 2 Del 553, 557, 558.

The Constitution for the united States of America was intended to be read and interpreted so that it would harmonize with itself. One provision was not to overturn or conflict with another. Something like "a house divided cannot stand" seems to be appropriate to define the principle.

The deceiver began to distort the meaning of Article IV, Section 4, by telling our People that they could establish republics in the states that were not Christian in form, e.g., governments where the legislature is the "highest organ of state power." (Note: some of today's state constitutions even allow the legislature to amend the constitution without a vote of the people.) The key to dispelling the lie about Article IV, Section 4, is to show that historically, when petitioning for admission to the Union, each state submitted constitutions establishing the three co-equal branch form of government as a prerequisite to admission. That is to say, to become a state in the Union, the People thereof submitted constitutions that by design made each branch equivalent in power, while exercising different functions.

THE REPUBLIC AND THE RACE

The first deception and usurpation took place when Congress began authorizing statehood predicated upon state constitutions that did not follow the common law principle of designating one race to govern. The first examples of that were the admissions of such states as Washington, Montana and others. This was the beginning of the conversion (or should I say perversion) of our "nation" to a socialist republic, a republic within the framework of international law.

The lie put forth was, that to establish a one race republic (one race governing) was prejudicial and un-Christian. The People were told by the preachers that the Biblical mandate to be "separated" was no longer valid. But that was merely the first in a whole series of alterations implemented to defeat the common law form of Republic and enslave the Citizens thereof. Alteration of the Republic required three main points of attack. These were and are:

1. The "People" must be convinced that miscegenation (race mixing) is authorized by the law of our Father in Heaven, and thus is condoned by the Christian faith;

2. The "People" must be convinced to alter the constitutions for their state and the united States of America to coincide with this new interpretation of Christian doctrine;

3. The co-equal character of the three branches of government must be removed and one branch must be made the "highest organ of state power"; or put another way, one branch must be given power over the other two. Of course, the People must either be persuaded that this is acceptable or kept in such a state of ignorance that they don't know that they no longer have three co-equal branches. The task of persuasion can be accomplished either through propaganda or by force of arms. The current system has been put in place through stealth, deceit, fraud and treason. The task of "persuasion" will only become necessary when the fraud is generally discovered and the legitimacy of the system is widely challenged and denied by a significant portion of the citizenry.

Up till now, the enemies of the Republic could claim that we gave our consent to all this. When it becomes obvious that we did not and the illusion can no longer be maintained, then the die shall be cast and they must act to preserve themselves.

ONE RACE, ONE FAITH, ONE LAW

Fact one, to be within the framework of a common law republic, one race must govern (hold the sovereignty). Alter this fact and you must alter all other provisions of your constitutions. Alter the provisions of your constitutions, where the government is one of law (that is, one that exists by written constitution), as in our case, then you alter the government itself. But bear in mind that for this to be possible it must be preceded by a change in religion, id est, from Christianity to "judeo-Christianity".

Take for instance the thirteenth amendment. Its stated purpose was to end slavery in the united States. But was the thirteenth amendment necessary to accomplish the abolition of slavery?

Why were people of African decent taken into slavery? Because nowhere on the face of this earth was there an organized government that existed for the protection of that race. There was no government or other organized authority among them that spoke for and represented the interests of that race among the nations of the earth and could be recognized as a government by the law of nations (international law). Thus, being unorganized and completely helpless, from an international power stand point, they became fair game to all those nations that had organized governments, called civilized nations.

John Marshal, one of the early Chief Justices of the supreme Court, was a member of a society organized to help the persons of African decent. The avowed purpose of that organization was to help them establish a government founded solely for them (Africans) thereby securing unto them, and only them, freedom from slavery forever. Once an organized government had been established that spoke for the African race and possessed the lawful power to make treaties with other nations (races), then they would have standing under international law and could be afforded the protection due them by the law of nations. They would no longer be a prey to slavery.

John Marshall drafted a constitution for the Republic of Liberia which had been drafted for the above express purpose. He and the society he belonged to took 500 Negro families to Liberia and these families "ordained" and "established" their own constitution for a government that was to be of, for, and by, the black race and none other. The constitution they adopted was predicated, like our own, upon the common law principle of like after like and kind after kind. They became an organized black nation that could be recognized by the law of nations. Under this constitution they could be free citizens forever without having to suffer the problems inherent in integration. They had, just as the colonists did in America, assumed a place among the powers of the earth.

The constitution that was drafted for Liberia was modeled after our own:

"The end of the institution, maintenance, and administration of government, is to secure the existence of the body politic, to protect it, and to furnish the individuals who compose it with the power of enjoying in safety and tranquillity, their natural rights, and the blessings of life; and whenever these great objects are not obtained, the people have a right to alter the government and to take measures necessary for their safety, prosperity, and happiness.

"THEREFORE, we the people of the Commonwealth of Liberia, in Africa, acknowledging with devout gratitude, the goodness of God, in granting to us the blessings of the Christian Religion, and political, religious and civil liberty, do, in order to secure these blessings for ourselves and our posterity, and to establish justice, insure domestic peace, and promote the general welfare, hereby solemnly associate and constitute ourselves a Free, Sovereign and Independent State by the name of the REPUBLIC of LIBERIA, and do ordain and establish this Constitution for the government of the same." Preamble, Constitution of the Republic of Liberia (July 26, 1847).

Their constitution recognized that political, religious and civil liberty are simultaneous and interrelated and are, in fact, inseparable. Justice Story called Christianity the religion of liberty. Obviously, he wasn't talking about "judeo-Christrianity".

The Bill of Rights in the Liberian constitution (1847) is also very close to our own.

"All men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, inherent, and inalienable rights, among which are the rights of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness." Art. I, Sec. 1, Constitution of Liberia (1847).

"All power is inherent in the people; all free governments are instituted by their authority and for their benefit and they have a right to alter and reform the same when their safety and happiness require it." Art. I, Sec. 2, Constitution of Liberia (1847).

"All men have a natural and inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, without obstruction or molestation from others: all persons demeaning themselves peaceably, and not obstructing others in their religious worship, are entitled to the protection of law in the free exercise of their own religion, and no sect of Christians shall have exclusive privileges or preference over any other sect; but all shall be alike tolerated; and no religious test whatever shall be required as a qualification for civil office, or the exercise of any civil right." Art. I, Sec. 3, Constitution of Liberia (1847).

