

Manifesto

The Request for the Establishment of a Free Social-Industrialist State

We are patriots - you and I. We both share a common love of our country, and of the Constitution on which it was founded. We may come from different backgrounds and have different objectives, but our common nationality binds us all together, and we all share the same loyalty to it. We may, however, be a little upset by the actions of some in the political class of society. Guided by our faithfulness to the Constitution, however, we absolutely refuse to let the American dream rot away in the grave of bureaucracy, and refuse its usurpation by corporate interests.

We are a grand synthesis of thought, a union of the heart and mind in a way that's been thought of plenty, but not really successfully attempted, because the situation that did not demand it. In a state of comfort, radicalism is never necessary or welcome, and people are content to remain in their corners and be silent. The gravity of the current situation, however, demands a new sort of action and movement. While we may come from all sorts of backgrounds and may, superficially, have very little in common, there are certain common threads - specifically a discontent with the state of the system, and perhaps even a little disdain for the system as a whole as it has been allowed to evolve, but a desire to work within it, by legal means. We share a common understanding that when we enter into a social contract, we are bound by it, and cannot (as some of our opponents have) change the terms in the middle of it as they suit our convenience. We seek redress by exclusively legal means, and through the traditionally successful tactics of good example and diplomatic persuasion. We draw strength from the beautiful emotionalism of the liberals, and the calculating intellect of the conservatives; between an emotional Prokofiev and an intellectual Stravinsky, we are a clever, cynical, sarcastic Shostakovich, working within the confines of the law, but quietly flouting its limitations. We seek no departure, we demand no revolution, but instead, we work diligently for change at manageable levels, culminating in the final realization and synthesis of the most perfect state. We take from nationalism a pride in identity, we take from cosmopolitanism a desire to incorporate the best ideas into our own state. Synthesis, above all, is our goal, in a most dialectic and workable sense.

In light of the centuries of hard experience that we as a nation have suffered and over which we as a nation have triumphed, it is then that we can propose these amendments to our Constitution which may better enable us to claim our rights to life, liberty, property, and above all, an efficient and able government which will serve our interests exclusively; without this understanding of who really serves who, there's no way we can act on the principle of government of, by, and for the people. The amendments themselves, however, do not constitute an adequate manifesto for our aims; the explanations and rationale behind each are of equal importance, because before one can chart an opposite direction, one must know just as well what it is they are opposing.

Similarly, a stock of ideas without a clear plan for implementation thereof is useless, like the stockpiling of goods without any customers.

Essentially, we're simply picking up where the Constitution left off, leaving it intact as a genuine expression of a more perfect union, and adding to it, by legal and practical means, a guarantee that it will survive through the power of common experience, and the good sense that comes with it. Without a foundation, nothing can be built, and our reverence for the good sense of those that built that foundation carries through all that we do, think, or say. The time has come to resume construction and assure our progeny of a real state that will serve them adequately in the future.

Amendment XXVIII.

1. The borders of the several states must be subject to realignment in accordance with recognizable cultural and geographic boundaries, which are to be ascertained by the Federal Government.
2. No state may be eliminated or divided without the consent of its legislature; or the legislature may turn the matter over to a proper referendum of the citizens of that state.

Rationale: The nature of the eastern and western states is fundamentally different. The older eastern states, those that fought against Great Britain for independence, grew out of a certain state-nationalism; each regarded itself as an independent nation prior to independence, and had the power to coin its own money, raise its own troops and the like. The states were drawn up organically, by arrangement of borders along clear geographic lines. By contrast, the western states, for the most part, were subdivisions of territories that were claimed to be the possession of the (eastern) united states. It is for this reason that, despite the disparate geography of the Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains, somehow, perfectly straight borders were drawn through them, whereas in the east, the borders tended to follow mountain ranges, rivers, and the like. Colorado is a particularly peculiar example of this; supposedly a state in and of itself, the eastern portion is the western section of the Great Plains, whereas the western half is completely filled by the Rockies. How this border was drawn is quite clear: it was a totally arbitrary division of the unorganized western territories. Similarly, the point where New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Utah all meet is a perfect cross, with no clear division there other than the lines of the map.

In the east, Maryland provides an excellent example of divisions which became outmoded. Maryland is, at its essence, three separate states; in the west, the Appalachian mountains provide home to a culture most closely associated with the other Appalachian states like West Virginia. On the eastern shore, the culture more closely resembles progressive agrarian states such as Delaware or Iowa. At its heart, the section between Baltimore and the D.C.

(including Northern Virginia) is densely populated, highly progressive, culturally liberal, and bears little or no resemblance at all to its other counties in the east and west. These three cultures are frequently at odds with each other when matters of statewide consideration come up. More often than not, the more densely populated center region can trump the desires of the eastern and western counties, suppressing their will, and their culturally appropriate desires. Similar examples of this effect can be found in states all over the country.

The reality is that, in our current environment, the states are not nations within themselves, but rather, districts of national administration. As such, it is of paramount importance that the states each correspond to a unified cultural will, which in our outmoded system, remains impossible, and frustrating to those minorities who feel their affiliation lies elsewhere. Still loyal to the United States, these minorities want their voices heard the more important (or, at least in the context of this country, what should be more important) and relevant, responsive local governments.

