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The big scoop – but how many of today’s sleuths are running from it?

This, my friend, is not an ordinary story. And, I must tell you before I even begin it, that my ghost name itself has a ghost name. Furthermore, the latter doesn’t even have a name… If you catch my drift.

Well, now that I’m fully identified, we shall begin with what I overheard just the other day while walking past an outdoor gourmet tuna shop.

“I tried my best!” uttered the voice of a stranger. That’s what caught my attention. Then I noticed a small huddle of what appeared to be journalists, there obviously to hear from (as I soon learned) this highly respected – but at the moment distraught – ace detective. Yes, they were eager to hear his story, drawn to a news pronouncement by his earlier fame. He had captured the notice of our whole city with a reputation for unfailingly bringing criminals to justice no matter how well hidden their crimes. Leaning forward to try and catch some of what was being said, I got quickly shooed away for lack of press credentials. Only pretending to depart, however, I merely stepped around the corner.

Peeking back inside at length, I caught the gist of our famed detective busily informing those journalists that he is ready to nab the biggest criminal ever apprehended! As I watched dumbfounded, that huddle went catatonic with their mikes and cameras, pushing closer for the scoop of their lives. Such a thronging you will not forget.

I could hardly see him, but his voice was clear as a cat’s meow before a can of tuna being opened, if you know what I mean. Well, since further eavesdropping at the time meant hiding where I stood, that was okay because you know what I’ve just said about tuna humming through a can opener and all. At that very moment, much of what might have been heard got muffled out by this big city bus pulling up and letting off some passengers. However, still able to see in, I noticed the cameras begin dropping to their sides. The excitement had gone from those faces. The whole pack of them turned in disappointment, each like a cat denied his wish and realizing his meowing won’t get the tuna.

You know what I’m talking about. Now don’t get me wrong; this is not a cat story, or even a takeoff on tuna. It’s about that biggest criminal of all – and still at large.

Those long faces visible on the many cats surrounding us even now as we speak has the same effect; it’s just like with that mob of journalists, a big letdown. Anyway!

I was at the part where this bus engine made so much noise I couldn’t catch any details, but still saw that catlike change of attitude when every single journalist just packed up and gracefully slinked away with piety. They left him like some people leave pets off at an SPCA shelter. If you get my drift. Okay, I will proceed to the point.

Well, the bus drove on, but I did catch just those three words that had suddenly ended the whole announcement. And, like a cat cuddling closer when wanting some tidbit, you know me, I went to the now empty spot where the small group of eager journalists had stood, and approached this detective. “The Fourteenth Amendment?!” I meowed, I mean, asked.

“Yea, the 14th Amendment!” He said, then grew silent, at first not wanting to add anything. But I could read his mind like a ball of yarn, just where it was going to land when pawed by a cat. Okay, so this may be a cat story; maybe not so much about tuna, though. For what our detective had to say really let the ole “cat out of the bag.” I’m talking here a long-whiskered, high-tailed, real speeding cat, too. Let me tell you what he revealed.
I guess, with no crowd around and his press release dropped like a worn-out mouse carcass, he still had to tell someone about this greatest of crimes, a spectacular case that depended entirely on the media doing their jobs by raising a little public outcry; he could’ve then surely busted it. For the man had come prepared to name his criminal! Yet, since the latter enjoyed political connections, a charged “official” investigation having purred along for awhile discovering nothing, and ordinary citizen jurists unaware of these facts, he couldn’t bring the culprit in for trial and discard.

Well, now I’m wondering: how come such a big scoop was not thronged upon by the media, why those journalists just acted like kittens lying around unconcerned and licking their paws? When I heard his case, it was like the proverbial cat out of a bag – running, racing, darting all over the place with excitement and telling everything. So what follows is that ole cat let out of the bag story, just as we have always heard. Today you get to hear one.

Okay, now that our cat is in the open let me get to this detective’s story. It was in 1963, himself then a happy investigator finding satisfaction by bringing in some of the most hardened criminals, each and all clearly guilty. He bragged about producing box after boxful of evidence collected on them, so convincing that they would just willfully confess their crimes – only a few playing hard, and going to trial.

“But, hey!” he exclaimed, “With the proofs I had, there was no way a suspect was going to beat the rap.”

He sips his coffee and says, “Look, kitty, I mean Mister…” Let me just get to the bottom of this and skip some of the details. Here’s the story he told me.

That was in 1963. Not having pencil nor paper, recorder or any device that might’ve contained all he said that day, I’ll just begin with this quote from the Sunday newspaper magazine called This Week, February 16, 1964, as written by one George J. Jaffee: “The greatest prison break of all times has quietly been going on for a year in the United States. Hundreds of prison-hardened criminals are walking out of their jail cells scot-free. Thousands of others will be freed soon. The most amazing thing about the great escape is that it’s all legal. And due to a Supreme Court ruling.”

That brought back to mind the detective having said some of his work would soon be trashed, and in just a matter of time have no value at all. Sure enough, the article goes on to report: “The prisoners escaping are not minor criminals. They have committed serious crimes in 15 States of the U.S. In Florida, for example, a random sampling of the criminals released would include

- A man, 36 years old, sentenced to 30 years in prison in 1961 for murdering his girl friend with a pocket knife
- A woman, 22, who had been convicted and sentenced in 1961 to five years in prison for armed robbery
- A man, 28, convicted in 1960 to six months to life for assault with intent to murder
- A man, 24, sentenced in 1961 to 20 years for armed robbery.”

The article then named all the States that were affected directly by this court ruling, reporting that over 4,200 prisoners were up for release, once their “rehearings” came due on the roster – just for the State of Florida, encompassing more than half of its 8,000 inmates. No figures could be gathered as to all of the releases expected.

Time magazine reported on October 18, 1963: “…In many cases where the courts have granted a new trial, it is virtually impossible for the prosecutor to rebuild the case – records and evidence are gone, witnesses have disappeared. [Florida] Judge Joseph McNulty points to the pending case of a man sentenced to life imprisonment in 1938 for second-degree murder after being tried without a lawyer. ‘He’s pleading not guilty, and it will be impossible to try him. The witnesses are dead or gone and I’m not sure they can even prove there was a corpse.’”

In the Los Angeles Times of December 10, 1964 an article stated, “Forty-six men in San Quentin prison’s death row will be among the most vitally interested parties Dec. 15 when the California Supreme Court takes a new look at two decisions which have helped keep the gas chamber idle for nearly two years.

“The State attorney general and 55 of the State’s 58 district attorneys say the original decisions threaten to free at least seven convicted killers and could release thousands now serving prison terms for various crimes…”

The report went on to state that a jump in Habeas Corpus cases soared from a low of 62 to 335 in October alone from the San Quentin prison, all filing with confidence that they would be released, just from the previous court ruling.

The case is well known and quoted across the country as Gideon v. Wainwright 372 US 335, an offspring from the “14th Amendment.”
I remember also that very day the same detective informing me how the Supreme Court claimed that the 1868 clause “due process of law” in the “14th Amendment” required indigents to be furnished with free counsel in certain cases. Surely, in 1868, due process did not mean that a person had a right to free counsel when arraigned for burglary. While it was standard practice to help and provide indigent defendants with some counsel when tried for very serious crimes, “requirements” were virtually nonexistent either in the States or by any court opinions.

So, what suddenly brought on a ruling that the “due process” clause really meant, and intended, for counsel to be appointed to defendants on most crimes? Did the words in that “14th Amendment” mean something different than as stated in the Fifth Amendment? Though these phrases are almost identical (the latter, following named crimes, inferring prosecutions and as a form of defense in federal jurisdictions; the former mandating against the States only), in any case, says this detective, our country went from 1792 to 1963 with no repercussions coming from the due process clause.

My detective now moved to the heart of the matter.

“But now we have criminals completely convicted for crimes being released under this new ruling where millions of previous criminals were always convicted without such vagueness of the court’s redefined due process clause as stated in the ‘14th Amendment.’ Not one Senator in the 39th Congress stated in any manner whatsoever that ‘due process of law’ would mean the people owed all defendants free lawyers.”

I called the waiter over and ordered a can of tuna, by that time ready to sup and chow with this cat.

As he continued, I thought a lot on what the detective was saying, and listened to many more of his gripes (stashed also in boxes for evidence), instances of how the court has used the “14th Amendment” to turn constitutional principles around. He even spoke of the Miranda v. Arizona case, where suddenly the accused, apprehended in the middle of a crime, had to be given a warning and a reminder about his rights to counsel and his rights not to be a witness against himself. If this little speech weren’t delivered, the court would then claim due process of law had not been carried out!

I asked him whether he was referring to the Fifth Amendment, wherein a person cannot be compelled to witness against himself, or the “14th Amendment,” which says nothing about compelling.

“The court,” he answered, “has claimed that the ‘14th Amendment’ incorporated the first eight Bill of Rights amendments.”

Then, in a voice of sarcasm and with a hand to the side of his mouth, he added: “But, here again, we find that the 39th Congress never mentioned this, either.”

“Have you any idea where that court could’ve gotten such a doctrine?” I asked, thoroughly bewildered. “Surely you’ve overlooked a clue somewhere…”

“I am a student of the 39th Congress!” he fired back belligerently. “It never came from that Congress.” He sipped his coffee again, looked over at my can of tuna and thanked me for listening, but stated he had to go.

Just as he was leaving, we both heard several times a loud “Meow!” And, gazing to the part from which this had emanated, jumping at us we witnessed yet another cat out of the bag. “The 14th Amendment was never ratified!” exclaimed the fluffed-up herald. Now who’s gonna believe this cat, we both wondered.

The flyer that then fell off a bundle of messages he was carrying strapped on his back made it necessary for me to revise my account as above related, adding quotation marks here and there. Let me tell you what it said under the bold headline, “Fourteenth Amendment Never Ratified!”

“A Lawyer by the name of Charles Wallace Collins exposed the fact in 1912 that the ‘14th Amendment’ didn’t pass. Nor was it ever ratified according to the U.S. Constitution’s Article V.”

Wow! We sat back down, transfixed by this new lead, intent on finding out more. Our new arrival, purring softly, was eyeing us askance as we continued perusing his captured flyer: “Collins has a book out that he wrote in 1912 exposing those facts…”

Suddenly that cat scurried on past us. “Here, kitty, kitty!” we both called, leaping to our feet determined to run down this most important news just out of the bag. “Here, kitty, kitty!” But he kept on down the street, a really long-whiskered and speeding cat, high-tailing it.

Well, Detective Felix, you have a new trace-down job.

By the way, before finishing, I must tell you that in looking for any further clue, we closely examined this bag that the cat had sprung from. It lay now empty, of course. Printed upon one side was simply “RECONSTRUCTION AND CENTRALIZATION 1848. EXPIRATION DATE, NONE – signed, Karl Marx”

So remember your American Tuna, and don’t leave home without it.
Will Homeland Obscurity jail us for noticing what’s in front of our eyes?

Cats and the Dictionary Conspiracy

If you will recall the setting: all kinds of cats just “hanging around,” purring to share their origins — and from which bag they had been loosed — with anyone who would listen. Let’s continue the story from there. Well, we were hearing one at length that had emerged from a bag labeled “The Fourteenth Amendment,” a cat putting us wise to numerous inconsistencies in the Supreme Court’s rulings, its many different interpretations of that “amendment” and how it has hurt our system so badly that the old moral judgments have been crossed out and replaced with new forms, natural rights having fallen from the top of that fence down to the bottom while civil rights sit up there yowling.

We were interested enough in what this cat had to say about all the abuses of the “14th Amendment” and how there seems to be no correct way to apply it with the same moral judgments we used before it was ratified, or as we thought at the time that it was a ratified amendment, when out of nowhere this other cat came along and laid before us the bigger revelation that the so-called amendment had never even been ratified! So I will pick up from that point.

If you remember, I told you that the cat had paused only long enough to say his piece and then dashed away. Well, what happened was: the detective and I were so flabbergasted with this news, we dropped everything then and there and tried to catch that cat. But it was gone, as if with tin cans tied on its tail. So we decided to split up; only one of us would pursue it and the other stay back and see if any of the cats still lolling and licking their paws around here might know anything about him.

Since I’m no detective, I suggested that private investigator Felix run down the fleeing cat and I would stay, purr and rub up against these other cats to get whatever information I can out of them. It turns out that, because of this arrangement, I now have a lot more to report to you. So, while detective Felix runs down the cat with that evidence on how the “14th Amendment” is an illegal immigrant, we will find out something about this cunning one that has been snuggling warm and cozy among our true constitutional amendments.

Whoa! Talk about lying down with the enemy, can you imagine resting anywhere near that “amendment”? Not me. I moved several clauses back; as a matter of fact, to the 5th Amendment, and just made my bed there. Meantime, we should all approach the “14th amendment” like it were a puffed adder — alone from what we have received from these cats here. If you can, be sure to trace down the book that the fleeing cat had mentioned, by Charles Wallace Collins, The Fourteenth Amendment and the States, published in 1912.