"There shall be no slavery within this Republic. Nor shall any citizen of this Republic, or any person resident therein, deal in slaves, either within or without this Republic, directly or indirectly." Art. I, Sec. 4, Constitution of Liberia (1847).

"No place shall be searched, nor person seized on a criminal charge, or suspicion, unless upon warrant lawfully issued, upon probable cause supported by oath, or solemn affirmation, specially designating the place or person, and the object of the search." Article I, Sec. 9, Constitution of Liberia (1847).

"All elections shall be by ballot; and every male citizen of twenty one years of age, possessing real estate, shall have the right of suffrage." Article I, Sec. 11, Constitution of Liberia (1847).

"The powers of this government shall be divided into three distinct departments: Legislative, Executive, and Judicial; and no person belonging to one of these departments, shall exercise any of the powers belonging to either of the others. This section is not to be construed to include Justice of the Peace." Article I, Sec. 4, Constitution of Liberia (1847).

Article V of the Constitution of Liberia (1847) contains further provisions that are not only of interest, but, consistent with what American law was in 1847.

"The property of which a woman may be possessed at the time of her marriage, and also that which she may afterwards become possessed, otherwise than by her husband, shall not be held responsible for his debts; whether contracted before or after

marriage. Nor shall the property thus intended to be secured to the woman be alienated otherwise than by her free and voluntary consent, and such alienation may be made by her either by sale, devise or otherwise." Article V, Sec. 10, Constitution of Liberia (1847).

"No person shall be entitled to hold real estate in this Republic, unless he be a citizen of the same. Nevertheless this article shall not be construed to apply to Colonization, Missionary, Educational, or other benevolent institutions, so long as the property or estate is applied to its legitimate use." Article V, Sec. 12, Constitution of Liberia (1847).

"The great object of forming these Colonies being to provide a home for the dispersed and oppressed Children of Africa, and to regenerate and enlighten this benighted continent, none but Negroes, person or persons of Negro descent, shall be admitted to citizenship in this Republic." Article V, Sec. 13, Constitution of Liberia (1847), Amendment 1907.

Once you have read the Liberia constitution you know that Americans had given the Africans, previously held in slavery, the greatest gift and remuneration possible to replace the degraded position they held at the time: freedom from slavery forever, a government by which they could maintain freedom within their nation as well as provide it for others of their own race who entered, and the ability to enlighten all of Africa with a republic formed and governed on Christian principles (the common law). No better plan could have been devised to end slavery. Not only could slavery be ended by this plan, but the resulting commotion that took place by not following this plan could have been avoided and both races left contented, free, and completely selfgoverning.

All that really needed to be done to end slavery in the United States was to accept a treaty with Liberia for that express purpose, and according to Article VI, Section 2, of the constitution for the United States of America: "...all treaties made or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme Law of the Land..."

Clearly the thirteenth amendment was not needed to end slavery. Its sole purpose was to end state sovereignty. A treaty made and performed under international law, which is the proper law for dealing with other nations (races), would have held the character of supreme Law but would not have changed the sovereignty or government of the Union or the several states. Such a treaty would have also resulted in the eventual repatriation of all who were of black decent back to Africa. That end result would have been inevitable and a natural consequence of the establishment of Liberia as a black nation and the subsequent treaty therewith.

This shows you the proper use of the treaty power to end slavery. "We the People" did not have to add to the citizenry those of another race who where not of the "posterity". "We the People" did not have to alter our common law republics to accomplish the end of slavery in America. But, then, "We the People" didn't pass the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments either, the several state legislatures did!

Now we begin to perceive a hidden purpose in the events that lead up to the war between the District of Columbia and the southern states and climaxed with the alleged adoption of those amendments. Their purpose was not to free the blacks, it was to enslave us! Through the hidden ramifications of those Satanic measures, we the white race have almost been placed in the exact same status that the black race formerly occupied in this land. South Africa and tiny Iceland are the last governments on this earth that are of, by, and for, the white race and restrict their citizenship accordingly. When they are gone, we will no longer have a government anywhere on this earth that even pretends to represent the white race and we will then be a prey to all comers under the law of nations, just as blacks once were. In so far as the feds are concerned, we are already there. That was accomplished relative to domestic politics when "free white" was removed from the last state constitution.

RELIGION AND LAW MUST AGREE

Secondly, you cannot alter the laws of a Christian nation until you alter that nation's Christian doctrine. A change in the nation's laws must be preceded by change in the nations religion, because religion is always the source of law! When you research the early constitutions of the several states you will find all of them established only white males as the body politic, or, in other words; white

males only could vote and hold office; white males only could govern.

This held true since the Christian doctrine was that the head of a household is responsible for his wife and children, being their protector, their voice and their provider, insulating the family from the world at large, both in law and fact. Today the state says, "We have jurisdiction over your wife and children." The type of situation we are experiencing today is unheard of in a common law republic, but, common place in a socialist republic.

In a Republic where the sovereignty is predicated upon one race and one race only, miscegenation is perceived as being treasonous. Why? Because it destroys the race comprising the sovereign body, subverts the organization of the lawful government, and makes the entire reason for the existence of the Republic a nullity; a moot question if you will.

Only white males voted in our common law republic, and only black males voted in Liberia's common law republic. In both instances, the citizenship established by the organic law of their respective Republics was exclusive! But in a socialist state, anyone can vote, regardless of race, color, creed, or sex. The 14th Amendment purports to establish a uniform and universal citizenship of subjects in the socialist vein.

You have three co-equal branches of government in a common law republic, but, only one branch of government holds the power as "the highest organ of state power" in a socialist republic.

Our Father said His word is the same yesterday, today and tomorrow (See Hebrews 13:8). His government is founded upon a perpetual law, a perpetual faith and a perpetual constitution. If we believe the scriptures and this is true, then, how and when did Christian doctrine change from that which established a common law republic to that which is required in a socialist republic? Did Our Father (God) alter His law? Not according to Scripture!

Today preachers condone miscegenation, get licenses to preach, encourage our children to get marriage licenses, social security numbers, drivers licenses, or, in other words, the preachers tell us and our children to surrender to Baal as they themselves have done. If the preachers of this nation where teaching true Christian doctrine instead of pagan fables and adhering to the Christian doctrine of our forbearers, our state constitutions would still be in the common law republic form.

