

# **A Special 4<sup>th</sup> of July**

## **“State of the Union”**

### **Discussion of**

### **Dissolution, Secession & Anarchy**

(A discussion of the meaning of all three and their application to the present condition of the so-called “United States of America”)

July 4, 2012

Compiled for Seth Brown of the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment Center upon his request by  
Ronald F. Avery

It started with a newspaper article on the topic of the latest “US Supreme Court” ruling finding the individual mandate by Congress to purchase life insurance constitutional and the “law of the land.”

### **Supreme Court Once Again Dissolves the U. S. Constitution and the Union of States**

As you know by now, the dissolved “Supreme Court” of the dissolved “United States” has found that it is lawful for the government to impose a fine on a person for not buying a commercial product. The dissolved court said in a 5-4 decision that the Affordable Health Care Act (AHCA) was not constitutional under the commerce clause but was constitutional under the taxing clause.

So the dissolved court found that the dissolved federal government did not have the power to impose a fine on a person for not buying a commercial product under Commerce Clause which says: ‘The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.’ Now why is that? This clause was added to the Constitution because the States would not be good at regulating their own commerce between themselves and would be in a constant turmoil without a third party to decide fairly among them in the best interest of all the states. So the dissolved Supreme Court says correctly that the dissolved federal government has no authority under this clause to fine a person for not buying insurance because it has nothing to do with the regulation of commerce between the several states. Coercing an individual from any and all states to buy private commercial health insurance has nothing to do with commerce conducted between two or more states.

Let’s take a look at the taxing clause and see if the dissolved feds have dissolved constitutional authority to impose a fine on a person for not buying a commercial product. The taxing clause says: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.” There is a problem here isn’t there? The dissolved constitution said that all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States. That means everyone pays the same amount for federal duties, impostos and excises. What are these kinds of taxes? A duty is “a tax on imports;

but it is sometimes used in a broader sense, as including all manner of taxes, charges, or governmental impositions.” This is because the word also implies all “legal and moral obligations or an obligation that one has by law or contract” The quotes here are from the dissolved US Constitution and from Black’s Law Dictionary 6<sup>th</sup> edition. So just because the constitution did not use the word ‘taxes’ when saying they should be uniform throughout the US does not mean that was not included by saying “all Duties.” Taxes have to do with the permission to do something, import a product, perform an act like removing a tooth or earn interest on investments. Taxes do not involve failure to do something the government wants you to do. A fine is the proper term to be used in describing failures to perform an act the government requires.

Black’s Law dictionary defines a “fine” as a noun “A pecuniary (monetary) punishment or penalty imposed by lawful tribunal upon person convicted of crime or misdemeanor; as a verb “To impose a pecuniary punishment or mulct. To sentence a person convicted of an offense to pay a penalty in money.” Is this not exactly what the Affordable Health Care Act does? If you don’t buy a commercial product from one of the several insurance companies involved in commerce for profit you are found guilty of a crime and sentenced to pay a fine, a monetary penalty. Now where in the dissolved Constitution does the dissolved federal government have delegated authority from the states and people to find a person guilty of not buying a certain commercial product and punish that person with a monetary fine? There is no such provision anywhere. Fines are reserved for violation of the law and there is no provision for making it against the law not to buy certain commercial products. This piece of tyrannical legislative and judicial piracy is just one more alteration of the constitution without an amendment passed by the people allowing such a thing which dissolves the US Constitution and the federal government. How many times over must the constitution and federal government be dissolved before the people just say “go to hell?”

By: Ron Avery is a semi-retired architect, author and speaker on topics regarding Christian theology and the principles of property that regulate every aspect of lawful government. Reply to: [taphouse@sbcglobal.net](mailto:taphouse@sbcglobal.net)

**Ron,**

Good article, as usual. At what point, Ron, does the topic of secession become viable? As regions, divorced from DC, some Americans just might be able to recover their economies. Texas could stand alone, of course. I think we are too western for the South and too Southern for the West.

**Doug**

**Doug,**

Secession is never an option under the scenario that the union no longer lawfully exists. The union is dissolved and there would be no point in seceding from a dissolved non-existent entity. Secession is a lawful and legal admission that the entity from which one is separating from lawfully exists. Do you want to make that claim? Why would any state want to secede from the union if it was lawfully conformed to its constitution of which the states agreed to? Secession is therefore moral suicide. The Declaration of the

Observation of the Dissolution of the United States of America is the only lawful position to take in regard to the dissolved union. All that could be said in such a document would be proof of the truth and reality of the situation and only an idiot or moron would argue with it.

Sincerely,

**Ron**

**Ron**

As is often the case, your great learning has driven you mad. But then, I have to remind myself, with you it's often a game of semantics.

To say that "Secession is moral suicide" is total nonsense. It's like saying, "Divorce is moral suicide." In fact, the two actions are identical. If the marriage has gone bad, for whatever reason, then either or both parties may dissolve that union.

Your statement is also demonstrably false: "Secession is a lawful and legal admission that the entity from which one is separating from lawfully exists." Following your contrarian rhetoric (if that is possible), I suppose you would say one cannot get a divorce from a union that does not lawfully exist. Perhaps the wedding itself was "irregular" or "common law" or even a "shotgun wedding". I am going to argue with you that a person who is forced to get married at the point of a shotgun is still recognized in law as being married, and the children of that union are still recognized as legitimate by law. And the only remedies I can think of are:

- ignoring one another
- flight
- murder
- divorce

It happens to be against the law to advocate murder. And as for flight, where will one go? (I realize that many individuals are leaving to live in exile, and believe me, I've considered it.) This leaves us with sulking and refusing to talk to one another, or going through the process of getting a piece of paper that says, "The deal is off." It doesn't matter how "moral" the deal was.

I'm trying to see this from your point of view. Maybe you're suggesting that it's more like growing up in the Mafia, and not wanting to be forced to go around and collect the loot from established routes - a business the Family considers just fine, however illegal. In that case, flight is probably more advisable than "serving notice of withdrawal" from the family. (I know a guy in Mexico who did that.)

We have a *de facto* government, kind of like a situation where a child is brought in to a family as a baby, and grows up in that family, and is given a place at the table, later growing to hate the oppression of his foster family. It doesn't matter how legitimate things are, the options are the same, but if the kid has earned property under this system, and wants it in his name, he's going to have to go through the process, however fraudulent he considers it, or he's going to have to fight. Which of those do you advocate?

Tell me, Sir, your solution to this fraudulent government. Tell me how you would pave the roads and secure the borders and apprehend criminals without speaking to those criminals who have the audacity to think that they are the civil government? Surely you

know what will happen. They will lock you up for the maniac you have become, if you are lucky.

Please give me a scenario where your theory could apply, if you can.

