

John (Jack) R. Venrick

From: "Ron Ewart" <r.ewart@comcast.net>
To: <r.ewart@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 2:22 PM
Attach: laws, hardly.jpg
Subject: "America, A Country of Laws? Hardly!"

"America, A Country of Laws? Hardly!"

By Ron Ewart, *President*

National Association of Rural Landowners

and nationally recognized author on freedom and property rights issues.

We are helping to spread freedom and liberty around the globe.

© Copyright December 2, 2010 - All Rights Reserved



"Rightful liberty is unobstructed action according to our will, within limits drawn around us by the equal rights of others. I do not add 'within the limits of the law' because law is often but the tyrant's will, and always so when it violates the rights of the individual." Thomas Jefferson

"Nothing is more destructive of respect for the government

1/30/2011

and the law of the land than passing laws which cannot be enforced."
Albert Einstein

"If you have ten thousand regulations you destroy all respect for the law." *Winston Churchill*

There you have it. Three admonitions by well respected leaders of countries and science and in its 234-year history, America has violated all three. American law has become the will of tyrants that violate the unalienable, God-given rights of individuals, too many laws have been passed such that millions of laws and rules are leading us towards a police state, if we aren't there already and passing laws that cannot or will not, or are too complicated to be enforced, is an all-too-common occurrence.

What good is a country of laws if we selectively enforce some laws but negligently or willfully ignore others, at the whim of those in power, be it politicians, bureaucrats, prosecuting attorneys, judges, or law-enforcement officers? What becomes a country of laws, if law-abiding citizens decide to willfully ignore the law, because there are just too many laws and every citizens is a de facto, law breaker? What respect will the people have for the rule of law, if some laws receive greater attention, or greater emphasis, than other laws? *(environmental laws are now vigorously prosecuted and examples made out of individuals who dare to violate them with heavy fines and jail times, while car thieves have to steal a car 7 times before they go to jail)* Why should law abiding citizens obey the law, when huge segments of the population are allowed to break the law with impunity? And finally, why shouldn't law-abiding, tax-paying legal citizens of the United States not be furious, when 13,000,000 law breakers are generously rewarded for breaking the law? America, a country of laws? Hardly!

Within months of the passing of Obama Care, winners and losers were slowly emerging with each passing day, winners and losers picked by government. From the Health and Human Services website we learn that 111 waivers to Obama Care have been granted by the government to some corporations and

1/30/2011

unions the winners. Those not receiving waivers are hosed the losers. (see http://www.hhs.gov/ociio/regulations/approved_applications_for_waiver.html)

Government breaks its bond with the people when it passes laws that are clearly in violation of constitutional limitations and they have been doing it for at least a century, if not more. Courts break their judicial bond with the people when they legislate from the bench, in clear violation of statute or constitutional mandate. As an example, the U. S. Supreme Court "invented law" (*Roe vs. Wade*) out of whole cloth when they decreed that the legal right to an abortion was protected by the Constitution. The Founding Fathers would be aghast at this decision by the high court.

A mockery was made of the Constitution, the Supreme Law, when President Clinton issued an executive order (*EO 12852, June 29, 1993*) establishing the "**President's Council on Sustainable Development**", (<http://clinton2.nara.gov/PCSD/>) when clearly sustainable development was the brainchild of an international body, the United Nations, and ran contrary to American law, especially property rights law. Essentially, if sustainable development was to be established as American law, and since it was developed internationally, the proper venue was a treaty that should have been debated and ratified, if approved by the U. S. Congress. The president openly and blatantly circumvented Article I, Section 1 of the U. S. Constitution, but presidents have been circumventing the Constitution for a very long time. Good 'Ole FDR issued over 3,700 executive orders during his three terms in office, more than the last five presidents combined. Presidential executive orders have long been a bone of contention by legal scholars, as to their constitutional authority.

If the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of government are allowed to twist, distort, manipulate or circumvent the specific limitations placed upon them by the U. S. Constitution and they are further allowed to unilaterally OPT out of or expand one or more of those limits, then the Constitution becomes meaningless. If the

1/30/2011

Constitution is meaningless and can be violated at will, than the Supreme Law of the Land is null and void and the very foundation of our freedom and liberty goes the way of the dinosaurs. Are we there yet? Close, very close!

If 13,000,000 illegal aliens are allowed to obtain amnesty and ultimately citizenship and they are rewarded with this sought-after honor by breaking our laws, how can any other law be looked upon as being enforceable?

