



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

*"We Hold These Truths To Be Self-Evident"*

In the military, when a general gives an order, a captain cannot remand that order. That's the 'chain of command': an order from a superior officer cannot be overturned by a subordinate officer. That same hierarchy exists between the US Constitution, the federal government and the states, with the Constitution at the top of the hierarchy.

Within the Constitution are provisions to whom certain powers are mandated and restricted. And because the Constitution was written such that the majority of powers would remain in the hands of citizens, only specified powers are mandated to states and the federal government. Any unspecified powers belong to American citizens.

Hand in hand with the Constitution goes the Bill of Rights—both can be viewed as a single entity. The Bill of Rights functions as constitutional orders, restricting power to the federal government and states, and mandating powers to remain with the citizens.

Legislators are mandated to make the laws by which the republic functions, and nowhere in the Constitution are there provisions for the legislature to 'pass-off' law making functions. As a result, any agencies making rules under which Americans must function, are illegal. Anything with 'force of law' needs to originate in the Legislature.

The job of the President/Administration is to enforce the Constitution and laws passed by legislators, which the president signs into existence or vetoes and sends back to Congress, where they are re-voted upon to override (or not), a president's veto.

Once a law is signed into existence, that's not the end of it. If it is thought to be unconstitutional, suit is brought against enactment of said law with the Supreme Court. The court has constitutional discretion to hear or not hear a case, but it is assumed that important cases brought by states against states will be heard, and if the court 'finds' against a lawsuit brought against a law, that law is regarded as valid, 'settled' law.

The Constitution/Bill of Rights is the 'law of the land', and the way it functions is generally how I have described. Consider each of the 3 branches of government, with a question as to whether or not they are functioning within the limits and mandates of the Constitution/Bill of Rights. Writing and passing laws for the United States is delegated to the Legislature—and no one else. Is the legislature adhering to that mandate?

They are not. With much of legislator's time given to raising money for re-election, along with the vast size and complexity of government, legislators feel the necessity to pass-along 'rule-making' capacity to legislative agencies. As a consequence, most

'rules' Americans are compelled to live by, are enacted by 'agencies' that are not provided for in the Constitution—agencies that exist outside of any legal mandate.

Since the US abandoned a restrictive gold standard for runaway credit and debt, government has grown exponentially, such that real legislative power belongs to agencies that endure long after the legislators that created them have moved-on into history.

These agencies then become 'the real source of power'—a 'permanent state'. As with EU parliamentary bureaucrats, these agencies function as governing bodies, unelected, with seemingly, unrestricted power. As an example, consider the 'coronavirus panic' where one man, Anthony Fauci, took over the US Government: where he was given more authority than either of two presidents under whom he supposedly served.

Adding to 'agency takeover', as viral infection unfolded, health agencies 'mandated' masks/lockdowns, while funding coercive campaigns and dictates to 'force-inoculate' any wanting to accomplish the simple tasks of life—such as having an occupation.

Here's something you may or may not know: health agencies are so far removed from 'legislative oversight' that they now allegedly co-patent drugs for which they then partner with government to inflict upon Americans, and the world, under 'emergency use'. In doing so, individual elites among the health regulators decide where funds are allotted for research/development—'gain of function'? Begging the question: are 'health agencies', as funders, responsible for the pandemic? Sharing in patents, are they interested parties in profit-sharing? To that end, are they willing to function as despots?

As the (agency-funded?) virus spread, with no constitutional mandate but a 'warp speed' administrative mandate, employing little or no testing, or studies, these unelected morons locked-down and destroyed US and global supply chains, disenfranchised any who opposed them, desecrated 'freedom of religion, freedom of speech, assembly, press, and our right to privacy'. Isn't that 'stripping of rights' the definition of treason?

In terms of hierarchy, this 'regulatory bunch' has no part in the constitutional chain of command—these are constitutional outlaws, taking illegal powers into their own hands.

Those governors that issued endless 'dictates'—their job is to enforce state (and some federal) laws. Nothing more. Within the framework of the US Constitution there is neither 'martial law' nor the word 'emergency'. Executive orders have no 'force of law'.

Constitutional supremacy is under vicious attack. I read recently that 'free speech is opposed by 2/3s of democrats and EU citizens. Along with that, our institutions and 'separation of powers' are also under siege. The Supreme Court reaffirmed citizens rights to 'keep and bear arms', and immediately Senator Warren attacks the court. Then, more than a dozen states add ballot-measures to restrict gun ownership. How is this any different than the captain voiding the general's order when it doesn't suit him?

So what do we do about it? That's the tough question. It seems so obvious that ballot measures remanding a Supreme Court decision have no place or standing. Here in Oregon, sheriffs are standing against the most draconian of 'gun restriction' measures that passed into state law. But we need to speak up as citizens—usurping powers that belong to another branch of government—equates to 'crude and rude' theft of freedom.

It doesn't matter that 2/3s of the electorate want speech restricted, state-ballot measures have no business remanding Supreme Court decisions. This is open-disregard for the Constitution/Bill of Rights—dressed up in 'legal finery'—to destroy our republic.

Please pass my articles along. Contrarians can become subscribers by request: erik@neverhadaboss.com. Visit my fiction at neverhadaboss.com. Thanks for reading.