**Doug**

***Doug,***

Thanks for likening me to St. Paul. Most people liken me to the south end of a north bound donkey or tree stump or a mother dog. What does semantics have to do with our present discussion? Dissolution is not at all similar to secession and therefore no semantic errors can be made or claimed to come to the same conclusion. Dissolution is not just a form of or another way of saying secession. I am amazed at how few people get the significance of dissolution compared to secession. And I am equally amazed at how much easier and non-violent they think secession is compared to dissolution. Our own great grandparents fought in the worst American war only 148 years ago. Now if there is some kind of peaceful component of secession I would like to know what that is and how that works any different then what we have witnessed in recent history. To quickly cover the results of secession 148 years ago it cost around 625,000 lives and the almost complete destruction of the South and many years of brutal reconstruction and occupation that did not accomplish secession but failed completely. Now just where in the hell are the advantages of the so-called “secession movement” compared to anything else on earth? After that quick review it seems everyone would be interested in any thing different. Just because it is not familiar does not mean it is a bad idea. Secession is familiar and memorable but devastatingly ineffective.

So let me delve a little deeper into my madness. Consider with me for a moment the moral, logical, philosophical and legal differences between secession and dissolution and other issues such as resulting authority: Legally secession is in fact an admission that the entity from which one wants to secede from does in fact lawfully and legally exist. You have made a very weak argument that one should try to secede from something that was not lawful or legal in the first place. I would like to know what the power of that argument really is founded upon. One does not need to get a divorce as you call it from a marriage that was never established. I will say once again however as I have before to you in previous discussions that marriage and family life make a very poor if not completely irrelevant comparison with government. But one thing can be said that is similar between a marriage and a union or state. No one seeks a divorce from a deceased spouse. And the same can be said about a state or union of states. Why would one seek a divorce or secession from a dead state or union? A divorce must be sought to legally separate when both spouses are living. So in summary; when dealing with a dead dissolved state or union of states, it is self-defeating to seek secession while it is lawfully understood that secession is not required when the state or union is dissolved.

Now let us deal with authority. In secession it is understood by those who want to secede that the remainder still has authority at least in their capacity over the remainder. Those who observe and understand the state of dissolution perceive that no one has authority over any one else that was in the union or state. This has powerful advantages and impact upon all who are shown the power of the logic involved. Those who want to enforce the dissolved state or union upon everyone or all parties must do so without

perceived authority on the part of the people. This is a powerful disadvantage to the tyrants and their foolish followers. A new government can be organized rapidly with a new constitution that addresses every issue properly that the dissolved union has failed to handle properly and lawfully. This becomes a moral and lawful replacement for the old dissolved government which carries the moral weight over the tyrants.

Now let's return to the concept of secession. What is the reason given by those who want to secede for their need and desire to separate? Is it that they simply do not want to participate in the union or state anymore? Are they bored? Do they have a better idea? Do they want to join some other union? As you can rapidly see there is no good solid moral reason for the need or desire to separate if the union or state is lawfully conformed to the provisions of its creation. There is no provisions in the union for member states to just pick up their toys and go home any time they want to. And if the union is not dissolved each member is required to use the means constituted in the union to solve the problem they are complaining about. But they cannot just go home on their claim that they have reserved the right to secede at any time they want for any reason they want. We can see that this indeed was not the intent or reason for the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment. The said amendment covers a lot of ground and is used properly in many cases but it does not and cannot cover secession. Unless a constitution actually specifies that no matter what the constitution says or what kind of provisions it contains any or all members can leave at their own will then secession for any reason is not permitted. It would be superfluous to painstakingly form a union in which any member could leave at any time for any reason. And that is what secession is all about and there is no such right in the old or presently dissolved US Constitution.

Therefore, the moral conclusion to secession is that those who want to separate are merely unhappy and tired of using the means constituted to maintain the lawful conformance of the union to its constitution. It also means that those who stay behind in the lawfully conforming union are "good little boys and girls" who want to follow the law and continue to work hard and perceive the union as lawfully conformed to its constitution.

So right away we see that secession is not a very morally or logically sound response to a government which is in fact totally dissolved, unlawful and completely tyrannical. The means of showing dissolution are scientific and irrefutable. Empirical evidence can be shown proving that a union and state is dissolved when it no longer has the form that it was constituted with and does not have the required amendments giving the government the permission of the people to change its form. Where Secessionists have nothing to use as evidence for their need and desire to separate the Dissolutionists have sound logic and empirical irrefutable evidence to show that no lawfully constituted union exists from which to secede or follow or obey and they are at full liberty to construct for themselves a new lawful union that they believe will better protect their property and provide for their safety.

It is easy to see where this leaves the states that may not want to secede. It leaves them not as "good little boys and girls" that want to stay home and not stray away but raging tyrants that not only love their own slavery but love serving their tyrannical masters as weak beggarly cowards. What state or people would want to remain in dissolved union that has been shown empirically to have lost all their authority to exercise tyranny and help tyrants unlawfully subdue their own people?

I will not try to unravel all your marriage and family life analogies to the study of political science. Our dissolved nation and states were formed between each individual by strict contracts and nothing can be assumed or presumed and they were not formed and cannot be altered by unwritten natural law or common law. Natural law can indeed dissolve them as it has done but natural law cannot form a lawfully binding nation or state.

OK Ron, we like what you say, and we believe you, now what do I do in the morning? Do I call my representative and tell them to leave office? Do I quit paying unlawful taxes, start running stop signs, start shooting cops and firemen? Do I ignore all things said to me by dissolved government officials and resist everything they do and ask of me? Do I go to another country and wait for this one to fall down completely?

**I advocate:**

1. Nothing but the knowledge of the truth of dissolution. Truth has power and when it grows among the people to fill them the power of it is felt everywhere and those who are its enemies become weak, frail and begin to shake even at the knees.
2. Study the principles of property contained in the Second Treatise of Government written by John Locke so that all know the principles upon which all government is founded and how all governmental issues are determined.
3. Practice writing a new constitution of the union of states because our nation will become part of a foreign nation if this is not done soon.
4. Join with friends and neighbors and church members to discuss what lawful government is and how it is dissolved and how it is lawfully framed anew.
5. Speak publicly about the principles of property to all tyrants and officials in dissolved offices so that they know what the truth is.
6. Continue to pay unlawful taxes and do nothing that gets you alone as an individual in trouble with tyrants. You can do nothing while incarcerated and destitute.
7. It will become more obvious as time goes on as to what we must do as a group and as a people. But we must be knowledgeable and prepared to make use of the time when it appears and we need to practice knowing what to do and how to do it.
8. We are either going to accept tyranny or some other tyrannical force imposed upon us or we are going to make our own lawfully constituted government. Are we going to be ready to meet the challenge or just lie down and take it.
9. I will say right now that the land is still filled with ignorance even among those who are most upset with what is happening. We must turn that anger into the thirst for real knowledge and truth not mere empty threats to repeat the past and slogans and propaganda.
10. Survival is not to be achieved alone but in groups and large groups as no one is safe under tyranny no matter how powerful and wealthy. So get with good people who want to know these things that most people in early America knew and were able to use. And this is not obtainable on CNN or FOX or TV. Use the internet it's free.
11. And by all means quit spending any money or time on elections. Don't vote at all for it continues the illusion of lawful government when there is none. This is one thing you can do that you will not go to jail for that also gives the right message. So don't vote!

I think that is enough for now. But it should give everyone a good idea about what to do in the future that can be done without self harm.

