

How Is the U.S. Constitution Violated?

2015 © *Cameron Rebigsof*

What is the nature of the U.S. Constitution? It is a will that our Founding Fathers commonly shared and expected the nation to follow generation after generation. There are two essences in this document: material essence, which is capitalism, and spiritual essence, which is Christianity. With this Constitution, the Founding Fathers expected these two essences to espouse each other, and mandated the government to defend both essences.

Americans have a popular motto: no one is above the law. Ironically, they have long made violating the Constitution their “tradition”. The number one target of the violation is indeed even exactly the Constitution itself. The groups of people violating the Constitution cover a wide political spectrum, from the so called liberals to those so called conservatives, from left to right, and from the head of the three government branches to the grassroots.

Section 1 Violation in General Principles

(1) **Language Violation. English is the official language of this nation.** English is the only language that the Founding Fathers utilize in establishing The Declaration of Independence and other two supreme law documents for this nation. This indisputably implies English being the only language that the Founding Fathers determine to use in communicating with their citizens. As such, they have imperatively enthroned English, and English only, as the official language. Using any other language in any governmental documents, even something as common as voting pamphlets and ballots, or test for driver’s license, is to create language block damaging the comprehension and trust between the Founding Fathers and their citizens. The only exception for our governmental documents to use other language is in something related to diplomatic matter with other countries. It is absolutely unconstitutional for any candidate to use any language other than English in his campaign for any government office. It is not the job of that office to understand the non-English speaking people’s language, it the job of the non-English speaking people to understand English if they want the service of this office.

(2) **An entire document of Supreme Law revered by the Constitution is put to sleep** without the Congress’ ratification; not even any legitimate reason is found accompanied when it is so done. The document herein referred to is called THE ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION AND PERPETUAL UNION (referred as AOC from here on). With its Article VI, the Constitution expresses how it has revered the AOC:

All Debts contracted and Engagement entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land...

This statement therefore indisputably affirms that the AOC is still there and actively alive, no matter one would consider the AOC as a debt, or engagement, or treaty against this nation. Indeed, besides the above statement, the AOC itself monopolizes one statement to have maintained the heartbeat of the nation and the Constitution of 1787. This monopolized statement, appearing as the First Article in the AOC, so claims:

*The stile of this confederacy shall be “**The United States of America**”.*

Reject or retire the AOC, anyone? Dare you!

(3) The spiritual essence of the nation, Christianity, is exposed to no protection from law while any non-Christian belief is tightly placed under the guarding of “law”.

If the Americans do not even care about to have the First Article of the AOC trashed, it is only natural for them not to pay attention to the Third Article in the AOC, which so states:

*The said states hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other, against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, **on account of religion**, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever.*

With the complete obscuration of this statement, the Supreme Law of the land is made powerless in defending Christianity, the spiritual essence of the nation, but made becoming to facilitate the full attack on this teaching. To further reinforce someone’s scheme promoting the separation of Christianity and the US, the anti-American factions have also peddled the following concepts through distorting our Constitution:

- (a) **Equating “establishment of religion” in the First Amendment with *religion*.** Today, so many Americans have accepted and believed that that “Congress shall make no law respecting religion” is how the 1st Amendment should read. Reinforced by the obscuration of religion protection clause in the AOC as mentioned above, Christianity is made losing its spiritual privilege enthroned in this nation by the Constitution. Among the competition with other religion or faiths, Christianity is pitifully made to fight for

freedom of religion instead of constitutional privilege. The deprivation of such constitutional privilege only offers convenience for someone to make Christianity lose hand after hand and battle after battle in all this competition when “law” being applied. There is one essential point that Americans’ focus has been misled but should be recovered: an establishment of religion is not a religion. This is the same concept as that a citizen of America is not America.

An establishment of religion = a religion ? What a sinister insult to the profound wisdom of the Founding Fathers!

(b) **Contorting “no religious test shall ever be required” into “no religious test shall ever be tolerated”.** Because of this contortion, a principal reading Bible to his students is fired, and a Christian supermarket owner is penalized for firing an Islamic employee who refuses to handle pork. Persecution against Christians has been all over in this country that is established by Christian founders.

(c) **Placing a dead treaty above the Constitution** as evidence to disprove the Christianity nature of this nation. The treaty herein referred to is the treaty of Tripoli. It is the 11th Article in this treaty that the anti-American factions constantly quote for their support. Here is how it said:

As the Government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion; as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquility, of Mussulmen [Muslims]; and as the said States never entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mahometan [Muslim] nation, it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries

Clearly, the expressions *Government* and *said States* have been distinctively used in different parts of the above statement and cannot be interchangeably replaced with each other. **No one** can read “As the Nation (or Country, or said State) of the United States of America...” from the above text. Indeed, so worded, “*no pretext arising from religious opinions*” hereby conversely allows a suggestion that religion opinion can potentially become a candidate of reason in the case that “*interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries*” does occur. In a war legitimized by religious pretext, opposing Muslims, what religion would the then United States inevitably choose to stand for? If not Christianity, what else? Atheism? Forget it! Political reality has shown that atheists would only fanatically embrace Muslims as their ally for their purpose of defeating Christianity. Atheists have only two choices toward Muslims: (1)

befriend with Muslims when they themselves are still politically valuable to the Muslims, (2) when such value fades, knee buckling at Muslims, who must stone death homosexual activists.