That was a very enlightening experience, with what I had found out in general about this place, and then the many revelations these cats had to expose — which, I assure you, I shall share with you.

The first feline I approached knew what I was after, I guess by the expression on my face and seeing as how I had just tried to run down one of those “14th Amendment” cats. Here I learned that the witness having fled with the 14th Amendment story had to be constantly on the run because of so many intermediaries everywhere trying to re-bag him. There is a good chance I may never see that one again because they have an ADB (All Dogs Bulletin) out for him.

About this time there were as many as 12 to 15 cats surrounding me and going “catatonic” — wanting to tell their stories about the bags they were let
out of. After I had got their meows down to a purr so I could give each one a chance to tell why it had been bagged in
the first place, and since Mr. Felix may be weeks or even months getting that “14th amendment” cat back here, I should
have time to hear all of their tales. I noticed one very pretty calico cat that was a little over to the side and not so much
with the group. I asked what was his story and why he is not over here in the crowd.

One of the Persians said, “We call him Doubtful Dell because he’s a
conspiracy theorist and does not always fall on his feet. Boy, does he
have some stories that will make you think, though. And a lot of what he
has to say sounds good, possible even, but then he seldom offers enough
proof to convince us alley cats. Granted, many of his stories are backed
up with a very large amount of substantial evidence that some do find
convincing.”

“So, his real name is Dell?” I asked.
The reply: “When he first showed up here we learned his name was
Morris, and he had come from a farm.”

Morris? Now, that is so unusual these days. This to myself: “Perhaps
he is a plant!?” The cat asked if I remembered the Farmer in the Dell. I
was going to say that I had never been a farmer nor visited a dell, but
thought… maybe I should just play this one out and keep the cool cat
image I have already established with them. So I said, sure, his wife’s
name is Lisa and they have that local salesman Mr. Haney that comes
around a lot huh?

I got the ole eye brow from him a little but he went on and said, “Well,
about Dell: to hear his side of the story there was much more to why he was taken by the dog than what we were all
told. According to Dell It was a setup by the cow. As you recall, the cow took the dog that in turn took the cat. Anyway,
the cow supposedly set him up because Dell knew the former was a beef cow just impersonating a milk cow so as to
avoid the butcher, hence the chorus, ‘Hi-Ho, the Dairy-O.’ According to Dell, he figured the cow needed to get him
out of the way – reasoning that if there were no cat around then there could be no cat to let out of the bag. He also
pointed out that the cow had a choice of over 30 breeds of small dogs present to choose from, and he selects the most
vicious German Shepherd ‘standing the furthest away,’ and one that instantaneously began chasing him.

“All of us cats know there’s a certain amount of bull in any cow story” he sniggers.

“Then,” I asked “Why is he allowed to hang around with this group if his story has holes in it? For one, everyone
knows that cows are unable to co-conspire. At least on this side of the moon.”

Replied the Persian, “We let him stay among us because he is reasonably honest and will always spill the beans. He
is educable and has come a ways. besides, this is a haven for all cats that have been let out of the bag regardless of the
weight and value of their stories. We are in the process of upgrading the shop so as to only attract the more elite and
most sought after cats. Oh, and you can also ignore ‘Xerox Willy’ over there; he’s just another copy cat. Not a whole
lot we can do with him.”

Okay, so now we know there are some important cats and others less significant, even if they all have been let out of
the bag. Let’s waste no more time on Dell and get to this meaningful specimen I spotted among the company.

So many cats there, and each of them with a very big story to tell! Unfortunately, mostly they’re products of the
suburbs and far from the momentous information we need at this time – like Doubting Dell, for instance. But you’d
still be surprised how some of these subtle ones get around. Just then the idea flashed to me: “If only we had Socks
here, that White House cat could tell us quite a bit.”

I will let you know that, looking over among these colorful critters, I noticed one carrying on his back two very
large leather books, ancient-looking and with some of the leather missing – the chipping and cracking of age,
probably. So I asked the other kitties, if they didn’t mind, to let me inquire of him about that double burden on his back.
They all agreed, but hissed under their whiskers a little at not being chosen first; so, I thought, well how about if I treat
you all to some salmon while we hear his story? MEOW! they exclaimed in chorus. So I ordered the required amount
of salmon for them, and the mesquite-grilled trout for myself. “Be sure to lick your paws before you eat,” I reminded
them.

“Okay, Kitty,” I said to the heavy-laden one. “Let’s hear about those two books and what information you have.”

He told me that the pair of volumes were dictionaries, one printed in 1863 and the other 1864. The reason he keeps
them both handy at all times is because people want proof. “They are not just going to believe my story without the
evidence.”
I thought to myself, “They do?”

Maybe I’m from the wrong area; I’ve found many people to be gullible. As my expression again gave me away, he read my mind, and stated, “No one is going to believe that a professional lexicographer would purposely falsify the definition of words, especially if that news comes from a cat just let out of the bag.”

“You do have a point,” I observed.

“Some of these words,” he continued, “have been arrested right out of common usage and detained without counsel into the ‘archaic’ vault by iconoclastic sophists, to be replaced at their whims with captious and fallacious utterances. Thereafter, the ‘disappeared ones’ aren’t heard from again in public discourse.”

“Hmm!” I thought to myself. (Well, of course to myself, I’m not going to think out loud and have this cat imagine that he’s speaking over my head. Shall I admit the learned one speaks better English than I?)

He proceeds to lay out both dictionaries and begins walking me through them. In no time at all, after examining some very key words and discerning his cat tale to be true, I flip to the fronts of the two volumes to see who would’ve done this; for, no way could I believe that such was by a legitimate staff of lexicographers.

Webster’s? No. No! They are the most trusted authority known to the American people! Looking at just a few more words I became speechless – fanatically gesturing, pointing to my mouth beckoning to know which one of those cats had got my tongue. I was glad they understood sign language even if not the official version; more like panic reading. Having regained my voice, I reprimanded the guilty scudder and told him he might benefit by learning the many ways I can skin a cat if he will not do that again.

I now move to expound on what I’ve discovered, and enter these two dictionaries into evidence. To begin with, words are very important in describing government. For instance, the definitions of Federal, Confederation, State, E Pluribus Unum, Congress, Alliance, Democracy and Union to speak of only a few. I will first brief you on each one, then select certain quotes directly from the two dictionaries by way of comparison.

Federal was changed from denoting a confederacy, to acquire a national meaning – Confederation remaining the same except for the second part: “The United States are sometimes called the Confederation.” Hmm! Wonder why they left that out?

State was changed from an Independent Political body to a national dependent (and later editions further reduced the States down to nothing but “territorial units”).

E Pluribus Unum (our motto) was changed from “One composed of many… many States confederated” to “One government formed of many States.”

Congress was changed from “The assembly of the Delegates of the Several States” to “The assembly of senators and representatives of the people of a nation.”

Alliance remained otherwise the same, but, struck out had been that part stating, “A confederacy.”

Democracy was changed to mean the same as “a Republic,” and

Union had acquired a new meaning, no longer “States United” but a consolidated, single body.

Now for the quotes.

Congress [from Webster’s 1844 edition (Retained until 1864)]: The assembly of delegates of the several British colonies in America, which united to resist the claims of Great Britain in 1774, and which, in 1776, declared the colonies independent. 3. The Assembly of the delegates of the several United States, after the declaration of independence, and until the adoption of the present constitution, and the organization of the government in 1789. During these periods, the congress consisted of one house only. 4. The assembly of senators and representatives of the United States of America, according to the present constitution or political compact, by which they are united in a “federal” republic; [“federal” meaning a confederacy; see below] the legislature of the United States consisting of two houses, a senate and a house of representatives. Members of the senate are elected for six years, but the members of the house of representatives are chosen for two years only. Hence, the united body of senators and representatives for the two years, during which they hold their seats, is called one congress. Thus we say the second session of the sixteenth congress [and have a clear understanding that the parties making up that Congress were delegates from their respective States to a “political compact” entered into by “the several United States” assembled in a “federal republic” – all this in the 1844 definition by Noah Webster].

Here we move to the 1864 edition.
**Congress** [post 1863]: 5. The assembly of senators and representatives of the people of a nation especially of a republic, for the purpose of enacting laws, and considering matters of a national interest, and constituting the chief legislative body of the nation [no longer “the several States,” but one nation and one citizenry instead of the independent Citizens of the several States].

**E Pluribus Unum** [pre 1864]: One composed of many; the motto of the United States, consisting of many States “confederated.”

**E Pluribus Unum** [post 1863]: One out of many; one composed of many; – the motto of the United States, as being one government formed of many independent States.

**Federal** [pre 1864]: 1. Pertaining to a league or contract; derived from an agreement or covenant between parties, particularly between nations. 2. Consisting in a compact between parties, particularly and chiefly between states or nations; founded on alliance by contract or mutual agreement; as a federal government, such as that of the United States.

**Federal** [post 1863]: 1. Pertaining to a league, contract, or treaty; derived from an agreement or covenant between parties, especially between nations; constituted by a compact between parties, usually governments or their representatives. 2. Specifically composed of states or districts which retain only a subordinate and limited sovereignty, as the Union of the United States, or the sonderbund of Switzerland; constituting or pertaining to such a government, as the Federal Constitution; a Federal officer; friendly or devoted to such a government.

About this time a second book-bearing cat dashed up, laying before me another dictionary that supported our findings with what the Merriam Webster Company had done. The newcomer wished to participate in the efforts of our group, as he too was fresh out of the bag bearing information of similar kind and believing it needed to be entered as corroborating evidence. Since the emerging practice in America was to manufacture new definitions and let many natural meanings just pine away and out of existence, this cat bore proof of the whole process in a collection of dictionaries he had obtained while researching the issue. Bragging of his volumes he stated that, in 1864, absolutely no other dictionary in the world carried the same definitions as this edition above cited, while pointing out that even the Merriam Webster Company had for 36 years stuck with the original and true definitions, and only after the appearance of that corrupt edition did other dictionary companies follow the trend.

“Yep!” Meowed the two cats together, “We are out of the bag.”

“May I see the one you have in your paw?” I asked.


**Federal**: Of or pertaining to, or founded upon and organized by, a compact or act of union between separate sovereign states; as (1) by a league for common interest and defense as regards external relations, the internal sovereignty of each member remaining unimpaired, as the Hanseatic League or the Germanic Confederation; or (2) by a permanent act of a union founded on the consent of the people duly expressed, constituting a government supreme within the sphere of the powers granted to it by that act of union, as the United States of America. The constitution of the United States of America is of a very different nature from that of the Germanic Confederation. It is not merely a league of sovereign States for their common defence against external and internal violence, but a supreme federal government or composite State acting not only upon the sovereign members of the Union, but directly upon all its citizens in their individual and corporate capacities. Wheaton Elements International Law section 52 p. 78… From 1776 to 1789 the United States were a confederation; after 1789 it was a federal nation [note: in 1776 and 1789 the words confederal and federal were synonyms].

“Paw that 1930 *New Gresham English Dictionary* over to me,” I asked. Opening it to the word “federal,” there I read

**FEDERAL**: Fed’er-al, a. [Fr. federal, fr. L. foedus, foederis, a league or treaty, seen also in confederate; akin to fidus, faithful, fides, faith. FAITH] Pertaining to a League, covenant, or contract, particularly between states or nations; united in a federation; confederated; founded on alliance between several states which unite for national or general purposes, each state retaining control of its home affairs, civil and criminal law, &c. (a federal republic) – n. One who upholds federal government.

Note that this dictionary was not influenced by the Merriam Webster company but retained the true etymology as historically laid out by all the earlier lexicographers. There are others also that unfailingly stuck with the truth in America. For instance, as late as 1947, the *Winston Dictionary College Edition* states:

Fed’er-al: pertaining to, or of the nature of, a compact or union of sovereign states, which agree to delegate certain specific governmental powers to the new state or government thus formed; 2, of or pertaining to an agreement or alliance between sovereign states which, for certain purposes, agree to act together; Federal, 1, designating, or
pertaining to, the government of the United States as distinguished from that of any State; 2, during the American Civil War, favoring the North: Federal Reserve Bank, any one of twelve district banks established in the United States by the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, to cooperate with the Federal Reserve Board in Washington in regulating and aiding the member banks of each respective district: Federal, n. during the American Civil War, a supporter of the North.

Notice the Federal Reserve Bank and the Federal Reserve board are mentioned here, but that is another cat and another bag. Moving on to the Webster’s Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary,

Federal [1965]: 1. archaic: of or relating to a compact or treaty; 2 a: formed by a compact between political units that surrender their individual sovereignty to a central authority but retain limited residuary powers of government; b: of or constituting a form of government in which power is distributed between a central authority and a number of constituent territorial units; c: of or relating to the central government of a federation as distinguished from the government of the constituent units.