"And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself, is brought to desolation: and every city or house divided against itself, shall not stand." Matt. 12:25 Holy Bible K.J.V. (1611).

APPLICATION OF THE SOVIET PRINCIPLE

Thirdly, to prove facts one and two above, it will be necessary to examine the amending of the state constitutions since there are certain articles which, if amended, effect other articles of the same. In every state admitted to the Union prior to the war between the states, the citizenship was restricted and exclusive to the white race. After the war, these were amended under the compulsion of martial law to comply with the 14th. The state officials were faced with the choice of enforcing the 14th over the organic law of their respective states and committing treason thereby or continuing to obey their state constitutions and face diminishment of representation in Congress. They could not lawfully act in contravention of their state constitutions and adopt the 14th which was only a power contemplatable within the District of Columbia and its enclaves, if at all.

Prior to the 14th and 15th Amendments, all the state constitutions permitted only white male citizens to vote. After their adoption, the state constitutions were changed to permit every "citizen" of the "United States" who is a "resident" to vote. Of course, when it is known that the term "United States" as used in the 14th means the District of Columbia, the complete thrust and intent with respect to the expansion of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 (U.S. Const.) becomes obvious.

This proves how the state constitutions, through amendment, have removed the one race (nation) body politic (government) designation. It also proves my statement that we are becoming more like the U.S.S.R. in our form of government and our order of law.

"Uniform Union citizenship is established for citizens of the USSR.

"Every citizen of a Union Republic is a citizen of the USSR." U.S.S.R. Const., Ch. II, Art. 21, (1936).

"Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or conversely, the establishment of any direct or indirect privileges for, citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy or racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law." U.S.S.R. Const. Ch. X, art. 123, cl. 1 (1936).

"Equality of rights of citizens of the USSR, irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, government, cultural, political and other activity, is an indefeasible law." U.S.S.R. Const. Ch. X, art. 123, cl. 2 (1936).

Examine the principles of "Social Structure" for a socialist republic.

"The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a socialist state of workers and peasants." U.S.S.R. Const. Ch. I, art. 1 (1936).

"Work in the USSR is a duty and a matter of honor for every able-bodied citizen, in accordance with the principle: 'He who does not work, neither shall he eat.'

"The principle applied in the USSR is that of socialism: 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his work.'" U.S.S.R. Const., Ch. I, Art. 12, (1936).

Is the purpose of the American Constitution socialism?

At one time the supreme Court of the united States held the view that "New Deal", socialist, legislation very similar to the Social Security Act was unconstitutional. But, the Court withdrew from this opinion in later years after "We the People" had shown our acceptance of it by our individual signatures (in multiple millions) upon the individual contracts for social insurance. Of course, the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. embraces universal social insurance.

"Citizens of the USSR have the right to maintenance in old age and also in case of sickness and disability." U.S.S.R. Const. Ch. X, art. 120, cl. 1 (1936).

"This Right is ensured by the extensive development of social insurance of factory and office workers at state expense, free medical service for the working people, and the provision of a wide network of health resorts for the use of the working people." U.S.S.R. Const. Ch. X, art. 120, cl. 2 (1936).

Social Security Act of the United States:

"The Board shall perform the duties imposed upon it by this Act and shall also have the duty of studying and making recommendations as to the most effective methods of providing economic security through social insurance, and as to legislation and matters of administrative policy concerning old-age pensions, unemployment compensation, accident compensation, and related subjects. Title VII, Sec. 702, Social Security Act, August 14, 1935, Ch. 531, 49 Stat. 636.

Clearly "social insurance" is socialism. Does the supreme Court now believe that socialism is constitutional? That communism is constitutional in America? Or is it that the supreme Court has no choice? Just what conditions could force the supreme Court to follow the principles set out in the constitution of the U.S.S.R.?

Only one answer is possible. "We the People" have allowed our state and national constitutions to be amended to bring them within the guidelines of a socialist republic. Considering the attitude of socialism (communism) toward Christianity and the scriptures generally, we have abandoned the Word of our Father and the common law that put His Word into practice in society. We have altered not only our FORM of government (or at least permitted it to be done for us) but also have abandoned His law and with it our hereditary national faith. They are all inseparable. You can't have one without the others! What did the Christ teach us on this point? Do you remember the Lord's prayer?

"Thy Kingdom (government) come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in Heaven."

THE COUNTERFEIT RELIGION

To substantiate all of the foregoing, I only have to prove one more fact, that the states individually and collectively have abandoned the common law principle of government that represented and embodied the triune character of God. That is to say, that "We the People" have reduced, by the amending process, our state and national governments to one branch of power and have abandoned the three co-equal branch Christian principle of government.

The alteration had to begin with the state constitutions, since the United States, under Article IV, Section 4 was bound to support and guarantee every state a republican form of government; which means that Congress would have to support those state constitutions that provided for a common law republic form of government.

The first alteration had to be to remove the constitutional distinction as to which race would govern. This, in turn, would open the door for the socialists to introduce international principles of toleration for all races, colors and creeds into our domestic scene, and of course into our domestic constitutions. Thus, through the 14th and 15th Amendments, the socialists obtained the power of the vote (ballot box) to accomplish their ultimate ends.

To accommodate all creeds (which includes all non-Christian, anti-Christ religions) they had to change the Christian doctrine of the nation by convincing the governing people that the Christians that founded our Christian republics erred in their understanding of our Father's laws set out in the Old and New Testaments of the Holy Bible.

Note how Judge Rives (Ex parte Reynolds et al, Fed. Case No. 11,720) in his decision tries to justify the fourteenth statutory article to the triune government of a State: his problem is that, under the triune form of government, he knows the county and city/town officials are not subject to obey the 14th statutory article.

The first fallacy that was presented as Christian doctrine was that the coming of the Christ put away the law of the Old Testament. This fallacy, like virtually all of the "judeo-Christian" viewpoint, was gleaned from the writings of Paul. It was presented in various and increasing degrees as justification for disregarding the Old Testament. This perversion of scriptural doctrine now unabashedly denies that the statutes, commandments and judgments of the Father ever had any relevance or validity with regard to life on earth and totally embraces the egalitarian universalist propaganda of the Talmud and its child, international communism.