Sincerely,

**Ron**

**Seth,**

Our friend, "Mad Ron", makes some compelling arguments, and I would ask you to share this (discreetly) with a friend or two for discussion. I think he may be on to something, because secession has failed so miserably the last time, with such horrific results. Furthermore, there was virtual unanimity of opinion and faith in the South at the time, something we certainly don't have today. It may be a "John Galt" solution for now, but dissolution and the recreation of some new forms of self-government just may start the pendulum swinging in a new direction.

**Doug**

**Ron,**

Outstanding and very thought provoking. Ok for me to publish this on Tenth Amendment Center-Texas website (<http://texas.tenthamentendmentcenter.com>)? Pls advise.

**Seth**

**Sure Seth,**

It would be nice to have it published on your 10th amendment website. Thank you very much and may I add you to our discussion list?

Sincerely,

**Ron**

**Thanks, Ron,**

and yes, add me to the discussion list (looks like you already have). Agree with Doug New--put some structure to the email dialog bouncing back and forth. I'd like to post that as well once done.

**Seth**

**John,**

I am taking the liberty of forwarding to you an exchange (above) between me and "Mad Ron Avery", because I think it's constructive, and should be put into the cauldron of discussion right now. Ron Lays out a compelling case for **dissolution**, as opposed to **secession**, which has been tried once, and failed miserably and with disastrous results. He makes a good point, and I want to hear this option discussion as an alternative to

secession. I don't think Ron will mind a bit, and may even give permission to include his remarks in a more public forum, (whether anonymous or not, I don't know).

Feel free to address remarks to Ron, who lives in south-central Texas, just east of the Alamo.

I clearly have not dissuaded Ron from his position, but I have at least forced him to clarify and articulate it in more detail to me, and now to you and a few select friends.

Blessings,

**Doug**

***Ron,***

I hope you're not offended that I've shared your answer with a few, select people whose opinions I also respect. I will point out that you may well be in a transition stage on this subject, since you recently ran for office yourself. No doubt, that helped you conclude

that the process is totally unfixable (something many of us agree on).

I should like to see some level of small groups cooperating with one another in both self-government and self-sufficiency and in creating alternative forms of lifestyles which can lead us in the direction of a John Galt-style level of subsistence and then building new alternatives.

Blessings,

**Doug**

***Doug,***

I am not offended at all and I think this will be a good topic of discussion. But I cannot answer anyone's questions until late tonight as I am following my own advocacy by continuing to play like the state of Texas is lawfully existing. I am completing my continuing education hours so I can "lawfully" call myself an "architect" and "interior designer" in the "State of Texas." LOL

I will reply to all who have sent email on this topic late tonight or tomorrow.

Sincerely,

**Ron**

***Dan:***

I'll take a look at this. If you think it would be profitable to introduce this subject on LS Staff for discussion, I certainly trust your judgment.

Thanks for sending.

**Michael**



## ***Doug & Ron,***

What is the basis to say that the current government centered in Washington City is dissolved?

Thanks,

**Tom Johnson**

***Tom,***

Since it's Ron's argument, I can only conjecture that he is saying that it's invalid, because the contract is predicated on fraud, was entered in to at the point of a gun, and is only enforceable with a gun, and we (as soon as we are able) will be fully within our Natural Rights to walk away from it.

(I'm still sticking with my marriage analysis, which Ron doesn't like, but as far as it goes, it helps me grasp the concept of covenant relationships.)

So, I'm guessing that Ron is saying, "Look, you can force a marriage relationship with a shotgun, or you can kidnap a girl and force her to marry you, but it's not a valid relationship and as soon as she is able, it's within her right to walk away." Help me out, Ron, or shoot me down. I know you won't be bashful.

Maybe I've just helped myself with this argument. In a legitimate marriage, both sign papers and make it look legal, even if one is under duress. In a kidnapping, there may not even be any papers. Were not all the Southern States, who did enter the relationship with papers, and then divorced with papers, find themselves kidnapped after the divorce, and forced to return to the bed of the Tyrant? This comparison may not please Ron, but I'll suggest that it will resonate with about 98% of the population who give it any thought at all.

**Doug**

***Doug,***

I don't know where new State Constitutions, passed by referendum of the people leave us on this subject(s). For example the current Georgia State Constitution was ratified in 1982. I don't know how many States have ratified a new Constitution but it would seem that if passed on referendum, this represents consent of the governed.

Right or wrong I voted for it in 1982. We need to be careful in our efforts that we don't let our passion over-ride reason. In the case of Georgia, it appears that in 1982 a majority of its voting citizens recognized the Constitution of The United States, Article I, Section 2, Paragraph 5.

At least in the State of Georgia an argument that the government is dissolved or illegitimate would run contrary to the voice of the people in 1982. That would be valid for the State Constitution ratified in 1868 or any of its derivatives, but the 1982 one was a rewrite. There was also a rewrite and ratification by the people in 1877 after the end of "legal" Reconstruction and federal occupation forces in the State in 1876.

This could be changed by Amendment, but that takes a 2/3 majority in both the State House and Senate - then a majority vote in an even numbered year general election.

Thanks,

**Tom Johnson**

**Tom,**

This may be the crux of one of the most important arguments we can muster. I'm prepared to argue that the Washington government was not dissolved, for it was (and is) still legitimate in the North, at least among those states not forcibly prevented from leaving

(Kentucky, Missouri, Maryland, among others). It is, however, illegitimate in those states forced by military might to return and/or remain against the will of The People.

Nothing the

Reconstruction Governments did has any legitimacy. Hence, may we not argue that we are still an occupied nation, or a collection of occupied sovereign States?

Wouldn't it be nice to someday force a plebiscite, perhaps in a state with Initiative and Referendum, that would allow The People to vote every ten years or so about whether they want to continue their submission to the Federal Government, or to go it alone?

**Doug**

**Gents:**

Dan, you're not wrong with your marriage analogy, although there is a bit more to it. Allow me to explain it from a Catholic theological perspective.

Marriage is a Sacrament first and foremost, wherein the proper matter is the parties, the proper form is a ceremony witnessed by a Priest and others, and last, but not least, the proper intention is a free and willful choice by the parties to do what the Church does, i.e. treat their covenant as sacrosanct & indissoluble, help save each other's souls, and to produce children for God's glory. If ANY ONE of the three requirements is missing (proper matter, form, and right intention), then the Sacrament was NEVER confected, and morally and theologically speaking, there was NEVER a marriage at all. This is the basis upon which the Catholic Church investigates a marriage and sometimes grants what is known as an annulment (a recognition by the Church that there was never a valid, Sacrament in the first place). If an annulment is granted, the parties are morally free to remarry without pain of sin. This takes care of the moral aspect of the situation.

However, the state still has laws relating to marriage that must be dealt with, e.g. custody of children, division of property, and a recognition that, from a civil perspective, the parties are no longer married. The Church may have granted me an annulment, but if I go and remarry without first obtaining a civil 'divorce', I can be prosecuted for bigamy. As a Catholic, I recognize that the moral authority of The Church and Her Laws are above, and supersede, those of the civil government. In an ideal arrangement, the two would be in harmony with one another; however, that is NOT the situation under which we live. The state will exert its power over you if you transgress its statutes. Because those are not in harmony with God's Divine Law, and are therefore morally invalid, is beside the point to the state. The state may not be operating in a *de jure* sense, but

because of their sword, they operate in a *de facto* sense, as you pointed out. And like it or not, most people recognize, and must deal with, the *de facto* situation.

