

Martial Law in the Twenty-first Century

Introduction

This article is built upon information and evidence provided in previous articles published by Mobius Strip Press. Articles that a reader must familiarize with to better understand the information in this article are titled *“What is the Real Problem”* and *“The 1798 Resolutions was the first attempt of Republic Review: Nullification or Interposition”*. These articles are available on the Constitutional Articles page on the “Reclaiming the Republic™” organization domain at this URL:

<http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/CA.html>.

It would also be prudent for the reader to understand the premise and principles of Republic Review as well. The premise and principles are also available on this same webpage.

Defining Martial Law

The basic definition of Martial Law that all countries (except the United States) adhere to is:

When the government deploys the military to take direct control over normal civilian functions of local government to ensure the laws are not only complied with but enforced as well.

This deployment of military is done in response to a temporary emergency such as invasion or major disaster, or in a territory that is being occupied by an invading force. Under the typical circumstances of Martial Law, basic civil rights are suspended, where the writ of habeas corpus, due process, trial by Jury, and other essential rights are suspended and managed by military tribunals.

Another critical point that needs to be clarified is the actual powers delegated to government. Powers delegated to government fall into two categories. The first category of powers is general powers. General Powers are broad sweeping powers leaving full discretion to the government sovereign(s) to choose the extent of powers it wishes to exert upon the governed. The other category of powers is specified and enumerated powers. Specified and enumerated powers spells out precisely what powers are delegated to the government by the governed to ensure the sovereign(s) are restricted to only those powers.

When powers are delegated to government, this is typically accomplished through an instrument such as a charter or a constitution. However, there are other names for these instruments such as a patent, an agreement, a frame, a combination, an ordinance, and last but not least fundamentals. For the purposes of simplification this article will focus on the terms charter and a constitution. A charter is established by a single sovereign and is usually issued by Monarch’s or ruler. Most of the colonies were initially established by charters and as they became more and more independent the Colonies became independent States. Connecticut was the first colony to use a constitution called the “Fundamental Orders” and was adopted by representatives of the people.

The American Innovation with Checks and Balances

As pointed out in the aforementioned article "*What is the Real Problem*," a principle check placed into the U. S. Constitution was ALL enforcement of Constitutional laws (i.e. laws in the pursuance of the Constitution) is to be enforced by the Militia. Instead of an Army, the general (i.e. federal) government was only to use a Militia. The importance of this must be emphasized. The framers understood that the road to tyranny would be accompanied by the general government's ability to enforce its own laws, which is why they were not to have "full" control over the enforcement of federal laws.

We the people were not only to possess a self-governing system with our sovereigns being our representatives, but we were also supposed to enforce our own laws. There has never been a government where the people possessed this level of control. The framers also protected us from ourselves from placing checks and guards in this system to keep us from a direct democracy form of government. This is why the only direct elections of our politicians the people were able to directly vote for were our representatives both in Congress as well as the body of representatives in the State legislatures. According to the Constitution, still today we are only supposed to vote for electors, who are to choose our President and we are not to directly elect the President.

The Seventeenth Amendment perverted the principles of American Republicanism, and the article "*Rescinding of the 17th Amendment*" on the same referenced web page above, provides the clarity on this. Suffice it to say, American Republicanism recognizes two distinctive sovereigns who require representation to protect the people and the sub-element of our government. This is why our Senators were originally selected by our State Legislature, and our State Senators in our State Legislature were originally selected by our county legislatures commonly called County Commissioners or Supervisors.

The election and selection of disparate representation placed checks and balances into our system of government and these principles that have been obfuscated and perverted over time. This has been done to transition our hybrid Constitutional Republic into a democratic socialist government. Those who have been supporting the plethora of violations to our Constitution have actually been seeking to overthrow our system and they have been inculcating the electorate well over a century into believing we are a Democracy and that everyone should vote in all matters.

