

Even conservatives fall for it

We are subscribers to *American Free Press* and a great admirer of Ron Paul. But, reading his article “Straight Talk” in *AFP* Dec. 22, 2008, was a huge disappointment for us. His remark in question is:

“... Those that wish to have guns, and disregard the law, will have guns. Gun control makes violence safer and more effective for the aggressive, whether the aggressor is a terrorist or a government.

“History shows us that another tragedy of gun laws is genocide. Hitler, for example, knew well that in order to enact his “final solution,” disarmament [of the Jewish population] was a necessary precursor. While it is not always the case that an unarmed populace will be killed by their government, if a government is going to kill its own people, it must disarm them first so they cannot fight back. Disarmament must happen at a time when overall trust in government is high, and under the guise of safety for the people, or perhaps the children...”

We ask ourselves, is it not necessary for someone who wanted to become President of the United States to also be informed about the most important period in the history of the 20th century: 1933-1935? How can Johnny Regular be blamed for his ignorance when his political leaders are the same way? No wonder that history will be repeated, and its repetition is unfolding before our very eyes.

The following is an article which I wrote about gun control in Germany, published in the Aug.-Sept. 2008 *Dialog* magazine of B.C., Canada.

Time to fear the government

By Herta Ruthard, Lisle, Ontario

316532@mail.com



This is the first time in my entire adult life that I am afraid of the government under which I live. I'm thinking of that “Bill from hell, C-51”!

On May 14, 1995, I wrote an open letter to the then Prime Minister Chrétien in which I quoted Dr. John Coleman of British Intelligence: “...by the year 2050 at least four billion useless eaters will be eliminated by one means or another. The population of Canada, western Europe and the United States are to be decimated more rapidly than on other continents until the world's population reaches a manageable level of one billion...” I asked Mr. Chrétien, what's this about the elimination of four billion useless eaters and must I consider myself, my family and my friends to be among those? And what does “manageable level” mean? Does it mean that a slave existence under the thumb of “managers” is what is in store for the remainder? Mr. Chrétien didn't bother to answer my letter, not even with a meaningless form letter from his secretary.

“By the year 2050”! Well, time flies and they'd better get started. Now is the time to fight for your life, because that's what is at stake! And when they don't succeed today, tomorrow is another day. If you think that any other party would be better, think again. There is none; whether it's the Conservatives, the Liberals, the NDP, the Greens, the Reds, the Blues or whatever, they are all the same. Go and vote, and the string pullers will laugh themselves silly! When you watch the parliament people on TV, look very closely, maybe you will be able to see the strings attached to them. That's the reality and anything else would be wishful thinking.

Now a word on “**Gun Control in Germany**” (re article from Mel Garden, June-July issue, page 47): There exists a letter-sized booklet of 48 pages. Both the German Weapons Law of March 18, 1938, enacted by the National Socialists, and the Firearms and Ammunitions Bill of April 12, 1928, which was enacted by an anti-National Socialist government, are given in full, first in facsimile and then in English translation. German firearms legislation under Hitler, far from banning private ownership, actually facilitated the keeping and bearing of arms by German citizens. The German Weapons Law of March 18, 1938, specifically *excluded Jews from manufacturing or dealing in firearm or munitions, but it did not exclude them from owning or bearing personal firearms*. Not everything you find on the internet, libraries, literature, etc., is the real thing, you know. There is a lot of disinformation about the media myth of Germany's roundup of guns. The citizens were encouraged to provide themselves with arms and they did; that's why the GIs were amazed that German civilians owned so many firearms, when they were ordered by American occupiers to turn in all of their weapons in 1945. The German government was not afraid of its citizens.

Disarmament of the people is a degrading and incapacitating measure. It is always, and only, *the enemy* whom one disarms! A government which plans such a measure will first create the conditions which push the crime rate up and then the people will themselves ask for gun control.

The crime rate in Hitler's Germany was close to zero. I cannot remember one single incident in all those years. Murder? Rape? These words didn't even exist in our vocabulary. And the same goes for many years after 1945.

But when I look at Germany today, it is as if it were another planet. The mix of different cultures, colors, mentalities, etc., is a powder-keg, ready to explode. The same goes for any other European country. Create Chaos, and the people will be desperate enough to accept anything that promises relief, even if it's the New World Order.

The fraudulent fourteenth

(From page 8)

other original States and those later admitted into the Union.

What constitutional right did Congress have to remove those State governments and their Legislatures under unlawful military power set up by the unconstitutional “Reconstruction Acts” [which had for their purpose the destruction and removal of these legal State governments and the nullification of their Constitutions]?

The fact that these three States and seven other Southern States had existing Constitutions and were recognized as States of the Union [again and again]; had been divided into judicial districts for holding their district and circuit Courts of the United States. Had been called upon by Congress to act through their Legislatures upon three Amendments [the 13th, 14th, and 15th] and by their ratifications; had actually made possible the adoption of the 13th Amendment. With State governments re-established by Presidential Proclamations [as shown by President Andrew Johnson's “Veto” message and “Proclamations”]; all these facts were brushed aside by the Court in *COLEMAN* by the Statement that:

“New governments were erected in those States (and in others) under the direction of Congress” and that NEW LEGISLATURES ratified the Amendment.