To illustrate the insanity of this situation, here are a few lines we received recently on this very subject:

A Connecticut woman gives an impassioned speech, proudly declaring that she is "undocumented." She goes on to say that she suddenly realized that her "legal status or social security number may stand between her dreams and her future." REALLY! There are people from all over the world who didn't come here illegally who also have dreams about their future. Why should anyone be rewarded for breaking a country's laws? She says; "We (illegals) won't stand on the sidelines anymore." "For years I learned to be quiet and to live in the shadows and to hide."

When over 13,000,000 illegal aliens get the idea that they can now come out of the shadows and demand rights they don't have or are entitled to, what does this say about the rights of law-abiding citizens, or the laws that govern them? And where did the idea come from that illegals now feel that they can come out of the shadows? Pandering by liberals!

If the Congress can pass a law that is purely a wish list of special interests, whomever they may be, (*try Monsanto, George Soros and the Food and Safety Act S 510*) and they can do so with the new law having no constitutional basis whatsoever, then the Congress can literally pass any damn law they choose. If Congress is allowed to exercise this plenary power, than there is not one single individual right that isn't at risk. The government "giveth" and the government "taketh" away! Natural, God-given rights are just a figment of the people's imagination under this scenario.

If the President of the United States can nationalize a business and

1/30/2011

fire its chief executive, then there is not one single business in America that isn't at risk of the same treatment, small or large.

When the courts become isolated and entrenched from the people, *(and they are)* when the legal system becomes corrupted by so many rules and procedures and only the chosen few *(lawyers and judges)* know what the Hell is going on in the courts, true justice is the loser and injustices are the rule, rather than the exception. This author has had experience in both federal and superior courts as a pro se plaintiff and came up against this entrenchment.

If a Supreme Court, state or federal, can adjudicate law and legislation in compliance with the beliefs, tenets and biases of a particular political party, or pursuant to international law and the intent of the framers of the Constitution, state or federal, is cast aside, interpretation of a constitution is left open to any whim of the majority of the court. That means that the last leg of the Founder's Separation of Powers Doctrine, the judicial branch, can be corrupted by the other two branches. FDR was a master at corrupting the other two branches of government to get his way, including the judicial branch. Under FDR's term in office, the U. S. Supreme Court was "twisted" from a conservative court to a liberal court, with the flip of just one justice, out of the nine justices.

Once a country that lives by the rule of law finds itself with leaders that can subvert, circumvent or invent new laws without limitation, can fascism be far behind?

In closing, we submit that there are five (5) hard and fast governing principles a free country must live by, or it will die, or morph into one of three (3) types of governing methods: 1) an Absolute Democrat Monarchy where the mob rules, under the direction of the elite class; 2) a socialist or communist country where everyone is made equal except the ruling class; or 3) a dictatorship where the people are ruled with an iron fist and only the dictator has any rights. The history books are full of such one-man regimes.

1/30/2011

1. *The first principle for national survival for a free country is, you do not make a country stronger by making the people weaker and dependent on government. You only subjugate a people in this manner.*
2. *The second principle is, you do not spend more money than you are taking in and you do not tax the people to the point it will stifle entrepreneurial effort.*
3. *The third principle is, you do not pass too many regulatory laws, but the laws you do pass must be enforced, or the rule of law collapses.*
4. *The fourth principle is, no politician should be allowed to serve more than two consecutive terms. Long-term political empires lead to elitism, arrogance, corruption, back-room deals, payoffs and racketeering.*
5. *The final principle is, the preponderance of the people and those in government must be motivated by honor, integrity, honesty and morality, or the first four principles won't matter. If there is no honor, there is no trust. If there is no trust, corruption reigns supreme. It sounds a little like where we are now.*

Our Founding Fathers gave us some pretty good guidelines to go by, to maintain and preserve our Constitutional Republic. No, it's not perfect. But representative government, under the U. S. Constitution and free-market capitalism, have proven to be the most productive governing method to maintain individual freedom, liberty and a thriving, growing economy. But representative government disintegrates when power is concentrated in too few hands and when our representatives have no honor and refuse to obey the RULE OF LAW. If the Supreme Law of the Land can be violated at will, then all other law, under the Supreme Law, has no foundation upon which to base its validity and a failed government, under chaos and anarchy, will be the final reward.

Ron Ewart, President
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RURAL LANDOWNERS
P. O. Box 1031, Issaquah, WA 98027

1/30/2011

425 837-5365 or 1 800 682-7848

Website: www.narlo.org



1/30/2011