Notice that the original meaning is given as “archaic,” a modern admission that the definition is still true, but has been archived. The difference between such an archived word and other terms relegated to obscurity (whatever they described having become disused, thus naturally fading from the language) is that “federal,” plus additional entries already mentioned, and here I’ll quote Mr. Cat, “have been arrested right out of common usage and detained without counsel into the ‘archaic’ vault by iconoclastic sophists, to be replaced at their whims with captious and fallacious utterances.”

Since the trend is now all “Porterized,” it’s unlikely that an American will find any modern dictionary sticking with the true meanings of these words. For instance, the New World Edition’s

Federal [1978]: 1. of or formed by a compact; specifically designating or of a union of states, groups, etc. in which each member agrees to subordinate certain specified common affairs. 2. designating, of, or having to do with a central authority or government in such a union; specifically designating of, or having to do with the central government of the U.S. [Central authority??]

Federalize [pre 1864 Webster]: To unite in compact, as different states; to confederate for political purposes.

Compare that with the 1965 Webster’s Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary:

Federalize [post 1863] 1: to unite in or under a federal system; 2: to bring under the jurisdiction of a federal government.

And then see the New World Edition’s

Federalize [1978]: To unite (states, etc.) in a federal union. 2. To put under the authority of a federal government.

Federalized [pre 1864]: United in Compact.

Federalizing [pre 1864]: Confederating.

Federate [pre 1864] League; united by compact, as sovereignties, states or nations; joined in confederacy; as, federate nations or powers.

Federate [post 1863 (1978 New world Edition)]: to league together… United by common agreement under a central government or authority… to unite in a federation.

Federation [pre 1864]: The act of uniting in a league. 2. A league; a confederacy.

Federative [pre 1864]: Unit: joining in a league; forming a confederacy.

State [pre 1864]: 5. A political body, or body politic; the whole body of people united under one government, whatever may be the form of the government. More usually the word signifies a political body governed by representatives; a commonwealth; as, the states of Greece; the States of America....

State [Post 1863]: 9. In the United States, one of the commonwealths or bodies politic, the people of which make up the body of the nation, and which under the national constitution, stand in certain specified relations with the national government, and are invested, as commonwealths, with full power in their several spheres, over all matters not expressly inhibited. [Notice the emphases on “national government” and the term, “invested as,” not that each of them is a commonwealth; which meaning, by the way, of commonwealth, was also changed in the 1864 edition.]

State [1978 New World Edition]: …any of the territorial and political units that together constitute a federal government, as in the U.S.

State [Webster’s 10th Colligate Dictionary 2001]: 7: One of the constituent units of a nation having a federal government <the fifty–states>.

State-hood [1868]: The condition of being a state; esp: the status of being one of the states of the U.S. [note: the origin of this term was at that time when new State Constitutions were written by the Generals who held military forces over the defeated Constitutional States having tried to hang onto the original “Federal” Government. I should also add that those 1864 definitions would determine the political conditions in such new “States” no longer in possession of their formerly sovereign governments, each having become a “territorial unit,” the newly-applied sophist definition of
**State right-er** [1947]: one who advocates strict interpretation of the U.S. Constitutional guarantee of states’ rights.

You may want to note that the term, “State(s),” as in the organic Constitution, is something quite different from its altered application in the “14th Amendment” of 1868. And the word *Congress* – before all that “reconstruction” legerdemain – would also have gained another meaning, in this so-called amendment, from what it had in the Constitution’s main body, *i.e.*, if we are to believe that revised dictionary of 1864.

A historical brief ought to be prepared to help us understand the lexicographer behind those many falsified definitions, that we might determine whether or not he made such changes properly and legitimately. Noah Porter worked with Merriam Webster Company from the start, when they bought out the rights to continue Noah Webster’s works after the latter had died in 1843. Looking at all dictionaries from 1847 (the first Merriam Webster edition), and taking into account the fact that Noah Porter was on the staff maintaining former definitions as laid out by Noah Webster even through the 1863 version with no changes whatsoever until 1864, we see that the argument over States rights had peaked, and tyranny-minded men at that time were left with no other means of winning but by the sword and pistol.

Since Noah Webster in all of his efforts to define these key words having to do with understanding our government maintained that we had a confederation, no editing was called for. Everyone except those lusting for inordinate power considered the States sovereign – separate entities administered by their respective governments, and duly authorized to maintain themselves thus. The “delegated” (also a word changed in the 1864 edition) “Congress” was a body of representatives beholden to these States, and therefore not a nation.

We should also take note that when such words were falsified, Noah Porter and the Merriam Webster Company stood alone in the whole English-speaking world as to these new meanings. All lexicographers including Samuel Johnson, Boags, Walker and even Joseph Worcester maintained that “Federal” meant a league or compact (Compact was also changed), therefore a confederacy. Noah Webster and the entire realm of lexicography, along with Porter, had been agreed on this. But in 1864 Noah Porter and the Merriam Webster company sent the people of the United States into an obscurity of meanings and concepts.

Although a book could be written on this subject, I offer but one final item for consideration here, which rather than my conclusion is more of a question. Why did the 1864 “American edition” make these changes while the same staff left alone the previous definitions and did not alter them in their “London edition”? Yes, that’s right, the “American edition” had been reconstructed; London and all of the other English-speaking countries received their 1864 editions with the proper definitions intact, though both the American and the London compilations came from the same staff. Not until 1877 was England presented with the false definitions.

So, if you like what you’ve learned here, next time you see a cat treat it well and open that big can of tuna; rub him on top of the head as he purrs his way through it, for one never knows if it’s a cat-out-of-the-bag or just another scaredy-cat.

Oh! And here comes Detective Felix just now, toting a bag labeled “Socialism and the 80th Congress.”

Maybe later.
Political correctness as defined elsewhere than Merriam Webster’s

Cats and the crime of smuggling

In the last part I told you Detective Felix had brought in a bag labeled “Socialism and the 80th Congress.” I also implied that I would let you know about that cat. But, as it turns out, all these felines were too interested in the dictionary conspiracy and they insist that I finish with it, all of them knowing there’s much more to this story than last reported, and that Homo Sapiens being (next to themselves, of course) their favorite species should know there’s a lot more to it from just what little I’ve told you. After all – they have run, hidden and sacrificed almost nine lives to get these truths out to you, and I agree.

Just to touch on Detective Felix a bit, he did return with that bag, and had traced the Socialism cat back here to the Tuna shop. I’m sure he is among us somewhere, but, being just released, is still hiding right now. In the meantime, Detective Felix has some good leads on that 14th Amendment cat, so please stay in touch with us and make sure we have the necessary contacts for you to share in this information once we recover communications with that fleeing, fugitive cat-out-of-the-bag.

Okay, I am back with Mr. “Dictionary” Cat (most of them decline to give actual names for fear of being recaptured by their baggers; I assign nicknames accordingly), and he has filled in some additional history that we should first be aware of.

I have been very busy with examining their dictionaries, and, I assure you, those books are everything these cats say they are. From what I’ve been shown, the wars against the true definitions begin in 1823 when a man by the name of John Taylor wrote that book called *New views of the Constitution*. After reading it, I certainly owe you an explanation on how those words pointed out to me by Mr. Cat were modified in conspiracy with our enemies from the very beginning, at which time Mr. Taylor exposed the *national* form already put into practice.

Let’s pick up with when Mr. Taylor Cat eased into the discussion by stating, “If you are a constitutional historian, then you will know that no publication of the debates at the constitutional convention was released to the public until 1818.” That is correct, my Sapien friend; the government officers operated from 1789 until 1818 with their own interpretation of what they were and while feeling that the confederation should function as they saw fit. It turns out that the delegates had already begun practicing as if those States having given them limited authority retained no rights, and that the government was a strict *national* regime. But, once John Taylor read the debates, he wrote his book exposing the facts: that the confederated States were behaving as if a national government had been ratified. His first chapter begins with the meaning of certain words, and here I quote Mr. Taylor: “I shall attempt to ascertain the nature of our form of government, and the existence of a project to alter it. Principles and words are the disciplinarians of construction, but the latter require definitions to come at truth” (*New Views of the Constitution*, section I, 1823). Here we find his argument against the national government by going through words such as Union, Federal, Compact, United, Congress, State, etc. So the stage was set for the continued debates to grow further apart even to a state of war. It will be remembered that John Taylor had every lexicographer in the English-speaking world to support his claims, including Noah Webster.

“Thanks,” I replied to Mr. Taylor Cat. “What I gather now is that, because of this book written by John Taylor, nationalism lost its primary thrust as many statesmen, including John C. Calhoun, for instance, came to the light of its truth. This began the States’ Rights arguments about the power to nullify Federal (keeping in mind Federal meant Confederate at the time) Laws.”

Daniel Webster (not the dictionary’s dedicated keeper, Noah), while throughout the early 1830s ignoring the compact’s true basis, argued in the halls of Congress for the national side despite understanding the meanings of its words. It should also be pointed out that Daniel Webster was an associate to Noah Webster if not an outright friend, for letters found by historians show their having written to one another. This being the case, how can one excuse Daniel Webster’s brutalizing the federal compact and imagining a national charter? Taylor also pointed out that the Constitution was framed with the word “national” in it, but one of the first things done on June 25th, 1787 was to strike out the words “national” and replace them with “United States of America” as found in the Article of Confederation.
Now we are beginning to see what had transpired here: the nationalists sending in their arguments on wooden pegs since their conclusions didn’t have a leg to stand on; and, if not for a cat that got out of the bag, here we would still be seeing our long-trouser-wearing nationalists walking, or so appearing, among us even as sprinters or marathon runners. We would have been deceived from the very beginning. But, as it turns out, we now know that such a cat actually has pulled the curtain open and exposed the great Daniel Webster as a wizard of clods.

This enlightened revelation at the time leveled any national theory before it could utter a syllable of untruths. The reply by those who didn’t like having their wings clipped was to begin a wrecking campaign against all lawful States’ Rights doctrines, and since that couldn’t be accomplished via truth it had to be done with force. The principles laid out by our confederated States would now come under attack from mercenary rather than the true meanings well understood by our forefathers. Slavery as the front issue would cause so much confusion that the actual form of government might be overlooked. But this worked only to instigate the secession of several Statestreasuring their sovereignty, after which, unelected usurpers overthrew by the might of the sword those original precepts and agreements.

Realizing in 1864 that the aggressors would win insofar as physical force was concerned, now the power of information that had checked the eventual instigators of that war in 1823 would surely rise again. So chaining this truth away forever would involve altering public concepts regarding the principles and forms of our republic; thus the power-hungry took to deceit. First they begin by smuggling false definitions to the people under the wraps of a famous dictionary, *Merriam* Webster’s having got control of the name when Noah Webster died. Next task, find a way to do away with the equally-noted *Dictionary* by Joseph Worcester. Remember, prior to the War of Northern Aggression – and known as the “Great Dictionary Wars” – all the literati of the times gladiated the works of Noah Webster and Joseph Worcester as superior lexicographers. The most educated and elite men split hairs over which was the best overall, little difference supporting any preference. It seems as the war went on that it was more and more clear that neither lexicographer had much on the other. So, exactly what happened, that one of these dictionarians disappeared into obscurity where the other kept his household popularity?

While not having found the cat that could tell us, it’s possible both dictionary companies were approached about their willingness to make falsified definitions to counter Taylor’s *ad populi* arguments revealing what had been agreed upon, and certain facts suggest why one of those otherwise equal lexicographers was blackballed into oblivion.

First, Worcester’s 1864 edition and all issues thereafter never falsified these words, and even in supplements pointed out that changes were due to the so-called Civil War. As late as 1904 (which is the last I have found of Worcester’s work) it still retained the true definitions. Fact two: The new regime displayed signs in government printing offices instructing proofreaders, editors and compositors to “FOLLOW WEBSTER.” And then the Merriam Webster Company bragged of its pedigree by claiming that Webster was the choice of the Courts. In some of their old dictionaries a page can be found quoting Supreme Court Justices praising the work of Webster (Merriam, that is, for Noah Webster’s works were barely to be found after the verbal ambuscades had distilled them out and concocted a new language brew. This potion has been the American drink ever since).
Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes announced publicly that he preferred Webster over Worcester, but the final blow came when Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard, wrote in 1900 that he had made use of Worcester’s for the past ten years but now would happily replace Worcester with Webster. It should also be noted that Eliot called the *Merriam Webster Dictionary* “The Revision.”

I shall now quote from the pen of Robert Keith Leavitt in his book titled *Noah’s Ark, New England Yankees and the Endless Quest*, published by the G. G. Merriam Company, 1947, page 67: “The West Point cadets were furnished with a copy of Webster for each room – and required to keep it in good condition. Schools in State after State and city after city (prodded by a well organized ‘adoption campaign’ from Springfield) standardized on Webster. Legislatures made Webster their authority by resolution, and courts followed this lead, right up to the Supreme Court of the United States. In every executive department of the Federal Government Webster was the authority.” It should further be noted that imperialistic countries flocked for rights to make Webster (Merriam, that is) the chief dictionary for educating their subjects. The King of Siam, the Sayid of Aleppo, and China, were among those so beseeching; this in light of the fact that many other English dictionaries were still being published and remained available – such as Johnson’s, Walker’s, Bailey’s, Boag’s; and, foremost, Joseph Worcester; not to mention a dozen other fully-qualified lexicographers.