The U.S. Supreme Court overlooked the fact that it previously had held that at no time were these Southern States out of the Union (*State of Texas v. White*, 7 Wall. 700, 19 L.Ed. 227, 726; *White v. Hart*, 13 Wall. 646, 654 [1871]).

In *Coleman*, the Court did not adjudicate upon the validity of the “Acts” of Congress [which set aside those State Constitutions and abolished their State Legislatures]; the Court simply referred to the fact that their legally constituted Legislatures had rejected the 14th Amendment and that the “new legislatures” had ratified the Amendment.

The Court also overlooked the fact that the State of Virginia was also one of the original States with its Constitutions and Legislature in full operation under its civil government at the time.

The Court also ignored the fact that the other six Southern States [which were given the same treatment by Congress under the unconstitutional “Reconstruction Acts”] had legal Constitutions and a republican form of government [as was recognized by the Congress by its admission of those States into the Union]. The Court certainly must take judicial cognizance of the fact that before a new State is admitted by Congress into the Union; Congress enacts an “Enabling Act” to enable the inhabitants of the territory to adopt a Constitution to set up a republican form of government as a condition precedent to the admission of the State into the Union. And upon approval of such Constitution; the Congress then passes the “Act of Admission” of such State.

All this was ignored and brushed aside by the Court in the *Coleman* case. However, in *Coleman*, the Court inadvertently said this:

“Whatever official notice is received at the Department of State that any Amendment proposed to the Constitution of the United States has been adopted, *according to the provisions of the Constitution*, the Secretary of State shall forthwith cause the Amendment to be published, with his certificate, specifying the States by which the same may have been adopted, and that the same has become valid, to all intents and purposes, as a part of the Constitution of the United States.”

In *Hawke v. Smith* (253 U.S. 221, 40 S.Ct. 227 [1920]), the U.S. Supreme Court unmistakably held:

“The fifth article is a grant of authority by the people to Congress. The determination of the method of ratification is the exercise of a national power specifically granted by the Constitution; *that power* is

conferred upon Congress, and is limited to two methods, by action of the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, or conventions in a like number of States. Dodge v. Woolsey, 18 How. 331, 348, 15 L.Ed. 401. The framers of the Constitution might have adopted a different method. Ratification might have been left to a vote of the people, or to some authority of government other than that selected. The language of the article is plain, and admits of no doubt in its interpretation. It is not the function of courts or legislative bodies, national or State, to alter the method which the Constitution has fixed.”

We submit that in none of the cases [in which the Court avoided the constitutional issues involved in the composition of the Congress which adopted the “Joint Resolution” for the 14th Amendment] did the Court pass upon the constitutionality of the “Act” of Congress which purported to adopt the “Joint Resolution” for the 14th Amendment [with eighty (80) Representatives and twenty-three (23) Senators, (in effect) forcibly ejected or denied their seats and their votes on the Joint Resolution proposing the Amendment (in order to pass the same by a two-thirds vote) as pointed out in the New Jersey Legislature “Resolution” on March 27, 1868].

The constitutional requirements [set forth in Article V of the U.S. Constitution] permit the Congress to propose amendments only whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary; that is, two-thirds of both houses as then constituted without forcible ejections.

Such a fragmentary Congress also violated the constitutional requirements of Article V in that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

There is no such Thing as giving life to an Amendment illegally proposed or never legally ratified by three-fourths of the States.

There is no such Thing as an Amendment by latches; no such Thing as an Amendment by waiver; no such Thing as an Amendment by acquiescence; and no such Thing as an Amendment by any other means whatsoever except the means specified in Article V of the U.S. Constitution itself.

It does not suffice to say that hundreds of cases have been decided under the 14th Amendment to supply the constitutional deficiencies in its proposal or ratification as required by Article V.

If hundreds of litigants did not question the validity of the 14th Amendment [or questioned the same perfunctorily without submitting documentary proof of the facts of record which made its purported adoption unconstitutional]; their failure cannot change the Constitution for the millions in America. The same Thing is true of latches; the same Thing is true of acquiescence; the same Thing is true of all ill considered court decisions.

To ascribe constitutional life to an alleged Amendment [which never came into being according to specific methods laid down in Article V] cannot be done without doing violence to Article V itself. This is true because the only question open to the courts is whether the alleged 14th Amendment became a part of the Constitution through a method required by Article V. Anything beyond that which a court is called upon to hold [in order to validate an Amendment] would be equivalent to writing into Article V another mode of amending the U.S. Constitution which has never been authorized by the people of the United States.

On this point therefore; the question is, was the 14th Amendment proposed and (See page 10)