So, you could morally argue that the South was dragged into a 'union' with other States against her will. So, there was no free consent on her part (proper intention), and that fact morally invalidates the 'union'. But the powers that be of the u.s. don't see it that way. They recognize themselves as legitimate, as does the rest of the world by dealing with their 'elected representatives' in Washington City. They certainly don't see themselves as having been dissolved by their illegal, immoral, and unconstitutional actions, nor does the rest of the world. The u.s. regime rolls along as before.

The fact that we are morally correct about the invalidity of our 'union' with the rest of the u.s., and its lawlessness, does not relieve us of the obligation and necessity of dealing with the *de facto* arrangement of things. In theory, I agree with Ron, but we must deal with the everyday realities of our condition. This means that secession is the course to pursue.

Secession is the civil 'divorce' we need to obtain from the 'union', despite the fact that our skirts are clear morally. Secession IS a 'dissolution', albeit a unilateral one, but then, the decision to join, originally, was also a unilateral one for each State. That's what FREE government, by CONSENT, is all about.

Ron is also completely wrong about there being no provision for secession in the original constitutional arrangement. Granted, the constitution does not EXPRESSLY mention secession; however, the 9<sup>th</sup> amendment casts a wide net concerning all those unenumerated rights retained by the People. Add to this that fact that the u.s. constitution is, in fact, a treaty between distinct, independent, and sovereign nations (even though we use the term States). An accepted maxim of international treaty law is that if any party enters with stated conditions, then those conditions apply to all the parties and become a part of the treaty proper. Virginia, New York, and Rhode Island all entered the 'union' upon the condition that they could recall their delegated powers, i.e. secede, if they were perverted to their injury or oppression. How could it be plainer?

Respectfully,

**Larry A Thompson**

**Larry,**

Well done. I'm not trying to make the analogy follow all the way through, but on one level, it makes a lot of sense to me. I don't know if Ron is saying this or not, but I am suggesting that in this analogy, (a) the legal marriage in 1789 was legitimate; (b) the legal divorce in 1861 was legitimate; (c) the remarriage in 1865 was illegitimate, hence all that has happened is illegitimate.

Hence, in my analogy, Ron is right - how do we apply for one divorce, and then later apply for another?

**Doug**

**Dan:**

Many thanks for your kind compliment. The only reason for applying for a 'second divorce' is alluded to in my 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph. Simply because the 'union' thinks our remarriage in 1865 was legitimate, as do a lot of the common folk. It is the latter whom we need most to join our Cause and make our independence happen. I could care less if the minions of the empire agree, don't care, or whatever.

Another way to look at it is to say that we're not so much applying for another divorce as we are finally making the first one conclusive and binding. It's only been 150 years, but as Brother Dave Gardner used to say, 'What's time to a hog?' (I guess that means more to me since I'm an Arkansas Razorback)

There are a number of meritorious ways to argue our peculiar situation and how it can or should be remedied. I'm only suggesting that we meet the situation as it is, in its practical, real world state and deal with it accordingly.

Respectfully,

**Larry A Thompson**

**Larry,**

As a structural engineer, it may do us some good to discuss the foundations we must lay in order to build an "Alternative Society".

ONE concept (and not exclusive), is to create an Order or a Club. A social club along the lines of the Freemasons or the Knights of Columbus, but without the deep, dark (and sometimes pagan) doctrines. There might even be levels of membership. Members would place certain items under the umbrella of some organization. (The first debate is whether or not to set it up as a tax-exempt organization.) It could be a "Brotherhood" or a Social Club. But it would offer members certain protections, including some legal insurance - the club could hire sympathetic attorneys on retainer and for a discount, for example, to defend all of us from encroachment by the County, the State, or the Federales.

In any event, suppose we create a Trust, or better yet, fifty trusts, which could own property, and would lease it back to the first owners. Those with land which has no encumbrance of liens is easily moved under this umbrella. The same could be done with automobiles. When the Trust owns ten or a hundred homes, or a hundred automobiles, I think it might be able to negotiate some killer deals on insurance. And I can lease my vehicle from the Trust for a monthly fee that will include: (a) insurance; (b) taxes; (c) loans, if necessary.

IF we were to deal in silver and gold, instead of paper money, is there any law against that, if we all sign the agreement? Contract law.

We are probably all familiar with brotherhoods which take care of one another instead of normal insurance. If we held this to be a religious tenet (such as the Amish do), that

we depend on God and One Another, rather than the government, then this has potential as well.

Indeed, a Religious Order, with some minimum doctrines will appeal to a lot of people. We'll not resolve the split of the Reformation, but we could have more than one religious order, one that appeals to you and another to me, and we can cooperate on things of a financial question. Religion gets a lot of privileges (rights?) under the current system that none of us like. Are we being cowards and hypocrites to avail ourselves of those privileges, or are we being "gentle as doves, wise as serpents"?

There are certain things I sure do want to work toward in this country, and chief among them is the restoration of private property, where ZERO taxes can be levied against private property. This is an area where almost every property owner agrees. Do we work for legislation at the state level to affect such changes, or do we just become vagabonds? (Or do we place our property under the religious and thus tax-exempt control of a religious order?)

**Doug**

***Doug,***

You are correct that it was Ron's position.

One reason that I asked the question was referenced in Larry's response. This may not be popular, but the South was not forced into the current Constitution of 1787. In fact the Southern States in some very critical votes swung the direction towards a national government (May 30, June 6, June 19, etc). On both May 30 and June 19 the Southern States could have replaced the working national government model with a report that would have recommended amendments to the Articles of Confederation, retaining a federated form of government. Instead they voted to continue using a national government as the working model.

Yes the framers (they were not our Founding Fathers as some call them) or delegates to the convention practiced deception (by establishing secret proceedings) and publishing misleading information in the Federalist Papers. Probably very few, if any, of the delegates envisioned what we have Washington City today, but they insisted in "*as well as of avoiding too great an agency of the State Governments in the General one. (Madison – June 6).*

However, that raises a question. Is a covenant established by fraud binding? Before answering that it is not, study the covenant that Joshua made with the Gibeonites (Joshua 9:14-15) and what happened when it was violated (2 Samuel 21:1-3).

We are facing perilous times, but need to be careful that we look to God not man to determine the proper course to follow. Many of the things going on today that we find disgusting at best, are simply a national government doing what national governments always do – consolidation.

**Tom Johnson**

***Tom:***

I was referring to our being dragged into a 'union' against our will circa 1865. Sorry for the confusion.

You're right about 1787-89, though. That time, we did it of our own volition, and much to our detriment, as it turned out.

I would argue that agreements, treaties, covenants, etc. obtained by fraud or deception ARE morally invalid, as their basis is a lie, and, therefore, a transgression of the Commandment against bearing false witness. They are also legally invalid, as there are civil laws against fraud. Of course, the legal dissolution has to be pursued through a court so that the unjust deed may be undone properly.