Adding all of the above to what these cats have already meowed into my ears as reported to you previously, we can see that old saying “Curiosity killed the cat” is nothing more than a myth; but the cat-out-of-the-bag has become a major source for information. The dishes are now empty and they’re wanting to cat nap, so,

I shall get with you now on the one that Detective Felix tracked back here. He did saunter on, joined the salmon feast, even spoke very good English.

---

It will be interesting.
From “14th Amendment” to labor plantation

Lazy as a cat! But not for long...

Since I’ve not heard from many of y’all, I suspect you may not be getting my reports; or, if so, you’re being heavily guarded by the dogs. I have whole bagfuls of reports from these cats, so I trust you’re not under such heavy watch as we are here. I know there’s a new “patriotic” bill authorizing the kingdom to increase the number of guard dogs and pay them more, so that we cats I mean these cats will not fully meow their stories across the land even though they’re out of the bag for several months now. In any case, I shall commence this latest report in hopes that it gets through.

Confronted by several cats still wanting to add more of what they know about the dictionary conspiracy and having heard them out, I’m persuaded that I should send you this most valuable information. However, as promised about the 80th Congress, I shall break from it for the moment to give out this imperative information that will help y’all understand why you’re working harder than ever and accomplishing less than in times past.

And I must first admit my own mistake. It was the 79th Congress, not the 80th. I was corrected by one of these cats thinking the error might be blamed on them. With that out of the way, I’ll now introduce to you a “freecat,” as he proudly meows his status. I can’t give out his real name, but shall refer to him as Mr. Beveridge Cat: a real big, fully-whiskered Maine coon. Mr. Beveridge Cat has no time to lie around or just purr and watch the birds hopping; he’s been very active at pursuing his call of awakening the cat world out of their sleep and getting them back into the more alert state of cat napping.

When asking him how he came to be a political spokescat, I found he had lived a quite normal life, until circumstances sent him forth purrless for several years. Having nothing to purr about in all those dark and foreboding days, he grew wise for the experience. Mr. Beveridge Cat once lived all snuggled in a very fine, cozy, but low-budge home. In other words, there was no such thing as a cat in the cradle and a silver spoon in that house. Day after day he would lazily saunter from the one room to another, stop by his favorite window and leap up there to watch a few birds, claw on the ole pillow, etc. In short, he was simply taking in the handouts available. But one night when his owners were having a budge crisis and wondering how they might make such and such payments, he heard one of them say, “Regrettably, it looks like we’ll just have to rob the kitty to help us out this time.”

Boy, did he light out from that place never to return, even though the wife had come to his defense and argued belligerently that they not touch the kitty. That cat was not taking any chances. Which sent him from alley to alley, street to street, living on the scraps of what were already scraps left over from other scrappers. And some talk about a dog’s life! Try being a cat when our mortal foes are going through their “dog days.” He finally came upon a librarian in need of a lap friend to pet and cuddle while she read. This is when he began awakening to the reality of how most cats get caught up holding their paws out wanting tuna for nothing.

I found him chatting with the other cats, telling them how this had all come about that he was overworked and underpaid.

Hold on! I think I see the Fourteenth Amendment cat behind the counter peering out at me and motioning that I should hurry over. He finds very little leisure to meow much of what he knows at a sitting, always prepared to dash away again. So, while I’m listening to him now, I’ll just play you this recording I made of the talk between Mr. Beveridge Cat and these other cats about socialism in the 79th Congress.

Meow, Meow, meow! Hold it, Kitty. You need to speak English around here. I know you’re excited, and the bag you have been in for so long must’ve been an ordeal for you.

“Yes, it has, Detective…” a pause, then meowed out loud: “Cat-eyes!” He’s gaping at me while taking full credit for having exposed my secret identity.
“Huh!! Detective Cat-eyes? How did you find me out? I thought I had hidden my secrets well.”

“Huh!! Detective Cat-eyes? How did you find me out? I thought I had hidden my secrets well.”

“What do you take us unbagged cats for?” he asks, giving me the ole eyebrow look. “Can’t you see what’s happening now? There’s no more masquerading! We cats-out-of-the-bag are catnipping that so-called Project for Some Kind of a New American Century in the bud; or, if you prefer, snatching a sparrow posed as an eagle from the Bush. For exposing lies is what we do.”

Okay, we’ll deal with this secret identity thing later.

Here he begins cuddling up to me, impatient to reveal the contents of that bag he was let out of.

“Not to be imposing,” this as he double purrs, “but you did promise to hear me out, and then just wandered off on that dictionary thing.”

“Surely,” I replied, “you’ll agree it was a story worth publishing?”

“Oh yes, but mine is a hot one too. And you did tell those you’re relaying this to that what I’ve got will prove interesting.”

“Okay! However, as you’ve interrupted the sequence of my reports, I want you to know you’re not the only cat here with a story to tell. We are all unbagged, but the truths we must send out aren’t welcome by the media’cracy; only certain local weekly newspapers and a few patriot tabloids and talkshows listen to us. Those exposing their Big Lie, the establishment liars repeatedly claim, belong to a vast, right-wing conspiracy. So, let us grab the attention of folks who aim to recover constitutional self-government at home after learning how it slipped away, and that means we stop scratching at each other for the catbird seat and meow amiably one at a time, not all these ‘catatonic’ sounds and grievous screechings echoing so as would recall that black cat bricked up inside a wall in Eager Allenpoe’s tale. You can’t all meow at once!”

“Yes, sir, I agree, and apologize for my overreacting. I do want to know more about Mr. Taylor cat and Mr. Dictionary cat and what else they further have to say.”

“Okay.”

“Okay what?”

“Okay you have the floor!”

“My story begins in London, and…”

“In London? We don’t need to hear about what happened in London. We are American cats and have our own problems over here.”

“Yes, but London is just where it began. The problem only migrated here as passed by the 79th Congress. Remember the good ole days when the American people were mainly enjoying a leisurely life? The time when you would catch a daytime ball game, and the Sapiens could even fill a stadium during daylight, or, as we now say, ‘working hours’?”

“Yea, those were the good ole days.”

“Have you ever heard of William H. Beveridge?”

“From London?”

“Right; he was a leading socialist and chairman of the Inter-Departmental Committee for the British government. He wrote the ‘Report on Social Insurance and Allied Services.’ In 1942 he penned a sequel to this study and called it, Full Employment in a Free Society, a book published in November of 1944 which sold so well that a second printing of it was released the next month. In his first report, he proposed a ‘freedom from want.’ He aimed to render everyone ‘free’ from ‘idleness.’ In other words, if you can go to ball games, then you must have time on your hands; you’re idle, and, in his mind, ought to be working. By giving new meanings to old terms, a large part of the proposals in this work makes one fear the idleness of having to hunt, fish, go boating, attend ball games or spend time with the family. Government, after all, makes no money off citizens who just lie around. The status of ‘unemployment,’ then, should be a dread condition that scares one into making sure he’s working.”

“So what you are saying is that this chairman guy, uh, Beveridge, was writing a book on the need to put everyone alive to work?”
“Well, he didn’t say it that way, but I think you can look around and see where each member of the household is working, ‘fully’ or if not, and bitterly trying just to make ends meet. On page 20 of his book in the second paragraph he states, ‘Idleness is not the same as want, but a separate evil, which men do not escape by having an income.’ His meaning, with regards to the term ‘full employment’ (pages 17 and 18), wasn’t that everyone should be employed, but rather the scheme called for always having more vacant jobs than unemployed people. Just to quote him briefly:

‘Work means doing what is wanted, not doing just what pleases one.’

‘All liberties carry their responsibilities. This does not mean that liberties themselves must be surrendered. They must be retained’ (page 23; by the way, is retained liberty still liberty?).

‘It is much easier for men and women to change their occupations and it is much easier for boys and girls to choose their first occupations, with reference to the demand in particular industries, than it is for work-people of any age to move their place of residence’ (page 25; this was the first mention of ‘women, boys and girls’ as part of the social plan).

‘On the views taken in this Report, the most urgent tasks in Britain, once war is over, are, on the one hand, the making of a common attack on the giant social evils of Want, Disease, Ignorance and Squalor, and on the other hand, the re-equipping of British industry, whether in private or Public hands…’ (page 31).

‘Organized mobility means that if and when change is necessary, men and women shall be willing to change their occupations and their places of work, rather than clinging to idleness’ (page 32).

‘To ask for full employment while objecting to these extensions of State activity is to will the end and refuse the means’ (page 36).

‘Finally, as the war has shown, there are many people not dependent on employment and not normally in the labour market, such as pensioners and married women, who can be drawn into employment at need. It may be necessary to use emergency powers of direction to get such people to work, but if that is necessary the war emergency itself will justify the use of such powers to the public opinion’ (page 130; emergency Powers?).

‘Controlling the flow of adaptable juveniles is the simple, painless way of adjusting the total supply of labor in each industry to changes in demand’ (page 171; at least he was ‘thinking,’ uh, ‘painless’).

‘Remember I told you that this book by Mr. Beveridge did not see print until Nov. 1944. The American edition – as if we needed his lessons, too – wasn’t published until 1945. However, it is clear that the London edition must have made its way into the hands of the President of the United States and was studied by the sitting Congress because, on Jan. 6, 1945, just shy of seven weeks from when the first edition appeared, certain identical doctrines began moving in the halls of Congress. On that January day the President proposed a plan for ‘full employment’ pitched as a ‘Second Bill of Rights,’ eight of which stood not only identical in nature to the Beveridge scheme but came almost in the same order proposed in his book. Those eight ‘rights’ were as follows:

‘1. Full employment after the War is a Must Federal Program [I remind you of the above quote from Beveridge’s report: ‘after the war’].

‘2. Demand for goods and purchasing power by private consumers must be high enough to replace the loss of war-time consumption by the Government.

‘3. First reliance for the production of jobs is on private enterprise. If it fails, the government will make up the difference in order to avoid mass unemployment. There will be need for close to 60,000,000 jobs.

‘4. Federal financing of small business enterprise in peace as was done in war.

‘5. The large outlays [the term outlays is used in Beveridge’s book] of money required should be raised through normal investment channels with the Federal Government taking the special; and abnormal risks’ [this really means the tax dollar will take on all failures from these ‘abnormal risks’].

‘6. A part of this expansion will be made through the development of river watershed projects like TVA [hmm, I wonder if the Ashwander vs. TVA doctrine was now being considered], highway construction and housing.

‘7. The millions of productive jobs in this expansion will be jobs in private enterprise.

‘8. Under such a program the national income can be maintained at such a high level that the public debt can be retired in an orderly manner and a reasonable reduction made in taxes’ [did public debt retire or taxes get lower, it now being some 60-plus years later?].

“Inside less than a week of February the ‘Full Employment Act of 1945’ debuted as S.380, 79th Congress, first session. Throughout that year there were regular deliberations and changes, but the final ‘Beveridge Plan’ passed the following year as ‘The Employment Act of 1946’…”

[Ahem.] Okay, I’m back and, yes, I did get some more information about that 14th Amendment. Now where were we? Let me cut that recorder off.

I am sure you will agree, having heard this tape, that it’s high time to “let the cat out of the bag,” as we put it. But let
me further point out to you that we’ve also discussed this new term the President used, that had never been applied to the citizens of our several States in such a way before. The President said the new economic bill of rights could be implemented without discrimination as to “station.”

Station? The normal anti-segregation formula had been: “without discrimination as to race, creed, color or national origin.” Station, as it turns out, was the term used in Beveridge’s book, also noted and pointed out by Mr. Wallace in argument before the Senate committee.

It just goes to show how a cat that once tooted a sign saying “Will roll on back and paw at stringed ball for tuna” can be down to nothing, but through the simple act of a catless librarian is now a “catchy” spokescat. The book he was reading while in the lap of his Sapien friend was called *Whither Solid South* by Charles Wallace Collins, written in 1947. That would be the same Collins our “14th Amendment” cat mentioned to us in my first report.

Speaking of him, He only wanted to ask a question now that the Communist Party has been recognized as a political entity – one that could never take office, since the constitution forbids every other form of government except republican. So how can the “14th Amendment” be reconciled with that? Better yet, can the court grant a non-republican polity any recognition at all in our government? Purrty interesting, I must say.

Well then, let’s lap up what’s left and chat about the coming tuna crash.

What tuna crash am I talking about? Well, I’ve heard about some cats up there in the Northern States living in Catmandu that’ve opened their own banking system hoping to purr it by a catnapping Catgress, sneak a bill through calling for a Kingdom Reserve Bank. It would be issuing tuna certificates bearing different numbers. They’re referred to as Kitty or Tiger Notes, depending on value.