Of course, it includes a complete disregard for the divine law of "kind after kind" and the injunction against placing strangers in positions of authority over us. The tolerance for government officers outside the original governing race (nation) and for miscegenation (race mixing) is now sanctioned by government edict.

In a truly Christian republic, and Christian nation, the above is a bunch of hog-wash. The words of the Christ refute these delusions:

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the Prophets. I am not come to destroy, but fulfill.

"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one title, shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5:17-18, Holy Bible, K.J.V. (1611 ed.).

Has the earth passed? I'm still standing on it. How about you? How do Christians figure the Old Testament is no longer valid? Are the Ten Commandments put away as well?

Consider what an affront and crime it is against our God to place in our government one who openly states that he is not a believer in Jesus the Christ or one who openly denies that Christ was God come in the flesh! Does it make any sense to place such as these in our legislative bodies and upon the benches in our judicial offices? Do you really believe that you can argue law and doctrine predicated upon Christian principle before these people and receive a Christian judgment? Not in a pigs eye you can't! Christian law does not allow non-Christians to hold office or sit in judgment over Christians. How can a non-Christian wield authority in a Christian government? It's absurd! It can't be done!

THE COUNTERFEIT GOVERNMENT

How then did it come about? It is the 14th Amendment that allows those who are anti-christ to hold office and sit in judgment in our land. Obviously, then, the 14th Amendment is un-Christian. Evil cannot proceed from good; good cannot come of that which is evil. Decide for yourself.

Once the breach in common law was accomplished (one race sovereignty) the door was opened to destroy the Christian doctrine represented by three co-equal branches of government, at both the state and national levels.

First, the national legislators proposed the thirteenth amendment. The Congressional purpose as embodied in the thirteenth amendment was not to free the slaves, although this was the cloak with which they covered their real motives as you have already seen. So what was Congress' motive if it wasn't to abolish slavery?

POWER! POWER! POWER! Congress wanted to destroy all the Christian common law principles of three co-equal branches of government to bring the Executive and Judicial branches under their control and thereby consolidating all governmental power in one branch. But Congress had to be careful not to awaken the Christians who understood the triune God doctrine represented by three co-equal branches of government, and not to awaken them to the fact that a socialist Congress was destroying that Christian doctrine.

Sure, we still have three branches of government. But, are they co-equal? The answer is an emphatic, NO! In reviewing the Constitution for the united States of America we find only one article that gives Congress power independent of the Executive and Judicial Branches.

".... To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by

Cession of particular states, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the state in which Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; - And " Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 17, Const. for the united States of America.

It is clearly stated, "To exercise exclusive legislation..." Here the door was opened for Congress to usurp all power and absorb it into the legislative branch. The scheme was to bring, via subterfuge and deceit, the people, the several states, and the Executive and Judicial Branches of the national government within the power delineated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, above.

Congress' first try was to bring Article IV within the purview of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17. Congress wanted to control the territories under the exclusive legislative power. Congress claimed that Article IV and Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, were not separate, but combined, to give Congress exclusive legislative power in the territories. The supreme Court of the united States disagreed. In Dred Scott v. Sandford, 19 How. 393 (1856), the supreme Court ruled only whites were citizens, and more significantly, that Article IV was a separate power not to be exercised under the exclusive legislation clause. (See Downs v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 , 1901). Slavery was not the issue in Dred Scott that caused the civil war, instead, the restriction of Congress' power under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 and the attending destruction of the socialist dream (to consolidate all power in one branch of government) were the causes.

Under Lincoln, the District of Columbia declared war on the southern states. There was no war between the states, only a war between the District of Columbia and the southern states. Lincoln merely used his powers to draw troops through the northern Governors, who should have refused to send their militias to the District of Columbia. In fact, some Governors did refuse. Even modern history books claim that the first shot wasn't fired on a northern state, instead they claim that the first shot fired was against D.C. soil, a fort of the United States, an area subject to Congress' power under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17. Lincoln clouded the real issue by telling the people of the northern states that slavery was the issue. Even today Dred Scott still holds that Congress cannot combine the powers of Article IV with the powers of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17. Dred Scott spoiled the socialist scheme to convert the states back into territories under Article IV. What the supreme Court said was that under Article IV the territories had to be governed according to the principles of the common law. The white citizens of the territories could not be deprived of the Article III right to judicial review.

Clearly, the Dred Scott decision mandated that the Christian principles of the common law were to be embodied in the organic laws of the territories. The people, and those who framed the state constitutions for territories like Oregon, kept these principles in the organic law for their respective states when they obtained statehood.

The socialists needed a new scheme. They needed a territorial jurisdiction which would not fall within the boundaries of Article IV of the Constitution for the united States of America, but one that, instead, would fall within Article I, Section 8, Clause 17. The socialists knew they had to expand Congress' exclusive legislative power in order to realize their plan to destroy the Christian foundation of three co-equal branches of government. They put the thirteenth amendment in place. Their only interest was in the second section.

> "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." 13th Am., sec. 2 (1865).

Notice the wording "by appropriate legislation". Section two of the thirteenth amendment gave the socialist Congress the pretext of power they needed for expansion of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17. Notice that section two only expands the power of Congress, not any other branch of the national government. Obviously, since only Congress' power was expanded, the amendment could only be effective where Congress had exclusive power in the first place; that is, within the District of Columbia and its enclaves. The Amendment was only effective in the expansion of Congress' power under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, which was a power exclusive to Congress and outside the reach of the other two branches.

Now that they had section two of the thirteenth amendment in place (remember it applies only to D.C. and its enclaves), they needed more residents under their power. The Congress next proposed, and the state legislatures ratified, the fourteenth amendment (1868), the purpose of which was to create new citizens for the District of Columbia. The same scenario was then followed with the fifteenth amendment (1870) to give the newly created citizen the vote. All three amendments have the same power clause, the effect of which is to expand Congress' power under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, step by step with the same "appropriate legislation" clause. It should be noted that the first principal acts of Congress, under the power clauses of the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments, were civil

rights acts which authorized the use of military force to enforce the socialist Congress will. You will notice that whenever their is an uprising of civil disobedience that relates to one of these amendments, like the case when Wallace refused to follow the orders of the supreme Court related to entrance of a black student into a state college, you see the national guard on the scene. Apparently martial law has never been lifted and this military force clause is still in effect.

