The Unknown Teeth In The Constitution

Preface

It is usually a bad sign, when an article starts off with a preface. This typically stands as a warning that this is going be a long one. There is an adage worth paraphrasing; one gets what they pay for. In context to this adage, too many Patriots complain about corruption in politics. Yet they are unwilling to pay the necessary attention to educate themselves to solve the problem; thus, they get what they pay for. This is explained by a simple economic term referred to as "opportunity cost." There is no denying that this is a long article, but the reader must understand in today's world some things cannot be condensed into a 90 second elevator pitch. If one is too busy to learn what is necessary for any Patriot in this Republic to know and to act for one-self than one better pray and ponder upon the veracity of what one is being told by those who are considered trust worthy. There are many "conservative entertainers" capable of delivering extreme witty sound bits, pointed analysis, and even make one feel good. Keep in mind they are paid because the problem exists and not paid to solve the problem. Therefore, they have no real incentive to solve the problem… they are getting rich because of the problem.

My dear Patriot we are in the final civil war. This war is ideological and miss-information is the common tool used by the enemy, especially because they control the narrative. They have deliberately obfuscated the Constitution to such a degree for such a long time that all of the electorate (with very few exceptions) has embraced unconstitutional tyranny.

This article builds from previous articles and therefore, if this is your first article you should read these articles first: *What is the Real Problem*, *Martial Law in the Twenty-first Century*, and *Nullification or Interposition*, all of which are available on this page: http://reclaimingtherepublic.org/CA.html.

Finally, the core issue in this article covers the repugnant practice of slavery, though this is not about slavery at all. Therefore, for the record the following is provided:

- The United States did not invent slavery.
- In America (before the United States government) Slavery was instituted by the British Crown (See Thomas Jefferson's Original Draft of the Declaration of Independence).
- The political compromise during the Constitutional Convention of 1787 to make slavery a State issue was this nation's biggest mistake.
- Thomas Sowell points out; the word "slave" is a derivative of the word Slav. In other words, the origins come from the Slavic people of Europe.
- Slavery has been a practiced institution for over 5000 years.
- The one nation/empire that utilized this institution for the longest period was Egypt/Africa.
- Academes in history marvels and revere artifacts like the Great Wall of China, the Colosseum, the Taj Mahal, and the Great Pyramid of Giza. The irony is that many of these same academes speak out of America's use of slavery, yet all of these wonders were built with slave labor.

- Slavery has been on the rebound throughout the world and those who are enthralled with past forms of slavery are absolute hypocrites for not engaging in stopping the resurgence of Slavery, instead of the ending of slavery over 150 years ago.
- The intent of reparations at the end of slavery was to pay those who lost their property (i.e. slaves) due to emancipation to provide economic help to pay for labor due to the government's actions.
- One of the Commandments God gave Adam and Eve as they were driven out of the Garden of Eden, was the man was to live by the sweat of his brow. Slavery is compelling someone to sweat so another can live.
- If the spilling of blood and the loss of life is the ultimate price for the repentance of sin and is the greatest cost a person and a nation can spend – the half million plus who died to end slavery surely paid the price for the sin of slavery, unlike any other nation.
- The only other time a government emancipated slaves before the governments use of the slaves had completed was ancient Egypt emancipating Israel. This was done by spilling of blood and loss of life by the Divine Hand of Providence- instead of a civil war.

Definitions

The Definition of a Patriot

The formal definition of a Patriot is a person who vigorously supports and defends their country. Well that describes a Patriot in every country today except the United States, this definitions implies that Patriotism in essence is when one is in the support of one's government. The United States was designed with distinct layers of sovereignty, where most of the governing power was distributed out closest to the people (i.e. the county governments), and the least power was delegated to the general (i.e. the federal) government. The framers not only warned the citizens at the time of the dangers of centralizing powers in a government, they also designed and galvanized in the Constitution to place the Constitution above the government and those persons acting as the government. This is why in Article VI Section 3 of the Constitution requires all public servants to take an oath not to support and defend the government but the Constitution. Needless to say, this is why the oath of a naturalized citizen MUST take an oath to support and defend the Constitution against enemies, foreign and DOMESTIC. A naturalized citizen is a person who was not born by parents who were not under the jurisdiction of the United States at the time of their birth and successfully become a U. S. citizen. Enemies of the Constitution today should be labeled as terrorists who place their fidelity and trust in men, governmental organizations, and ideologies above the United States Constitution.