Implementation: A survey of the states would be necessary by the Federal Government, in order to realign them appropriately. Maryland, for example, could be split into three clear parts; the west would join with West Virginia (as well as the western mountain counties of Virginia), central Maryland (Baltimore and southward) would remain Maryland and absorb the culturally similar region of Northern Virginia, northern Maryland would be absorbed by the Allegheny region of Pennsylvania, and eastern Maryland would join with Delaware. In this fashion, the outer regions would finally have a unified government responsive to their interests, and central Maryland would be able to still retain its congressional strength by maintenance of its larger population. Similarly, eastern Colorado (east of Denver) would join with the more culturally similar Kansas, and western Colorado would expand northward and southward along the Rockies. Vermont and New Hampshire could unify and Puerto Rico could finally gain statehood, to be on an equal footing with fringe states like Hawaii and Alaska, to give greater weight to the fringe voices in Congress. Massachusetts would split into coastal and mountain regions, expanding along the eastern seaboard, while surrendering its mountain interests to Connecticut and New Hampshire-Vermont. New York would contract to New York City, northern New Jersey, and the seaboard area through Connecticut, splitting at the Mystic River with Rhode Island the southern part of the New England seaboard. Thus, New York and New England would have a clear and distinct division; New York state would then split between Pennsylvania and New Hampshire-Vermont. California could contract appropriately to its more densely-populated coastal regions, and cede to Nevada the western lands, and to Arizona, its southeastern desert. Oregon could retain its culturally consistent Pacific-Northwest forest region, expanding into Washington State, which would contract to the Pacific-Northwestern seaboard. Iowa would split along appropriate river lines between the other large midwestern farming states and the Dakotas could unify or have North Dakota split between

Montana and Minnesota. Similar expansions and contractions along these lines would be appropriate to achieve local cultural unity, which would give a much clearer voice to the interests of the concerned states in Congress.

Amendment XXIX.

1. No member of any branch of the Federal Government may receive a pension or benefits of office for greater than ninety days following the end of their term.
2. Members of government at the state level may be subject to the same restriction upon approval of their respective legislatures or popular referendum, in a manner to be ascertained by those state legislatures.

Rationale: Members of the Federal Government are nothing more than employees of the people, whose employment is subject to the will of their constituency. They are not the managers of the people in a business sense, but rather, people hired by the people to, for the duration of their term, help to manage the direction of the country. Departure from office constitutes a termination of employment.

Among the working class, it is commonly understood that, upon leaving, an employee is not going to receive the benefits of that job anymore. For whatever reason a person leaves a job, when that time is over, it's over, and everything that goes along with it. It is only appropriate, then, that these employees of the people should be subject to the same treatment, both in order to limit the expenses of the Federal Government and in order to bring the Representatives, Executives, and Judiciary closer to the people, rather than aloof and unconcerned about the problems of the economy (unemployment, etc.) and the responsibility that comes with the freedom to manage one's own everyday life.

Ninety days appears to be a nationally acceptable standard - a generous one at that - for benefits to continue, whereupon the public servant may seek alternate employment, and resume conventional civilian life. The knowledge that if a public servant is found incapable of doing the job they were sent to do will result in unemployment will force the public servant to pay closer attention to the needs of their constituency, rather than those of the heavily-monied special interests. Special attention can then be made to the economy, with the realization that if a public servant's employment is terminated, they'll be compelled to face the same situation as the constituency that empowered them in the first place.

Implementation: Legislation to this effect will, obviously, be necessary, and it will be very difficult for a person campaigning for office to argue contrary necessity. With a clear demand from the people on their candidates, they will then be compelled to work on this issue, with the understanding that if they fail, they will be sent home as quickly as they arrived in office.

Amendment XXX.

1. All persons born within the United States are no longer to be considered automatically citizens of the United States at large, but are to gain citizenship through a means ascertained by law, with the exception of those persons who currently serve or have served and been honorably discharged from the Armed Forces administered by the Federal Government, whose federal citizenship becomes automatic.
2. Those noncitizen residents shall be subject to the same taxation, administration, and justice of citizens, but shall not be permitted to vote in federal elections, hold federal office, or receive any welfare, emolument, or subsidy from the federal government without first having attained federal citizenship.
3. This amendment will not be construed as to disenfranchise those persons already citizens at the time of its ratification.
4. No requirement for citizenship shall be set on the basis of race, creed, gender, or political affiliation, or previous condition of citizenship to a foreign state, provided that the applicant for citizenship renounce all allegiance and citizenship to any foreign states or governments.
5. All person born in a particular state are hereby to be considered citizens of that state only, unless the legislature of said state should legislate to the contrary; no state legislature, however, may impose any restrictions on noncitizen residents that differ from the federal one, or deprive any current citizen of their status.
6. No state may impose quotas on immigration, nor legally limit immigration into their state, except by way of the administration of fees.
7. A foreign national may apply for temporary residency in the United States to the Department of State. Visas may be granted for a period not longer than three years; after two years of legal residency, a legal alien may apply to their state government for noncitizen resident status, or to the federal or state government for citizenship.
8. A person granted legal alien residency by the federal government is guaranteed that same status in any state or territory administered by the United States, until said time when the visa for residency expires, at which point, the applicant may remain in the country for ninety days to apply for extension. Any person found residing illegally after that point is subject to immediate deportation or punishment, subject to review of the local courts.

Rationale: The problem of illegal immigration is obvious. To quote Dr. Ron Paul, "you can't simultaneously have free immigration and a welfare state." Parents coming to this country illegally in order to assure citizenship for their children is a dangerous process which stagnates the economy and is a clear violation of the law. Just as those who live by the sword will die by the sword, citizenship gained in violation of the law is an invitation to further encroachment on the rule of law.

The benefits of immigration, however, are impossible to ignore. Legal

immigration more often than not brings forth citizens imbued with patriotic zeal, an expansion of the labor force, a greater customer base whereby businesses may prosper, and the cultural enrichment of the nation at large. How, then, do we reconcile these two opposing arguments? Simple - by making citizenship itself something that everyone has to work for. Thus, immigrants have an equal opportunity to contribute to society, and those born here are compelled to work harder for that citizenship which all so highly prize, benefiting everyone.