(d) **Allowing words from celebrities to be more authoritative above the Constitution in law application, such as Jefferson's "Separation of church and state".** In the Constitution, while the spirit of separation of church and *government* is evident, no one can find any statement demanding the separation of church and *state*; the word state means a nation or country most of the time. Because Jefferson is such a political giant, people then just follow and gobble this phrase without second thought. Without clear distinction between the meaning of government and country about the word state, "separation of church and state" could someday serve to provide the legitimacy of dispelling Christianity from this country. The anti-American factions just use any opportunity and mean they see fit for their purpose; there is absolutely no mercy. It is exactly because of this political instinct that they have obscured the AOC meanwhile reviving the political corpse of the Treaty of Tripoli with all the energy they can find. In too many cases, instead of pursuing the true meaning of the words of the Constitution, people often take what some professors said for granted. It is said by many scholars that James Madison told people AOC no longer carrying any power as soon as the current Constitution took effect. Very simply, however, for example, can what Madison said, if he did say, remove (I) the First Article of the AOC, or (II) the **Union** that the preamble of the Constitution of 1787 vows to perfect while this union is formed with the AOC? As a matter of fact, both theoretically and technically, wording as "in order to form a more perfect union", the Constitution has placed itself as an amendment to the AOC. That the AOC continuously stays as the Supreme Law of the land is further reaffirmed by those statements of Article VI in the Constitution, as pointed out in (1) above.

With all is said here, the point is that, regardless of who said what, whether Jefferson, or Madison, or any egghead in the academic campus, **unless such saying is ratified by Congress, none of them can be accepted as law above the Constitution and thus be used to dictate the Constitution.**

Only congressional ratification can have the power to retire the AOC!

(4) The Americans have flooded their political arena with too many "laws" that are never strictly defined, and no part of them can be found with conformance to the Constitution. Nearly all these laws are centered on "rights" and enjoyment, such as human right, civil right,

poor's right, weak group's right, gay right, animal right, fairness, sharing, income equality, woman's right, fetus right, democracy, American dream, illegal immigrant's right, inmate's right, minority right, anti-discrimination... Almost any demand or human instinct topped with "right" can be used to dispel the sanction of Constitution in law application.

(5) The American government even leads to establish laws that are directly against the Constitution, such as Affirmative action policies, anti-Trust Law, Affordable Care Act and many welfare programs that are strictly based on ideas of Socialism. Anything that is of Socialism must be anti-capitalism. There is no room for compromise between capitalism and Socialism. The U.S. Constitution is a document very typically enforcing and defending capitalism. So, anything against the operation of capitalism has to be unconstitutional in America. From the Declaration of Independence, to the AOC, to the Constitution, one word is repeated besides God/Lord. The word spanning across all these documents is **commerce**. Commerce is nothing else but free-trade. Trading is free only if the parties joining the trade can obtain something without the escort of violent power. Socialism is exactly an idea to guarantee someone to obtain something in a "trade" with the presence of only power, the most irresistible power, which is the government power. Trading accompanied with violent power is robbery. Therefore, Socialism is nothing else but a theory to glamorize robbery. So unbelievably, lacking the sense of genuinely understanding its own Constitution, but abducted by all sense of various "rights", a supposedly capitalist government has been so zealously creating so many socialist laws to shackle and rob its people, the most creative people in the world.

(6) The Supreme Court is allowed to invented Laws without the ratification of Congress, such as the so called (religious) neutrality, secularism, religious clause (said to be in the First Amendment), equal protection (without due process of law), and also qualifying academic subject as science in spite of the fierce controversy involved, legalizing various "human right" demands, such as the same sex marriage, which is in a position directly bleaching the text of the Constitution. To make it worse, many cases have shown obvious selective application of law by the Court in mediating cases of the same nature. Typically, in cases of faith competition, protection is given to anti-Christian party, disregarding whether or not the practice of the anti-Christian party is in violation of the Constitution. When a court is allowed to do all this, the Court is above the law, declaring "I am the law". When a tiny group of people can invent law and apply the same, tyranny oligarchy appears; Constitution becomes only a piece of paper.

Section 2 Violation in Literal Details

Here we make a list about the violations that we found in close literal comparison with the text of the Constitution. The list so enumerated and displayed follows the sequence how the text appears in the Constitution.

(1) Same sex marriage is an action to bleach the word *Posterity* from the preamble. Bleaching the word *Posterity* is a direct action of rooting out the Constitution. Here is how the preamble would read without the word posterity:

*We..in order to...secure the Blessing of Liberty to **ourselves** (only), do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.*

Today, the Founding Fathers, those biological beings indicated by the word “ourselves”, have long gone. Naturally, without posterity, according to the above text, the country they established must also have long gone. Then, what can have been more efficient in murdering their nation than to have their posterity terminated? Not George III, not the war of 1812, not the attack of Pearl Harbor, not Bin Laden’s horrific September-11 slaughtering... Let’s go extreme: A people allowing only same-sex marriage must hopelessly perish in about 60 years, regardless; but a people allowing no same-sex marriage can biologically exist forever. Americans have created an environment to allow their court to legalize an act of nation murdering. The Founding Fathers handed down to us an unprecedentedly brilliant country; we return them an action of utmost cruelty against them. Shame on us!

(2) Illegal immigrants are in the front line of collapsing the preamble in every aspect involving “establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare”. However, the “liberty” of Constitution violation allowed in the American tradition even goes as far as criminalizing many law enforcement agents as well as ordinary citizens who try to resist the pouring in of the illegal immigrants. Without any sense about the grandeur of the Constitution and the sovereignty of the nation, one former president promised to a Mexican president to clear up the action of the southern “villains”, who self-organized to put up the effort to block the invasion. As if it is not enough to have this nation disintegrated, the currently incumbent president even issued an executive order to give amnesty to all these illegal aliens. American media overall cares far more about the hurt agitated by the term anchor-baby than the hurt raised by the murder of an American citizen in many cases committed by illegal immigrants.