Consequently, a "PATRIOT" in the United States is one who vigorously supports the Constitution, not a person who gives their allegiance to the government. Again, we are required as citizens and obligated as public servants to take a stand when the Constitution is being violated.

Defining Treason, Rebellion, and Violating the Constitution

Treason, insurgencies, rebellion, and what is referred to today as terrorism are acts that are intended to pervert, subvert, undermine, and or overthrow a government. In context to the United States, these actions are used to undermine and or overthrow our Constitution and our principles of individual liberty and individual sovereignty (i.e. a U.S. citizen's "Civil Rights"). Insurgencies, rebellion, and terrorism are not new concepts. Some would say the Revolutionary War employed these tactics; however, that assertion would only come from one whose paradigm is based upon the Government being the sole Sovereign.

For clarification, the British Constitution was a general Constitution granting general powers; however, the Glorious Revolution of 1688 injected negative powers against the sovereign (i.e. the Monarch) and the general government (i.e. Parliament). These negative powers are what were referred to as the first Bill of Rights. The Patriots in our Revolutionary War were the Americans who were demanding compliance to their British Bill of Rights and the rebellious ones of the law at that time was the King and Parliament, or aptly stated the British government. Our Declaration of Independence clearly was built upon the aforementioned principles that we were endowed with individual liberty and individual sovereignty by our creator and adhering to and honoring those liberties that were identified as "protected" in the British Bill of Rights.

Our Revolutionary War was in all rights a Civil War. A Civil War by definition is a struggle between two factions to control of the government. Ironically our Civil War in the mid nineteenth century was not a true struggle of control; it was a struggle over fundamental contract law. Whether one term of the compact is being violated or a variety of terms of the compact are being violated, are the parties in the contract:

1. Legally obligated to stay in the contract?
   Or
2. Able to terminate the contract?

Madison clarified the fundamental understanding of contract law in Federalist Paper #43:

> "A compact between independent sovereigns, founded on ordinary acts of legislative authority, can pretend to no higher validity than a league or treaty between the parties. It is an established doctrine on the subject of treaties, that all the articles are mutually conditions of each other; that a breach of any one article is a breach of the whole treaty; and that a breach, committed by either of the parties, absolves the others, and authorizes them, if they please, to pronounce the compact violated and void" (Madison, J. Jan 23 1788).

This fundamental tenant stands to this day that compacts are in jeopardy when even the slightest deviation of a term of the compact is committed by any party in the compact.

With regard to violations to the Constitution President Lincoln and the remaining Congress disagreed and actually asserted that the States were somehow slaves to the general government; however, they NEVER provided any academic or contractual proof to his assertion. Instead, President Lincoln initiated a war against the South that was supported by Congress. The issue at hand is the universal fact that in

contract law, as Madison stated; when one condition of the contract is violated the entire contract can contractually be abandoned and declared void.

In their twisted way, Congress agreed with the incorrect interpretation (likely for self-serving reasons) and considered the Southern secession as Rebellion against the compact. Unfortunately it took a despot like Lincoln to correct a political compromise that has stained the true virtue of this Republic and the Constitution.

At the time, the only teeth in the Constitution that demanded compliance of both citizen and public servant until the Civil War was the act of treason. Even though the oath of office was already entrenched in the Constitution, this oath was solely dependent upon the honor and moral integrity and character of those who took the oath. Furthermore, the bar of proving treason in today's time has become unconstitutionally convoluted. Now fools obfuscate the meaning of treason and assert that treason requires the United States to be at or in an "officially declared war" status. This way, as one gives aide and or comfort to the enemy they have not committed treason unless we are in a declared war and that the one charged with treasons was aiding the identified enemy.