Next, the federal courts, under acts of Congress, began to naturalize citizens, a function previously belonging to the state courts under prior naturalization law.

All of this still didn't give Congress power over the white citizenry in America. Congress bided their time and took the next step in the scheme by bringing Senators under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, via the 17th Amendment. This also was ratified by the state legislatures (May, 1913). In the mean time Congress (guided and directed by the jews) created a monetary mechanism to fuel the new machine with revenue via the sixteenth amendment (Feb., 1913).

Having established a concurrent jurisdiction with the several states over prohibition (18th am. 1919), Congress next absorbed the women of America into the jurisdiction of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, with the 19th amendment (1920).

Finally, the white males, those who where not only of the sovereignty, but, who where the only lawful body politic, had to be brought within the power. Here the socialists had a problem, some of the state constitutions still stood in the way. They had to get all the several states to remove constitutional clauses that allowed only free white males to vote and hold office in state government. To do this they had to fully destroy the sovereignty of the several states in order to bring them within the Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 power. Congress' attack was in earnest; they understood that this step of the plan was absolutely necessary to bring the entire nation under Congress' municipal powers.

"Fifth. The Constitution has undoubtedly conferred on Congress the right to create such municipal organizations as it may deem best for all the territories of the United States whether they have been incorporated or not, to give to the inhabitants as respects the local governments such degree of representation as may be conducive to the public well-being, to deprive territory of representative government if it considered just to do so, and to change such local governments at discretion." Downs v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244, 289 (1901).

Municipal organizations were the tools chosen by the socialists, like:

1. The Federal Reserve; and,

2. The Social Security Administration with attendant regulatory bodies such as H.E.W., with additional supportive acts like the Uniform Commercial Code.

Agency (Municipal organization) after agency, all created by Congress, all created under the expanded authority of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, were added. With the personal income tax already in place upon created citizens, subjects and persons, these agencies absorbed more and more of the populace to fuel the socialist machine. That's right, the income tax is imposed by a municipal law of the District of Columbia which became applicable outside its geographical area when Congress defrauded the white citizens of the several states into joining Social Security. Once state sovereignty was broken, municipal law became the supreme law of the land. A new territorial jurisdiction, different from that originally established by the constitution, including national areas and regions, was created and erected. When you signed up for the Number you became a piece of walking talking D.C. property and that jurisdiction travels with you wherever you might go throughout the world. When you took the Number you became one of those "persons born or naturalized in the United States (District of Columbia), and subject to the jurisdiction thereof". The Number makes you one of the "citizens of the United States (District of Columbia)" no matter where you might "reside" even if its in a state. These circumstances are identical to those embodied within the organic law of the Soviet Union.

"The Soviet of Nationalities is elected by the citizens of the USSR voting by Union Republics, Autonomous Republics,

Autonomous Regions, and National Areas on the basis of twenty five deputies form each Union Republic, eleven deputies from each Autonomous Republic, five deputies from each Autonomous Region, and one deputy from each National Area." U.S.S.R. Const., Ch. III, Art. 35 (1936).

It is clear how D.C. is restructuring the nation into regions and national areas, bringing all into the power of the legislative branch! No reasonable citizen can look at the two maps above and dispute their meaning. Does the national area of the zip-code bring the post office under municipal law? Does using a mailing permit (represented by permit (account) number) and a zip-code allow the post office to open your mail? Does your state take municipal script (Federal Reserve Notes) to finance so-called state functions? Doesn't it seem clear that so-called state government is placed under Congress' municipal control? Do you now understand how Congress made you drive 55 m.p.h., put your car through D.E.Q., and made you file federal tax forms, all of which waive some of your most sacred vested rights?!

THE STATES CONQUERED BY D.C.

All that remains to be proven is that the state governmental structure has been completely subjected to the power of Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17. You can look at practically any state in the Union to prove this fact.

In the original American form, the National/Federal government could not violate state sovereignty, nor could the several states invade the National/Federal sovereignty. This held true even when their jurisdictions appeared to somewhat overlap one another.

The common law principle of separation of jurisdiction continues even within the state itself. The state's jurisdiction could not invade the County and the County's jurisdiction could not invade that of the cities and towns. Consistent with the national structure, each of the three jurisdictions within the state (i.e. state, county & cities) were replete with the same republican form of government mandated by common law principles.

In contrast you can clearly see that the jurisdictional organization of a republic created under international law provides only one power to govern and that supreme legislative will is dominant and unrestrained. Under that system the states, cities and towns are all subject to the supreme legislative will within the central government. Under that system, there is no authority within the government that may question or challenge the validity of a legislative act. That is exactly the position which the Congress of the United States aspires to today and apparently thinks it has achieved.

Question: Has the amending of the Constitutions of the respective and several states broken down the Christian common law structure originally intended and fundamentally embodied in the design of those several Republics?

The only way to determine if this condition exists is to examine the original constitutions for the respective states (especially those admitted prior to 1865) and make comparisons against the amendments that have been made thereto. In each and every instance you will find that it was the free white electors of the territory who drew up and ratified the proposed state constitution which was to be submitted to Congress for approval and subsequent admission. These constitutions were, without exception, styled as an act of "We the People" and the authoritative expression of THEIR will which was supreme, not that of the respective territorial legislatures. It was the People who formed these states and gave them life and no legislative will or authority was incumbent therein. Thus, it is readily evident that it is "We the (free white) People" ourselves who ARE the respective states.

All of the states admitted to the Union prior to 1865 submitted constitutions to Congress which were predicated upon the foundation of a "free white" sovereign body. In each and every instance the Congress of the United States of America approved those constitutions as being in compliance with the organic law of the Union. This approval was confirmation of the fact that these constitutions were in accordance with the common law principles embodied in the constitution for the united States of America, the organic law for the nation.

The foregoing cumulative testimony as to the original basis of the constitution is attested to by multitudes of authorities in the old books. From the lowest justice of the peace to the highest judicial officers in the land, they all ring as one voice declaring the eternal foundations of the American Republic to be the triune citadel of one race, one faith and one law.

The Constitution for the united States of America was, like the constitutions for the respective states, ordained and established by conventions of the people of the several states that formed the Union. Instead of being accepted by legislative authority, both constitutions were accepted by conventions of the people. (See Article VII, Constitution for the united States of America).