(3) The U.S. Supreme Court has a long history of seriously violating “all legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States” (section 1, Article I). Equally pathetic is that Congress is apathy all the time about this power evasion. Why does the Congress stay silent? One open answer is that certain judgement made based on violation of the Constitution meets the interest of some individuals, or group of members, the so called caucus, or even a party, in the Congress. A less open answer is that many of them have very vague idea about what Constitution is. Their being there is not for defending the Constitution, but for having a job and power. That is why a joke like this can happen: A congress member told the reporters that that our legislature body has three branches guarantees democracy in our country. A third reason can also be easily found: They themselves already motivate to violate the Constitution. The Court’s violation just serves them an opportunity to avoid having their own true face from being exposed.

(4) Section 8 in Article I, where powers of the Congress are listed, is one of the sections where the Constitution is found most liberally violated.

(a) First of all, **the USA, a typical country of capitalism has been driven along the direction of nationalizing private business.** Nationalizing business is a typical syndrome of Socialism, which is a social system that our Constitution has open statements not to allow. In general, the Congress has power to “regulate Commerce”, but no power to force “commerce” or operate commerce.

The very first victim having been nationalized in America is the school system. Schools are actually markets where knowledge is sold. Setting up public schools just places schools under the absolute monopoly control of the government. Public school is a concept started with a noble idea, and that is why public schools are set up early in the history of the United States. However, any noble idea also inevitably exposes itself to the exploitation of people who are not that noble. Human greed is always a more overwhelming element than nobility. Today, our public schools have been hijacked by anti-American factions and converted into temples where students are made to worship hedonism and various atheistic nonsense, such as that the universe and life are created from nothing, and that $1+1<2$ from special relativity is a result of ingenious thinking.

To retain the noble idea of education supported by government without violating the Constitution, the proper way to do is to return all schools to private enterprises, while government supplies tuition, and tuition only, equally to every student, regardless of each student’s family financial status.

The second victim having been nationalized is the personal health insurance business, which is lately placed under the control of Affordable Care Act. The establishment of Affordable Care Act violates the Constitution in two folds, because it is a combination of (a) nationalizing business and (b) welfare program. The enactment of any welfare program is absolutely unconstitutional and is the result of absolute power abusing by the Congress. We will go into this topic again soon.

A third victim is the various municipal transportation facilities at many local government levels. With three victims already successfully being hurled into the barn of nationalization, who will be the fourth one? In this author's expectation, media may potentially be the next target. Haven't Americans heard enough how arduously some government heads are promoting the so-called speech neutrality? Of course, no "neutrality" is neutral enough unless it meets what these government heads want to hear. If a fourth victim is successfully reined into the barn, a fifth target would soon be spotted, then the sixth, the seventh...

(b) Nowhere in Section 8, or even in the entire Constitution, has statement to empower the Congress to enact welfare program. It is easy for anyone to see that the purpose of the enactment of welfare program can serve only two purposes: (a) to purchase domestic peace, or to appease, (b) to help politicians to purchase ballots. No matter how one may glamorize the welfare program, the money spent for welfare program must be sourced by an irresistible power, the government power, and end up purchasing only one merchandise—poverty, and more poverty. It is only a natural human rule that everyone tries to pay as little tax as possible—but he has to pay because of the government power. It is also the rule of the welfare system that when the welfare money reaches the hand of the recipient, the recipient does not have to contribute anything but poverty in exchange. Such a process of money changing hand is thus absolutely outside of any sense of commerce emphasized in the Constitution, but fits perfectly the definition of robbery. A constitution supposed to promote capitalism is thus turned into an instrument for Socialism to set sail. Our socialist welfare program not only has crumbled our economy, but also corrupted the moral of the society—violation of the Constitution has confused so many people as to take crime as justice.

(c) Monopoly is protected in our Constitution! Therefore, Law of anti-Trust is anti-Constitution, particularly when this law is only set up against business owners while favoring labor monopoly. The protection on monopoly, though, is

emphasized as time limited in the Constitution. Here is how the Constitution presents the protection:

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.

A successful business under the leadership of a successful business owner or a group of owners definitely fits into what this clause presents: useful art of business management, authors and inventors of the successful management, and the discoveries of such management.

Too bad, monopoly has its born criminal nature encouraged by human greed. When it gets to a certain level or power, any monopoly must tend to gain social control in its own favor and then promote forced-trade to a certain degree. As such, according to the Constitution, the protection on monopoly can only be provided up to a certain time limit. Beyond this time limit, the protection must be removed, and the monopoly must be made split and exposed to competition. To protect monopoly is to encourage creativity in business. Any society that needs to move forward must depend on the growth of successful business. To split the monopoly is to avoid the society being controlled by special interest. One of the famous actions in cracking down monopoly in American history is the split of Ma-bell in 1984.

To protect and to split, both are constitutional; purely “anti-Trust” is thus unconstitutional.

(d) If the government’s nowadays practice that we see along this nation’s southern border makes any sense, **the Founding Fathers must have all committed crime of no excuse by embedding the expression “repel Invasions” in the Constitution.** Today, so many laws, codes, rules, regulations have been made to restrict or even punish those people who faithfully carry out their duties of expelling invasions. Those who are against the expelling have occupied every level of the government offices.

What is an invader? To a country of sovereignty, anyone gets in or stays without permission is an invader, armed or not armed. However, the unprecedented scale of violation of the Constitution promoted by so many government agents/officers has

allowed tens of millions of illegal personnel in this country to do all things harming Americans, from murdering to robbery to “legally” sliding away their jobs.