Clarity is critical; this is why hard constitutional evidence must be cited when one asserts anything that is not within the Constitution. The point in fact, there is no evidence of this erroneous assertion. Keep in mind, the first trial of treason was regarding the Whiskey Rebellion where two of the participants were found guilty of treason. The Whiskey Rebellion was a protest to a new tax on distilled spirits in Western Pennsylvania NOT a declared war.

Another famous treason trial was former Vice President Aaron Burr, in 1807. The trial was headed up by the leadership of Thomas Jefferson and was clearly during the time of the framers, who did not have any pretense of what treason was. However, Jefferson's political foe, John Marshall, presided over the trial and was instrumental in undermining the trial in getting Mr. Burr an acquittal. Regardless of the nuances and putting aside political positioning, the point in fact is the United States was not under declared war, nor was the enemy foreign and that premise was not entertained in the trail whatsoever. The trial was not dismissed because of this excuse, it was dismissed and Burr was acquitted by the Jury due to Marshall's direction and positioning. Thus, the theory of a declaration of war to determine treason is not based upon Constitutional standing with the framers.

Background

Without going into through the entire history of why we had an alleged Civil War; it is paramount to point out that George Mason predicted the coming of the civil war and he was correct. His prediction came towards the end of the Constitutional Convention, when ten States caved to North and South Carolina and Georgia's threat that if the Constitution was going to abolish slavery they would leave the union. This was when George Mason stated:

> "Every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant. They bring the judgment of heaven on a Country. As nations cannot be rewarded or punished in the next world they must be in this. By an

> inevitable chain of causes & effects providence punishes national sins, by national calamities" (Mason G. Aug 22 1787).

Skipping over a plethora of data, in 1861 an amendment to the Constitution was offered up to permanently preserve the evil institution of slavery in the United States. The intent was to assure the South that they would always maintain slavery; however, the abolition sentiments were so strong; there is no way this Amendment would even pass Congress. The point in fact, the North had been using economic hostilities to punish the South beginning with the Tariffs of Abominations in 1828.

This 1861 amendment would have prohibited Congress from making any law interfering with the domestic institutions of any State (though slavery was not specifically mentioned). Congressional research shows that the amendment was ratified by two states, the last being in 1862. This amendment is also known as the Corwin Amendment, as it was proposed by Ohio Representative Thomas Corwin (Lupton J. 2006).

The text:

> "No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State" (Constitution Society, 2020).

Regardless, the South seceded and if one reads the Secession declarations one will find many of these declarations point to slavery and economic harassment as the primary reasons. Consequently, the South fully withdrew from the union and abandoned Congress. They printed their own money, completely severed ties, and erected a republican form of government in the new Confederacy.

A paradox still exists to this day, regarding whether the South could secede or not. One cannot have their bread buttered on both sides. Sure the North claimed the South could not secede, but the South seceded. The question to clarify this is simply did the South participate in government after they seceded? Did they participate in Congress, did they participate in the federal court process, or did they continue to participate in the financial and economic system of the United States? Of course not, so whether the North liked it or not, the South left the union. Maybe the real question was could they legally do this and the answer was yes. Had this gone before an objective court, there is no doubt the North was violating the Constitution; therefore, the South could legitimately leave the union. Consequently, the South actually seceded and if one reads the secession documents the primary focus was slavery and the potential threat of having slavery become unconstitutional and illegal.

Secession or No Secession – That is the Question

To this day the matter of secession is still debated. Were the independent and sovereign States swindled into becoming slaves of the general government? Or are States capable of leaving the union? As previously cited Madison stated in Federalist Papers that "a breach, committed by either of the parties, absolves the others, and authorizes them, if they please, to pronounce the compact violated and void." This was and still is the standard of contract law, unless there is a clause that:

1. Each party in the contract or compact acknowledges that as a term of the contract or compact and in acceding to the contract or compact via ratification that they are eternally bound to the contract or compact.
2. That there is a term in the contract that after a specific duration of time being in the contract or compact the Party acceding is then bound. Like a buyer's remorse clause, the Party would need to revoke acceptance before this certain point in time.
3. Amend the contract or compact in accordance with Article V of the Constitution to now permanently bind all Party's forever.