The injurious effects of slavery were in mind when the idea of birthright citizenship was first proposed, and then it was first ratified as an amendment. Seeking to suppress the inhumane desire of the Southern states to keep their former slaves in a state of disenfranchisement, the government declared that all born here are citizens here. Unfortunately, times have changed, and the temptation of birthright citizenship has brought on an undesirable wave of illegal immigration from all corners of the world, to get a seat on the gravy train of federal benefit, at the expense of those both citizens already, and those that had to work so hard to attain their citizenship. Their status is cheapened - an inflation of the citizenship, if you will, a cultural equal to economic hyperinflation.

Relaxing the standards for immigration will enliven the economy by offering a greater population the opportunity to advance, and welcoming everyone in the world with something worthwhile to contribute the opportunity to do so. In a free-market economy, this can only benefit all those involved. As business grows, so does prosperity.

A safeguard, however, must be made against discrimination, both at the grassroots and governmental levels. It is an abomination for states to exclude worthy citizens based on arbitrary standards. This sort of action only breeds prejudice and would dismantle the effects of the inflow of people and business. On the flip side, though, the society as a whole must have the ability to remove those to be proven to be of no value to it. By offering one single equal chance to all people, the appropriate course of action - legal, safe, and humane - becomes clear without explanation.

The effect of an individual immigrant cannot be felt on a national level, but it can be felt at a local level. If, for some extraordinary circumstance, a group should find a particular person especially worthy of residence, but unable to attain it due to some extraordinary circumstance, it can, by referendum, grant the residency, or an extension of residency, to a particular person, so that that person can advance the cause of their own citizenship or continue to contribute to that local society.

Implementation: A system of either testing, affirmation of loyalty, or another appropriate means must be then administered at a federal level; this further separates the local and federal government, giving the local government more control over the standards of citizenship, while at the same time allowing citizens a chance to have a say at the federal level, i.e., the level that affects the nation as a whole.

States can set their own standards for citizenship, either retaining state citizenship as a birthright or proceeding in an action to the federal level. Thus, states more susceptible to illegal immigration, or those that invite more immigrants in more liberally may also limit the standards for its local citizenship and make benefits available only to those who qualify, streamlining the bureaucracy involved, and assuring that benefits go only to the proper channels - to those that have truly earned it.

Amendment XXXI.

1. The Federal Government is hereby prohibited from establishing any fund or endorsement for the promotion of the arts.
2. Contributions to the arts are not exempt from taxation of any kind.
3. The Federal Government is permitted to receive, at its discretion, any work of art for public display or consumption, provided that the work is submitted as a charitable gift without expectation of compensation or favoritism of any kind; the Federal Government may require, as necessary, a contract of affirmation for this stipulation.
4. Architecture for Federal buildings must be submitted by the Federal Government to the states, which must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the state legislatures.
5. This amendment is not to be construed as to disparage endorsement of the arts by state governments, as their legislatures and citizens see fit.

Rationale: All good sense will draw the conclusion that the arts are purely subjective and not under the jurisdiction or whim of federal favoritism or aesthetic taste. As such, it is not right for the Federal Government to grant taxpayers' money to the promotion of art that any particular taxpayer would find offensive, distasteful, or just plain wasteful, especially (but not exclusively) when it is for the exclusive consumption of those in the political class.

Dr. Ron Paul presents the case most clearly, with regards to private sponsorship of the arts: "... that money is almost certainly better spent than government money: [federal] funds go not necessarily to the best artists, but to people who happen to be good at filling out government grant applications. I have my doubts that the same people populate both categories."

Architecture, however, is a peculiar animal. It is of paramount necessity for the Federal Government to construct buildings by which their business be transacted; however architecture itself is a form of art. For this reason, a demand for function overrides a desire for form, and so approval by the states, the employers of the Federal Government, should be required before buildings are constructed.

If a state feels itself artistically inclined in some way, then the government of that state, employees of the people and transmitters of their popular will,

should be at liberty to make endorsements as it sees fit, particularly if the amendment regarding the realignment of states along proper cultural boundaries should succeed. On a national level, however, it will be impossible to reconcile different regions to this end.

Implementation: The NEA and other sorts of federally funded arts programs are to be immediately abolished to free up money in the federal budget for more relevant and appropriate programs.

Amendment XXXII.

1. The states may reserve the right to set tariffs on foreign goods entering their own borders, but not to set tariffs on any sort of interstate commerce with the exception of tolls paid for the use of their roads.
2. The Federal Government is hereby prohibited from setting national tariffs on foreign goods, but retains the power to regulate interstate commerce as necessary.
3. In all matters of trade disputes between states, the Federal Government retains the right to intercede and legislate to an appropriate resolution.

Rationale: Different states have different levels of industry, and different industrial priorities. More industrially-apt states may desire the power to protect the jobs therein, while those less apt may be more inclined to import goods to the benefit of their population.

Implementation: Federal tariffs are to be rescinded, and states may then set their own on goods manufactured outside of the country. The mechanism of dispute resolution between them shall be preserved by the Federal Government, as to maintain order and prevent the states from encroaching on the rights to trade or economic protectionism of others.

Amendment XXXIII.

1. No person deprived of liberty through due process of the law may be permitted to be exempt from labor in service of the Federal Government or any state during the time of incarceration, except in cases deemed necessary by the court that holds jurisdiction over the said prisoner.
2. Petitions for exemption from labor may be proposed either by the prisoner, the prisoner's legal representative, the state legislature, a petition of 2/3 of the district's citizens coupled with a referendum of 2/3 of the state's citizens, or by the administration of the district court, or any superior court.
3. Labor considered cruel and/or unusual by the corresponding legislature may

be prohibited.