The framers understood the dangers of a direct democracy, which is why they instilled a multifaceted republican form of government, keeping the people in control using a government of discipline. This is why we were given the people the ultimate say in the enforcement of our laws by making the Militia the integral component to our Constitution and its enforcement. This is how we are to protect ourselves from a despotic government. This is why reading the article *What is the Real Problem* is so important to the reader to provide insights in how the Militia is still to this day the only Constitutional entity to enforce laws, support local sheriffs in keeping order, and to protect us from both external and internal hostility.

During the Virginia Ratification Debates as the framers in Virginia were debating the importance of the Militia, George Mason was pleading for an Amendment to the Constitution to restrict the general government's uses of the Militia. In doing this, the States would have greater checks upon the federal

use of deploying the Militia. This was due to George Mason's fear that the general government would abuse the States Militia by deploying them too far. Needless to say, his fears were incorrect; however, during the same portion of the debates George Mason pointed out the formula that the general government could use to render the Militia irrelevant. George Mason stated:

“There are various ways of destroying the militia. A standing army may be perpetually established in their stead. I abominate and detest the idea of a government, where there is a standing army. The militia may be here destroyed by that method which has been practised in other parts of the world before; that is, by rendering them useless — by disarming them. Under various pretences, Congress may neglect to provide for arming and disciplining the militia; and the state governments cannot do it, for Congress has an exclusive right to arm them, &c. Here is a line of division drawn between them — the state and general governments. The power over the militia is divided between them. The national government has an exclusive right to provide for arming, organizing, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States. The state governments have the power of appointing the officers, and of training the militia, according to the discipline prescribed by Congress, if they should think proper to prescribe any. Should the national government wish to render the militia useless, they may neglect them, and let them perish, in order to have a pretence of establishing a standing army,” George Mason June 14th 1788, Page 239.

To be clear, this process or formula would be a direct violation of the Constitution; unless the States ratified an Amendment to the Constitution to remove the delegated power in Article I Section 8, subsection 15 “Congress shall have the power to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions” and the amendment must add a delegation of power authorizing another entity the responsibility and power to “execute the laws of the union.” Simply following George Mason’s process would be a blatant violation to the Constitution and that is why not having an active Militia in every State today is literally a “Constitutional Crisis.”

What Does This Have To Do With Martial Law?

The brief answer to the above question is everything. As defined Martial Law is the deployment of an “enforcement” entity, and in accordance to the Constitution the only Constitutional enforcement entity is still the Militia. It is only the Militia that has the authority to ensure the laws along with emergency laws are followed and enforced. What is imperative for the reader to understand is this: there is **no** or **zero Constitutional standing** for a National Guard as well as ANY type of federal enforcement agency. Both the National Guard and a sundry of federal enforcement agencies have been created without obtaining the proper delegated power from the States through an amendment to the Constitution.

The Constitution does not mention Martial Law, so is a declaration of an emergency and calling for Martial Law even Constitutional? Actually, Martial Law may not be mentioned in the Constitution, but its uses were defined in the Ratification Debates of the Constitution.

As George Mason was postulating the formula for dissolving the Militia by violating the Constitution he pointed out that the general government would then empower itself unconstitutional with a standing army by stating:

“They may effect the destruction of the militia, by rendering the service odious to the people themselves, by harassing them from one end of the continent to the other, and by keeping them under martial law.

The English Parliament never pass a mutiny bill but for one year. This is necessary; for otherwise the soldiers would be on the same footing with the officers, and the army would be dissolved. One mutiny bill has been here in force since the revolution. I humbly conceive there is extreme danger of establishing cruel martial regulations. If, at any time, our rulers should have unjust and iniquitous designs against our liberties, and should wish to establish a standing army, the first attempt would be to render the service and use of militia odious to the people themselves — Subjecting them to unnecessary severity of discipline in time of peace, confining them under martial law, and disgusting them so much as to make them cry out, "Give us a standing army!" I would wish to have some check to exclude this danger; as, that the militia should never be subject to martial law but in time of war. I consider and fear the natural propensity of rulers to oppress the people. I wish only to prevent them from doing evil. By these amendments I would give necessary powers, but no unnecessary power. If the clause stands as it is now, it will take from the state legislatures what divine Providence has given to every individual — the means of self-defence. Unless it be moderated in some degree, it will ruin us, and introduce a standing army,” George Mason June 14th 1788, Page 239.