There is no reference of any permanent binding clause within the Constitution, the Ratification Debates, in any ratified Amendment, or any clause such as a statute of limitations or binding based on the period of time, like a common law marriage. Bottom line, there is no evidence that the States are permanent members to the union.

Believe it or not finalizing this point on secession is paramount, because there is still an underlying issue. The primary issue is this; some claim that the Fourteenth Amendment was not properly ratified. This is because some assert the South was forced to ratify the Amendment prior to readmission. Distilling the argument is the fact that there were those who support the North position that States could not secede; thus, they should not have had to be readmitted to the union, since they never left. Therefore, their acceptance of the Fourteenth Amendment was coerced – if one believes that the South could not and hence did not secede.

The definition of secession according to Webster and others is:

1. Withdrawal into privacy or solitude
2. Formal withdrawal from an organization
3. The action of withdrawing formally from membership of a federation or body, especially a political state.

Did the Southern States withdraw? Absolutely, they even formally withdrew by submitting "Declarations of Secession" (Avalon, 2020). First and foremost what form of government is the United States, is it a democracy or republican form of government? The answer is clear the United States is a republican form of government. As research proves, the Southern States formally vacated their posts occupied by their Representatives. Referring to the previous inference as to what does the Constitution or the compact states about secession? The answer is simple, it states nothing. The States must willingly enter the union by ratifying the Constitution; consequently, every State that joins the union does so by ratifying or fully accepting the Constitution, its amendments and treaties that are Constitutional.

The point in fact is that South did then and any State today can secede from the union. One would hope that a State would not marginalize its membership in this union and based on the secession declarations the South truly felt they could no longer remain in a union that had been directly attacking them for maintaining the institution of slavery. Lincoln and the North were wrong and in abject denial that the South could not secede; however their secession was necessary to correct the course of a nation that started in violation of its ideological declaration, the Declaration of Independence.

When political compromises are made that stretch and ultimately destroy the bonds of union, either a severance or rectification is necessary. In the case of slavery both was required, and the rectification required the spilling of blood to sanctify the required rectification, and the South supplied the opportunity. Unfortunately, Lincoln and the North made critical errors, which cost the nation even more lives to rectify this fundamental sin, but even worse, from that time to today, the people in this Republic still cling to ill-conceived biases, hatred, and many have become opportunists with machinations for nefarious purposes.

As an aside:

In a myopic perspective during the mid-nineteenth century, the southern intelligentsia began to embrace socialist and Communist ideologies and considered slavery as the perfect form of government. One southern Communist theorist, George Fitzhugh, along with other academes asserted that both blacks and whites would be better off as slaves (Calton C. 2018). That all laborers would be better taken care of as slaves then freemen, and slavery had finally plateaued into what these delusional folk referred to as a civil and respectable institution. These theorists later became apologists; however, they never disassociated themselves with statist ideologies, attacking Adam Smith, Thomas Jefferson, John Locke, James Madison, and other advocates for liberty. Paradoxically, Thomas Sowell points out at the beginning of the civil war, a significant percentage of slave owners in Louisiana were black. In addition, he points out that the anti-slavery sentiment of the average southern white was reaching an all-time high. One can look at the initial trial of Dred Scot in Missouri, where “the jury found for the plaintiffs. Dred Scott and his family were free” (Missouri Digital Heritage, 2020); however, revisionists, diversionists and separatists today prefer that no one know this fact, as it would not fit their agenda.

If the South was coerced into rejoining the union there is no substantial evidence to support this theory. Keep in mind this war ravaged families with its divisiveness and in principle they lost what they were seeking to preserve – their institution of slavery. Remaining separated would only add insult to injury; thus, the South concluded that it needed to rejoin the union.

The important question that is seldom asked is this: was the application of the South to rejoin the union compelled or did they willingly see the advantage of being a part of the union again? Why is this important? Non-union States (whether a State in the South after their secession or Canada), according to Article IV Section 3 of the Constitution – they must apply to Congress to become a State again.