This author is sure that the Founding Fathers would have never expected that what they created with blood can be so worthlessly converted into easy meal to be relentlessly pecked by vultures from all over.

(5) With the confusion on the Constitution, Americans must prepare themselves to welcome **another violation: the requirement of birth status for a presidential candidate.** There are only two statuses meeting the constitutional requirement: (I) natural born Citizen and (II) citizen of the United States, but only those “*at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution*”. (Section 1, Article II)

Before the Constitution was established, there must have existed thirteen official versions of concept how an American citizen was recognized. The definition most inarguable and readily acceptable by all thirteen states for a person, if not born in the land of America, to be a *Citizen* (non-natural born) *of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution*, was a person whose birth was given by an American citizen. As to how this parent giving birth to this citizen outside of America was recognized as an American citizen was up to each of the thirteen state’s acceptance, and the Congress accepted all thirteen versions. Then, we ultimately come to a point that the Constitution only recognizes the birth place as the prerequisite to decide whether or not a candidate has been a natural born. Subsequently, anyone born anywhere outside of where the power of this Constitution can reach is not a natural born. For such a non-natural born to become a presidential candidate, he must meet the sole time mark requirement in history at which this Constitution is adopted.

Today, we have the Naturalization Act of 1790 to help us to define what is natural born for a person. It states that children born to U.S. citizens abroad may have chance to be regarded as a natural born citizens. However, the Act is passed three years after the establishment of the Constitution, and the Act was not made with a power to retrospect and redefine a presidential candidate’s prerequisite in the Constitution. Therefore, legally, the natural born definition adopted in the Constitution for a presidential candidate stands by itself, having full power to decline the measurement from the Act. In other words, today, after all those citizens who were *citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution* having long gone, the Constitution allows only birth place singly to determine a presidential candidate being natural born or not.

In history, controversy arose concerning many candidates’ birth prerequisite. George Romney, born in Mexico, was accepted to run in 1968 while he should not be qualified

according to the Constitution. Barry Goldwater, the 1964 GOP nominee, born in Arizona before it was a state should also be disqualified unless the Constitution can have fully governed that territory by then. Sen. John McCain, should not have raised the birth issue in the 2008 campaign although he was born in the Panama Canal Zone. When he was born, his father was stationed there. It would be different had his father lived there as a private citizen. Any child born anywhere but by **legally married** parents who had been American citizens when assuming duty assigned by the U. S. government is natural born to meet the prerequisite of the president candidate mentioned in the Constitution. Otherwise, it is not. If we do not abide by an absolutely rigid definition, very soon, Americans will allow someone to introduce too many kinds of people all over the world to run president in this land. Consider how many bastards were made in Vietnam alone by American soldiers. When Arnold Schwarzenegger successfully secured the California governor office, many people did try hard to find crack in the Constitution to see if it is possible to sham in someone not natural born to run American president.

However, all such natural born definition is only applicable to the presidential candidate, which is an office provided by the Constitution and therefore must follow the definition that the constitution sees proper. The citizenship for anyone else today must follow the Naturalization Act.

Currently, a political-correct term has put up heavy political pressure in this country, which is the so called anchor-baby. People supporting this term in defining citizenship obviously take birth place as the determining factor, disregarding the citizenship of the mother and thus disregarding what the Naturalization Act stipulates. This Act defines a baby's citizenship by its parent. According to this act, no anchor-baby can be an American citizen, and this Act is one of the Jurisdictions of the U.S. emphasized in Amendment XIV: *All persons born or naturalized in the United States **and subject to the jurisdiction thereof**, are citizens of the United States...* People must meet two requirements to earn the citizenship: (1) place to be born or naturalized, (2) **and** subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Jurisdiction of the U.S. says, through the naturalization Act, that a baby's citizenship is determined by the citizenship of the mother.

Some so called scholars wrote that "natural born" had a longstanding definition dating back to colonial times. British common law recognized that children born outside of the British Empire remained subjects, and were described by law as "natural born". Do these group of "scholars" realize that the purpose of an American Revolution war is to topple what the British law sees right? If we go strictly according to the British definition, we are all British other than Americans today. America borrows the model of common law from the British, not duplicating this law system term by term. America is a country of sovereignty, absolutely independent of

the United Kingdom. We too use English, but it does not mean that we use passport issued by the UK to travel in the world.

(6) Any American president allowing the promotion of “separation of church and state” or hindrance of the separation of church and government equally **violates his oath of “preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States,”** unless he restricts the word state to mean government. We have had plenty arguments how the Constitution mandates the government to defend the spiritual prestige of Christianity in this country. No more elaboration on this topic is given here.

(7) An Achill’s Heel is created in the Constitution with a statement that “The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behavior”. What is good behavior and determined by whom? Even when the behavior is found not good enough, who can remove them from the office, particularly “the supreme”? Is facilitating the act that can bleach the word *posterity* from the preamble a good behavior? Is invading the power of the legislature by inventing law a good behavior? Should the behavior meet the merit approved by Republicans, or Democrats, or atheists, or Muslims to be called good? Is allowing the dominance of some undefined law, such as human right, illegal immigrants’ right, over the Constitution a good behavior? Frankly, this Achill’s Heel is the primary source leading America to have evolved into such a lawless state as we see today.

Even in the most unbiased situation, not every decision from the courts, including the Supreme Court, would necessarily conform to the Constitution. Simply, many court decisions are the outcome of voting made by the judges. Between the voting groups for and against, it cannot be that both are constitutional. What if the outcome is produced by the prevalence of the opinion that is more deviated from the Constitution?

