



neverhadaboss.com
updates on the insane world of money and power
Stuck In the Middle

There's a Gerry Rafferty song that goes: *Clowns to the left of me—jokers to the right—here I am—stuck in the middle...* . Nowhere is this more apparent to me than my own life. I'm at odds with my neighbors and town (Bluepillville), about most everything. A critic of the left for decades, my readers can't understand why my house isn't picketed. Now I'm in the crosshairs of the right, for whom facts don't matter—over my criticism of DJ Trump.

Tension in the US air takes us back to 1854/61, in the lead-up to the Civil War (Bleeding Kansas), when non-slaveholding brothers killed brothers over whether to join the US as free or slave states.

That was then, but now, our entire nation is at odds. I see it in comments to my articles. Long-time friends call me names, grasping for plausible deniability (about what I write)—casting aspersion on my character.

DJT's MAGA base is deep in turmoil/doubt with themselves—resulting in a lashing-out. For what reason? Until one is willing to call-out DJT for his aggression towards the world—as with this Iran blunder—those remaining steadfast supporters have a need to obfuscate facts—deny realities.

Even something so basic as 'war powers' being mandated to Congress, not the President, brings anger for merely bringing it up. But I'm not the responsible party—that was James Madison. Madison (author of the

Constitution), denied any congressional responsibility to ratify hostilities a president initiated: *the same person initiating hostilities/conducting hostilities would not be functioning as a president—but as a prince/monarch.*

It's said that Ben Franklin, exiting the hall where the Constitution was drafted, responded to a woman's question about what kind of government they'd been given: 'A republic madam, if you can keep it.' What's the difference between a Madisonian republic and a democracy?

The founders were profoundly educated men who left Europe for a new life—free from political servitude. Distrusting the capacity of human beings to align with justice, they saw a need for small government—and crafted a Constitution where most of the powers resided in the hands of the people.

Franklin's warning came with an *inevitability*. Democracy, by default, devolves into anarchy, then anarchy into tyranny. A republic, with build-in checks and balances is preferable to democracy only in that the stripping of wealth and liberty from citizens by elites—is slowed down.

Think on this: The Constitution is 3 long pages—that's it. But somehow, that document has generated countless laws. So, how does 3 pages produce 1000s of laws? It's because of divergent views of the Constitution: either as a living document or a fixed template against which Congress makes laws, which the Supreme Court judges as to their constitutionality.

The Constitution as a living document is favored by those who would re-interpret its unambiguous, simple language for their own ends. The living document theory presents an interesting paradox—actually a contradiction. If the Constitution is a *relative* thing, the intent of the Constitution is what's questioned by the Supreme Court—not the law in question. Who would want the Constitution to be seen as a living document—and why?

Before taking on that question, what do we call those who do not see the

Constitution as a living document? They are the strict constructionists, for whom the Constitution means what it says, by which Congress makes laws, heeding Constitutional mandates.

To elucidate the two ways of viewing the Constitution, we have to understand the founder's unifying theory for the document. They understood the underlying plot by which history is written: always the same plot, a struggle between the common citizen (desiring a productive/peaceful life), and a self-proclaimed elite desire, to take from citizens—their liberty and wealth. It's that simple—both then and now.

For that reason elites want the Constitution viewed as a living document—one that can be interpreted such that, incrementally, they take control of everything. For a description of this we again go to James Madison—who is credited with writing the Constitution.

Madison wrote multiple essays (bound in the *Federalist Papers*), writing under the name, 'Publius'. Number 10 is considered one of the most significant of 85 essays, in which Madison argues for the benefits of a large republic in controlling the dangers of political factions. Factions as opposed to parties, are elites acting not to benefit the republic. Bent on taking control, they initiate actions that instead benefit their own aims.

In the US Congress there are no longer political parties, instead factions—parties paid some heed to the Constitution. Advancing the mission of their party, they also kept focus on the good of the nation. Focus on the good of the nation made possible—dialogue and open debate.

For present-day factions, the rationale is to move forward a mission in support of the faction. Consider the example of Trump: after years of being subjected to RussiaGate lies and (some), phony lawsuits, he is incapable of taking the high ground. Accusing justices as being influenced by foreign

powers, Trump forgets what he had to endure, or, for his own ends, derides the Supreme Court as an institution—as well as the Constitution.

How did we lose our power? 2 ways—incrementally, and by not heeding Franklin's warning. While citizens lost focus, elite's sharpened their focus. They convinced Congress to interpret the *commerce clause* such that everything to do with commerce fell under elite purview—the antithesis of the founder's intent—leading to 1000s of restrictions/laws/policies.

In an America incapable of focusing to read a book, how do we put back control into the hands of the people? How do we convince both parties/executive to mind America's own business abroad? With both parties standing and applauding (bought and sold by Israel), for war with Iran—how do we make the case that Iran poses no threat to the US?

The result will be a chicken/egg thing—whichever comes first. Either we will be defeated militarily or suffer economic collapse—whichever comes first. Can economic collapse be stopped? It seems unlikely.

Elites pervade our very existence. They are at war with us even when we are not at war with them. Go down to the city/county offices and see what it takes to get a permit. Watch some YouTube where parents get arrested at school board meetings for objecting to their elementary school-age children subjected to drag queen shows and teachers reading explicit same sex stories—from shelves in children's elementary libraries. That historical plot I spoke of, where elites want total control—right now is the worst example.

Get my articles by email with a request, or comment:
erik@neverhadaboss.com. And thank you.