4. The Legislatures of the Federal Government or states where jurisdiction applies may, at its option, grant a compensation for services rendered while incarcerated, provided that this compensation is equal for all persons doing any work.
5. Vocational education, appropriate to the skills of the person incarcerated, shall be provided by the Federal Government, free of charge, but cannot be substituted for labor, it may only supplement it; permission to accept this education must be granted by the relevant court upon application by the prisoner.
6. Compensation for services at a rate equal to or greater than the federal minimum wage will be required in districts where the prisoner is expected to provide for their own food and/or clothing. No State Government or the Federal Government is permitted to demand rent or any other tenant fee from any prisoner.
7. Prison labor is not permitted to be rented out to any private corporation.
8. Wages paid to prison laborers will be subject to taxation at a rate equal to the taxation of the free population.
9. State-administered health care will be provided, free of charge, to all prison laborers, and the state or federal government may not prohibit the purchase of private health insurance by any prisoner.
10. Nonresident aliens convicted of a crime and imprisoned may be subject to deportation after service of their term, but noncitizen residents may not be deported outside of the prison administered by the district in which they were convicted.
11. Regardless of previous status, all persons duly convicted and imprisoned are deprived of the rights of citizenship until such time that their incarceration expires, whereupon they will be immediately returned to their previous status without provision.

Rationale: Prisons are breeding grounds for trouble, this much experience has shown us. Rather than being penitentiaries, places in which a convicted criminal may consider the error of their ways, our modern prison system has become a catalyst for sloth, violence, drug abuse, and leeching off of the national state; from a community of those persons deprived of their liberty as punishment for their violation of the social contract, this can only be expected. As such, prisons must be turned into, if nothing else, places where productive work may be performed in service of the state. Should a person be unable to work, or if the court should determine that this person is truly penitent and/or desiring reform through education, an exception must be made for the betterment of society.

Prisoners, however, must not be made into slaves, which only encourages society to increase their numbers and fill the prisons by illegal means. As such, appropriate wages must be paid, and healthcare maintained, to mitigate the desire to force free citizens into slavery. Similarly, private corporations must not be at liberty to access prison labor, as it is really just a form of corporate welfare,

whereby companies in the favor of the government may receive labor services at a rate discounted from the free population.

Deportation is a free ticket out of paying one's debt to society, incurred when the social contract is broken. As such, a foreign national convicted of a crime against the society of any state or the United States as a whole, must be required to serve out their sentence, whereby they may be immediately deported to their native country and begin the process for re-application for residency and/or citizenship again.

Implementation: Basic processes manual labor, essentially the lowest common denominator in terms of the application of raw, unscreened, and unproven labor would then devolve upon the prisons. Management to appropriate positions by the warden, administration, or legislature will enable those persons of talent to advance. Public works such as the construction of roads, dams, highways, or government buildings are applicable, as well as intraprisn tasks such as foodservice, auxilliary crowd control, or the like, are equally applicable, depending on the assignment for labor by the warden or other appropriate manager. Wardens found to be exploiting prison labor are to be criminally liable.

Vocational schools or educational programs, paid for either by the public dollar or by the prisoners themselves, are to be instituted, so that those that desire a more honorable line of work after their release may advance themselves in their free time. Through this process, the prison system will move from its original role of penitentiaries, and out of their current role of holding tanks for those abusers of the public trust, into places of true reform and productivity. It is possible, too, that wardens may be subject to popular election, rather than appointment by the state legislature, but the decision to proceed with this course or maintain a current one will rest with the states themselves.

Amendment XXXIV.

1. All legal transactions of the Federal Government, the several states, or of any territory administered by either, are to be henceforth performed exclusively in the English language.
2. This amendment is not to be construed as to prevent any person from speaking the language of their choice, nor is it to be construed as to prevent any business from conducting their transactions in any language they find expedient, but all interactions with the Federal Government must be conducted in English only.
3. In cases of trial for capital or otherwise infamous crimes, should the defense not desire the assistance of a state-provided translator, the right to a speedy trial as stipulated in the Sixth Amendment will be suspended until the defense is satisfied with its translator.
4. The defense in any trial may refuse state-sponsored representation only twice,

whereafter, they will be expected to defend themselves and the trial will proceed, unless ordered otherwise by the appropriate judge or legislature.

5. In cases of petitions for appeal of convictions, similarly, the defense may not accept the aid of any state-sponsored counsel past the second appointee, whereupon they will be expected to defend themselves. This applies to each separate appeal.

6. The right to a speedy trial may not be guaranteed if the court determines that the defense is delaying the process unnecessarily.

7. The court is obligated to provide the defendant with no more than one multilingual defense counselor, or one defense counselor and one translator, at a time.

8. All other guarantees outlined in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth amendments shall be otherwise preserved.

Rationale: A wave of outrage swept over the country in recent years in the case of a trial of an accused rapist and murderer was dismissed, citing the Sixth Amendment right to a speedy trial. The defendant continually delayed the trial by repeatedly firing court-appointed translators, and the lack of a clear provision for national language did not require that the trial be conducted in a common language. As such, through crafty delay and manipulation of the system, a probable criminal's case was dismissed. Even more upsetting to many was the discovery later on that the accused was, in fact, perfectly capable of speaking English.

Arguments against the establishment of a national language have revolved primarily around the idea that those not speaking that particular language would be disenfranchised. While possible, the trouble of not having a clear, unified, and distinct stipulation for the conduct of business is far more dangerous to the population as a whole. As with the example above, it is possible for someone who is accused of a crime to delay the trial without need, citing a necessity to conduct the trial in his own language, rather than the common language of the district.

The unity provided by the establishment of an official language would give a clearer path on the road to citizenship and domestic order. This will also curtail the additional expense imposed on the Federal Government by requiring that documents be translated into and printed in several languages. The evolution of the United States into a nation with a common language should not be stifled for reasons that would damage the work of the majority.

It is apparent, however, that businesses catering to a local population that includes non-English speaking people, that it is just smart business to cater to its clientele; certainly no amendment should forbid the people from conducting their interpersonal transactions however they may please.