If the Congress really carries out its constitutional duty, it has the constitutional power to correct many decisions made by the court, all the way up to those made by the Supreme Court, based on the power so stated: “...the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, **with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.**” (2nd clause in Section 2, Article III) This quotation from the Constitution therefore clearly declares that the Congress has higher power over any decision made by even the Supreme Court. **No decision from any court can be final in this country if the Congress chooses to intervene.** However, the bipartisan politics would easily eclipse this power to invisible unless at some point common interest can necessarily lever both parties to seek “such Exception, and under such Regulations...”

(8) Behaviors of Treason and policies encouraging treason are flooding in this country if we measure many government officers with **“Treason against the United States, shall consist only in...adhering to their enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort.”** (Section 3, Article III). What are considered enemies by any country? Any invader who jeopardizes a country’s sovereignty, armed or not armed! Here is a simple question for those officers: will you open your own house for anyone to intrude freely? “No” must be the answer—you would consider the sovereignty of your house being inviolable, because you have exclusive ownership of this house. Then, for those who make and promote policies favoring the invaders, why do you open the land belonging to the rest of the population for free intrusion made by more than 12 million invaders? Is it only because you do not have exclusive ownership of this land? If these invaders are so “legal”, why are those worldwide colonists of two, three or four centuries ago are seen so criminal and must be so demonized?

(9) Sanctuary city is a concept openly defies **“A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the crime.** (2nd clause in Section 2, Article VI) Dear fellow citizens, do you remember the heartbroken tragedy of murdering of an innocent American citizen, Kate Steinle in July , 2015, by an illegal immigrant? This is a direct result of allowing the establishment of sanctuary city by our government.

(10) Bipartisan politic, or any political operation within government under the influence of party or parties, is in direct conflict with **“...nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States** (Section 3, Article IV) The main theme of this quoted statement is to prohibit states from ganging up. However, party politics is exactly the activity of ganging up of states, no matter how partially or fragmentally it can be. The parties involved just split each state’s resources and extend the violation so that **“new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State.”** Let’s imagine an extreme case: what happens if some states are coincidentally grouped under the dominance of one party and other states under the dominance of another party, and further, all those states belong to the same gang happen to be geographically contiguous to each other? Is this good enough to serve as the base to split a country? Indeed, the ripening of the America Civil War was because 10 states had ganged up; they were dominated by a group of people favoring one dogma, enslaving, and these states were geographically contiguous. And so were the other side that held opposite dogma.

Whenever and wherever party politics exists, politicians belonging to certain party must place party interest above national interest; national interest is then hijacked as a political tool to serve party interest. With all the due respect to Thomas Jefferson and James Madison,

these two super giants in politics are the initial promoters of party politics in this country; George Washington persistently opposes party politics.

It is the party politics that has factually made the Supreme Court the strongest branch of the three, instead the weakest as how the Constitution mandates with **“with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.”** (2nd clause in Section 2, Article III) It becomes the strongest only because the party interest can drive a party, any party, to silence when the court’s decision favors a party’s interest, even if this silence means relinquishing of certain congressional power to the Court, and even if the Court’s decision is not conforming to the Constitution. The advantage that can be gained through Court’s decision for a party is the reason why both parties fiercely fight to have its own people to fill this vacancy each time a vacancy happens in the court of any level.

Party politics is not democracy, but it is oligarchic politics in nature, except it does extend the number of rulers to include a bigger population. However, the same nature applies: **we are the law!**

(11) Siding with more than 12 million invaders to this country, a big number of our “leaders” have made invisible the following statement: **“The United States shall protect each of them (states) against Invasion”** (Section 4, Article VI). This has become an open fact, no need to elaborate in detail.

(12) Nearly the entire Article VI has been thrown to the ditch. For this, a reader can refer to our argument presented in (2) and (3) in Section 1 above. The only part that our self-converted government diligently follows is the last sentence of this article, but with a twist so that it reads “no religious Test, unless anti-Christianity, shall ever be tolerated as a Qualification...”

(13) An obvious theistic sentiment in our Constitution is allowed to be contorted as atheistic/secularistic. The obvious theistic sentiment in our Constitution is emboldened with **“...in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the twelfth.”** The calendar cited in this statement is apparently a Christian calendar; the Declaration of Independence apparently worships a supernatural that are commonly revered by the Christian signers. In order to eclipse the Christian halo of the Constitution, anti-American factions have long put up lies to smear the Founding Fathers as deists, which mean people believing that god no longer intervene after his creation of the world. However, the liars must fail to fit into the perception of deist in their propaganda the following expressions from our Founding Fathers: Nature’s God; ...(they are

endowed by) their Creator; Supreme Judge of the World; the protection of divine Providence; Great Governor of the World; Sunday excepted.

(14) Amendment I seems the most favorable part of the Constitution that Americans frequently refer to in settling political competition between different faiths. However, so far, nearly everyone takes “**shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion**” in this amendment as “shall make no law respecting a religion”. This popular misunderstanding gives our Court so much convenience in law creation as well as violation. In the case that the Supreme Court forces a Christian bakery owner either to comply with a gay couple’s wish of decorating their cake with message favoring homosexual behavior or to have his business closed, the 1st Amendment is violated in two counts: (a) the court makes law respecting atheistic faith; (b) the Court abridges the freedom of press. The cake on which a message is to be laid is the bakery owner’s medium of publication. As such, altogether, the Court further violates the “equal protection” clause in Amendment XIV, because, so far, business owners of conventional publication still have the right to refuse to publish any message they decide to decline. Why such a right is not allowed to be had by the Christian business owner?