The Preambles to these respective constitutions specifically declare that it is "We the People" who have ordained and established the constitutions for the governments of the several states and of the Union. In these several constitutions they speak of and refer to the organization of the states and of the Union as a Social Compact. What do the words "social compact" mean? A basic understanding of the "social compact" formed is clearly established and related by the text and content of the citizenship provisions in these several constitutions; for without exception they specifically declare that only those of the white race may be naturalized as Citizens of the states and become electors thereof.

PERPETUAL LAW, FAITH AND UNION

When one considers that we have a perpetual constitution and a perpetual Union, then it is, by deduction, rather apparent that the constitutions upon which these states entered the Union are also perpetual! And so is the citizenship declared therein!

Obviously, the "social compact" spoken of in both, the national and the several state constitutions, is a "compact" between members of the white race only for their own "social" well being!!!

Were the people of the several states who included such exclusionary clauses in their constitutions merely a bunch of racists, or were they people who understood the principles behind the two forms of Republic previously mentioned, and the principles of the Holy Bible that are fundamental to a common law Republic?

"And their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them; and I will cause him to draw near, and he shall approach unto me: for who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto me? saith the LORD." Jeremiah 31:21 (KJV).

The citizenship provisions of the several state constitutions were reflected and echoed in the first naturalization law of America.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any alien being a free white person, who shall have resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States for the term of two years, may be admitted to become a citizen thereof, ..." An Act to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, March 26, 1790, Ch. 3, Sec. 1, 1 Stat. 103.

The white people of the several states understood that to admit all races to citizenship in their states would be to establish a republic under international law, not the common law.

Compare the citizenship and elector provisions of these original state constitutions with the following provision of the USSR constitution:

"Elections of deputies are universal: all citizens of the USSR who have reached the age of eighteen, irrespective of race or nationality, sex, religion, education, domicile, social origin, property status or past activities, have the right to vote in the election of deputies, with the exception of insane persons and persons who have been convicted by a court of law and whose sentences include deprivation of electoral rights." Chapter XI, Article 135, U.S.S.R. Constitution.

The difference between the two types of republics are clearly evident. However, the citizenship and elector provisions of the several states no longer read as they once did; they now emulate and copy the soviet constitution. They provide, without exception, for a universal citizenship and suffrage for every "citizen of the United States" regardless of race, color or creed.

CONGRESSIONAL FRAUD AND TREASON

Did anyone tell the people of the states that by amending their constitutions they were altering the basic order of law for their respective states from Christian common law principles to anti-Christ international law principles, and actually restructuring their states (republics)? Did anyone bother to tell them that they were setting aside the common law structure and restrictions which protected the rights of the people from government encroachment in favor of an international law and governmental structure which offered no such protections?

It must be reiterated; we are being told that the U.S.S.R. is becoming more like the United States, but, the truth of the matter seems to be that the United States is becoming more like the U.S.S.R. As repulsive as this statement might seem we owe it to ourselves to take a closer look at what is happening to us in this country. Look around you! Can you deny what your eyes see?

Wouldn't the altering of the state constitutions and their citizenship and elector provisions change the meaning of the "social compact" spoken of therein? By amending those respective articles didn't we enter a new "social compact", one that was never contemplated by the people of the states when they adopted their respective constitutions?

If the original intent of the state constitutions has been altered then it is highly possible, and certainly likely, that other provisions of those several constitutions were also automatically altered by implication, although, not actually (directly) amended.

How much more of the state constitutions has been altered from the common law republic to the international law type of republic by this kind of subterfuge? What about the respective state provisions for census, apportionment of the state and federal legislators, and election of the state officials? Just what law is now being faithfully executed by the state officials and the respective Governors?

In all the state constitutions the Governor is commander of the military forces of the state and these may be called out to execute the laws and suppress rebellion as well as repel invasion. Just what law is it that is now going to be executed? The answer is rather obvious I would say! According to the changes we have just discussed, the Governor is required to faithfully enforce those provisions of the state law which are equivalent to the laws of the U.S.S.R.

He has the authority to do this by calling forth troops of the supreme SOVIET (the District of Columbia if you will) or their domestic equivalent! He no longer has any troops at his disposal that are under state authority. The Governors of the several states no longer command a state militia. They are totally dependent upon the militia of the District of Columbia (previously known as the armed forces of the United States).

TREACHERY OF THE LAWYERS

The ramifications of these alterations to the state constitutions reach into every facet of governmental structure and operation.

In all the original state constitutions, the judicial power of the state was vested in a supreme court, circuit courts, and county court, which were to be courts of record, having general jurisdiction, to be defined, limited, and regulated by law, in accordance with those respective constitutions. Justices of the peace were also vested with limited judicial powers, and municipal courts were created to administer the regulations of incorporated towns and cities. These courts were characterized by the following points:

(Note the difference between an incorporated town and a town incorporated: the former does not mean to the State.)

1. Courts:

(A) Supreme Court;

(B) Circuits Courts;

(C) County Courts;

2. Courts of record;

3. Having general jurisdiction:

(A) defined;

(B) limited;

(C) regulated by law in accordance with this constitution;

4. Justice of the Peace:

(A) also vested with judicial power;

(B) also limited;

5. Municipal courts:

(A) created to administer regulations;

(B) for incorporated cities and towns;

The state constitutions as now amended still provide that the judicial power of the state shall be vested in one supreme court and in such other courts as were from time to time created by law. The judges of the supreme and other courts are still elected by the "legal voters" of the state or of their respective districts for a term of years, and still receive such compensation as is provided by law.

Almost always there is also a provision which states that such compensation can not be diminished during the term for which those judges are elected. However, there is something missing! The state constitutions, as now amended for the most part, don't list:

1. Circuit Courts;

2. County Courts;

and, don't mention:

1. Courts having general jurisdiction:

(A) to be defined;

(B) limited; or,

(C) regulated by law in accordance with this constitution;

2. Justice of the Peace Courts; or,

3. Municipal Courts.

What does the deletion of this language mean?

In simple terms, such omissions leave the whole jurisdiction that previously belonged to the inferior courts to the supreme Court and to the whim of the legislature of the state to determine whether the supreme Court will be allowed to exercise that jurisdiction. In other words, the judicial branch of state government is now completely subject to the will of the legislature thereof and has been subverted from its intended purpose and function. It can no longer act as a check and balance against legislative usurpations.