This reasoning is, I think, supported by the explanation in my earlier post. In layman's terms, if all the parties are not on the up-and-up and doing things completely right, then there is no contract.

Respectfully,

**Larry A Thompson**

**Ron**

Good to hear from you again. I take it as an invitation to reply. Please respond to these specific thoughts. Thanks.

1. I am beginning to wonder exactly how many times a Union, a Constitution, and a Government can be dissolved before it is DISSOLVED. As you know, this Government has been committing unlawful acts since the States called for a meeting in Philadelphia under the Articles of Confederation (which you will recall required a unanimous agreement by all the States to change any of the provisions of the Articles).
2. The "Supreme Court" found nothing; to find something takes a modicum of knowledge and perseverance. Its members lack both. You and I, on the other hand, found more boring evidence that each of its members are closet politicians lacking in morals and principles. They are no different than virtually all other government parasites. They say they are public servants, but in fact they are public serpents, parasites serving (and helping) themselves.
3. Now, ignoring for the moment that "regulating commerce" means simply to make commerce (between and among the States) regular (that is "common") and not to control it, which was agreed to by the representatives of the States, let's examine "taxes". You are correct that "taxes", as envisioned in the Constitution, are a form of permission to engage in an activity of Choice. Choice is the operative word. No natural person (as distinguished from a fictional person - a corporation for example) was ever required to pay a "tax" just because he was breathing. "Taxes" on natural persons are theft by another name.
4. Now it appears that if a natural person fails to acquire a health insurance contract, s/he has committed a federal crime, and will be fined. I wonder if the "presumption of innocence" and a "due process hearing" is in order before the "fine" is levied. Perhaps this is a way to combat the so-called unemployment problem. You know, Health Insurance Courts, Judges, Prosecutors, a New Cabinet-level post and staff, together with all the government contractors to erect the necessary buildings.

Don't you just love government?

**Harry**

### ***Good Morning Gentlemen,***

I have now renewed my license to practice architecture and interior design and call myself those things in the dissolved state of "Texas." LOL! But that is another subject but very similar to the one I will now address. I want to take Tom Johnson's question first because he is the first on my email list and now the last and his question gets right to the heart of the real question. Let me start by saying that the knowledge of a whole lot of history regarding the "war between the states" or the "civil war" is almost a hindrance to the topic at hand because it is simply irrelevant to the question of the lawfulness of the present so-called "federal government" in the so-called "District of Columbia." The good news there is that we will not have to teach the people a laborious tangled history lesson.

Mr. Johnson's most important question was: "What is the basis to say that the current government centered in Washington City is dissolved? The basis is in the natural law of contracts. There are two laws in the state of nature; the law of torts and the law of contracts. The first says; "no one should, or has authority to, harm their neighbor in their lives, liberties, or possessions." The second says; "do what you say you're going to do." All authority of the present federal government came from the "Constitution of the United States of America." Now this is important to start with because it is something that the same present dissolved government in DC will agree with. They would also agree with us that this Constitution has provisions that require the federal government to be conformed to before it can assert its delegated authority. If they don't agree with us on that, we still have the upper hand and the mind of the people on our side as can now be shown.

Article 5 of the US Constitution provides the only means by which the US Constitution can be altered. This article sets forth the manner upon which amendments can be made to the US Constitution. No where else in the US Constitution provides any means to alter the Constitution. There are two ways to violate the US Constitution but one of those ways alters the form of the government and the other does not. The type of violation that alters the form also dissolves the union at which time no one in the government created by the contract retains any authority to act for or against the people. Let's say the President of the United States denies me the right to vote because I said I was a Christian while in line with him at the polls and he has his secret service escort me from the voting place. Well that's pretty mean but it does not change form of the nation or the provisions of the Constitution. I was merely prevented from voting by the act of one man acting as the President. All other Christians I know got to vote and there was no law passed that said Christians can't vote if they talk about Christ at the polls. So in this case the courts and judiciary remain lawfully constituted for me to file a suit for injury and repair I suffered from being denied my Constitutional right to vote.

But now let's take the most recent case where the legislature passes a law that requires all people of the various states to buy health insurance and if they do not they shall be fined for "failure to purchase a commercial product." Now the problem here is that there are no Congressional Powers delegated to the Congress of the United States to be able to impose a fine upon anyone who does not purchase a commercial product sold by private

companies for private profit. The dissolved government can call it a tax but it is not and cannot be called a tax by any standard. Some will say that a tax is simply revenue or money raised by any means whatsoever for the operation of government. This would be an overly broad definition of the term tax. Just because the feds have placed the collection of this fine in the bowels of the IRS does not make this Fine into a Tax. There are fines already within the IRS provisions and they are still called fines and penalties for the failure to comply with something the IRS wants you to do. But those incentives, if you must, are still called fines and penalties that merely become part of your tax burden as they see it. It's hard to go anywhere with this because the IRS is riddled with unlawful violations and omissions and commissions of crimes.

Let us deal with a very simple case to make the same point: The currency we find in our pockets and that we use everyday is paper while the US Constitution says that "no state shall make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts." I challenge all men and women of America to find the US Constitutional Amendment that provides for their state to use paper currency for the payment of debts. Is the condition we have the result of the federal government failing to enforce this provision and the states just went wild and started printing their own currency? No! The federal government instituted this paper currency with their own laws passed by the legislature without an amendment. This act of the legislature changes the form of our nation and how it behaves and how all people relate to one another without the required amendment.

This one change of form is all that is required to show a complete dissolution of the United States of America. Some might say; "No Ron, the people can appeal to the courts to have this resolved." I answer; "False my good friend, because at that instant upon which the legislature passed a law that changes the form of the union without permission of the people in the manner in which they agreed to, namely, the passage of an amendment, the federal government is dissolved and no one in it has any authority at all to act for or against the people including the highest court of the land. If this is not true, I dare anyone to show to me how many changes in form a nation must endure before it is dissolved. We constantly hear people say; "I will defend the Constitution." The only way to defend the Constitution is to not permit the change in its form without an amendment. But once it is done it cannot be saved by anyone or regenerated without the coming together of all the people or their newly appointed representatives totally separate from the previous dissolved government. If this was any other way the instrument and institution of a constitution would be nothing more than the perfection of tyranny under which no people could escape and upon which all the burden of tyranny must be borne by them eternally.

Now I can name at least ten more that are even more egregious than that one that alters the form of the union without the required amendments:

1. The maintenance of a federal standing army for more than two years after a declared war has ceased;
2. The creation of a central bank or banking monopoly that issues money to the government with interest;
3. Federal gun laws that prevent the people from keeping and bearing arms;
4. Two wars and occupations conducted without declarations of war by congress;
5. The collection of direct taxes from the individuals of the several states on their wages without apportionment;



6. The Patriot Act that violates the 4th Amendment;
7. The use of drones over America by private corporations and the military and police;
8. TARP or Troubled Asset Relief Program where tax dollars were used directly to bail out the bad investments made by private banks;
9. Participation in the United Nations which is an unlawful super government with a legislature, judiciary and executive;
10. No Child Left Behind Program to aid in public education;
11. The adoption of ancient monarchial "Sovereign Immunity" to harm the people even unto death and to take, destroy and convert every kind of property of the people without judicial remedy unless waived by statute or congressional resolution prior to suit.