(15) In the name of anti-discrimination, private property right is taken away from the protection of **Amendment III**, which disallows even soldiers to be quartered “**in any house, without the consent of the Owner.**” However, in the current society, any premises open to public but owned by private organizations, such as churches, have been forced to open door to personnel whose entering is not seen at the interest of these organizations. Anti-discrimination of any kind but based on natural background of a human being has no base in our Constitution. Law making based on such “anti-discrimination” concept is also violating a famous motto of the Supreme Court: “Separate but equal is inherently unequal”.

To set up discrimination, human beings are first separated into different groups in the perception of some people. To set up anti-discrimination, exactly the same perception must be applied; otherwise no need for anti-discrimination to exist. Then, how can anti-discrimination, which is supposed to promote equality, escape from “separate but equal is inherently unequal”? Typically, for example, the promotion of Affirmative Action has madly promoted discrimination.

(16) Violation of Amendment III can easily lead to the violation of **Amendment IV**, which states that “**the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures**”. This violation always leads to some tragedy that a house owner has less security than a thief/burglar who breaks into the house. If the self-defense put up by the house owner against the illegal intruder ends up not to have the thief killed but injured, the thief can come back to exert immeasurable damage to the house owner

through court procedure. The loss incurred to the owner may lead all the way to the loss of his house.

Favored by the anti-Trust Law, picket lines can “lawfully” prevent the in-and-out traffic of a business premises, such as a store or a factory, and strikes can lock up the normal operation of a business. These activities harming a business are also a violation of Amendment IV. In some bigger business, a union can grab a certain job titles as union job, and the business owner’s decision to hire or to fire employees covered under such particular job titles is subjected to the union’s approval. The invitation of employment offered by the owner thus becomes an invitation to have someone to quarter in his business premises in spite of his consent, and also becomes an invitation to jeopardize his right to be secure in his person against unreasonable seizures.

(17) Amendment V is brutally “restructured” and made powerless in the name of human right according to the need of anti-America factions in the War against Terrorists. Here is the text of this amendment:

*No person (note: not citizen!) shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment of indictment of a Grand Jury, **except in case arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger...***

Do people remember the so called waterboarding gate against the CIA? With the word **except**, Amendment V clearly gives the CIA the full power to deal with any person in any necessary way satisfying the CIA in order to hold a person “to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime” as long as this person fits himself in the definition “in case arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger.” Depriving the CIA of this power is anti-Constitution, serving no purpose but only treason! Remember, only the US Constitution is the Supreme Law of the land, not human right or civil right that can be put up by anyone according to his instantaneous need.

(18) Sometimes people must wonder how America has raised its formidable troop of law workers among whom so many are so illiterate about the US Constitution. Now, we have piles of law suits in various courts against this country in favor of the illegal immigrants. Can illegal immigrants sue America? Here is what **Amendment XI** says:

*The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by Citizens or **Subjects of any Foreign State.***

So clearly, suing America in behalf of or on behalf of illegal immigrants, or the acceptance of any law suit of this nature by the court, any court in America, is to single out Amendment XI for an open trampling. There is no doubt that some lawyers are against this wave of suing against the American government. But where are they? Have they applied Amendment XI? If Americans are so lost in respecting their own Supreme Law, should they wonder why they are so widely disrespected abroad? It is why a border patrol was successfully sued and punished by a foreign drug smuggler who conducted illegal business across the border and was injured by this border patrol on duty.

(19) **Slavery or involuntary servitude is absolutely constitutional and is compulsory** in this land according to **Amendment XIII**:

*Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, **except as a punishment for crime** whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.*

Being able to ignore completely the existence of the section “**except as punishment...duly convicted**”, some “laws” developed from human right or civil right have turned the US prison system into some secured clubs. Inside these clubs, prisons receive anything that can be enjoyed by a free citizen, but just not government punishment. The only punishment they receive is from the gangs organized by the prisons, while the oppression from such gangs is criminal in nature. The advantage for a prison to get what a free citizen cannot get but at no cost of government punishment was a theme for story as early as in the time of O. Henry (see *The Cop and the Anthem*, 1904). Today, this advantage has even been elevated to full cover on every luxurious aspect of life, such as kidney transplant and gender reassignment surgery. Even more ridiculously, some convicted criminal can even make multiple female correction agents pregnant for him, placing the prison under his command.

(20) **Amendment XIV** is another disastrous area showing people how the US Constitution has been trampled.

(a) Concerning citizenship. As pointed out in (5) above in this section, the Naturalization Act of 1790 sets up the concept that a person’s citizenship acquired upon birth is determined by the mother’s citizenship status. Then, according to that “*All persons born ...in the United States **and** subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States...*” no person born in the US can acquire American citizenship unless the mother is an American citizen—this is the jurisdiction of the U.S. Some media says that the term anchor-baby hurts. But hurting whom? Frankly, any law making must hurt a certain group of people, and our Constitution is no exception; otherwise King George

can come back to this land with his law. The best way to avoid hurting anyone is not to produce any anchor-baby, and if the anchor baby must come out, let the American sovereignty determines what to do according to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(b) Concerning Equal Protection. We have seen too many cases how the Court granted special privilege to special people by referring to “equal protection clause” in the name of anti-discrimination, particularly in case related to faith competition. In so granting, the Court completely disregards the clause of **due process of law**. To make the matter described in amendment XIV a little more clearly visualized, let’s present it with a little rearrangement of the same exact text in the following:

Without due process of law, no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Therefore, it is no more apparent that this amendment requires that equal protection is applied only with due process of law. In a human society, protection is made equal between two social members only if these two members present equal social value to the society. To find out such social value is exactly the purpose of due process of law. It is unacceptable that any ordinary person should be equipped with the protection equal to what is equipped with the president. Without due process of law but only equal protection, no policeman can arrest any criminal suspect. But in daily life, common sense just obscures the necessity of due process of law in court for many obvious situations. The application of such process in these situations, such as the protection provided for between an ordinary citizen and the president, is only wasting time and social resources. He who makes equal protection an issue between an ordinary citizen and a president can only end up silencing himself. However, all this does not mean that due process of law can be deleted in every case that controversy must come up. So, let’s inspect how the Court has skipped due process of law in granting “equal” protection to favor some special group of people.