The answer to the question as to whether the Fourteenth Amendment was constitutionally ratified while the South was still out of the union is yes. If a State has willingly left the union, he then must petition to Congress to join the union. Therefore, when a State joins the union - the process of fully acquiescing to become a State in the union requires the formal and seemingly perfunctory act of ratifying or in other words, fully accepting the Constitution, its amendments and treaties that are Constitutional unconditionally. One cannot cross their fingers behind their back in this legal process and then claim contrary.

In summation on the secession issue, both sides tried to butter their bread on both sides. The South seceded and after the war they wanted to be considered “still part of the union.” The north refused to

admit the South could and did secede and after the war, they acknowledged the South's secession and held them out of the union until their reconstruction work with the Civil Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment were passed and sufficiently ratified based on the split union. One who stands that the Fourteenth Amendment is unconstitutional does not see the Divine Hand of Providence in this matter.

The Need for Teeth in the Constitution

Clearly, those serving in Congress after the Civil War recognized a few things. First the South was not and would not be represented until their conditions to joining were defined and accepted by Congress. Second, that due to the existing framework of the Constitution, the specific privileges and immunities that are protected in the Bill of Rights only applied to the general government. Third that the South was already passing laws to directly oppress the freemen, which is why the Freedmen's Bureau was established in 1865; however, this too fell short in protecting these precious rights. Consequently, Congress then passed the Civil Rights Act of 1866 (U.S. Congress, 1866); however, it was vetoed by President Andrew Johnson on March 27, 1866. President Johnson's veto was overridden by the House and became law on April 9, 1866.

To be clear, both the Freedmen's Bureau and this Civil Rights Act of 1866 were violations of the Constitution, because there are no enumerated powers that grant the general government the ability to create and enforce these laws. The solution was elementary, the Article V amendment process in the Constitution was the only mode for the States to delegate and grant new powers to the general government. In addition, the process does not require Presidential approval ergo it cannot be vetoed. Consequently, on the heels of the President's veto, the House of Representatives began working on the Fourteenth Amendment.

Ultimately, the Fourteenth Amendment possessed some very important protections that one needs to understand. The point of this article is focused on Section 3; however, the following gives you a high level view of the purpose of each Section:

Section 1 defined and established citizenship. Those who were living in the United States or its territories as slaves were under the general governments limited and defined jurisdiction and were granted citizenship. The key here is "subject to the jurisdiction thereof," foreign citizens inside or outside the U.S. is NOT subject to the jurisdiction thereof. This clause was to make the freedmen legal citizens and to undo the discrimination applied by the Supreme Court who asserted that blacks could not be citizens as SCOTUS ruled in the Dred Scott case. Even though this was blatantly incorrect, many States already had free black citizens who were voting and possessing property. Another critical point about this clause, this did not facilitate the concepts of "anchor babies," because the "jurisdiction thereof" eliminates foreign citizens who are parents or soon to be parents, since they are under the jurisdiction of another nation; therefore, they and their children regardless of where they are born are not legally under the jurisdiction of the United States until they become a citizen.

Section 1, applied the same restrictions placed upon the general government upon the States as well, regarding privileges and immunities guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; thus,

protecting ALL citizens' privileges and immunities from their State and local governments from passing laws that would violate those protections within the Constitution and its ratified amendments. In addition, Section 1 guaranteed due process and equal protection for ALL citizens who were being charged with a crime. This one portion of Section 1 is redundant, since due process was already guaranteed in the Constitution and due to the preceding clause this protection was also applied.

Section 2 defined that the apportionment of representation in the House of Representatives would include all citizens who were eligible voters, which the State allowed to vote. However, if a State did not allow eligible voters to vote, such as Freedmen, than those persons would be deducted from the apportionment of representation. Today, the way this section is written, illegal aliens cannot be counted for apportionment, which is being violated today as pointed out by the Center for Immigration Studies that states:

> "Under current policy all persons — not just citizens — are included in the population count when apportioning seats to states in the U.S. House of Representatives and for votes in the Electoral College, which is based on House seats" (Center for Immigration Studies, 2019).