We could name some more. These are egregious changes in form passed by law made by the legislature, defended by the highest courts, executed by the chief magistrate and are not permitted by the required amendments to the US Constitution. This is nothing more than GROSS DISSOLUTION provable with sound logical natural law and hard, direct substantial, even, empirical evidence. No one in their right mind can argue the truth of our present condition of dissolution.

We will often hear this; "Let's take back our government" or "Let's enforce the Constitution." No sir not me! To do so would be the institution and maintenance of abject tyranny. Anything that is so grossly dissolved has only one purpose and that is to keep the people bent down to the ground. What parts of the Constitution are being enforced presently? Only the provisions that demand things from the people are enforced and even things that are not demanded of the people by means of a dissolved government.

Now I will leave this at that for now as I believe I have proven my point without too much rigor and detail which could be added later for those who need references. One other thing: This is not my concoction but the sound thinking of John Locke who wrote these concepts down and published them in 1689 without his signature for fear of losing his head. Thomas Jefferson said all the principles of human liberty in American came from the writings of two men, Algernon Sidney and John Locke. I would agree, and it is obvious from the language of most state constitutions and that of the federal union. Our forefathers would know what I am talking about. The most dangerous book in America from 1776 until this day remains the Second Treatise of Government written by John Locke in 1689. I suggest you read the last chapter on the Dissolution of Government at <http://www.constitution.org/jl/2ndtreat.htm>

As a final note; It matters not what happened right before the Civil War or what happened after the Civil War or even what happened right before the US Constitution or even what happened instead of the Articles of Confederation. All of those things are irrelevant. It makes for good stories and can certainly be instructive but has no merit for or against what I am saying herein. The important element here is that the US Constitution, no matter how it was created, is the instrument by which the tyrants now claim has given them the authority to do as they do. But, unfortunately for them, it is that very document which will bury them.

As I have said before with others, a constitution has two very distinct and very powerful functions. The first function is to check tyranny by limiting authority. The second function is; if and when that first function fails, that same instrument proves the

dissolution of all authority of tyrants and delivers the people from under it into full liberty to protect their property as they see fit. We must now discern what stage of the US Constitution we are under. Are we under the first or the last? Both places are good places! But only the second has power for us now.

God bless you all for your interest and participation in this discussion. We will need God's intervention from now on and prayer for that must be made unceasingly!

Sincerely,

**Ron**

***Tom (Should have been Larry),***

I have read all the remarks made by all parties privy to this topic of exchange and find only one comment that demands my attention to better expose the truth of our condition of dissolution and what could be done. It follows: "Of course, the legal dissolution has to be pursued through a court so that the unjust deed may be undone properly." Now I ask; if our present condition be one of dissolution, where are we going to find a court that has jurisdiction to determine our state of affairs or whether or not we are dissolved and how to resolve it or what it means? Dissolution is a condition that strips the authority from every branch of government and every person who is a part of it. Presently there is no lawful, de jure if you will, "Supreme Court." In fact there is no court on earth with authority to hear this issue and rule in any way upon it. And that is the essence of the elegance of dissolution!

And what unjust deed are you referring to? The unjust deed under the US Constitution, of which the tyrants maintain that we are under, is the deed of making laws that change the form of our union without the required amendments to do so thereby releasing all parties to it to form a new lawful union for the protection of our property. Now also how would we undo the unjust deed of dissolution? That would imply the reunification based upon the will of a dissolved court with no jurisdiction. You have totally confused the idea of dissolution with the idea of secession. You have entangled all kinds of deeds and times of occurrences and results and remedies which will frighten most men and leave them in doubt of what their foundation is.

The beauty of dissolution is that it is simple and easy to understand and you simply no longer seek the assistance of tyrants in dissolved government to do your own will and organize your own lawful government. But long before that is ever realized there must be much talk and instruction about this concept because it will surely be resisted by tyrants if it is not formidable in numbers. There is one other caution I might bring up here. A fragmented America with many single stand alone republics with out a union that we consent to will make every one of those states weak and subject to the devises of other larger unions even from those overseas. In fact, a fragmented weak America was the design of the globalists who work to separate us at present. As I alluded to in another email, the states are also dissolved for the same reason the union is and they too must be recreated. The best plan is to have a gradual realization of a large number of Americans that their union is dissolved and that the dissolved states must seek a new and lawful union that would purge the unlawful statutes from the states or recreate them from their dissolved condition in order to join. This would indeed protect all states from larger more

"foreign" dangers which are also ready to pounce upon any attempt to obtain real freedom.

Sincerely,

**Ron**

***Ron,***

I like it. I recommend the entire dialogue be edited into coherence and posted, perhaps in series, to the League of the South.

**DN**

***Ron***

You may have just started a game, or a contest. **LIST THE REASONS FOR DISSOLUTION**

Here are the first couple that come to my mind:

12. The alteration of the number of People represented by those who sit in the House of Representatives, without amending the Constitution. From the original "one representative per every 30,000 citizens," that would give a nation with 311,000,000 citizens a total of 10,366 Members of Congress. It would be much more difficult to "buy Congress", and you could stop in the grocery store and chat with your congressman. Who cares if it's unwieldy - that government which governs least, governs best. Unwieldy government beats efficient government every time.
13. Creation of an unauthorized bureaucracy, the Department of Education, with swarms of agents who eat out our existence, mandating curricula and policy to every school district in the country, and which places such a financial burden on the taxpayers of those States that the very economy is crippled, and all this by design. Control.

Perhaps, when we gather 100 or more of these, any of which might be considered grounds for dissolution, if allowed to stand, we can then order them in some manner, and present a case for "altering or abolishing" the present government.

**Doug**

***Doug,***

See how much fun this is and how easy! Anyone can play. All you have to do is find a law that uses power not delegated by the Constitution and then see if it is permitted by amendment. If not the constitution is dissolved. I wonder what those in government thought defending the constitution really meant. I guess they thought it meant; keeping somebody from setting it on fire. Because it is way past defense - it is deader than hell. For someone to say they are going to defend the constitution actually means now that they are going to make sure the people conform to a dead and dissolved instrument. Because no one presently in government has authority to, even, repeal laws to come into conformity with the dissolved constitution. Those in the federal government have simply

destroyed their own authority and they cannot reinstitute it or any other without all the people.

Sincerely,

**Ron**

***Ron,***

Just a personal note to say I feel I have accomplished something here, which is to get Ron Avery to make sense, for a change!

You did a good job, in a short space of time, and you helped me understand what you were saying, and I must say that it makes so much sense that I would tell you I agree with you, except for one thing -- that would give you a chance to say, "I told you so!"

**Doug**

***Doug,***

This is just not like you. You are up to something. I will remain on guard and cautious but I accept your admission for now as sincere. Oh, and; "I told you so!"

Sincerely,

**Ron**

***Gentlemen,***

As you can see Doug and I were having a little fun below and I enjoyed it. But when I closed my computer and headed downstairs a moment ago it hit me like a ton of bricks. If I can win Doug New and then Harry Carter, I have won the world. I will have taken the South and the Christians with Doug. And if I could now persuade Harry then I will have won the youthful libertarians, voluntarists, and Austrian economists. And that is my goal. My battle cry remains - Lawful Government in the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth! Amen and God's blessings to you all.