First, Christianity vs. atheism/secularism. In the name of equal protection, the court actually gives absolute dominance to atheism/secularism in our public school while Christianity is absolutely dispelled there. The Court even does not allow equal time of teaching proposed by the churches. Christianity and atheism/secularism each has absolutely different social value from the other in this nation, and therefore, if due process of law is applied, they must enjoy different level of protection according to Amendment XIV. As we pointed out in (3) of Section 1 above, Christianity is a teaching

that the Constitution mandates the government to defend, but atheism and secularism is not found so protected by any part of the Constitution. Furthermore, in the name of promoting rational thinking, atheism and secularism actually advocate nonsensical thinking. All the three theories, namely, the Big Bang theory, Darwin's Evolution, Einstein's relativity, are self-defeated, but the atheists and secularists use all these "theories" to fortify their legitimacy of usurping the education power in this country. For the proof of the self-defeated nature of these three theories, a reader is cordially invited to visit www.huntune.net. Sizable awards can also be found in this website for the support of refuting these theories. Not only has the Court skipped due process of law, but it has even invented laws, such as religious neutrality, "religious clause" that the Court asserted existing in the 1st Amendment, Darwin's evolution being science. With all these laws invented by the Court, the Court has given atheism/secularism the "equal protection" that Christianity cannot enjoy. A visitor can find more details about all this from the article "**Court Cases—Analysis on Court cases over Education between Christians and Their Opponents**" in the home page of www.huntune.net.

Second, concerning the same sex-marriage license. It is also under the same consideration of "equal protection" that gay couples are granted the privilege of obtaining marriage license like a heterosexual couple. But, will the due process of law find that the heterosexual couple and the homosexual couple contribute the same value to the society? It would not have to take a genius to conclude that they at least bear different biological value to the society. Let case go extreme. Giving two counties, one allows only heterosexual marriage, another only allows homosexual marriage. Can you, dear readers, predict which country must go perish and which one would continue on? Someone puts up argument that homosexual couple can overcome their barren nature by artificial insemination. This is a straightforward manifesto of removal of family value, because a third party must get involved. Ironically, people supporting same sex marriage usually also support evolution. How could termination of biological offspring give any material support to their idea of evolution? Because of their biological function, "families" organized under the same sex marriage license must end up bleaching the word "posterity" in our Constitution.

Third, due process of law is also made obscured by the Court in many situation concerning matters like murdering and death penalty. So wording, Amendment XIV obviously states that death penalty is constitutional so long as due process of law is applied. Therefore, no law of any kind in America, no matter at what level of court, can be found confirming to the Constitution if death penalty is prohibited by this law. By scarcely allowing the application of death penalty, we have made too many innocent

people lose their life to social scums. Why must those innocent people be made losing their life to those scums without due process of law?

Forth, some of our laws are made on the base of obvious violation of equal protection, such as the anti-Trust Law and various affirmative action policies. Anti-Trust Law openly stipulates that this law will not apply to labor organizations, such as unions. Affirmative action openly states that if someone possesses certain natural characteristics, he would enjoy special privilege over those who do not. At this point, someone may challenge us with a question “do you support racial discrimination?” If so, we would like to have him first clarify what racial discrimination is. Is using racial discrimination as a reason to acquit a murdering suspect a practice of racial discrimination? If Amendment XIV is restrictively applied, we must say that all races have the same social value. However, the social value of each race carries does not guarantee each member of the race carrying the same value. It is the individual from each race, any race, that has made himself different from the others in social value. When he has made himself different in social value, he cannot expect to have the protection that is equal to that of the others, regardless of his race, gender, or any other natural characteristics. Any law or rule helping to advance or suppress the protection on this person not matching his social value, but at the obvious absence of due process of law, is a law or rule of promoting discriminatory “protection”, regardless.

In general, any law made to promote discrimination or anti-discrimination based on human natural characteristics is unconstitutional, because each of this kind of law must make absent the due process of law in establishing the comparison of social value between the social members involved. On the other hand, any so called anti-discrimination law is also anti-Constitution if it is made to forbid different human ideas, thinking, efforts or behaviors from receiving different social consideration. Our Constitution is exactly established for a purpose of protecting discrimination with respect to human ideas, thinking, efforts or behaviors. Absolutely fundamentally, how did our Constitution forbidden King George from being discriminated in this land when it was established?

(21) Prohibiting ID verification of voters, in the name of anti-discrimination, i.e., the so called equal protection, further promotes the violation against all these Amendments: **XV, XIX, XXIV, and XXVI**. All these amendments contain this clause:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote...

but not just simply *the right of persons to vote*.

Citizens are a group of social members carrying social value that is different from persons who are covered by a word that is not qualified with further condition. ID verification is a due process of law. Forbidding identification between these two groups of social members in the name of anti-discrimination is straightforwardly declining due process of law, which is done with verification of ID in this situation. Equal protection? The “protection” is straightforwardly made unequal by the court, just lowering the citizens’ social value, depriving them of the protection that the Constitution specifically endows them with.