What? You must think we do nothing but stare at fish bowls! We’re not like you Sapiens. We will stick with the tuna and salmon standard as God is our witness. If the Kingdom Reserve Bank wants to pull the wool over our heads, then they better gather up a lot more sheep, because they’re going to need them trying to trap us. We’re out of that bag. Besides, we have watched what the Federal Reserve bank has done to the Sapiens, and we listen to Cat Stevens. He warned that longer boats were coming to take us, and advised us to “hold on to the shores.”

I’m glad you are already aware of this, because, as I hear it, once their Kingdom Reserve Bank is enacted, they will appoint a Catman of the Board; and I believe Mr. Bernarncat is already the one chosen to work your kingdom over. When this takes place, those who think his fishy notes guarantee a 6-ounce can of tuna on demand – as they will read in bold letters at first – could see them eventually good for nothing but kitty litter. And that, my friend, puts a new light on the phrase, “robbing the kitty.” Also, don’t let some of those special pouches called Albacore mislead you. I see them showing up in the store quite a bit. They are good for now, but keep a close eye on the ingredients. See that your can opener stays clean and free from gummy buildup.

**The Purrteenth Amendment: I smell a rat**

**The Slaughtermouse case**

I shall open here with some good news about the Fourteenth Amendment cats we now have flooding our tuna shop. Cat! You will not believe the plethora of information coming from all these unbagged cats around here. It turns out that there is more than one Fourteenth Amendment cat. In fact, we’ll have a band here tonight at the tuna shop, Paw Revere and the Whiskers performing for us on their “Purrrteenth Amendment” tour.

The leader of this band is a well-educated cat that overcame old “handout” times known as the “Chicken in Every Pot Syndrome” and his struggle for social acceptance. Of late having found his call, he has sold over one million copies of his newest release, “Oh! John Campbell.” A writer of both fiction and truth, he has been on the best seller list more
The author of “Unbag Me Now,” “10 or More Lives to Give,” and his most famous, “The Runaway Amendment,” we are quite pleased to have here tonight, and even more so because we get to do a pre-show interview. So let me introduce to you the one and only – Thomas “Cat” Cooley!

Mr. Cooley, there has to be a million questions the readers would like to ask, all about your rise from the old fence-walking days and working by candlelight because you couldn’t afford to electrify. But we also want to know how you came to make this album with so many hits that, if this were baseball, you’d be intentionally walked from now on. Explain to us what gave you the idea for “Oh! John Campbell.”

“Well Mr. Cat-eyes… uh, it’s okay to call you that now, isn’t it?”

“Yeah, why not, its out of the bag lately anyway. But let me first remark on the super status of your ‘Oh! John Campbell,’ the song that has taken America by storm. Folks, it has been so popular you may as well call it the new Confederate Anthem. Being sung across America by young and old alike, not only has this song become the favorite among Southerners, but even in the North people have seen the truth about States’ Rights and rallied behind the ole call of such men as John Taylor, John C. Calhoun, Patrick Henry and, of course, the father of States’ Rights, James Madison.”

“Yes, Mr. Cat-eyes, I’m amazed myself. I am so glad to be a part of this great turnaround coming upon the American people. Just as you mentioned, regarding Madison: most people didn’t know about him being a States’-Righter.”

“Oh, Yea! Even though at first he did favor a national government and drafted the Constitution in such a format, soon as that plan failed there was no protest from him. Madison’s Federalist Paper number 45 and his Virginia Resolution show he was in favor of, and supported, the confederated form that did get ratified instead of his original proposal. But let’s move on with your Purrteenth Amendment Tour. How has this come about?”

“It started when I was studying for my degree in legal history. I was making quite a bit of progress on the early days of our Constitution, learning just what it meant, the original intent and how the States had delegated certain enumerated rights to a Federal government. As you’ve interviewed Mr. Dictionary Cat, learning the exact dates in history that the Merriam Webster Company of that time falsified many key words, it’s clear that you well know what Federal meant in those days. I took note of the chronology, thinking it would be of interest to look around, dig into those clues, and now just look what the cat has drug up!”

“Your song ‘Oh! John Campbell,’ how does it play into this?”

“Well, Detective Cat-eyes, it has no direct bearing on the dictionary conspiracy per se, but when I started centering my studies in that time period, I came across a legal battle fought by Louisiana to save States’ Rights. John Campbell of Alabama, who had held a seat on the U.S. Supreme Court and gave up that office to support the State of Alabama in the cause of States’ Rights, like many a turncoat politician, was a changed man after the war. He became the leading lawyer for the White butchers of New Orleans in the Slaughterhouse cases.”

“From what I have read, John Campbell presented some very good arguments on behalf of the butchers. Your song arouses suspicion as to his motives, though.”

“Yes, Campbell did make arguments that should have prevailed, one being the fact that the law was signed by Governor Warmoth after the legislature adjourned. A second argueable argument was that the statute had not been signed within the five day period mandated by the Louisiana Constitution. Thirdly, the statute had no constitutional basis because, in enacting it, the legislature had granted a monopoly ‘in every sense of that term.’ But, read further the arguments of Campbell. Remember, he was a strict States’-Righter just five years prior to his arguments found here now advocating, ‘It is a mistaken idea...that the Legislature of the States have powers of legislation limited only by the express prohibitions of the constitutions of the States or the Union, or by necessary implication…’ He further maintained in his briefs that the exercise of legislative power to pass the Slaughterhouse statute ‘is contrary to the fundamental principles and theory of our form of government.’”

“I see what you are saying, Mr. Cooley. Some of his arguments were on target but flying on the wrong plane.”

“Yes; in other words, these arguments, if contained in States’ Rights and according to State constitutions, etc., would have remained on course – with the right of the people of each respective State to deal with the issues at their own level of sovereign power. It will also be remembered that, at the time the ‘14th Amendment’ was said to have passed, there were no other doctrines or interpretations to influence Campbell or anyone as to its meaning.

“What made me suspicious from the very beginning was that John Campbell, an ex-Supreme Court Justice with nothing before him but the fact that the ‘14th Amendment’ aimed to constitutionalize the civil rights act of 1866 which intended no more than to raise the level of the freed slaves of the time, could not have been confused like these modern jurists – swarmed with so many variations of meanings today that there is nothing to stabilize an agreeable definition
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and purpose for the said ‘amendment.’ So how is it that John Campbell thought White butchers, already protected by their own State constitution, needed Federal relief from the Slaughterhouse laws passed on June 1, 1869, this by way of the so-called 14th Amendment that they had rejected just nine months earlier? Why, in the midst of the chaos of that time, ask for still more interference from the occupation power? Only after military force had usurped their government out from under the people of Louisiana (and, of course, all the other States both north and south) did they agree under duress to accept that fate, and here John Campbell had the White butchers begging for ‘14th amendment’ protection.”

“I see what you mean. It is not whether the Slaughterhouse ruling is right or wrong but rather, is it right or wrong under the correct jurisdiction? – for instance, the due process clause of the 5th Amendment – if it were to become a Federal question at all; otherwise it must remain inside the State.”

“Now you are glimpsing somewhat the light. These butchers were defrauded into looking for protection under a Federal power. That contrasts heavily against the known tradition of Baron vs. Baltimore.

“Also, and you have to remember this; whether the amendment passed or not, it had its purpose: to make the civil rights act of 1866 constitutionally acceptable for the newly-freed slaves. Now, let me ask you this, detective. Was any particular butcher one of the freed slaves? Another question: Were there other grounds to base the case on, and make a winning argument so as to altogether avoid this 14th amendment that would soon come battering and clanging minor privileges against the majority rights of the people and their States as stated in the Ninth and Tenth Amendments? Why the 14th? That is the real question; not this bickering about what was ruled on in the case itself, but, why the 14th?”

Aw, heck, I see you have to go, as it’s time for your band to get on stage. Thanks very much and, if we have time, I will talk with you after the show.

Now, readers, you are in for a real treat. We’re going to sing along with Paw Revere and the Whiskers. Since cats are not known for their abilities to write music, the band has adopted the tune of “Oh! Susanna.” So, if you know that one, sing along with us.

**Oh! John Campbell**

He came from Alabama with the 14th on his mind,
Going to Louisiana where the 14th was declined.
He thought all night the day he left, on the lawsuit that was due;
It doesn’t matter ’bout that case, John Campbell don’t you sue.

Chorus:
Oh! John Campbell, don’t you rob us blind.
He came from Alabama with the 14th on his mind.

The “amendment” number he might use would rally a new cause
And help these future criminals to get around the laws.
The rights of States were then controlled, as the Union did subdue,
But we had better plans than that; John Campbell, don’t you sue.

Oh! John Campbell, don’t you rob us blind.
He came from Alabama with the 14th on his mind.

The constitutions of our States were written for this land;
Read Baron versus Baltimore and you will understand.
The 14th never could have passed, till Yank his pistols drew;
As, otherwise, the States were free; John Campbell don’t you sue.

Oh! John Campbell, don’t you rob us blind.
He came from Alabama with the 14th on his mind.

The Ninth and Tenth Amendments he never did pursue,
In fact, he left them out, of course, so the Court would not review.
The case was one of privilege, he argued to excess;
And emphasized equality, instead of due process.

Oh! John Campbell, don’t you rob us blind.
He came from Alabama with the 14th on his mind.
The case of the case that never was

Marshall vs. Madison

A very educated group, that Paw Revere and the Whiskers, putting to good use the entertainment industry. We all sang along with a number of Paw’s great hits and enjoyed ourselves immensely. I asked him after the show how he thought his Purreteenth Amendment tour was affecting the community and whether that high degree in American legal history might not better de-program listeners if he came on as a lecturing professor at colleges and other educational facilities. After all, I opined, he would be more respected as a cat wearing pinstripe fur while quoting books and documentaries than just a mere guitar banging entertainer. His response: colleges were not inviting speakers that are purists on historical facts. He would never get the message out going that route. Dr. Paw then named Garfield as an example of potential success by playing the comedian. It came to him that Garfield has acquired a huge audience out there; people go out of their way to catch his jokes.

“I figured by getting into entertainment it might work for me. Instead of wasting time on frivolous subjects like Garfield does, I would use that stage to educate the cats that will soon educate the Sapiens.”

Paw then gave as an example the song, “Being for the Benefit of Mr. Kite,” written by the Beatles in 1967. In that one Mr. K wanted to challenge the world by way of entertainment. If the enemy could by such distractions introduce false philosophies, surely our Paw Revere might in like mode resurrect the truths. Just another form of fighting fire with fire. Okay, next witness. Now comes a cat that has something on the Marbury v. Madison case.

“Yo, get down off that tree and tell us what you’ve been waiting all this time same as all of the others around here. Purrrty interesting, as there were 65 years between the subject of his expertise and the Fraudulent Fourteenth. Well, now, we’ll just pause while he circles and hunches his back, hops sideways over toward me to let it be known he does not care for such sarcasm. I’ll assure him it’s for the purpose of emphasizing his story, the one we shall hear in a minute; uh, it seems we’ve got hecklers. What is this? Looks like their leader is masquerading as one of us, but (if I hear him right) “one with different views.” And he’s leading a whole band of argufiers with him. I think we’re in for a cat fight.

Uh oh. My 14th Amendment cat has just stepped aside with a “nonchalant attitude.” He sees the same as the rest of us that our intruder is nothing but a polecat, disowned even by his fellow weasels. “Big Daddy Cat,” he’s calling himself, and he’s renouncing all of our patrons in this Tuna Shop. Wup! One of the locals, Xerox Willy, now marches over and claws him across the face with three slashes, leaving a big Z across his face, and slinks off sniggering and purring a single word: “Thinner.”

That puzzles me. Let’s get over here and see what it was all about. “Hey, Xerox, don’t you have Zorro and Stephen King mixed up?”

“No. I may copycat a lot – that’s why they call me Xerox Willy – but I was trying to be original in combining the two; the Z stands for zootic, meaning diseased.”

“Uh! okay, I think I get it, but don’t you mean epizootic?”

“No, I took off the epic part because he won’t be spreading much of his philosophy amongst us cats anymore. We’ll not have New World Odors like him thinking they can just waltz in and occupy the forum. Since you’re reporting these happenings to the Sapiens, I want them to know we don’t put up with polecats claiming superiority over us. We are the sovereigns.”

Um, can y’all hear that loud, collective “Meow!” from the Amen corner? Whatever else may happen here today, a perplexed Big Daddy Cat has just turned away and left. Some of us know better than to let that cat’s nose get inside our tent; we catnip it in the bud.