Sincerely,

**Ron**

***Dream on, Ron.***

You must realize that I represent less than one percent of any constituency.

**Doug**

**Doug,**

All good things come to an end. This one was just very short. Hey it was good while it lasted! LOL.

**Ron**

**Ron**

" . . . I have won the world." Sorry Ron, that sounds like new world order talk to me.

**Harry**

**Not at all Harry,**

It is more like St Paul saying:

"3 For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh:

4 (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;)

**5 Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;**

6 And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled."

2 Corinthians 10:3-6

Christ has created the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth, yet men are trying to get control of it and transform it and put it under their own domination with their own contrived human doctrines. But God is against tyranny and those things that create it and maintain it. Therefore, God and Christ desire to see lawful government in their Kingdom that they have instituted by the Death, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ who now sits on the throne and rules through his saints. We already have a government in the world and it is controlled and ruled by the doctrines established by Christ Jesus. Yet this government is covered up by tyrants. God has set us free and wants us to live in freedom under His jurisdiction and no other. But he has made all Christians kings and priests on the earth to establish lawful government that rewards good and punishes evil and we now know what those things are. So government is not avoidable as it is created by God for the protection of our property. But the saints are not perfect and do not yet live in perfection but have a right to create the best government they can in view of what Christ has done and God approves of that effort and will aid in its institution and maintenance. But evil men will try to destroy it and control it as you say. But this does not deter the right of Christians to create and support a government made for the purpose of the protection of the property of every person under it.

And when I said I have won the world I mean it in the sense that I have been able to persuade the minds of men to seek lawful government which God has ordained and maintained. If we repent and seek new lawful government I have no doubt that God will once again stand up in heaven above and command his angels to go down and fight with us.

Sincerely,

**Ron**

***Ron and Doug and others,***

You all make thoughtful points, but .....Ron's reference to the inapplicability of ancient thoughts such as the Articles of Confederation were targeted at me when I suggested to him that the Articles were violated when the Framers met in Philadelphia so many years ago. My point was and is that men, as representatives of a larger audience, cannot be trusted to manufacture anything that will, by edict, apply to members of that larger audience UNLESS members of that larger audience have the liberty to Opt Out. So, how can a new "lawful government" be manufactured to replace a "dissolved government"; who would you trust to represent your views?

Hence, I offer No Government as the first step.

**Harry Carter**

***Dear Harry,***

How we all agree, I'm sure, that zero government would be like Paradise, except for one little problem, and that is the sin nature of man. When anarchy looks like paradise, or Utopia, it will be spoiled in short order by some guy who thinks he can take what is yours or mine, without repercussion. And then anarchy grows to look like the Libertine French Revolution. And then we all beg for martial law, or we flee for our very lives.

As much as I hate to admit it, Ron Avery is right. (Even a blind hog finds an acorn now and then.) More to the point, I spent some hours reading the link he provided from John Locke's Second Treatise on Civil Government, and could not find a word with which I could disagree. And Locke could be writing specifically about our situation today as he describes the problems of dealing with tyranny.

**Doug**

***Doug,***

A slight correction: "it will be spoiled in short order by some guy who thinks he can take what is yours or mine, without repercussion" by forming a government!

**Harry**

***Harry,***

Of course, that's the most obvious. He can't do it by himself because I'm well-armed, but with 100 or 1,000, he can. I'm curious if you've taken the time to carefully read

Locke's Second Treatise on Civil Government. You're not proposing anything new - he discusses each of these alternatives, and the problems, in detail. He agrees with you and me and Ron - to affect a change is not likely until a certain level of critical mass is reached - and NFL and the Final Four seem to be more important to the universe of people around me, and I suspect around you. Which means... what? I think it means that you and I and Ron stop cooperating, and even help bleed the system dry, until it collapses. THEN it would behoove us to be able to band together to protect one another's lives, liberty and property, in short order and against all comers. Will we have an alternative model ready, which our neighbors will buy?

The more I think about it, Harry, the more I think the best form of government is a benevolent dictatorship, but that's only gonna work if I get to be the dictator!

**Doug**

**Harry,**

Others also had alluded to the discussions just prior to 1789 and the Southern states' will to join the union under the proposed constitution. But indeed I was referring to your prior comment about the Articles of Confederation being abandoned with or without the authority of the people. At this point I am trying to make an argument before the people of America that we do not have a lawful government not based upon what did or didn't happen that should or should not have happened in history but upon what the tyrants claim is the source of their own authority. That source is the US Constitution and I am glad of it because we can prove beyond the shadow of any doubt that this instrument has been dissolved beyond any recognition stripping them of all authority.

Your first step that you offer is already here. We have no government. How do you like it? We have tyranny that maintains the illusion of lawful government before the people in order to continue its tyranny. This is a form of anarchy where confusion and violence rules without law under the direction of a dissolved government.

The law or Constitution no longer stands and the dissolved government does as it wants without check and there is no lawfully formed government or even a loose agreement between the people as to how and when to resist its tyranny and violence. This illusion is maintained only by constant elections of people to dissolved offices constantly held in the face of the people by the fascist media outlets.

Sincerely,

**Ron**

**Ron,**

Of course you are mostly right, but we are talking in circles. To effect a change (improvement) as you desire, these points cannot be ignored:

1. Except for the fully invested (those who say "I'M A REPUBLICAN", or "I'M A DEMOCRAT" or "I LIVE IN THE GREATEST COUNTRY IN THE UNIVERSE"), the remnant knows that there are serious problems with the thing they call government (CIA, TSA, IRS, FDA, EPA, etc.). They just don't think about government as "lawful" or "unlawful". They think it IS law, but it is just wrong, perhaps corrupt. And they are proud that they are "law-abiding citizens".

2. Prove it to whom? 300,000,000 people, 1 person at a time? I don't believe that 300 people will listen to the proof when there is a Football Game, World Series or America's Got Talent to attend to.
3. "We" don't have "no government"; "we" have a corrupt government staffed by corrupt people, who go into government "service" to govern (control) other people. If "we" had "no government", no one would or could control us. We each would govern (control) ourselves. It is error to equate corrupt government with anarchy, which by proper definition is "without government" or "no government", lawful or otherwise.

The suffix; **archy** means form of government or rule. The prefix "an", like the prefix "anti" means the opposite. For example: thesis / antithesis or matter / anti-matter.

4. "archy" as you can see is a form of government or rule. And to rule, one exercises authority. That is what energizes government people - exercising authority over other people and animals and things and behaviors. People, as I said above and as you know, believe "government" is the law, people are "law-abiding", and the law ("government") has authority to rule (by definition, above).
5. The problem resides in this word "authority". It is a myth because "all men are created equal". And, people can only get authority if it is delegated to them. So, as you well know, you can delegate authority to someone to rule over you, but you cannot delegate authority to someone to rule over me unless I personally consent - not by a majority, not by a plurality, not by an elite committee - just me.
6. Therefore, even lawful government, as conceived, is a myth unless one consents.