Ending Note

Now, we can see that, violation, or even trampling, of the US Constitution spans across the entire body of the Constitution, beginning from the Preamble, all the way to Amendment XXVI, while the last amendment of the Constitution is only numbered as Amendment XXVII.

Under the two-party system, or the so called bipartisan politics, the Constitution has long lost its dignity, but become a tool for each party to gain party interest and ruin political opponents at the same time. The reason for some politicians being so successful in so manipulating the Constitution is that people have long been “educated” to place another set of law above the Constitution. This set of law has never been defined. The typical components of this set of law are the so called human right, civil right, democracy, freedom, love, fairness, sharing, American dream, and class division of wealthy and poor... Under the pressure of the undefined law, many anti-Constitutional agendas can be promoted with honor, and nearly any Constitution abiding action can be shamed and punished. It is why the welfare programs can be so overwhelming in this country, and the population of children without father can be so explosively multiplying. It is why a mayor advocating “let them loot” is not facing impeachment, but a county clerk refusing to issue same sex-marriage license is jailed.

That the undefined laws, or laws of will, can satisfy immediate human instinct is one of the reasons why they can be so easily accepted as a higher law above the Constitution. In many cases, its acceptance by an individual feels no need to respect the others, or the community, or the nation, because any “right” so enabled by the laws of will is “my right.” Riding on the mentality that “rights” can be established outside of the Constitution, but our Constitution has been made losing almost any power to restrict such rights, Socialism found itself easily and deeply permeating in our society. To establish the right, any right, outside of legitimate law is some form of robbery, but Socialism is exactly an idea of advocating robbery done through government power. Contrary to satisfying immediate human instinct, however, Constitution abiding needs education, self-disciplinary, self-restraining, and sometimes even sacrifice. So,

for a people who have more and more taken satisfaction of human instinct for granted, abiding by the Constitution gradually loses favor in every aspect of their daily life.

Because abiding by the Constitution needs self-disciplinary or even sacrifice is why the US Constitution has been established by no one else but a group of people like George Washington, who put up his personal fund to sustain a near collapse military force for the revolution, and firmly resigned from the most powerful office to set up an example telling the nation that government power is not for personal purpose. Unfortunately, if nothing can be done to curb the “moral” trend currently developed in this nation, people should not be surprised that George Washington may be exhumed someday. When this time comes, “he owned slaves”, hysterically yelled some figure of “sublimate” moral standing next to Washington’s grave. Didn’t people already hear “God damn America, God damn America, God damn America” chanted by a flock of descendants of slaves in a church at the eve of the 2008 presidential campaign? If America can be damned, what is George Washington?

The political world is rapidly evolving globally. Sometimes the evolving pace in a certain part of the world can be described with the word *avalanche*, such as the spreading of ISIS. Among the events shuffled up in this evolution, one political mechanism more and more prominently shows itself as a dominant lever goading the evolution. This mechanism is called family. It has been getting clearer and clearer that those communities prioritizing family value are ascending with ever increasing potential, shortening their distance to the control end of the lever, regardless of other born defects of such communities. For those communities that must place the satisfaction of human instinct above family value, history can only give them the cruelest exit: **PERISH**. Haven’t we heard enough many intellectuals warning of that the Western culture will soon be no more? Family value is the key. It has been more than apparent that the West is making every effort toward digging its own grave by decimating family value, engraving its tombstone with script of increasing national debt but decreasing population of legitimate born children, both in Europe and America. In so digging, the West honors adultery, honors single mother, honors homosexuality, honors atheism that must worship stupidity in every way of life, even in science, where rigid logic is supposed to prevail. The honoring includes material awarding, fame awarding, legality awarding and power awarding. In comparison, the Islamic world tightly grabs the family value, allowing no denting on it in any form. In front of the seemingly irresistible conquering launched by the Islamic world, many Western people feel very lost with overwhelming despair.

“The Muslims hate the United states,” complain many Americans, who try to figure out a reason why their country must be so suffering, such as the catastrophe of September 11, 2001, and find a way to fix the loss they are suffering.

They do, unfortunately. Americans want the Muslims not to hate a society that glamorizes all behaviors that they conceive as evil acts, such as adultery, unrestricted divorce, homosexuality, parent defying, single mother of early teen age, female nudity exposure, drug abusing, and indeed anything that must lead to family vanishing? The Yankee men must be kidding. Do spend some time to explore and understand why they hate. Indeed, the hatred may not have completely started with the Muslims, but with some among us. In the war with Afghanistan against terrorists, an American born young man having no Islamic family background was found serving the terrorist militia. The American society seemed shocked about this sudden unexpected finding. But then, today, more than a decade afterwards, in place of a single young man, Americans have only found that terrorist cells, even with training camps, multiplying and provokingly infiltrating in this land. Self-started rottenness is an invitation to the infestation of maggot. Do not complain the flies.

Of course, hatred of what Americans do may only be their flag issue. Their core issue is to grab this honey land with effort as little as possible. Seeing this society so relentlessly decays itself, it is time for them to come to further exert pounding force from within to accelerate the collapse. Americans, if you are smart, do not hate them who hate you, but hate what you have become and wake up.

With the Constitution so unrestrictedly abused, the American society should have long been a lawless society. It is the remnant of centuries of moral teaching of Christianity that still escorts the society with certain healthy operation. However, how much longer can this remnant sustain itself before the pus of lawlessness must someday pop? Whether one likes it or not, indeed, open declaration of insurrection has been on the way.

“What do you want?” “A dead cop!” “When do you want it?” “Now!”

Should it be time for the Founding Fathers feel restless in Heaven yet?