Okay, as you can see, we have our days and disruptions. So now let’s get this 14th Amendment cat to tell us about Marshall v. Madison. We shall call him Midnight, even though he’s white as snow. You’ll know why after hearing his
story. But first, as I’ve said before and will say again, we never reveal the true names of these cats because the catbaggers (something like carpetbaggers) would find and have them back in the bag before we could even purr twice. Which reflects a recurring problem in our own nature. It seems no matter how patriotic one is, nor determined in the stands we take, and regardless of all the training we’ve gone through, our natural instinct simply kicks in. We have already lost a few of our out-of-the-bag cats because of this natural compulsion to degrade ourselves. They took the bait when their previous owners showed up with a bag of cat treats and just called out, “He-ere, kitty, kitty, kitty,” and before you knew it they leapt to the call without thinking and back in the bag they went.

We once lost a cat because the bagger was using artificial bait. He had this battery operated can opener, showed up and just turned it on. You know what the sound of a can opener does to us; practically every cat in the shop leapt to its feet and, seeing the bagger was a stranger, only reluctantly held back. However, it isn’t easy for a cat to turn down his previous owner. So don’t think it frivolous that we never reveal the true identities of our friends. You might’ve even noticed that on those few occasions we’ve allowed an on-camera interview or a photo release, we distorted the face or put a black rectangle over the eyes. Now to our story.

“Mr. Midnight, in what way can we link the Marshall v. Madison case with the 14th Amendment?”

“Well, there is always a beginning, you know, to everything; so, in order to help people understand the ‘14th Amendment,’ let’s go back there where the real battle was drawn and look at whose was the first claw to throw down that gauntlet against States Rights.”

“You mean Marbury v. Madison?”

“No, that’s an incorrect call. The truth is that it was the Chief Justice of the supreme Court. He came fighting James Madison with practically every word penned in his dictum. Notice I identify the document as a dictum instead of a Case. Also take note that I never capitalize the word ‘supreme’ when referring to that Court. One of the things you will find out here is that, at the time of this Court, the constitution not only gave very little power to the judiciary but the first cats put in office didn’t get around to naming what the Court was to be called. The term ‘supreme’ was purposely ratified in the lower case, inferring an adjective. But some polecat then stuck his nose in and ‘amended’ that portion of the constitution, making it integral with the proper name by capitalization. I can assure you, that didn’t transpire by way of Article V. And as for my pointing out that this famous treatise was no court case but merely an Arbiter dictum, hear me out and you’ll know yourself that such is the fact.

“For here the seeds of destruction were planted, needing only to be watered, tilled and cared into fruition. This is where the canker worm began boring into the minds of the people, gnawing at the vitals of our constitutional organs, relentlessly driving the established Confederacy of States to accept nationalism and finally put it in print…”

This was going to be an astounding story. I took notes and will paraphrase the more urgent things covered by Midnight in that conversation. First is James Madison and his understanding of our States’ Rights. Let me quote from his vast writings two arguments I found to be very clear and to the point. One you may peruse in Federalist #45: It explains that “...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.” I should not have to remind you readers that the word few means “not many,” and always refers to the lesser part of any whole. Madison also stated that such delegated powers were not only few, but even defined. These “defined” powers understandably left no mystery as to their identity. Hence the opposite was declared for our several States’ numerous and indefinite powers.

Purrty interesting, I must say.

It will be remembered that within the Constitution’s first draft, Madison had inserted the words “national government.” But after the States gathered for ratification the first thing they struck out was that term, “national government.” They replaced it with the words “United States,” meaning exactly the same thing as understood in the Articles of Confederation, which clearly spoke loudly against any kind of “national” government.

Keeping this in mind I quote Madison from the Virginia Resolution: “...The States then being the parties to the constitutional Compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows of necessity that there can be no tribunal above their authority, to decide in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated; and consequently that as the parties to it, they must themselves decide in the last resort...” This was stated on January 7, 1800.

It is clear from these writings that the Constitution’s drafter and chief statesman of the time had given his definite opinion as to what he meant in the said document and how he understood its final draft after the debates leading up to its passage. One should take notice that their agreed-upon proposal was sent to the States to become ratified – not to their federal chambers, but to the States.

This much said, I believe we have a right understanding of the federal government knowing few and defined powers, our State governments possessing innumerable and indefinite reservations. It is observable that Madison in his writings has also defined the supreme Court’s role regarding controversies inside the States. In other words, the
State Courts have the final authority for all cases inside the States.

What’s instructive here is that members of the supreme Court knew their limits. In those early days the supreme Court of this government played but a modest role in its trinity of branches. One need only peruse Article III to see the crumbs it received from the whole pie gracefully served up at the constitutional convention. In those early days, the office of chief justice was looked down upon. In fact, the first chief justice of the supreme Court, John Jay, gave up that seat voluntarily so he could become governor of New York. And John Marshall refused an offer by John Adams for a position on the court two years before finally accepting the seat as chief justice.

The last of the federalists, and this is well known, were being smothered out of office. John Adams so willingly accepted the new bill allowing sixteen more federal judges to be seated (Marbury and 15 others – a then total of 42 judges) that he spent his last hours, literally all of them, in his office getting those he appointed commissioned and sealed. Thomas Jefferson would take his oath the very next day, and he had made clear his opposition to such an increase of judicial officers; so this kept Adams busy until close to midnight seeing to it that the appointments got finalized and even sealed by the Secretary of State, whose name we shall leave out for now. At the end of the Adams administration – into the midnight hours – he accomplished this mission and got them into office before Jefferson took over the following day. Those seated were called the Midnight judges.

Next morning Jefferson found upon his desk the sealed commissions, but refused to order them delivered thereby resting the appointments in fieri (incomplete). Both Jefferson and Madison understood this as having killed them.

Enter John Marshall. The judges sued, demanding that a mandamus be delivered to them commanding their completion of the process. Remember, until this time the only official opinions put forth concerning the Court’s powers were those of James Madison and a few anti-federalists such as Brutus (a code name honoring the assassin of Julius Caesar, but believed to be Robert Yates). It was argued by Brutus that if any branch should possess power to review the constitutionality of laws, then Congress, seeing as how its members were controlled by election and therefore answered to the people.

But what does John Marshall say? He comes to the Court session where neither Jefferson nor Madison would appear; for, as they saw it, that body had no jurisdiction in the matter. Marshall even so states, but continues with vain jangling and nonsense about his opinion, which, as stated, has no jurisdiction (this from his own mouth) and therefore no place in American case law. True, he wrote that famous “null and void” phrase. But the man invoking the term was at the same time setting a precedent for a “judicial review” power by the Court, an authority not of the constitution but rather fantasized by John Marshall.

One need only read the debates to learn that this question regarding judicial power had been brought up two times, yet failed to be placed in the constitution. The fact that such authority is not defined in Article III and was rejected twice is proof enough. Ex post facto laws are expressly forbidden. This constitutional statement makes clear that supreme Court justices cannot create law from the bench. Their acts are judicial, not legislative. The supreme Court cannot legitimately exercise “judicial review,” as, by the very nature of that office, its judges enter the case after the facts; and nothing they might say, even if granted legislative powers, could become law if passed after the facts. Hmm! I mean, “Meow.”

And just who was Secretary of State on the night that John Adams was forcing all these commissions through? None other than John Marshall.

Yes, my Sapien friends. It was John Marshall now sitting on a case where, even if the court had original jurisdiction in the matter, he could not have legally helped decide it, for having been an actual party to those commissions. This is typical, and not all that unusual, for the actions of Marshall. Commissioned to be chief justice while still serving as Secretary of State, for one month and four days he held both offices. Let us also point out here that, in 1827, we see Marshall still holding that supreme Court seat while also participating in the Virginia Convention. Oops, that cat sprang out much too fast, and has now gone prowling after further clues.

A curious cat myself, I find it purrrrrty interesting that just about everything stated in his unofficial decision contradicted what Madison had said; this with Madison now holding the position that Marshall had occupied until March 4, 1801. And another purrty interesting aspect of this is Marshall’s implied power to place mandamuses on other branches of government.

A thing that mystifies me is that no one seems to have made an issue out of this at the time. It must be remembered that, in the history of mandamuses, they always were used for the purpose of commanding inferior judges to perform exactly as they should. Never in the history of the world had a mandamus been imposed outside the judicial branch, for it was strictly a device for controlling their own. The very thought that Chief Justice John Marshall could command one of the other branches of government was unheard of, and this established a nationalism that would eventually become legislation from the bench, a fraudulent “14th Amendment” disguised as law attempting to decree in writing
the national powers that had been accumulating ever since this Marshall vs. Madison “case.”

Notwithstanding Section 5 of said “amendment” wherein Congress exercises powers to enforce such nationalism, we see the judiciary still doing all the lawmaking. Some refer lightly to the increasingly tragic situation by euphemism as judicial review, judicial legislation or judicial protection. Call it what you will, but we all know it’s judicial tyranny.

So what we have here is a string of Court rulings that supersede all State authority, legislation and executive powers. It’s law according to the supreme Court’s position, whatever its whim at the time. Article V could amend the constitution and grant them those powers if the people really wanted it that way.

You Sapiens have presently got nine chief justices making all your laws for the land.

Purrty legislative, as I can with my better eyes see.

Black cats, witches and ghost writers

If you’re wondering what those sounds are all about… we captured this recording of noises emanating from the Supreme Court chambers, and have determined it’s a totally different tribe of screeching black cats, a rattling of chains as the ghouls get together there with all their ghost writers to see what this week’s precedents will be. I know that sounds spooky, and here’s such a cat-out-of-the-bag as might’ve better held off until Halloween to tell his spooky tale around the campfire, but it seems the supreme Court couldn’t wait that long to bring out their ghosts.

I have here a cat that’s only half out of the bag, apparently unable at this time to come completely into the light, but what information he does bring is sufficient that we should give ear and hope to coax him on out. The bag seems to be holding this creature stuck, some kind of an adhesive material that looks like it is made from “I will tell you but I can’t give you my name” compounds. I always hate those types of cats, but in this case there is enough of the story out to warrant hearing whatever more we can.

“Did you know,” meowed this one, “the Justices do not write those opinions sold to the public as their own?”

That is all it took for me and I’m ready to hear the whole half of this subject not stuck in the bag. Nor am I alone on this. Usually around our place if it’s just a few sections of information we don’t pay much interest; but Mr. Dictionary cat, Mr. Taylor cat and the rest of the purring class have gathered around to get today’s episode of this and with full gleefulness. In fact the purrs are even lowered because they’re intrigued at the thought that the most notorious moves against the rights of the Sapiens are not even by the Justices’ themselves.

You know from our last report, Marshall vs. Madison had made things bad enough with the so-called supreme Court Justices assuming themselves to be constitutional interferers, I mean interpreters. We found out how Marshall vs. Madison became the Magna Charta for judicial review. Which was unfortunate by itself, history having a choice to turn either the Madison faucet on or tap into the Marshall spigot for a flow of justice wherefrom the people might drink, even purrhaps a little of both. But, as we now have seen, Madison’s original concept was shut off from the outside and could not have even been turned on, thus leaving only the false notions of Marshall to quench any thirst for truth.

Well, at least Marshall wrote his own opinion. But, take these courts of modern times: especially the Warren Court – where the absolutely spookiest ghost stories and changes took place. This cat is now dangling a bit more from the bag, unable to come on out, and yet contented that we’re listening to what he knows and can tell us.

Here our cat begins purring in relentless comfort, as he names all the writers behind that Warren Court. The 1957 list provided these names:
In 1966, he was quoted in an interview with ghoul writers. "Leave them kids alone." Well, I can understand now what Roger Waters was getting at there. Anyway, back to the education. We don't need no thought control, purr, purr, purr," or something like that; then it turns to, "Hey, teacher! continue these policies by "carrying on the tradition of the Center's founders, by working to reform law and policy through the courts, through legislative advocacy, and through public education." The Center, in the Warren court’s legacy, comes on as a very strong advocate for the “14th Amendment.” It seeks to continue these policies by “carrying on the tradition of the Center’s founders, by working to reform law and policy through the courts, through legislative advocacy, and through public education.”

Have you ever heard the song, “Brick in the Wall, Part II”? The words go something like – “We don’t need no education, We don’t need no thought control, purr, purr, purr,” or something like that; then it turns to, “Hey, teacher! leave them kids alone.” Well, I can understand now what Roger Waters was getting at there. Anyway, back to the ghouls.

One firsthand account of how law clerks are hand-chosen came from former Justice Sherman Minton, who retired in 1966. He was quoted in an interview with U.S. News and World Report when asked what his clerk did for him: “As
far as my own [clerks] were concerned, they prepared memoranda on all certiorari. On opinions, they would correct them as to the facts and they would make suggestions on the law with respect to opinions. If I agreed with them, the opinion would be rewritten.”

In response to a question put to him by *U.S. News and World Report*, “Did they draw up memoranda, citations, precedents, etc., or merely supply a list of pertinent decisions?” His response: “They prepare memoranda on what is in the certiorari and what the lower court had decided and recommend whether we should take the case. As you know, the Supreme Court is selective in choosing cases to hear.”

Therefore, from this statement by Justice Minton, we learn that his little helpmates made the decision as to whether a case should even be taken. So much for appeals to the court; we should petition these clerks.