This was George Mason’s primary justification for the need of an Amendment; to keep the general government from “rendering the service odious to the people themselves, by harassing them from one end of the continent to the other, and by keeping them under martial law.” As a point in fact, this was not the case whatsoever. The reason the general government established standing armies; they simply ignored the Militia, stopped funding them, stopped training them, and with the sleight of hand they deceived the States that they could create their own enforcement agencies. The first such federal enforcement agency being the Home Department (called the Department of Interior today) created in 1849.

Nevertheless, Martial Law was clarified further by James Madison in his response to George Mason by stating:

“Mr. Chairman, I most cordially agree, with the honorable member last up, that a standing army is one of the greatest mischiefs that can possibly happen. It is a great recommendation for this system, that it provides against this evil more than any other system known to us, and, particularly, more than the old system of confederation. The most effectual way to guard against a standing army, is to render it unnecessary. The most effectual way to render it unnecessary, is to give the general government full power to call forth the militia, and exert the whole natural strength of the Union, when necessary...

The honorable member is under another mistake. He wishes martial law to be exercised only in time of war, under an idea that Congress can establish it in time of peace. The states are to have the authority of training the militia according to the congressional discipline; and of governing them at all times when not in the service of the Union. Congress is to govern such part of them as may be employed in the actual service of the United States; and such part only can be subject to martial law. The gentlemen in opposition have drawn a most tremendous picture of the Constitution in this respect” James Madison, June 14th 1788, Page 241.

This not only explained the necessity of the Militia and the general government’s use of the Militia, but Madison also clarified that Martial Law can only be called during the time of “war.” This means that Congress must declare war against a hostile nation, organization, or people.

Later that same day, George Nicolas provided more clarification regarding Martial Law and the use of the Militia in stating:

“But his great uneasiness is, that the militia may be under martial law when not on duty. A little attention will be sufficient to remove this apprehension. The Congress is to have power “to provide for the arming, organizing, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States.” Another part tells you that they are to provide for calling them forth, to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions. These powers only amount to this — that they can only call them forth in these three cases, and that they can only govern such part of them as may be in the actual service of the United States. This causes a sufficient security that they will not be under martial law but when in actual service” George Nicolas, June 14th 1788, Page 246.

Consequently, the only way, and to emphatically emphasis this point it must be repeated, THE ONLY WAY, Martial Law can be declared is for the Militia to be called into service. Again, the Militia is the only entity with Constitutional authority to execute the laws of the union. Even Governor Edmund Randolph later that day emphasized the limitation to Martial Law in stating:

“But it is feared that the militia are to be subjected to martial law when not in service. They are only to be called out in three cases, and only to be governed by the authority of Congress when in the actual service of the United States; so that their articles of war can no longer operate upon them than when in the actual service of the Union,” Governor Edmund Randolph, June 14th 1788, Page 252.

The importance of these statements is this: These statements legally tie these terms and definitions supplied, in this as well as the other Debates on the Ratification of the Constitution, as a legally binding to the compact (i.e. the Constitution).

In contrast to all other nations, our general government was delegated specific enumerated powers within the Constitution. The circumstances of how Martial Law could be declared were clarified and as these definitions along with others were provided – this created the basis for the State delegates to formally accept or ratify the Constitution.

There is a reason why the Constitution is not taught in this context, that the Constitution is a compact and like all compacts are subject to contract law. One inherent basis of any type of contract or compact, is how the compact is described and or defined, and these definitions and clarifications verbally or in writing are legally binding. This is why, when James Madison was asked for his personally notes on the 1787 Constitutional Convention, so that others could understand some of the less understood portions of the Constitution, Madison stated:

“But whatever might have been the opinions entertained in forming the Constitution, it was the duty of all to support it in its true meaning as understood by the Nation at the time of its ratification. No one felt this obligation more than I have done; and there are few perhaps whose ultimate & deliberate opinions on the merits of the Constitution, accord in a greater degree with that obligation” James Madison, 27 December 1821, letter from James Madison to J. G. Jackson para 6.