## Harry

### *Harry,*

#### **Ron's answer to Harry's Point 1 above:**

If we were able to convince several Christian denominations - that would make a difference. If we could persuade clubs and groups that have their own communication network that would help.

#### **Ron's answer to Harry's Point 2 above:**

Same problem and answer for this. There are a lot of angry people and they are growing in numbers as the tyranny heats up and they will be looking for ideas. We must have them ready for them when they come looking or they will take whatever is available.

#### **Ron's answer to Harry's Point 3 above:**

What makes you think that the absence of government automatically means the presents of peace and harmony among all human kind? What do you think actually gave rise to government in the first place? It was some men seeing an opportunity to over power other men and take their stuff without recourse because the individuals were unorganized and could not defend themselves from a bigger guy or a group of guys. Yes indeed, one of the definitions of anarchy is no government. But the definition of anarchy also covers conditions of terror, confusion and harm as a result of bands of robbers and cut-throats and it also covers conditions where tyranny reigns without lawful government



to resist it. And what is tyranny other than the exercise of power by those who have no authority. Anarchy does not imply the absence of tyranny or terror only the absence of lawful government.

**Ron's answer to Harry's Point 4 above:**

It does not follow that because "archy" means government or rule that one exercises authority to rule. We can have rulers who have no authority to rule and that is, in fact, exactly what we have presently.

Many things energize people, "government people or otherwise, but the lawful exercise of authority demands a basis upon which those people have obtained and maintained their authority. If they cannot show this basis they are not exercising authority but only power without authority which is tyranny.

Show us how government is the law and how the people are law abiding and how the government has authority to rule.

**Ron's answer to Harry's Point 5 above:**

This is a major impasse for you as we have come here before and I now want to demonstrate the weakness of your position once again. You have admitted herein that people rule over others with authority if it is delegated to them by others. So you are in agreement with all reasonable men that we can delegate our authority to other men to act as a whole to protect our property. And you are also right that no one can rule over you unless you give them your own personal delegated authority to do so. I agree.

But the next step is where we do not agree and where you have taken a weak and indefensible position. Because you withhold your own personal delegated authority from a government being constructed you think that the new government cannot apply to you or anyone else who withholds their authority because you think that a lawful government cannot be made that will rule over any given piece of land mass if any one of those people have withheld their authority. From this you also conclude that no lawful government can be constructed because it cannot obtain the delegated authority of everyone who lives in the domain it would cover.

Do you think that God will not recognize the lawfulness of a group of men who come together to defend their own God given lives, liberties and possessions because you and a few other anarchists withhold your authority? Not so. The new government can be lawfully constructed upon those who do delegate their authority and it can cover the ground upon which you and your anarchist friends live and own because it is they who are protecting it.

If a new government is constructed for the purpose of protecting the property of all those who live there you have only two choices; you may continue to live there by ascent without delegation by obeying the laws of the new government or you may sell your property and leave. Now I don't want to sound mean here so I will explain why that is not mean. What is the purpose again of lawful God ordained government? It is the protection of all the property of all the people that live in its domain. Now if you personally don't like such an idea and prefer areas where property is not protected by a lawfully constituted government then you are free to sell your property and move to that region and defend yourself the best you know how.

No one is advocating the construction of a government to harm the people and take their property nor advocating that all grant their authority to such a tyrannical device and I would say it would be an unlawful government upon the moment it was constructed.

However, I will also say it might not be a perfect government but if it is a great improvement over that which is harming us presently and it was all we could muster at the critical time in history it will be acknowledged, aided and defended by God and the mind of mankind.

**Ron's answer to Harry's Point 6 above:**

You have here given a summary of your view of all government. If that were actually true, that lawful government was impossible, I believe that men would have discovered that long ago. Anarchist today act like the idea of anarchy sprang up three years ago. Anarchy is very old and very weak and always yields to tyranny or lawful government as it has no power of its own and by definition is against all agreements between men. For the moment that we agree upon those things that are common among us and those things that we think should be protected by the whole for the good of each individual we have the opposite of anarchy which you have so plainly showed above in your definitions. We can even go so far as to conclude that anarchists are anti-social as well because the pinnacle of society is government or the agreement between people who live together. It is no myth that men do agree on what is important to them and how they shall protect it and there is no force on earth and or philosophy or reasoning among men or God's word that proves it to be erroneous. Therefore, lawful government cannot be a myth if it is not shown to be impossible by something. You certainly have not proven lawful government to be a myth by your arguments above.

I also want to thank you Harry for your comments because they are thought provoking and require considerable thought to answer and if we cannot answer them in a way that is irrefutable and compelling then we have no chance of survival in the world of tyranny. For it is certain that anarchy, containing tyranny, has never been a deterrent to it.

Sincerely,

**Ron**

***Ron***

Excuse me for carrying on past the bell, but I had one other thought that I forgot to include. John Locke was a Philosopher! He is referred to in Wikipedia as an empiricist, but he had no experience in forming a government as he describes. It is theory only, and as most theories, they tend to work on paper. But when the human element is injected, conditions change. For after all, men are not pre-programmed robots. They see a government obstruction and go around it. In fact, that is why people can still succeed in this corrupt government environment. And it is why government becomes more corrupt by the day. It seeks to obstruct further those that try to avoid its obstacles. Also it is why Austrian economics explains and predicts with accuracy. Precision of timing is not known because while human action can be predicted, its timing cannot. After all, all men are not per-programmed robots, despite the government lies to correct that situation.

**Harry**

**Harry,**

You have opened our discussion to a new topic. Could you therefore explain to us what Austrian economics has to offer us under tyranny and how we might employ its doctrines to the protection of our properties? I will only add that while none of us, to my knowledge, has actually written a constitution, John Locke actually wrote most of the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina in New England in 1669. I must also say that his Second Treatise of Government was read by all the founders and used extensively in the Declaration of Independence and the constitutions of most of the states, if not all of them. In essence Jefferson said that all of the United States was built upon the writings of Algernon Sidney and John Locke. It is interesting that some have called the reasoning of John Locke theory. Is it only theory that "no one can delegate to another more authority than they hold in themselves?" Is it only theory that healthy sound men form governments for the protection of their property rather than for the destruction of their property? Is it only theory to conclude that governments dissolve themselves by changing their form without permission by the means specified in their constitutions? Is it only theory that  $2 + 2$  equals 4? These are not theories but logical conclusions based upon reason and experience. And the principles of property that Locke described may be stood upon with one's life without regret.

I would truly like to know what Austrian Economics holds for the liberation of mankind from the grips of tyranny and how we may employ it. I have never heard it explained in any detail that gave me confidence to reach out for it. If there is something there we need it desperately.

Sincerely,

**Ron**

Gentlemen,

This concludes the discussion as of July 1, 2012 at 10:42 PM. As can be seen after they have been compiled, not all the questions received a reply. However, it does present a picture of how these ideas are employed. This compilation is now submitted to all that participated for their use and hopefully for a more organized discussion at some future date. I maintain that the shortest and most accurate "state of the union" speech can be made in one word; "Dissolved."

Sincerely,

Ronald F. Avery

July 3, 2012 4:20 PM