In other words, because Section 2 of the 14th Amendment is being violated with this policy and the States of Massachusetts, Illinois, New Jersey, Florida, New York, Texas, and California are stealing 21 seats of representation from other States. California benefits the most by gaining 11 seats due to adding illegal immigrants and their born children in the U.S., whom are not citizens as previously clarified. This policy was introduced in 1980 by Jimmy Carter's administration and Murphy D. 1991 stated:

> "The Constitution does not grant illegal aliens the right to vote. Nevertheless, illegal aliens were counted in the 1980 census and included in the reapportionment base that year. As a result, Georgia and Indiana each lost a seat in the House of Representatives. If an equal or greater number of illegal aliens are counted in 1990 and included in the reapportionment base, it has been predicted that Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kansas will each lose a seat in the House of Representatives" (Murphy D. 1991).

This is theft and a blatant violation to the Constitution.

Section 3, which is the focus of this article, clarifies that ANY public servant who takes the oath of office to "support the Constitution" and while in office violates their oath by directly violating the Constitution, immediately becomes ineligible to hold their office. In addition, they are to be banned for life from ever becoming a public servant again, unless two-thirds of both houses of Congress remove this "disability."

Section 4, delineates that the United States is not obligated to pay " any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void." Thus, sending a message to all foreign entities that finically supported the South that the general government was not going to pay off any of these debts and these debts were considered illegal.

Section 5, is a common phrase that was first used at the end of what people refer to as the Thirteenth Amendment "The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." This does not empower Congress the ability to create an entity to enforce these laws, this

means that Congress can make laws and then call upon the Militia in accordance with Article I Section 8, subsection 15 to execute the laws of the union. The only way Congress could assume the ability to create enforcement agencies would be to remove subsection 15 altogether; however, this would have showed their hand and the States would have rejected this amendment.

The point in summarizing the Fourteenth is to illustrate how little the public and even those in government really understand this amendment. Again, the focus is Section 3 but parts of Section 1, Section 2, and Section 4 should pique ones interest to realize how much teeth there is in this Amendment to correcting the direction of the Republic. Imagine California losing 11 Electoral College seats along with those same seats in the House.

Based on the debates in Congress after the Civil War, one would observe the exigencies in extending Constitutional protections to the Freemen; the sitting Southern President was looking to protect the South from the wrath of Congress. Consequently, both houses of Congress also felt the Constitution required more aggressive teeth to punish all public servants who attempt to violate the Constitution. The cost of the Civil War, in every aspect was high. In addition, because Congress was still only occupied by the Northern States these representatives of their respective constituent were poised to extract justice and serve notice to any potential rebellion or insurgencies in America from happening again. Thus, Congress inserted Section 3 into the Fourteenth Amendment to disqualify any public servant who directly or indirectly supported rebellion against the "Constitution," or aiding enemies of the "Constitution." This Section does not specify foreign or domestic enemies, because an enemy to the Constitution is one who violates, undermines, or ignores laws in pursuance to the Constitution or the codified processes delineated in the Constitution.

Out of this entire amendment, Section 3 is the least understood clauses in both this amendment as well as the entire Constitution for a reason. At the risk of creating smacks of conspiracy theories, when the communist infiltration into America began (in the late nineteenth century) the Fabians knew they would need to subvert the Constitution to such a degree, that they would have to completely obfuscate this one section to protect those who are committing treason and supporting rebellion against the Constitution. If the people and public servants do not understand these facts and standards that give teeth to immediately remove ANY public servant who violates their "Oath of Office." Anyone who understands Section 3 sees this contrast as irrefutable, like good and evil, black and white, positive and negative. As Senator Howard of Michigan (a key architect of the Fourteenth Amendment) stated:

> "It seems to me that where a person has taken a solemn oath to support the Constitution of the United States there is a fair moral implication the he (or she) cannot afterward commit an act which in its effect would destroy the Constitution of the United States without incurring the guilt of at least moral perjury" (Howard, 1866, Page 2898, para 4).