Madison clearly pointed to the fact that the only thing that matters was how the States understood the Constitution as it was explained, clarified, and defined by the States delegates to the Constitutional Convention and the Federalists who were supporting the ratification of the Constitution.

The Obvious

It may be obvious but necessary to state:

1. The States have not delegated the power in the Constitution or amended the Constitution delegating these powers to the general government and the dates are the years in which these powers were usurped:
 - Interior – 1849
 - Justice – 1870
 - Agriculture – 1889
 - Commerce – 1903
 - Labor – 1913
 - Health and Human Services – 1953
 - Housing and Urban Development – 1965
 - Transportation – 1966
 - Energy – 1977
 - Education – 1979
 - Veterans Affairs – 1989
 - Homeland Security – 2003

In addition, the States did not delegate the powers for a plethora of other roles, responsibilities, and powers currently exercised by the general government such as the Environmental Protection Agency.

2. The Militia is still the only Constitutional entity to enforce the laws of the union.

3. Martial Law can only be used in the State(s) or portion of the State where the Militia is deployed. Using the Civil War as an example, Martial Law would not be declared in the States that were not occupied by fighting forces such as Maine, New Hampshire, etc.. Only in the States where the conflicts were occurring and the Militia was deployed for engagements.
4. Without the Militia, Martial Law cannot be declared.

So it is also painfully obvious that the Militia needs to be restored to ensure the people and the States can preserve their roles, responsibilities, and powers as well as maintain their critical check on the general government. Furthermore, due to the magnitude of how our society has grown, and the potential uses of the Militia, the Militia structure should be reevaluated by each of the States and the general government to adapt it to our needs today and implement compensation for those while in active service. While stating the obvious, the Militia must be an amalgamation of both volunteers as well as paid regulars, for a variety of reasons.

If the general government wishes to expand its powers and jurisdiction, it MUST follow the Article V process and provide the States with an amendment to the Constitution. However, the author strenuously suggests that the States NEVER delegate powers that are domestic in nature to the general government. In Federalist Paper #45 cited above, Madison points out that the general governments powers are “principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce.” It is ill conceived to place powers over domestic matters such as education, agriculture, business, energy, commerce, housing, etc.

The world has become far more dangerous as mankind’s use of warfare has migrated into every facet of life. The danger hostile nations such as China, Iran, Russia, North Korea, and others present has become obvious that States need to take greater responsibility in enacting security measures in areas of cyber, chemical, biological, economic, agricultural, and other non-traditional forms of warfare, instead of depending upon the general government to take full control of every facet of our lives, because they will if we do not keep them in compliance to the Constitution.

The Relevance of Martial Law

Some might argue there is no more need for Martial Law; however, under the constructs of the Constitution, there are three categories for the general government to deploy the Militia and the potential need for Martial Law. Remember Martial Law cannot be declared in an area that does not require Militia service to “execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions.”

Therefore, in context to today the Militia should be called out during times of rebellion or protests. Contrary to thinking today, protests as they are applied in the streets, in places of business, or at institutions of education are outright unconstitutional. The framers concept of a First Amendment protest is ones “to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.” This means that protests or petitions are to occur in the halls of government not in the streets. The people are to stop the progress of government and have a right to have their grievances addressed and answered.