Implementation: All publication of government documents would proceed exclusively in English, and translations of said documents would not be required

of the government for any reason. All signs paid for by the public dollar will be rendered exclusively in English. The Federal government reserves the option to remove any signs paid for by the public dollar that are not in English.

Amendment XXXV.

1. No person residing within the United States or any of its administered territories may be arrested, kidnapped, or otherwise removed by any government without a publicly-accessible warrant consistent with the Sixth Amendment having first been issued.
2. No person residing within the United States or any of its administered territories who is not a member of the armed forces will be subject to military imprisonment or tribunal.
3. No person residing within the United States or any of its administered territories may be considered an unlawful enemy combatant without probable cause and an appropriately corresponding warrant issued by the Federal Government.
4. Military tribunals may be established only on foreign soil for the trial of enemy combatants or members of the military that have violated the law, for the express purposes of preserving fresh evidence, or preventing local anarchy during wartime.
5. No military presence may be continued in any foreign state without sufficient proof that a specific military mission may be compromised, or without sufficient proof that the removal of said forces will result in local anarchy, the determination of which may be made exclusively by the legislature.
6. No president may claim the right to dispatch troops unilaterally to foreign soil for any reason, without express permission of the legislature, or an official declaration of war by the same.
7. Congress has absolutely no authority to cede its power regarding the initiation of hostilities to any other branch of government, any local government, or any secret organization.
8. No troops may be dispatched to foreign soil without sufficient proof that the government or administration of the place in question is engaged in active hostilities against the United States, or any of the several states.
9. No citizen of the Federal United States may be delivered up to the justice of another foreign power without approval of the Federal Legislature.

Rationale: In recent years, we've seen some strange things happen to civil liberties. Somehow, we claim to be a free nation, while tolerating totally unconstitutional government encroachments on our individual rights. It's a fundamentally strange phenomenon, but not beyond understanding. Some insist that they have nothing to hide, so they don't mind government spying. Others subscribe the paranoiac belief that without a central state holding unlimited

power, their freedom would be lost (but doesn't ceding that kind of power to the government actually constitute a loss of freedom?). Some would suggest that without the curtailing of civil liberties, the "terrorists" will hamper the survival of our "American Lifestyle" (doesn't that lifestyle revolve around civil freedom?). Regardless of the ideas defending such actions, the danger of this arrangement must be acknowledged: giving the government this sort of unlimited access (regardless of whose name or purpose is invoked in these sorts of abuses) only opens the door to a firm entrenchment of an elite and privileged political class with the power to micromanage its citizens, the very people that are supposedly employing them; in short, letting the government encroach on civil liberties establishes a momentum towards the creation of a police state.

All in all, it seems strange that some would fight so hard against a perceived threat to their liberties by surrendering those liberties to someone else. It is easy to see why some would choose this, seeing an "us" vs. "them" mentality, but with the stakes so high, this misdiagnosis of the actual consequence is dangerous. Rather than thinking of "us" vs. "them," one must rather focus on the causes of strife (poor interaction between governments, misunderstanding and cultural ignorance, economic turmoil) in order to attack those instead of each other, surrendering civil liberties in the process. By strength of example, by welcoming foreigners into the folds of American freedom and opportunity, and by focusing military power directly onto those that use force against us, we can achieve safety without the cost of a residual police state: as history has shown that though an enemy may be neutralized, police-state measures instituted during that time remain.

Of course, when you're flush with victory, money, and paranoia, there may be other things that remain as well. As of this writing, the United States maintains an active occupying force of 75,000 troops in Germany, 20 years after the end of the Cold war, and over 60 years after the end of the last actual war with Germany. Obviously, these troops are not being fed and supplied by Germany; the great and unnecessary expense for this occupying force is shouldered by an either uninterested, unaware, or unwilling American people. While some would argue that troop strength should be maintained all around the world (the adherents to the philosophies outlined here would not favor such a course), most can agree that an actual force of that size, truly an occupying force rather than just the maintainers of a base, is totally unnecessary. This is just one example of a large presence in a country we're not fighting - now, what about the 130 other countries?

The fact of the matter is that a pseudo-proactive defense, especially against allies and trading partners, not only is a complete waste of resources, but weakens our defenses at home, where it really matters. On a practical level, this amendment is an extension of the Third Amendment (preventing the encroachment of the military on civilians) and Amendments Four, Five, and Six (concerning the process of justice). It's disturbing to think that restrictions on the Federal Government regarding the establishment of a police state are necessary,

considering the spirit of the original Constitution, but to turn a blind eye to the necessity of change in a changing world is to hasten one's own ruin.

Implementation: Controversial though it may seem, this re-affirmation of basic civil rights for all citizens must begin with an immediate release of political prisoners, or at least the drawing of publicly accessible warrants justifying their detention. While this may superficially compromise security, it does no more so than the creation of new enemies abroad, the money wasted to secure the innocents (which could be better spent on defense), and the necessary allocation of troops and foreign cooperation to secure them. The fact of the matter is that the people who would wish to unseat the government aren't totally ignorant of the fact that they're being looked at and watched, and it will be these very people that will go the extra distance to cover themselves up, leaving people with shaky or no ties to them out in the open to take the flak from a distracted government. Furthermore, the blatant ignoring of the complaints of those that would wish to do us harm is just as dangerous as the harm itself. Without understanding why anyone would be out to get us, there's no way to address the root cause. With the money freed up by the release of political prisoners, a re-focusing on international stabilization and image rehabilitation may be aided.