*U.S. News and World Report* went on to ask if the clerks drafted opinions. Justice Minton replied, “In my case, after an opinion was written I submitted it to the boys for their comments and criticisms. And if their criticisms were valid the opinion was rewritten.”

Now, did you catch that, or should we just call it ball one and pitch again? “Submit it to the boys”? And make changes as per their opinions? So, instead of nine justices making decisions, there are at the Warren Court 27 ambuscading cases. That’s right, or what else would you call that system of deciding which ones to accept and then how to rule on them?

Here is where we could not get that cat fully out of the bag. Even *U.S. News and World Report* didn’t reveal the name of this high government official, but did point out that he was a “former high official of the Government with experience in the federal judiciary” when quoting him as saying, “Many lawyers feel that law clerks in the Supreme Court and other U.S. courts are too influential in preparing some of the opinions handed down”; then adding, “If a judge is not aggressive or very able, if he is a very busy or lazy man, his clerk can be very influential… If the judge is a man of strong mind and convictions he will be exercising his own convictions in writing opinions. However, the reverse can be true… There is a well-founded belief among lawyers that some judges rely heavily on their clerks, and the clerks are in a position to direct the judges’ attention to certain views and conclusions that may show up in their opinions.” You might take note that even after Brennan’s time on the bench, himself now deceased and his clerk Clyde Szuch no longer with the court, all of this is still changing our America. Merely going by what the cat has let partially out of the bag here, we see their efforts as yet undermining the law by these three methods they use in place of the U.S. Constitution’s Article V. You can go to their website at [www.probono.net/ny/news.cfm?fa=detail &id=41373& fromFa=summarizeArchive](http://www.probono.net/ny/news.cfm?fa=detail&id=41373&fromFa=summarizeArchive) and see that such social plans aren’t just in their heads, but are active and gaining over the American people.

The 1997 *Harvard Law Review* stated, “If Chief Justice John Marshall was the chief architect of a powerful national government, then Justice William Brennan was the principal architect of the nation’s system for protecting individual rights.” Did you catch that? “Powerful national government.” And this, many years before the “14th Amendment.” I will say about Marshall that he can be credited with the origination of “judicial creativity” within the courts. Such innovation has nothing but the boundaries of imagination to limit the court’s reign. Remember: no document or verbal confirmation existed that would have backed John Marshall’s Marbury vs. Madison dictum, a remarkable work that is yet to be exceeded either by himself or any supreme Court justice since. His painting of nationalism, judicial control and the power of the court was canvassed out with rainbows in the air, unicorns roaming meadows that flourished daisies; birds, butterflies, and streams led to the great national fountain of youth, a picture of such beauty that no one even suspected, nor could they have heard, the rattlings of serpents in the background. Because of the mesmerizing effect of this picture painted by Marshall, no viper could strike so long as the painting held captive its beholders. But then came such stalwart critics as the John Taylors and the John C. Calhouns, with senses that could penetrate into the background images, unveiling that sound back there to the spellbind beholders who only belatedly shook off these effects and made out the rattle, when, then – and only then – did the hidden serpent strike; causing the “Civil War” and the venomous “14th amendment.”

The Court has no constitutional license to make laws by way of opinions, but even ghost writers do so today. I was told by one cat that sleeps close to the Court house steps that mysterious sounds emanate from there, like, “I’m on the first step, where is my opinion?!“ “I’m on the second step, where is my opinion?!“

Ooohhh! Rattle, clang, Boo! I’m outta here and turning on all the lights. This is spooky – and getting scarier.
The arts of invading, occupying and creating States

The cat in Lincoln’s hat

In previous reports I’ve covered a host of events that played a large part in finalizing the “14th Amendment” – from Marshall’s mere dictum falsely labeled as a Court case that gave us the notorious Marbury vs. Madison escapade becoming the Magna Charta for Judicial Authority, to falsified definitions in a well-respected dictionary, to the new regime that depended on those lies by grammarians for its continuance, to tricks played in the slaughterhouse cases that ended up with the Court’s clerks doing most of its work as ghost writers. Our cats have done well in bringing us these stories of events that either directly related to the “14th Amendment” or helped pave the way toward said amendment.

Once upon a time, before the “14th,” a 13th Amendment had appeared. Back then there lived a very strange guy wearing a very strange hat that lived in the house that Marshall built. The general who supported this strange man’s crimes also lived in the house that Marshall built. Many others of kindred sort took up residence in the house that Marshall built, all willing to keep the tradition laid down by Marshall. Sure, there would be a few Joseph Story drapes put up here and there, some Daniel Webster wallpaper, even upgraded shutters styled by Benjamin Curtis – but only to improve the house that Marshal built. These all lived in a fairy tale tailored to form an evil and flagitious kingdom in charge of upkeeping the house Marshall had built. Now, about that strange guy in the strange hat.

We have here a cat that has on a leash this pony he has brought with him, and the latter wants to tell us about how the 13th Amendment was conspired and bribed into place. Mr. Nevada Cat tells us that the 13th Amendment was ratified by the trickery of Abraham (sorry, but there may be kids reading this) and one of his right-hand men, Charles Dana. Turns out that, after the war, this strange-hat-wearing guy wanted a no-slavery amendment. Such an amendment, he believed, would be worth a million military men. The guy imagined that if he could pull this off and get the thing ratified, then it would save the Union having to draft another million men, thus forcing the Southern States into submission without all that extra military.

“Ever heard of the cat in the hat?” this Siamese asked me.

“Well, what was in the hat that this strange guy wore may have been a cat-in-the-hat, but not your friendly Felis Catus. It was of the genera Vormela. In other words, a weasel.

“When Lincoln [oh well! the kids will hear it enough] reviewed the status of the Union, he realized that finagling his amendment through would require adding another State on paper.

“Nevada boasted hardly enough people to form a county, much less a State, but it was Lincoln’s determination to make them a State, and very quickly. So, in March of 1864, his bill came up before the House of Representatives. It had strong opposition, and looked unlikely to pass.

“So Lincoln assigned Assistant Secretary of War Charles Dana to do some bribing. Dana had already been doing spy work for Stanton, who, because not trusting Grant, had put Dana as a tail on him. It was Dana that, through such spying experience, was able to point out to the guy with the weasel in his hat three key ‘representatives’ who needed either cat A or cat B from his hat in order to vote for Nevada becoming a State. Lincoln would announce: ‘It is easier to admit Nevada than to raise another million of soldiers.’ But, as it turns out, Lincoln’s plan got both Nevada and the soldiers; for we know that, during Reconstruction, the soldiers came anyway.”

“Where did you get this information?” I asked Mr. Nevada Cat.

“ Heck! I got it straight from the horse’s mouth. You’ve seen the way they are, all over themselves with their victories, bragging how they did it and all. You know their own kind takes it as ‘clean scheme’ instead of ‘dirt that hurts’ – so why not write a book on it?”

“Is that the book you have in your paw there?”

“Yes. Just take a look at page 174 and read on through 177. While you’re doing that, let’s also hear it straight from
the horse’s mouth, so they can have a bit more to tell their Sapien contacts.”

Here he pulls on the reins and his friend comes forward, hees a little, but then begins: “In March, 1864…”

“Excuse me. First, let us acquaint our readers with your source. Okay, folks, the name of this book is Recollections of the Civil War, 1902, by Charles A. [I’ll have to protect the kids from that one for now, but at least it’s not heard so often as that other profanity]. And let’s have it straight from the horse’s mouth. Now you can see this is not all about cats, but horse sense as well. Everyone knows if it comes straight from the horse’s mouth that’s as good as a cat-out-of-the-bag.

“Okay, Mr. Ed? Silver? Flicka, Friday or whatever your name is…”

Says the Horse: “Well, first, I am a horse with no name and I’ve been through the desert with a Sapien with no name. And, to think, he would sing about me and my namelessness. ‘Hee!’ to him, too. You will be surprised how many of us horses have something to say as well. Why do you think they send us out to the pasture claiming it’s all over for us? Okay, I’ll quote verbatim.

“In March, 1864, the question of allowing Nevada to form a State government finally came up in the House of Representatives. There was strong opposition to it. For a long time beforehand the question had been canvassed anxiously. At last, late one afternoon, the President came into my office, in the third story of the War Department. He used to come there sometimes rather than send for me, because he was fond of walking and liked to get away from the crowds in the White house. He came in and shut the door.”

“He shut the door? We all know what that means, but go ahead.”

“‘Dana’ he said, ‘I am very anxious about this vote. It has got to be taken next week. The time is very short. It is going to be a great deal closer than I wish it was.’

“‘There are plenty of Democrats who will vote for it’ I replied. ‘There is James E. English, of Connecticut; I think he is sure, isn’t he?’

“‘Oh, yes; he is sure on the merits of the question.’

“‘Then’ said I, ‘There’s ‘Sunset’ Cox, of Ohio. How is he?’

“‘He is sure and fearless. But there are others that I am not clear about. There are three that you can deal with better than anybody else, perhaps, as you know them. I wish you would send for them.’

“He told me who they were; it isn’t necessary to repeat the names here. One man was from New Jersey and two from New York.

“‘What will they be likely to want?’ I asked.

“‘I don’t know’ said the President; ‘I don’t know. It makes no difference, though, what they want. Here is the alternative: that we carry this vote, or be compelled to raise another million, and I don’t know how many more men, and fight no one knows how long. It is a question of three votes or new armies.’

“‘Well sir,’ said I, ‘what shall I say to these gentlemen?’

“‘I don’t know’ said he; ‘but whatever promise you make to them I will perform.’

“I sent for the men and saw them one by one. I found that they were afraid of their party. They said that some fellows in the party would be down on them. Two of them wanted internal revenue collector’s appointments.

“‘You shall have it’ I said. Another one wanted a very important appointment about the custom house of New York. I knew the man well whom he wanted to have appointed. He was a Republican, though the congressman was a Democrat. I had served with him in the Republican county committee of New York. The office was worth perhaps twenty thousand dollars a year. When the congressman stated the case, I asked him ‘Do you want that?’

“‘Yes, said he.’

“‘Well,’ I answered, ‘You shall have it.’

“‘I understand, of course’ said he, ‘that you are not saying this on your own authority?’

“‘Oh, no,’ said I; ‘I am saying it on the authority of the President.’

“Well, these men voted that Nevada be allowed to form a State government, and thus they helped secure the vote which was required. The next October the President signed the proclamation admitting the State. In the February following Nevada was one of the States which ratified the thirteenth Amendment. By which slavery was abolished by constitutional prohibition in all of the United States. I have always felt that this little piece of side politics was one of the most judicious, humane, and wise uses of executive authority that I have ever assisted in or witnessed…”

“Yikes! I mean, Meow! to the kittens that lost their mittens in this scam. Is there more?”

“Yes, but I don’t want to say it all here. Be careful; ignore discouraging news from the mouths of all the king’s horses. As you know, they’ve witnessed an irreparable egg that could never be put together again. Their disparity is chronic; we only want it from horses saddled for victory. Which means the White ones that will be bringing back Jesus Christ. Now, that is a horse to hear from. Until Shiloh come!”

28
Dear Mr. Sanford,

Would that there were merely one or two questions one might ask of you and expect a simple reply; but, because of ongoing fraud, distortion and duplicity layered, embedded and engraved upon our minds about history and “law of the land,” the missing answers just multiply. However, I shall cut these inquiries to a few. It’s hard knowing where to start, as I have been subjected to the public/government school system. Yet, to the extent that an ill-educated background permits, and hoping my private studies suffice, I shall attempt to brief you on some historical facts that have me baffled concerning citizenship, due process (before, during and after the Civil War), the Union Army’s participation in the Article V amendment process of the U.S. Constitution, Congressional (Union of Northerners) usurpation of the Article V amending process and the outright overthrow of principles well settled in our jurisprudence at that time.

Senator Doolittle from Wisconsin, quoting all the daily statements from the Senate, added: “What is said every day; the people of the South have rejected the constitutional amendment, and therefore we will march upon them and force them to adopt it at the point of the bayonet, and establish military power over them until they do adopt it” (Congressional Globe, Feb. 20, 1867, page 1644). This was not just talk; they did just that, and the Reconstruction Acts prove it.