The concept of protests in the streets is stopping the flow of commerce, which is a violation of others civil rights to conduct commerce. Remember, ones rights end were another persons' rights begin. Uncivil behavior was repugnant to the framers and over the course of the last 150 years the unlawful behavior and the infringing on others rights became favorable to those in government service, since it removed the nuisance from their work place. In addition, instead of the grievances being addressed, the public has become subjected to unlawful hostility and property damage by these unconstitutional protests. This behavior is tantamount to anarchy and had occurred throughout history and was occurring in France as our new government was starting off. To be clear civil disobedience was not tolerated. The System gave all citizens the mechanism and right to petition government. There is also an acknowledgement that there may be times of civil disobedience; however, there are consequences to violating the law and the rights of others. One should be certain that the context of one's civil disobedience is grounded in the principles of individual liberty and individual sovereignty. Political protests such as ANTIFA, Nazi, KKK, and anarchist protests to name a few have no base in our society and the fact that this has become a basic right of violating the rights of other is unconscionable. All of the framers recognized the lawlessness and at the beginning of this Republic civil disobedience was also attempted in America with the Whiskey Rebellion. The Militia was deployed with President Washington who ended the rebellion with swift prejudice and prudence.

On June 14th 1788 during the Virginia Ratification Debates James Madison stated:

“a riot did not come within the legal definition of an insurrection. There might be riots, to oppose the execution of the laws, which the civil power might not be sufficient to quell. This was one case, and there might probably be other cases” James Madison, June 14th 1788, Page 258.

Please note Madison's use of the word “riot,” and what was considered a riot in their time did not include the burning of building and pillaging stores and stealing property. These acts were acts of war. In Madison's day they fought duels over honor to defend ones name and reputation. In addition, theft was at times treated as a capital offense; as a point in fact the men who stole retiring President Jefferson's facsimile machine, were hung once convicted. Consequently, what progressives have been purporting as a right to protest as a First Amendment right is not based on evidence. Furthermore, these actions are rooted in anarchist and revolutionary tactics for collectivists. This is why these tactics were used in the French Revolution, which was the first attempt of a communist revolution, in modern times.

Again, the only acceptable place for a protest is to petition civilly in the halls of government, as a petition for the redress of grievances – after all this IS our First Amendment right. If civil unrest gets out of hand the State legislature or the governor when the legislature is not in session must deploy its Militia as Madison suggested ensuring the laws are being enforced. Challenges of the law are accomplished through the aforementioned petitions and civil discourse.

One such case today where the Militia should be deployed today is on our Southern Border to stop the invasion that is directly violating the Constitution. An invasion is defined as: 1) An instance of invading a

country or region, 2) An incursion by a large number of people, and 3) An unwelcome intrusion into another's domain.

The Constitution states in Article IV Section 4: "The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union, a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against INVASION." Regardless of how the average person defines an invasion today, an excess of 100,000 foreigners from one or more countries, deliberately violating our laws to gain entry into our nation every year is tantamount to an INVADING political or social force.

When illegal aliens get involved in our political process to obtain access to 1) vote, 2) demand representation, 3) politically protest, or 4) try to participate in our political processes. This is when illegal aliens become political combatants not only as an invading force, but are actively working to undermine our laws.

In addition to the protection from invasion, the Constitution also requires Congress to exercise the power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization... throughout the United States." A "uniform rule of naturalization" does not include: Giving a race, culture, neighboring nation, or an age group preferential treatment over any other person seeking to migrate to America. Uniformity means all immigrants have equal opportunity to immigrate and that the same entrance criterion is applied to all; however, those violating our immigration laws deny others their opportunity. The unfortunate truth, there are tens of Millions of invaders in America today. A Yale study released data in 2018 that stated:

"Generally accepted estimates put the population of undocumented immigrants in the United States at approximately 11.3 million. A new study, using mathematical modeling on a range of demographic and immigration operations data, suggests that the actual undocumented immigrant population may be more than 22 million," Mohammad Fazel Zarandi, Jonathan S. Feinstein, Edward H. Kaplan September 21, 2018.

The term undocumented immigrants is an insult to immigrants. When someone or a group of people trespasses onto one's property are they called undocumented guests?

