

# FREEDOM 21<sup>SM</sup>

Advancing the principles of freedom in the 21<sup>st</sup> century

[www.freedom21.org](http://www.freedom21.org) [www.freedom.org](http://www.freedom.org)

March 11, 2011

[www.sovereignty.net](http://www.sovereignty.net) [www.repeal17now.org](http://www.repeal17now.org)

## Gas price too high? Thank the greens, Dems, and Clinton

By Henry Lamb

[To listen click here](#)



In December, 1996 Bill Clinton vetoed legislation that would have added more than a million barrels of domestic oil per day to help reduce America's dependence on foreign oil. His reasoning at the time was that ANWR could not produce oil for ten years, a [laughable excuse](#). For years, responsible Congressmen fought to open ANWR (Arctic National Wildlife Refuge).

The real reason ANWR remains closed to needed domestic oil production is the relentless propaganda campaign waged by green organizations that preach the [now-discredited gospel](#) of global warming. These organizations contribute heavily to Democratic candidates, and, during the Clinton administration, occupied the White House and management positions of federal agencies. (See this [report](#) and especially endnote #30.)

The Bush administration tried again to [expand domestic oil production](#). Congressional Democrats would not allow it. They filibustered Senator Ted Stevens' bill to open ANWR in 2005, and in 2008 killed a bill to expand off-shore drilling. Had the greens, the Dems, and Clinton not conspired to prevent the expansion of domestic oil production nearly two decades ago, America could be nearly self-sufficient in energy production today.

Obama may be worse than all of the above. Van Jones, his first energy czar is a [self-proclaimed communist](#). His "Green Collar Economy" cannot exist unless carbon-based energy is either outlawed or taxed to a price point beyond the price of his proposed alternative energy. (Continued on page three)

## Competing Constituencies: Guardians of Freedom

By Jeff Hays

### What is Federalism?

Our Founders understood threats to liberty inherent in giving one group too much say in forming the national government. Imbedded Constitutional mechanisms pitted different constituencies against each other to limit their power. Our Constitution horizontally separates legislative, judicial, and executive authority to limit Congressional power, but it also limits overall national government power through federalism.

### VERTICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION

There are three forms: unitary, confederation, and federation.

### UNITARY

Unitary governments have a supreme central government that controls and delegates power to lower subdivisions. Obvious examples are monarchies and dictatorships, but our state governments are also unitary. Power flows from the top down.

### CONFEDERATION

In confederations, subdivisions voluntarily join together and retain substantial independence. Central powers are typically weak, and unanimity is required to engage the confederation. Constitution changes or binding agreements are like treaties. Resulting United States weakness under the Articles of Confederation led to the Constitutional Convention. Power flows from the bottom up.

[Visit Repeal 17.org](http://www.Repeal17.org)



## FEDERATION

Federations have shared sovereignty. Power is delegated from subdivisions to the central government. No central or Constitutional changes are made without majority agreement among subdivisions. Federations have involuntary components, such as majority adoption and total binding of our Constitution and amendments, or legitimate legislation affecting the minority without their consent.

## “SOFT” FEDERALISM

In our Constitution, various clauses grant and protect states’ powers: election authority, the militia, the “electoral college,” Article IV (“Full faith and credit”), 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments, and Article V (Amendment by Convention). These “soft federalism” barriers are subject to interpretation and are on their own nearly powerless to prevent accumulation of national power. The Founders understood pen-and-ink limitations. That is why our Constitution pits constituencies against each other—the President is elected by Electors, the national Judiciary is approved by Senators, and Representatives are elected by districted voters—and formerly contained “hard” federalism mechanisms giving states direct input and control. The key to this hard federalism was the original Senate.

## THE ORIGINAL SENATE: CORNERSTONE OF FEDERALISM

James Madison’s and Edmund Randolph’s final draft proposal of the Virginia Plan defined hard federalism’s framework:

*4. Resolved. That the members of the second Branch of the national Legislature ought to be chosen by the individual Legislatures.*

([www.ourdocuments.gov](http://www.ourdocuments.gov))

Although Senate composition and term lengths were changed by the Connecticut Compromise, the indirect method of selecting Senators was unchanged:

*The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof for six Years...*

U. S. Constitution, Article I, Section 3 (original)

The original Senate bound state and national governments. Making Senators beholden to legislatures, not to the electorate, ensured state perspectives and interests would be voiced in national government formation, legislation, and control. Alexander Hamilton considered the reasoning for the original method of selecting Senators to be practically self-evident:

*Among the various modes which might have been devised for constituting this branch of the government, that which has been proposed by the convention is probably the most congenial with the public opinion. It is recommended by the double advantage of favoring a select appointment, and of giving to the State governments such an agency in the formation of the federal government as must secure the authority of the former, and may form a convenient link between the two systems.*

Federalist #62

*The proposed Constitution, so far from implying an abolition of the State governments, makes them constituent parts of the national sovereignty, by allowing them a direct representation in the Senate, and leaves in their possession certain exclusive and very important portions of sovereign power. This fully corresponds, in every rational import of the terms, with the idea of a federal government.*

Federalist #9

State sovereignty and preservation were reinforced by the Senate’s composition:

*...the equal vote allowed to each State is at once a constitutional recognition of the portion of sovereignty remaining in the individual States, and an instrument for preserving that residuary sovereignty. So far the equality ought to be no less acceptable to the large than to the small States; since they are not less solicitous to guard, by every possible expedient, against an improper consolidation of the States into one simple republic.*

Federalist #62

Hard federalism checked national power in everything touched by the Senate: trying impeachments, ratifying treaties, approving judges and Presidential nominees, and providing state perspective on legislation. It promoted Congress-limiting bicameral compromise and reinforced written restraints on national power such as the 9th and 10th Amendments. It preserved state sovereignty by limiting power's natural upward percolation by those who seek to wield it over the largest number of people. It prevented accumulation of power by the national government, the most dangerous threat to our liberty—a state government can only enslave a state, but the national government can enslave a nation.

There are two more great articles by Jeff on the [Repeal 17 Now! website](#).

\*\*\*\*\*

## Gas price too high? Thank the greens, Dems, and Clinton

*(Continued from page one)*

Carol Browner, his choice for global warming czar, is a [socialist](#). She served as Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency during the Clinton administration, and hates the use of carbon-based energy in America.

There is no reason to force an already stressed economy into a “green” economy where, for example, a Chevy Volt costs \$41,000 (before the \$7,500 tax credit) for a mid-size hatchback that's rated 40 mpg highway. Dozens of mid-size cars are available for half the price with mpg ratings in the mid or high 30s. A “green” economy requires massive subsidies from government and/or increased taxes on carbon-based energy to equalize the playing field. This kind of manipulation is not a free market economy. It is a major factor in rising gas prices and other energy costs.

What's happening in the Obama administration may be much worse than the price of gasoline. His [admission to Joe the Plumber](#) that he wants to “spread the wealth around” is a goal that is not limited to the United States. Even in defiance of a court order, Obama refuses to allow off-shore drilling for domestic energy. He has no reluctance, however, to provide [\\$2 billion in funding](#) for drilling off the Brazilian coastline. He is trying to spread the wealth to Brazil, while preventing wealth creation in U.S. oil fields.

Obama's desire to spread the wealth around includes spreading American-generated wealth to foreign countries. It was Obama who pushed his “[Global Poverty Act](#)” (S.2433) to increase foreign aid to the level [dictated by the U.N.](#)

What's worse, the Obama administration appears to be doing all it can do to weaken the U.S. dollar printing more and more greenbacks, each of which reduces the value of all greenbacks. One way to “spread the wealth around” is to take wealth away from those who have it and give it to those who do not. By reducing the value of the U.S. dollar, the value of most other currencies increases.

Moreover, Obama is cooperating fully with the G-20, a group of financial officers from 20 nations, along with the executives of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and the heads of certain central banks, who are working to equalize the global economy. G-20 meetings are private and their work is intended to strengthen “[global governance](#).”

On top of all this, consider that China and India are increasing their use of carbon-based fuels to expand their economies dramatically. They are using cheap carbon energy to manufacture solar panels and wind turbines for use in America to generate energy that is outrageously expensive. What sense does this make? It certainly “spreads the wealth around” at the expense of Americans.

The only way to stop this nonsense is to continue the revolution started in November, 2010 and intensify efforts to put a majority in the Senate who understand and respect the U.S. Constitution and value a free market economy. If the current administration can be replaced with a President who believes government has no business spreading around other people's wealth, and that the U.S. must become self-sufficient in energy production, while defending our borders at home and our interests abroad, then we can open ANWR, drill offshore, and use the resources within our own nation.

Those who object to this goal should be re-tested.

\*\*\*\*\*