The claiming of a president the power to declare anyone an 'enemy combatant' and imprison them without limit is more characteristic of a dictatorship than of a free state, and the without a recovery of our domestic self-consciousness, no rehabilitation of a solid international image may be wrought. Therefore, the president must immediately relinquish this privilege - an action that will cost nothing, but will go far to restore the faith of the people in their government. To those who would argue that our 'wartime' circumstance necessitates this unconstitutional power, we may refer again to our friend Dr. Ron Paul, who writes: 'We are indeed fighting undeclared wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and an open-ended war against terrorism worldwide. but if the president claims extraordinary wartime powers, and we fight undeclared wars with no beginning and no end, when, if ever, will those extraordinary powers laps? Since terrorism will never be eliminated completely, should all future presidents be able to act without regard to Congress or the Constitution simply by asserting "We're at war"?' A dubious assertion indeed to be rendered, considering that each of these public servants swears before the execution of their duties to preserve and protect the Constitution.

The actual secrets of national security should be re-examined in light of this shift. While the details of actual missions may be made confidential, a clear declaration of war by Congress must begin the initiation of any hostilities, holding each representative responsible to their constituency - a clear and irrefutable indication of whether that representative is doing his or her job, which is to transmit the will of their constituency to the national governing body for deliberation. Similarly, a recall to the actual tenets of the United Nations must be asserted, namely that all declarations of action by the UN are subject to the

review of each participating nation "in accordance with their respective constitutional principles." In other words, it must be made clear that this unelected international body does not have the right to impose its will on its members without their consent, both moral and political. In the same vein, foreign bodies may not claim the right to prosecute our citizens, unless their crime should be so grievous that the legislature may consent to such an action.

It may be reasonable to consider redirecting this money on research into foreign intrigue, but as we retract (not retreat) back to our natural borders and stop thinking of ourselves as a world police force, this need will not be as dire.

Amendment XXXVI.

1. The Federal Government acknowledges that it does not have the authority to impose on any state or territory, any law that shows preference to a particular religion, or the morality thereof, except in cases where obvious harm to the population, citizen and noncitizen, would result.
2. The states reserve the right to set standards for marriage, adoption, abortion, and civil service, and any taxation that may be corresponding to it; however, the states are not permitted to actively discriminate against any group whose standards cause no tangible harm to others around them.

Rationale: Two major issues, specifically those of gay marriage and abortion, seem to come up too often in the course of American debate. Both have issues that may be applied practically, but both just as obviously are motivated by a religious undercurrent. Moral objections to both hinge upon what different moral systems consider 'right' and 'wrong,' and those must remain the decisions of those religious groups, and not the government.

The idea of constitutionally banning gay marriage is absolutely appalling. What right does the Federal Government have to impose a uniform system of operation on a religious institution? At its heart, marriage is and has always been a religious rite, the sanctification of a union meant to ensure a child would have a two-parent household. A marriage is nothing more than a civil union with the blessing of the church, and the understanding of it as such lays clear ground for the limits of government; namely, that it cannot disenfranchise gay couples from having a civil union (a point agreed to by all but the most homophobic of politicians); so then, what right does it have to prevent a religious group from applying the label of 'marriage' to this union? America is no theocracy, and the social contract agreed to by the people is not one subject to arbitrary changes at the whim of a group with arbitrary authority - especially considering the multitude of religious groups that claim this exact same authority! By the right of the First Amendment, the no democratic government has the right to depress or elevate any of these groups at will, and one must face the situation honestly: a constitutional amendment banning gay marriage essentially repeals the First

Amendment, a late-stage step towards the establishment of a police state.

One must consider then, a fundamental truth, namely that children raised in the care of parents will tend to be better off than one raised in the ward of the state. Allowing gay couples to marry and adopt children will only benefit the children, as they will more likely be raised in a caring, personal, and attentive environment (critical to their development) than the state could ever provide. Furthermore, if a gay couple opts to take on this monumental responsibility, all aid given to a straight couple doing the same must be given, or at least that no greater restriction on them must be placed than is placed on a straight couple. To those homophobic types that would fear that a child raised in such an environment would end up gay as well, it must be pointed out that no person who is homosexual was the product of a homosexual coupling. This simple logic seems to be all-too-easily ignored in an environment of fear over a different (but equally valid) social standard.

Abortion remains considerably more difficult to address, because it does involve the termination of life, or as even the most militantly pro-choice circles loathe to admit, the termination of the potential for life. No decision as weighty as this must be attended to lightly: even in criminal cases, a jury must unanimously agree beyond reasonable doubt as to the guilt of someone facing capital punishment. Unfortunately, the situation never presents itself so clear-cut. Cases of rape, incest, or danger to the life of the mother must be taken into account. While an assessment of the circumstances presents considerably difficulty, it's clear what the necessary action should be: that the decision should rest on the individual states, whose legislatures are closer to the people it would affect. If a particular state's people feel outrage at this action, it should be banned there, but to apply that sort of heavy-handed policy across the entire country is both totally impractical and morally repugnant. The current situation of the case being decided by nine unelected judges strikes even some supporters of it as strange, because they do not feel a desire to impose their beliefs on the other states.

With both of these cases, where the fundamental question is that of whence moral authority is derived, it's clear that this authority must be as localized as possible, and for all practical reasons, it should come down to the states. In the case of abortion, it's a question of yes or no; in the case of gay marriage, it's a question of 'how much,' although in the latter case, it's very difficult to imagine many restrictions being placed on the application of civil unions before personal freedoms are infringed upon.

Implementation: Roe vs. Wade would be immediately overturned, and the question would then fall back to the state legislatures to decide. The process would have to be undertaken quickly, and given the gravity of the situation, it almost certainly would. In the meantime, it would be assumed that all restrictions would be lifted until a decision is reached, because the government should always assume a case of maximum personal freedom and individual responsibility.