The Constitutional purpose of the Militia is to oppose and stop invading forces, regardless of the type of force. Consequently, the Militia must be deployed and Martial Law must be declared along the border counties to allow the Militia to repel and shut down all access points along our Southern border. Some support the building of a wall; that may be a long term solution, but Congress and State legislatures doing nothing is tantamount to supporting the rebellion against our Constitution and or giving aid and comfort to those directly violating the Constitution. This is where Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment

Constitutional Application

With regard to the problem de jure (i.e. the declared 2020 Pandemic), those States that have decreed wholesale quarantines on its entire citizenry not only have violated the Constitution, those politicians

need to be held accountable for violating their citizens Constitutional rights. Again it is imperative to cite Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

States cannot declare Martial Law, without the deployment of their Militia; thus, when a State declares a "State of Emergency" and uses other resources they cannot declare Martial Law or suspend any of the citizens Constitutional rights. Because the general government has violated the Constitution by rendering the Militia anemic, inept, wholly unsupported, and placed into a non-applicable status, only serves as well as proves to be a national travesty of our Constitution in a real emergency as the one we are facing regarding this Pandemic.

What Can Be Done

Broad sweeping quarantines being imposed upon all citizens is clearly unconstitutional and is equivalent to a State declaring Martial Law as they are suspending ALL citizens Constitutional rights. The only type of quarantine that could be viewed as constitutional is simple. The "states" can only impose quarantines on those infected who are 1) exhibiting cold or flu like symptoms and or 2) those who have tested positive for the disease de jure (i.e. today it is the Coronavirus). Placing quarantines on ALL citizens violates their Constitutional rights to conduct commerce, peaceably assemble, religious expression, just to name a few of our "Civil Rights;" all of which are protected by the supreme law of the land. Those who are sick even with the flu can cause harm to others and the flu kills thousands every year. Passing proactive laws are far better than violating the Constitution with draconian debilitating lock downs.

Here is a very serious question, we as a society must ponder; how can just a few, let alone thousands, of flu deaths each year in America be acceptable cost of business in an enlightened society? State Legislatures possess the power and State Constitutional authority to quarantine those who can and will cause harm to those healthy citizens in the general public. Again, those quarantined are those actively exhibiting symptoms and or tested positive can and should be quarantined by the States or preferably the counties legislators. This is not an assertion of "arresting the sick," simply ensuring they are separated from the general public and medically treated either in their home or if they choose to leave home, then they will be taken to an appropriate facility to be treated, so that they too can enjoy the privileges of Liberty once healthy enough to be in and around the general public. Infecting another person with a virus is inflicting direct harm upon an innocent person.

The only thing the general government can do within their Constitutional powers to assist in combating the spread of an international disease permeating into America or a national disease getting exported to foreign nations is to stop all international travel into or out of the United States. Right, wrong, or indifferent, States have delegated powers over these other matters regarding their citizens, and have either one or both enumerated and general powers concerning health and safety issues and possess the Constitutional authority to act in protecting their healthy citizens from being harmed by those who are sick. This point must be emphasized, this is not by locking down the healthy, only mandating those to stay out of all the public spaces who have tested positive, or have existing symptoms until they are healthy enough to reenter the general public once again. This is the only Constitutional solution that meets the Maxim of protecting life. No longer should it be perceived that it is okay to go to a concert, a

child's recital, work, the game, church, school, or even shopping if you are a carrier of an infectious virus or disease.

To determine what powers and type of powers your State has been delegated, one must go through your States Constitution. These Constitutions have a great potential to impact your life. This fact begs stating, that if your Constitution authorizes your State the power to violate the U.S. Constitution, such as authorizing the National Guard, then that portion of the Constitution must be nullified and removed.

Though quarantining only the sick may upset those citizens who possess a myopic patriotic focus such as those that are calling for health-freedom and are supporting the ability for those who are sick with symptoms to freely work and be in public space; this is tantamount to unhealthy anarchy. It must be emphasized that this is unenlightened behavior. Telling a sick person to stay away from healthy people is not only logical, but compassionate to the entire general public. A State cannot carte blanche take away the rights of those who pose no harm to the public; however, those who actually pose harm at a specific point in time can be isolated. This is not a subjective issue; it is 1) how the laws were intended, and 2) why these powers were and are already delegated to the States. These powers should truly be in the hands of the county government. This way if you have a majority of the people in a given county who favor allowing infectious people to freely roam with the general public, then the effects of these laws would be somewhat limited to the county. Over time, the counties deploying and managing the best health management laws and protection measures will have the best outcome and eventually empirical data will help the people make better choices in their representation. This is how enlightened societies work. Therefore, as the sentiments change so can the powers and laws change at the state level, adapting to the best proven approach.