For decades, people from all walks of life, including opposing Parties, have complained about corruption in politics and holding politicians accountable to their oath. The original or initial language that was submitted to the body of the whole of the House of Representatives, on April 30th 1866 stated:

> "Sec. 3. Until the 4th day of July in the year 1870, all persons who voluntarily adhered to the late insurrection, giving aid and comfort, shall be excluded from the right to vote for Representatives in Congress and for electors for President and Vice President of the United States" (Stevens T. 1866 , Page 2286).

Clearly, the initial intent was for those States of the North to get their pound of flesh from the Southern rebels. It was obvious that the Representatives in Congress were willing to use a short sighted approach to extract their vengeance. If one understands ex post facto laws, this is a classic example of an ex post facto law, which is explicitly prohibited by the Constitution for all levels of government in this hybrid Constitutional Republic (see Article I Section 9 and 10). Fortunately rational minds prevailed and the words were reframed in such a way that Section 3 was not limited to the "late insurrection." The final words in the ratified Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment did not use or suggest the word "destroy" as Senator Howard implied, nor did the application of Section 3 expire after 1870. The wording had much deeper and further implications as follows:

> "No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or Elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office… under any State, who, having previously taken an oath… to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability" (U.S. Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment Section 3).

Because Section 3 was injecting real consequences into the Constitution regarding the actions of public servants tied directly to their oath of office by simply disqualifying any public servant from being able to be in or hold a public office, or even run for public office after they have violated their oath. To be clear, this section is referring to a "qualification" parameter and not a criminal charge or process even though criminal offenses are committed when one is directly or indirectly violating the Constitution. Prosecuting criminal charges would up to the voters and prosecutors to formally charge and try a disqualified public servant for their crimes committed, just like the impeachment process.

It is important to point out why Section 3 does not implicate a crime has been committed – just a consequence of ineligibility to be in or hold office for committing moral perjury. Had Congress declared this a crime such as treason instead of a "qualification;" those indicted would be entitled to due process per the Constitution. Thus, with a loss of qualification there is no need for a trial to expel a public servant. One only needs evidence that a public servant directly or indirectly supported:

- Supported a role, responsibility or power (RRP) that was not enumerated in the Constitution.
- Voted for creating a law or RRP that is not within or enumerated in the Constitution.
- Aided people or organizations that were violating the Constitution or constitutional laws
- Gave aide and or comfort to those violating Constitutional laws.

Today our evidence to remove public servants at all levels come in the form of videos, public statements, personal writings, wording in Bills, votes, and more.

If one fathoms the extent and magnitude of Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment, we have had and still have in public office, public servants who should and must be removed from office for a myriad of incidents. For an example, any public servant who does not support the immigration laws should be immediately removed. How? In accordance with Article IV Section 4, "The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union, a republican form of government, <u>and shall protect each of them against invasion</u>." By definition an invasion is:

1. An instance of invading a country or region
2. An incursion by a large number of people
3. An unwelcome intrusion into another's domain

Before placing context to an invasion, one must characterize the types or motives of invasion. Clearly the dominant type invasion would be a military force to directly engage with deadly force an attempt to conquer a nation. Another type of invasion could be a cultural invasion. A religious dogma referred to as Hijrah doctrine, is an Islamic policy/principle of Jihad by migration (Levy J. 2009, August 16). This is where Mohammadian's begin to mass migrate into a non-believer nation and entrench themselves in the nation. This doctrine dictates not to assimilate into a new nation and culture but to seek to undermine and take over by exploiting democracy along with accelerating growth in the Mohammadian's population. They accelerate growth by both immigration and by violating the nation's laws – using polygamy openly claiming religious rights or secretly. This way the Mohammadian's are able to have as many children as possible until they commandeer a nation to subjugate it to Islam.