The founders of the state constitutions knew and understood that a Republic, founded to enforce the principles of the common law, required three co-equal branches of government. Over and over again they stated this principle simply and clearly within the several constitutions that the people of the respective states adopted. So important was this proposition to the framers of the various state constitutions, that they provided entire articles to assert it.

The amendments used to subvert the judicial power in the respective state constitutions completed the conversion of the state republics from the common law form to the international socialist form in direct violation of the intentions of the framers set out in original judicial articles adopted when these states were admitted into the Union.

THE STATES AS TWO DIFFERENT FORMS OF REPUBLIC

Original Constitution - Common Law:

Three co-equal branches of government;

Separation of power, legislative, judicial, executive;

In all the states, the judicial branch was bound by the original state constitution rather than the legislative branch. This assured the judicial branch power and constitutional capacity of declaring acts of the legislative branch unconstitutional, void and of no effect.

Amended Constitution - International Law:

One branch (the legislative) all powerful which in effect makes the government of Oregon a one branch government;

With the other two branches subservient to the legislature, no separation of powers;

Under the amended constitution the administration of government conforms to that of a socialist international law republic; the judicial branch, just like in the U.S.S.R. Constitution, has no real power to declare acts of the legislature unconstitutional.

LEGISLATIVE BETRAYAL

If you have ever wondered why it is never reported that a circuit or district court of one of the states has declared an act of the state legislature unconstitutional, you now know the reason why. Those courts in particular have no such power under the one branch (soviet style) system.

If this is true then the evidence can be found in the restructuring of the state governments. Since it is the constitution that determines the structure of the state government in the first place, then the evidence of restructuring will appear in amendments to that basic structural law.

If your state is now, by amending of the state constitution, a socialist republic, then the actual structure of government in your state will be found in compliance with that new form and all that it requires.

To make your state a socialist republic certain structural elements must have been altered.

The separation of jurisdictions between the government of state, counties, cities & towns must be consolidated under one authority or jurisdiction.

The judicial power must be placed under the control of the legislative branch, which has clearly been done in virtually all the states.

By obtaining control of the judicial power the legislative branch also gains control of the executive branch. When the judicial branch enforces the acts of the legislative branch the executive branch is required to enforce the enactments of the legislature as well. If members of the executive branch fail to enforce the legislative enactments sanctioned by the judicial branch they would be subject to charges of misconduct and malfeasance which the judicial branch would try, and which would undoubtedly result in conviction of the offending member of the executive.

This leaves the legislative branch virtually unopposed when it enacts legislation to destroy the jurisdictions of the counties, cities & towns or even the individual unalienable and inalienable rights of the people themselves.

So, in this fashion and by these means, the state republics are being restructured to comply with the requirements and characteristics of international law.

Have the county courts and the circuit courts in your state been abolished and state courts established in their place? Has your county clerk's office been abolished and replaced by a state office called by the same name? Has your county sheriff been neutralized by having his authority controlled by the state instead of the county? Is your county sheriff now found solely under the executive branch functions instead of the judicial or has all mention of the county sheriff simply been deleted from your present state constitution?

THE LAWYERS ARE THE ENEMIES OF LIBERTY

All of this is being done in many states under the alleged mandate of the due process clause of the 14th Amendment. The states cannot establish legislative courts within the counties without the support of some external authority. They do not possess the intrinsic power of and by themselves. They must therefore claim a mandate in the 14th to justify their subversive acts. When confronted with their acts they will obviously respond that it was necessary in order to assure all those citizens of D.C. (re: Social Security participants) the measure of "due process" to which they are entitled. Upon that pretext the lawyers are overthrowing our form of government.

In most of the original state constitutions the county sheriff was provided for under both the judicial and the executive functions of the state government. Why did the Founding Fathers of the several states find it necessary to place such emphasis upon the office of sheriff?

ANSWER: Because the county sheriff under the state's common law republic is the highest law enforcement official. He had both executive and judicial functions for the state. The office of sheriff served process for both the executive branch of the state government (including the administrative) and the judicial branch whose authority was derived from, and executed at, the county level. The office of sheriff could not serve this dual function without specific authorization in the constitution. Under most of the original state constitutions there could be no state troopers or executive level (legislatively controlled) law enforcement.

The county sheriff's duties were to enforce the law of the county (power of the county). The county was a separate political unit which had rights of self determination which superseded enactments of the legislative assembly.

For instance, say the legislators of a state passed a personal income tax bill, and the executive branch began to enforce the enactment against you because you refused to obey the legislative enactment. The executive branch (the Attorney General's office and Department of Justice) would issue charges (a complaint) against you and the county sheriff, being subject to the executive under provisions of the state constitution, would serve the process on you. You, in turn, would file counter charges in a court which had full judicial power to hear allegations regarding the unconstitutionality of the legislative enactment. Your allegations would attack the constitutional validity intended to be enforced by the complaint, and asserting that the Legislative Assembly had violated the state constitution.

"No law shall violate the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable search or seizure; and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the person or thing to be seized." Article 1, Section 9, Oregon Constitution (1859).

The above provisions are found in every state constitution as well as the federal one and, if enforceable, would nullify all attempts at assessing and collecting a personal income tax. The personal income tax act is unconstitutional because by requiring you to file the tax return form it invades your vested and protected right to be secure in your person, houses, papers & affects. By requiring the filing of such tax forms the legislative assemblies are obviously violating the provisions quoted above. Rights are absolute, governmental powers are conditional. Where the exercise of conditional governmental powers violate absolute rights, the enactment is unconstitutional, null and void. What condition must governmental power meet to be legitimately exercised? The exercise of power must uphold absolute rights, and never can that power be used for a contrary purpose.

In a common law republic, while the Legislative Assembly has the power to pass tax legislation, they are precluded from taxing a vested unalienable or inalienable right nor can they impose taxation in such a way as to supersede other restrictions laid on them by the Bill of Rights in the respective state constitutions.

The courts holding the judicial power, in a common law form of republic, have the power to protect the citizen from an unconstitutional enactment such as the income tax statute, by refusing to regard it as law.

Those courts listed must act in accordance with the constitution that created them and gave them life. In all the states admitted prior to 1865, when the state constitution was adopted it included all the protections afforded by its Bill of Rights (Article I); and the circuit, and county courts had common law jurisdiction and the necessary judicial power to enforce the common law maxims embodied in that Bill of Rights.