State citizenship has been the proper (and, may I add, “only”) status that our forefathers possessed before that military enforcement of the “14th Amendment” upon our country. This so-called 14th amendment supposedly created a new “United States citizen” (U.S. vs. Susan B. Anthony, Van Valkenburg vs. Brown, the Slaughterhouse cases, Crosse vs. Board of Supervisors of Elections 221 A 2nd 431 1966, Twining vs. State of New Jersey, 211 U.S. 78, 1908, etc.). Though the proposed amendment never complied with Article V procedures and mandates and so cannot be considered constitutionally ratified, it is forced upon us. The Utah State Supreme Court in 1968 lamented in Dyett vs. Turner that “We feel like slaves in a galley.” Neither you, nor any jurist at any level, will find military power authorized in Article V, which requires the willful votes of State legislatures and forbids the deprivation of State suffrage except where States consent. Guns pointed at the head cannot be consent, nor a surrogate government installed by military replacement of properly-elected officeholders acceptable. A public official can only be “properly” taken out (Hoke vs. Henderson, Brown et al. vs. board of Levee Commissioner, White vs. White 5 Barb NY
The Courts have used a well-known escape hatch to avoid answering questions on this “amendment’s” validity. First and absolutely foremost, the attacks and invasions of the Southern States were without due process of law, so the whole problem involves a judicial question. Did the government provide due process when taking life, liberty and property from the States and the people in 1861 and thereafter? Can anyone produce evidence of a single summons, judicial hearing of any kind or Court order finding the accused States “guilty,” or that they were judged and sentenced by Congress? No, the entire taking of life, liberty and property lacked any presence or adjudication of a Court. Jeremiah Black, the Attorney General prior to those crimes, plainly stated that it would be illegal to invade States except by Court order. He further elaborated that, were the threatened States treated like enemies, they could retaliate in whatever form considered necessary, and that “…if Congress shall break up the present Union, by unconstitutionally putting strife and enmity and armed hostility between different sections of the country, instead of the domestic tranquility which the Constitution was meant to insure, will not all the States be absolved from their federal obligations? …then the Union must utterly perish at the moment when Congress shall arm one part of the people against another for any purpose beyond that of merely protecting the general government in the exercise of its proper constitutional functions” (Official Opinions of Attorneys General of the United States, vol. 9, pages 516 and 526). What Jeremiah Black said would be the official opinion of the United States Government according to section 25 of the 1789 Judiciary Act. What branch of government took heed, or even gave it any rank at all? While this is strictly a due-process argument, the Court has hidden behind the fraudulent wall of this well-known escape: “It’s a political question.” Where in the history of due process can it ever be called mere opinion when due process is strictly a judicial function?

Any new meaning of due process after the United States Constitution of 1790 must go through Article V, so postwar changes have no standing (e.g., Hurtado vs. Calf. 110 U.S. 516, 1884, arrogantly stating that a grand jury would not be necessary “so long as the rest of the trial is fair”). Even when a Court alludes to doubts about the “14th Amendment” while hiding behind this wall, saying it cannot rule on the issue, I find that contradictory since the Court has made rulings concerning the validity of an amendment five times (Hollingsworth vs. Virginia, 3 Dall, 378, 1798; Hawke vs. Smith, 253 U.S. 231, 1920; Rhode Island vs. Palmer, 253 U.S.; Dillion vs. Gloss, 256 U.S. 368; and United States vs. Sprague, 282 U.S. 716, 1931). That negates any trust in Courts that turn around and select a timeframe and an amendment not to rule on.

Article V of the Constitution holds State power superior to Federal license. States, use it. Don’t like how the Court defines Article VI, paragraph 2? States, just put Article V into practice; clarify State authority. Don’t want the Federal government occupying ten square miles? States, put Article V to practice and give them two square feet. Do States feel like “slaves in a galley”? Then use that constitutional power and put those oars back in Federal hands! If States’ rights are null, so is the government (Kidd vs. Pearson, 247 US 75-276).

Since the “14th Amendment” did not ratify, then first and foremost there is no such thing as a United States citizen as defined in post Civil War doctrines (Ex Parte Knowles, 5 Cal. 300, 302, 1855). As a single kind of citizenship exists, i.e., that of a State, I demand protection for my God-given rights. Take note that I said nothing about constitutional rights because there are no such. The Constitution of South Carolina as adopted in 1789 and its amendments are for my protection and the only law of the land (State vs. Simmons, 2 pears SC, 761, 767, 1844). Any other statutes, codes or acts placed upon the books being labeled “laws” that contradict true law have no authority, are null and void (Calder vs. Bull 3 Dall U.S. 386, 1798; Wales vs. Stetson 2 Mass. 145; Foster vs. Essex Bank 16 Mass 245, 1819; and the famous obiter dictum by John Marshall in what is “called” a case though it was not, the famous Marbury vs. Madison. By the way, that should have been Marshall vs. Madison since it attempts to deny what Madison had proclaimed just three years prior in the 1799 Virginia Convention concerning the authority of the State Courts as the highest in the land. Wonder what happened to that opinion, made by the actual drafter of the constitution himself, and why it is not the prevailing concept today?)

In Barron vs. Baltimore 7 Pet. U.S. 243, 1833, It has been ruled and understood that our (State citizens’) rights are to be protected by the States. Some of the above cases reflect these differences of protection. I find South Carolina grossly negligent in allowing her citizens to be defrauded in a government-supported School system where nothing is taught concerning true citizenship. Why are we called U. S. citizens? Why are State citizens (not U.S. citizens, “who are citizens in the State in which they reside”) being conned into believing that they are U.S. citizens? Why has “State citizen” fallen into disuse, perhaps to disappear from history and our posterity?

South Carolina knowingly allows this false teaching that three-fourths of the States ratified the “14th Amendment,” and publishes its policies thereunder sending the message that “we are slaves in a galley.” Why hasn’t the State protected me from an encroaching, usurping and tyrannical form of government, unauthorized power
trespassing upon my rights? Why are the Governor and State Legislature involved in this plot to render both State and Federal Constitutions null and void, by creating legislation and forms that reduce State citizens to subjects?

Will South Carolina forbid de facto officers from trespassing on our rights and forcing drivers licenses upon citizens who are not on the road for hire, but only private travel?

Will South Carolina cease using only the term “United States citizen” on all her voting, licenses, and other forms by adding to them the term “State citizen”? After all, what is a State without indigenous and committed citizens? Will this State introduce into textbooks the historical truths of why the “14th Amendment” never ratified?

As you can see, question follows question. I cannot ask them all, for each packs another loaded conundrum. In essence: will the State of South Carolina stand for truth?

I ask you to exercise the de jure office you hold though having come by it de facto. That “office” owes me the protections and remedies I am demanding here and not the person(s) possessing it. Because you are on record as a U.S. citizen and I find nothing that would claim otherwise, this State office is held by a foreign person. Reading Ableman vs. Booth as quoted in the Jeremiah Black opinion above, we see two distinct spheres of jurisdiction. Therefore a State Governor’s office should be held by a State citizen and not someone from another domain. Though there is no “real” United States citizen, but even understood as a fiction readily accepted by the ill-informed, that still spins out as a foreign entity; which dilemma causes conflict with, and trespasses upon, my rights. As all Federal offices were prior to the war filled by State citizens, they are now held de facto as well, unless we can determine that the people willfully and knowingly made such changes; but then the people would have attended conventions and made amendments through Article V, which they did not. The U.S. Constitution clearly is talking about State citizens. When has such a citizen occupied any of the State offices, been a President or a Congressman?

The damages caused by fraudulent teaching in public schools has severed common knowledge from the people in such measure and duration that, to be truly informed, one must leave his generational time frame and study past the public memory. The modern plenitude that overwhelms these commuting elements in people has dismantled necessary reasoning. So-called elections find few sound alternatives considered, since educational institutions have already pre-stored the present course in voters, classifying them ens legis rather than as natural persons.

A final note concerns the Law of Nations, in which Article 1 section 8 clause 10 states: “To define and punish… offenses against the Law of Nations.” It will be remembered that this was written by Emmerich de Vattel in 1758 and incorporated into our Constitution word for word, as John Jay instructed his grand juries around the circuits. Any legislation contrary to the Law of Nations goes against the Constitution and the several States. New international law supposedly accepted but contradicting Vattels Law of Nations has no binding force because no officeholder at any level is authorized to change the Law of the Land (Westervelt vs. Gregg 12 NY 209), either international or domestic. I remind you again that altering the Constitution can proceed only through Article V, as no amendment has nullified Article 1 Section 8 concerning this great part of our laws (United States vs. Smith 5 Wheat. 153, 160, 162, 1820; the Marianna Flora, 11 Wheat 1, 40-41, 1826; and United States vs. Brig Malek Abhel, 2 How. 210, 232, 1844); yet the present government violates every portion of it. Whether the importance of this is recognized by your office or not, I mention here without further elaboration the connection between this and the other problems mentioned above.

“The Constitution is certain and fixed: it contains the permanent will of the people, and is the supreme law of the land. It is paramount to the power of the Legislature, and can be revoked or altered only by the authority that made it. **What are Legislatures? Creatures of the constitution : they owe their existence to the constitution: they derive their power from the constitution. It is their commission, and therefore all their acts must be conformable to it, or else they will be void.** The constitution is the work or will of the people themselves, in their original sovereign and unlimited capacity. **Law is the work or will of the Legislature in their derivative or subordinate capacity: the one is the work of the Creator and the other of the creature. The constitution fixes limits to the exercise of the Legislative authority, and prescribes the orbit within which it must move. Whatever may be the case in other countries, yet in this there can be no doubt that every act of the Legislature, repugnant to the constitution, is absolutely void.”** (University of North Carolina vs. Foy 2 Howard NC 310, 1805).

Please note hereto attached affidavit giving your office the particulars of my status. It will stand in any Court of law, and can only be rebutted by overcoming evidence. If your office can prove anything to the contrary, this is my notice for you to present such evidence or accept all that is stated herein as binding truth. You should make a rebuttal either in writing or en silento. I think 30 days will be sufficient time for you to answer my questions and accept or disprove anything in the affidavit. Your silence shall be considered consent to all the facts therein.

“I SAID THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT HAD NOT BEEN ADOPTED.” (Senator Henderson, Congressional Globe, Feb. 20, 1867, page 1644)

Joel W. Rorie
Affidavit

I have given here ample proofs that the “Law of the Land” is on my side and that I am under the State’s protection concerning all of my rights, so I believe you as Governor control that department and can issue me a letter of recognition along with an order that I may show any officer who detains or attempts to classify me as a “subject/ens legis” while charging or arresting me for practicing my right to journey without a drivers license in traveling for private purposes. This order should instruct any police officer to allow me free movement on the public roads.

I will out of courtesy make an identification card with a recent picture of myself and giving enough details to conclude my identity as a State citizen and the person bearing the document. This is so that anyone inquiring or requesting the same would be able to determine that I am the natural person possessing it.

THE FACTS

1. Joel W. Rorie, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that the following statements are true to the best of my knowledge.
2. I was educated in the public school system.
3. I was never taught by the public school system the various differences in word meanings that dealt with the law of the land.
4. I was never taught in the public school system that the “14th Amendment” failed to ratify. Instead, it instructed me that the “14th Amendment” did ratify, and, as a result, I acted against the true government of this land.
5. I was given to believe that only one type of citizenship existed in the United States of America, and as a result acted under such false teachings.
6. I have in the last few months come to know the truth about (a) the failure of the “14th Amendment” to ratify, (b) falsified definitions planted in the 1864 Webster’s Dictionary and reiterated in every subsequent edition thereof, (c) lawful words and phrases such as “due process” and “liberty” having been changed by the post Civil War Supreme Court; and, as a result, now realize my original status.
7. I am not a United States citizen as defined in post Civil War doctrines.
8. I am a citizen of the State of South Carolina established in 1789.
9. I have accepted many contracts relating to the United States Government because of false teachings that purposely hid the facts about my status, and, as a result, ignorantly entered into various of those commitments.
10. I am presently engaged in research that has revealed many truths heretofore hidden from me by the public school system, as a result of which studies my ignorance has come to an end. Lately aware of my status as a freeman I hereby denounce all contracts with this new military government that defrauds people into believing it a legal entity deriving lawful authority from the organic United States and South Carolina State Constitutions.
11. I am a State citizen hereby proclaiming myself a South Carolinian by right and status.
12. When repeating words or phrases such as (but not limited to) due process, United States, Federal, Congress, citizen, State, liberty, jury, E Pluribus Unum, Union, person, etc., unless clarified by myself otherwise I use and read them off documents in their true meanings as defined before the Civil War.
13. I am a White male Christian born in one of the several States on August the 8th, 1954.
15. I believe natural laws come under Divine Law.
16. I believe that human laws also known as civil laws such as the Law of Nations (written by Emmerich de Vattel), United States Constitution, and the Constitutions of the several States all fall under the authority of both the Bible and of Natural Law.
17. I pledge allegiance to the original government established by the U.S. Constitution in 1789 and all amendments thereto passed strictly in compliance with Article V as sole authority for refining that charter, faith therefore in the original constitution and amendments 1 through 12 only, since I can find no other amendment having properly passed the mandates of Article V.
18. I am a direct descendant of those people mentioned in the preamble of the United States Constitution, the same having ratified it in 1789.

Further, affiant saith not.

Dated this _____ day of ___________________, ______

Respectfully Submitted,

_____________________________________ Joel W. Rorie, in propria persona, sui Juris.

In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established (II Corinthians 13:1).
Witnessed the signature above ______________________ dated_____________ etc.