With regards to gay marriage, any talk of a constitutional ban on it would have to be dropped immediately, and the question should then become one of what the premises of civil unions would then be. The governments of all states would cease to call their institutions 'marriage,' and would then be left with a question as to what benefits of civil union it may bestow, with the different religious groups then sanctifying them as 'marriages' as they see fit. If necessary and in accordance with the will of the populous, a state alone may recognize some unions as 'marriages' and others not to be so, with regards to the moral authority of the people of that state, and may also refuse to recognize those affirmed in other states, but it may not restrict the function of a Federal Civil Union and the benefits it entails. Benefits would then go exclusively to those couples of whatever combination specifically regarding the raising (and adoption) of children, which was the original intent of marriage anyways. The idea that couples may marry simply for financial benefit would then be eliminated, as there is no proof that there would be any benefit to anyone at large that a couple should simply marry for such a reason (especially considering the high rate of complex and painful divorces these days). Similarly, with such an action, any practical objection to gay marriage would be rendered moot, simplifying the situation.

Amendment XXXVII.

1. The administration of primary education shall devolve on the apparatus of the Federal Government, though it may not make its program compulsory.
2. The program of federal primary schools may only extend insofar as basic education and vocational training.
3. The Federal Government is prohibited from condemning or confiscating the property of state or private schools.
4. States are permitted, but not required, to establish schools and fund them, provided that these competing schools are not shown any favoritism against federal or private schools.
5. No fees shall be charged for the attending of federal or state primary schools.
6. Citizens and noncitizens reserve the right to establish private or home schools, but are not exempt from taxation that funds federal and state schools exclusively.
7. Clear provisions are to be made in the tax code as to how much money is to be channeled directly to the educational programs.
8. Application to government schools shall not be abridged to any legal resident or citizen for any reason.

Rationale: The condition of public schools is appalling, and for good reason: they have deviated from their purpose. Removed from the idea of teaching children and adults practical, useful skills applicable to work, they have come under the utopian idea of making students 'well-rounded,' which seems nice on paper, but

in practice, it has become a diluted and dissolute program which teaches students a few useful things and then proceeds to waste their time. Any student that has suffered through this would agree: a student not planning on entering an engineering or scientific field needs to learn about calculus, no student planning on entering the military needs a firm grounding in the fine arts, and physical 'education' is often simply a program of excessive exertion or a time for students to spend creating problems for themselves when the coach is distracted.

A vocational-only program offers the student considerably more freedom of choice to direct their own destiny. While a student may be afforded the option to study a specialty independently, a firm grounding in basic education is all that is necessary as it applies to work: reading, writing, basic arithmetic, and socialization. From there, a student is at liberty to direct their own future without wasting the money of the state on unnecessary sundries. After all, no one has ever seen 'well roundedness' as a requirement for applying for a job.

At the same time, freedom of choice for the parents is paramount as well. If a parent finds itself at odds with the curriculum of the schools, they should be at liberty to direct them elsewhere; however, considering the necessity of bringing education to those that couldn't otherwise afford it, they must not be exempted from contributing towards a basic public education. The reduction in budget facilitated by the elimination of unnecessary programs will make this cost more manageable for them.

Additionally, if any person desires self-improvement, or training for a new industry, enrollment in public schools shouldn't be prohibited. This opens the door for adults who desire to change careers. Night schools, administered by the government, would function for those who desire to work full time and train for a new career at the same time on the purely vocational level.

Implementation: The existing educational apparatus would be immediately dismantled, and replaced with a multi-tiered system of schools. First, the Federal Government would establish its basic primary schools and publish accounting and curricula reports available to everyone. Primary schools would teach exclusively basic items, and smaller secondary schools would teach a program that is specific to immediate entry into a government-sponsored industry (not dissimilar to the ones available to prisoners, but these would be more focused on an immediate career entry, rather than a long-term course of study). Upon graduation, the student would have a clear credential of ability that they can apply to work in either government or private industry, or the military. Citizenship testing (if that course is opted to confirm citizenship) could be administered at the completion of the curriculum.

State-sponsored schools could be then tailored to the priorities of the individual states. Each would be at liberty to establish primary schools, or to donate their existing structures to the government, and then would be at liberty to establish secondary schools which would offer not only vocational programs (if desired), but also specialty programs such as those in the fine arts, advanced

mathematics, engineering, or the like. States would not be obligated to establish these schools, if their budgets or priorities would not allow it. The university systems would continue to be administered by the states.

Private and home schools would continue to function as they always have. This compartmentalization offers greater freedom of choice for all parties involved and eliminates wasteful expenditures on programs attended by apathetic students, to the benefit of all industries.

Amendment XXXVIII.

1. No government within the United States or any of its territories is permitted to establish a currency that is not backed by a commodity, or that is not defined in relation to a particular commodity.
2. The right to make transactions in alternate forms of commodity-based currency is reserved to the people; however, they are not permitted to make transactions within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government in the paper currency or coinage of a foreign state.
3. The Federal Government alone reserves the right to determine the ratio of the currency to a standard of gold, silver, or any other particular commodity, provided that this ratio is not debased in any way, and that, once established, the standard commodity for the definition of the federal currency may not be changed.
4. The states must continue to cede to the federal government the right to establish currency and define it, and not to emit bills of credit.
5. Federal and State Governments reserve the right to purchase the rights to businesses, provided that they do not subsidize this business in any way, or provide it with unfair tax advantages over privately-owned businesses.
6. No bank, under any authority, is exempted from audits, public and private.

Rationale: The past century has seen the dollar inflated many times, for highly questionable reasons, on an unprecedented scale. The effect on the working classes has been just as clear as the cause, namely, a reduction of personal wealth, as their wages never can rise quick enough to match the rate of inflation. Dr. Ron Paul refers to this situation as an "inflation tax," whereby money is secretly taken from people by making the money they hold worth progressively less, while the new money being printed is going to political favorites. This most odious form of taxation, considered such by its underhandedness, must immediately be brought to a halt in order to restore confidence in the ailing dollar.