Removing the common law powers from those courts, by amending the state constitutions, left the courts without the necessary power to enforce the provisions in the respective State Bill of Rights; provisions which were originally adopted by the people for

protection from the very government they where creating.

The key words that were necessary to give the courts the common law jurisdiction, i.e., the power to protect us from government usurpations, have been removed from all the constitutions of the several states, or nearly so.

Maybe this explains why the respective states tout themselves as the home of the free, as long as you get a license (i.e. permission to be free)!

THE CONSOLIDATION OF POWER

Hasn't the amending of your state constitution reduced the sheriff to an administrative official of the state, subject only to the executive of the state, which in turn is subject only to the legislative branch? Although it may not appear so on the surface, as you have seen, the separation of powers for all intents and purposes is completely broken down; and the respective state republics are now within the definitive boundaries of socialist international law. Today the governments of the several states have only one effective branch, the legislative branch. All power in the state governments now effectively rests in that one branch just the same as it does in the U.S.S.R. under its socialist constitution.

By the amending of the state constitutions, the states, in both fact and law, have become socialist republics, and the people are left powerless to bring the legislative power over them into check under their current constitutions.

Our national government is called by the name United States of America, but it would be much more factual if it where called the United Socialist States of America.

Americans have been informed throughout their lives that our national government is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. When the people of the several states of the Union set aside the Christian common law for anti-Christ socialism and accordingly altered their several republics to conform, the United States government followed the people and reorganized itself too.

To comply with the people's alleged wishes, Congress expanded their own exclusive legislative power, found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, of the Constitution for the united States of America. With the consent of the state legislatures, the judicial and executive branches of the national government were also brought under control of the legislative power, as were the several state legislatures themselves. This was accomplished by the state legislatures, not the people of the states mind you, through their alleged ratification of the 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th, and 26th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

The structure developed by these amendments conforms to the structure of a socialist republic. Not one of these amendments was passed by conventions of the people of the several states in the Union, like the original Constitution for the united States of America was in 1787.

The citizens of the several states were misled as to the real reason for altering their own state constitutions. The citizens of the several states were told, by their state legislators, among others, that the only reason for ratification of the fourteenth amendment was to end racial discrimination in America, which is utterly untrue.

The thirteenth and later amendments are merely the vehicle used to dupe the people into taking a ride in a vehicle that eventually required them to leave the road of the common law by taking the off ramp leading to international law under the doctrine of socialism. The real problem is that nobody put up any signs to tell them where they were going.

Neither the state or U.S. officials told the truth about the impact of adding to the citizenry, that adding non-whites to the citizenry would alter the nature of the republics established in the several states. In fact, state and national officials have branded anyone who would bring the truth of the matter up a "racist" to cover up their previous deceptions with yet another false allegation.

THE IMPOSITION OF SLAVERY

The officials of the several states and the United States are drunk with power and they like their roles in this altered form of government. Socialism is the governing principle being put in practice by the governments of the several states as well as the national/ federal government.

The states listed below are states which no longer have their state boundaries recorded in their respective constitutions:

Alaska, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia.

Once this process is complete there won't be any states left; only ten socialist regions governed directly from D.C. You must ask yourself why your state officials have not raised a loud hue and cry warning our people of what was going on and protesting these usurpations? Why is it that they have not told us that our government was being restructured? Obviously, it is because they are benefiting from it. They are, along with the minions in D.C., gaining power and absolute authority over us. The socialist system is enriching them in untold ways. They are betraying us for their love of mammon. They are part and parcel of the socialist/communist plan.

Why do you think they want to make D.C. a state? Because when they do, D.C. will own (control) all the land in the united States. Remember, Moscow owns all the land in Russia! Not just 10 miles square.

THE WAY BACK

Put a stop to socialism! The citizens of Oregon, as well as the citizens of the other states of the Union, still have the authority to alter or abolish their amended constitutions and put the originals back in force. Our forefathers provided for it:

"We declare that all men, when they form a social compact, are equal in right: that all power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their peace, safety, and happiness; and they have at all times a right to alter, reform, or abolish the government in such manner as they may think proper.-" Article I, Bill of Rights, Oregon Const. (1859).

These words, or similar, are found in most of the original, and even many of the current, state constitutions. The citizens have the right by convention to re-establish the republics that have been taken from us by stealth and deception. The citizens have the absolute right to put the original state constitutions and the republics they formed back into full force and effect. The citizens have the right to put the common law principles of our Father's laws back at the head of government.

Everybody has their own opinions about what is wrong with government, but nobody, especially the politicians, seem to know what to do about it. This will be the last chance we will have to avoid a total break-down of the Christian form of government that the founders of the several states established!

The conspirators who seek a socialist republic have even gone so far as to remove the set boundary lines from the state constitutions.

Very few of the current state constitutions still retain the descriptions of the state boundaries contained in the originals.

In some states the legislature now has the authority to completely abolish the state boundaries by statute, by interstate compact, or with the consent of Congress. This is exactly what the socialists would eventually like to do since state boundaries only have meaning in the common law form of republic and have no real meaning in an international socialist form of republic. Or, maybe they already have done it through the Social Security Act.

"The Soviet of Nationalities is elected by the citizens of the USSR voting by Union Republics, Autonomous Republics, Autonomous Regions, and National Areas on the basis of twenty five deputies from each Union Republic, eleven deputies from each Autonomous Republic, five deputies from each Autonomous Region, and one deputy from each National Area." Ch. III, Article 35, U.S.S.R. Constitution.

No longer can the Christian citizens in the states trust their elected officials. They must act in their own interest and restore their constitutions.

The white People of the respective states have the vested right to alter or abolish the present constitutions and to replace them with the necessary safeguards to further our Christian republics. By calling for a state convention of the "People", which does not require consent from the legislature, or any other branch of government for that matter, this can be accomplished.

The time has come to answer this question: Do you believe in God or Government? Your fate, and the fate of your children, hangs in the balance. Decide wisely!!! If The Christ be with us, now is the time to act.

His Servants,

Edward J. Arlt

Robert W. Wangrud

(Ragnar, Slayer of Dragons)

Reprints of this article and other articles of Behold! Newsletter are available from Jerry.