Another invasion can be a political invasion such as a race or culture that illegally enters a nation to exploit labor and other opportunities. This is an invasion where people hide in plain sight – typically stealing identities and Social Security numbers; thus, committing additional crimes. These invaders do not assimilate also and insist on retaining their language and culture. Both of these non-military invaders try to directly engage in the political process to undermine barriers in the Constitution; thus, undermining the Constitution to replace it with a Statist government. In other words, these are political invaders with the intent to undermine the U.S. Constitution politically. This is also similar to an ideological invasion, such as communism, by seeking to implement unconstitutional laws of entitlement and every form of welfare possible to collapse our Constitutional political system.

Regardless of the type of invasion, each person violating our immigration laws are a combatant, in one form or another. There is no documented evidence that those who are a part of an invasion are doing so to benefit the country and the people they are invading. Accordingly, any public servant who has either:

- Voted for sanctuary status for illegal aliens
- Failed to vote or vote against supporting our existing immigration laws
- Initiate laws or executive orders to give preferential treatment to those in the United States illegally
- Failed to engage an invasion in accordance with Article IV Section 4 of the Constitution
- Give aid or comfort in any way to those violating our laws

Therefore any public servant doing any one of the above has directly or indirectly committed "moral perjury" and in accordance with Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment should be removed from office immediately and banned for life. Keep in mind this is only one example of a public servant violating their oath of office.

Obviously, the Fourteenth Amendment possesses far more relevance for our Republic today than anyone is willing to disclose. Enforcing the Constitution takes a little education, courage, and effort. There are various teeth in the Constitution or legal processes that we can use to obtain our desired outcome, if our desired outcome is full compliance to the Constitution by all. Going through these teeth and processes is one thing but the ways to enforce this requirement to comply with their oath of office is another article altogether. In the course of the last few articles along with this article we have defined, clarified, and identified some of these teeth and processes within the Constitution.

If the Constitution is to be saved, the States must coalesce upon the process of Republic Review. For more information and details on Republic Review please go to:
http://reclaimingtherepublic.org/CA.html.

References

Avalon Project, The (2020). *Confederate States of America : Documents*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/csapage.asp

Calton C. (2018). *George Fitzhugh, the Honest Socialist*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://mises.org/wire/george-fitzhugh-honest-socialist

Center for Immigration Studies (2019, December 19). *The Impact of Legal and Illegal Immigration on the Apportionment of Seats in the U.S. House of Representatives in 2020Federalist Papers*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://cis.org/Report/Impact-Legal-and-Illegal-Immigration-Apportionment-Seats-US-House-Representatives-2020

Constitution Society (1861). *Additional Amendments to the Constitution*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from http://constitution.org/afterte_.htm#amd1861

Howard J. (1866). *Congressional Globe*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://memory.loc.gov/ammem/amlaw/lwcg.html

Levy J. (2009, August 16). *The Hijra.* Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2009/08/the_hijra.html

Lupton J. (2006). *Abraham Lincoln and the Corwin Amendment*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://www.lib.niu.edu/2006/ih060934.html

Mason G. (1787, August 22). *Notes on the Debates in the Federal Convention*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/debates_822.asp

Madison J. (1788, January 23). *The Federalist Papers*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fed43.asp

Madison J. (1788, February 5). *The Federalist Papers*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fed49.asp

Madison, J. (1817, March 3). *Veto of federal public works bill*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from http://constitution.org/jm/18170303_veto.htm

Missouri Digital Heritage (2020). *Missouri's Dred Scott Case, 1846-1857.* Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://www.sos.mo.gov/archives/resources/africanamerican/scott/scott.asp

Murphy D. (1991). *The Exclusion of Illegal Aliens from the Reapportionment Base: A Question of Representation, 41 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 969* Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2054&context=caselrev

Stevens T. (1866). *Congressional Globe*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://memory.loc.gov/ammem/amlaw/lwcg.html

U.S. Congress, (1866). *An Act to protect all Persons in the United States in their Civil Rights*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://www.loc.gov/law/help/statutes-at-large/39th-congress/session-1/c39s1ch31.pdf

U.S. Constitution, (2020). *U. S. Constitution*. Retrieved 30 June, 2020, from https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/usconst.asp