Our system was summarized by James Madison in stating:

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce; with which last the power of taxation will, for the most part, be connected. The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State," Federalist No. 45 James Madison.

Thus, we have a hybrid Constitutional Republic. We have both a Confederacy where almost all powers is reserved to the States and a Federation where only enumerated powers not general powers are delegated to a general government. We too should thank the Divine Hand of Providence as the framers did in their first proclamation of Thanksgiving, that we do not have a consolidated Federal government.

Even our representatives have either never been taught or have forgotten these principles; that the object of government is to protect life and property. Government cannot force a person to be protected or be vaccinated, but they can protect the public from being harmed by using quarantines upon those

people capable of causing harm. Again, powers over health and safety are delegated to every state and this is why States or actually counties should quarantine sick people from harming others, even during the flu season.

Before an obtuse hypothetical is postulated, quarantining a person who possesses an airborne contagion type of disease such as a virus is not analogous to allergies or a person who is immune deficient. Their condition is not infectious and causes no harm to the general public; however, one who is carrying the flu or similar viruses is contagious and along with their ailment is a high probability they will infect others. These arguments are more often based on emotion and often turn into an ad hominem type of argument. The point in fact, in biological warfare, these types of diseases because of their contagious factors is an ideal weapon against the general public. This is why the public changes its paradigm to self-quarantine as well as public health standards and quarantine laws to mandate the protection of those who are healthy.

Summation

Until the general government restores the Militia and its role in the Constitution, there is no way the general government or the States can declare Martial Law without directly violating the Constitution. The framers could not have fathomed how far we would end up drifting away from the Constitution. They could not have known that the suppressed Ratification Debates would be the silver bullets necessary to get the federal genie back into the bottle. Maybe it is a coincidence that the Constitution was designed as a compact, empowering the States the full authority over the Constitution and even a bigger coincidence that the States during the Debates kept such good records as to how the Constitution was defined and clarified in its meaning and intent. The point in fact in politics is there are not coincidences; the fact that we have a compact for a Constitution and possess the defining documents (the Ratification Debates) today is directly due to the Divine Hand of Providence. This is where one must understand what to do when ones compact or for that matter ones contract is being violated.

The key is this, only the States are the parties to the Constitution, the general government is a creation of the States through the Constitution. This is why Madison and Jefferson attempted to initiate what is referred to today as Republic Review. Reading the aforementioned *The 1798 Resolutions was the first attempt of Republic Review: Nullification or Interposition* clarifies this point.

Bottom line, this Republic is at the precipice of either its demise or its point of restoring the Constitution and placing the general government back into the framework of the Constitution. The Patriots must decide if they want to restore this Constitutional Republic. If the Patriots decide they do, then in response to the government tyranny by both the States and the general government the Patriots must ensure their representation (i.e. their representatives or legislators in the State) focus is on full compliance to the Constitution and demand they stop supporting myopic issues such as abortion, health-freedom, the Second Amendment, stopping common core, and a plethora of other issues. Only full compliance to the Constitution will save this Republic.

We must stop accepting government continuous violation of our Constitution. The invasion on our Southern border and the complete disregard for Congress to protect the States from this type of invasion is unacceptable. These legislators as well as all the State legislators who are not enforcing the Constitution must be disqualified for office per Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Demanding full compliance to the Constitution resolves every one of the myopic issues. Consequently, Republic Review is the only process that forces the general government into full compliance. For more info on Republic Review and its process, go to <http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/>. If one needs any guidance or has any questions please use the contact info on this website. Thank you.

By G. R. Mobley