Similarly, the shielding of the Federal Reserve from public scrutiny has enabled this situation to come about. The simple truth of the matter is that the majority of people do not have the time to dig into the actions of the Reserve, and study the effects of its minutiae. Through the power of the audit, the representatives of the people would be able to investigate these activities on their behalf, and put to a stop the obvious abuses being perpetrated with this limitless

power. While it is not advisable for the Reservists to be an elected body, due to the trend of public disinformation on the matter, they must be regulated as any other business would be; in fact, regulation here is even more important, considering that their actions would affect anyone that is involved with any exchange of money - in a word, everyone.

By establishing a uniform standard of financial conduct on the idea that the currency is backed by a commodity, consumers may be assured that the money in which they trade isn't just some arbitrary printing by the Federal Government, but a real representation of their wealth, controlled by a standard that has been universal throughout human history. A prevention of revision of the standard would secure the paper currency's value and make more obvious to everyone the extent of problematic situations like deficit spending, political favoritism, and the values of goods.

A provision must be made, also, for the government to engage in industry impartially. It's common knowledge that the government itself costs quite a bit to maintain, but in fact produces nothing but talk. By allowing government itself to establish, maintain, acquire, and sell off the means to the production of goods, employment will be aided and the government may use these resources to balance its budget and use that acquisition of wealth for the benefit of the public.

Implementation: The dollar would be redefined in terms of how it always had been up to 1971, that is, a representation of a commodity, be it gold, silver, or something else whose supply is relatively fixed that the government may be decided on. The old dollar would then be redefined in terms of this new dollar, and transactions may then proceed as they always have.

The Federal and State governments may then involve themselves in the acquisition of private businesses as it sees fit, or the establishment of their own industries. Like any other business, it would require the venture capital to do so, providing an incentive to balance its budget, and maintain it as such to keep the health of the businesses up. Simultaneously, it cannot provide special grants to these businesses through any means, be it the inflation of currency, or subsidies after these businesses have been established.

Amendment XXXIX.

1. The Federal Government is obligated to provide all citizens with appropriate healthcare, paid for by the public funds, provided that it does not infringe on the rights of private practice, nor curtail its growth, nor establish standards by which private practice may conduct its affairs.
2. Federal healthcare may not extend to coverage of prescriptions, but those may be insured privately.
3. The Federal Government may not tax the earnings of private medical practice, with the exception of standard sales taxes incurred in the procurement of medical

accessories; however, these same accessories may be assessed as a reduction in profit for the purposes of taxation on incomes.

Rationale: It's quite difficult to find anyone out there that actually approves of the current managed-care system, whereby government meddling in private practice has made healthcare into a monster - uncontrollable, expensive, disorganized, and above all else, insatiable. Health insurance has become necessary for even the simplest of checkups (one can only imagine if this system were imposed on cars!), and the quality of healthcare has been in a steady decline.

It is of paramount necessity to separate government medicine and private practice. Healthcare should be a basic right of all working people, but necessity demands that cost-free care should be available to citizens only, to prevent the costs of such from soaring out of control (and providing an incentive to citizenship). Private practice must be permitted to operate as it sees fit, encouraging competition, and with it the increases in quality and reduction in price that comes with any competition. The steady advance of medical technology has seen go with it a dramatic increase in price, contrary to the natural expectations of a free-market economy.

Due to their open-ended nature and the risk of wasteful government subsidy, however, prescription drugs must be handled in a way that the patient sees most fit, under the advice of the doctor. It is with this hope that while the quality of private practice will remain superior to federal practice (encouraging the growth of these businesses), those citizens in difficult circumstances may not find themselves without coverage when they truly need it. Again, a limit on federal coverage must be imposed: for expensive operations or other sorts of things deemed necessary, a citizen may be at liberty to purchase insurance to protect against the cost of unexpected calamities, just the same way one may purchase car insurance in case of accidents or flood insurance in case of the less frequent incidents of flooding. Insurance, at its core, is nothing more than a measurement of risk (borrowing ideas and words from Dr. Paul), rather than a necessity for routine and predictable parts of daily life.

Implementation: HMOs and PPOs would see a gradual phasing-out, as government-run hospitals are established to replace them for basic care. Privately-run hospitals would return to their normal course of operation without government interference, allowing them to practice medicine as medical experts, rather than having to answer to the government on routine issues. The establishment of either privately-run or government-run malpractice insurance would follow, to mitigate the risks involved in healthcare and allow doctors to focus on the treatments most appropriate to a given situation, rather than being challenged by non-experts who are, by nature, not aware of everything that is actually involved in healthcare, and whose concern is only to mitigate risk rather than provide appropriate care. Frivolous lawsuits would require payment of court costs by the losing party, to prevent them from being undertaken. States would

be permitted to establish healthcare, but would not be required to do so. By establishing private insurances for malpractice and prescription, risks involved with running such an organization would be controlled in an appropriate manner, and the free market would then be free to drive prices down and keep care responsible and effective.

Amendment XL.

1. Military conscription is hereby absolutely prohibited within all jurisdictions of the federal and state governments, including citizens, noncitizens, resident and nonresident aliens, and prisoners.
2. Acceptance of a citizen into military service may not be abridged for any reason excluding clear and conspicuous physical inability.
3. Involuntary civil service, except as an appropriate punishment for a crime of which the subject has been duly convicted, is prohibited.
4. With proper review and upon approval of the court, in times of war, prisoners are permitted to volunteer for foreign combat service only, the duration of which is to be determined by the legislature, and admittance into this service must be reviewed by the court; whereupon, at the conclusion of honorable service, the prisoner may be considered for early release of their term of imprisonment.
5. Crimes committed by prisoners while in military service are subject to the jurisdiction of military tribunals, who will assess appropriate punishment, up to and including capital punishment for desertion or treason.
6. Compensation for services rendered in the military for prisoners will not exceed those of the lowest-paid nonprisoner volunteers.
7. All provisions mentioned in this amendment apply exclusively to combat service; private contracting in a military zone is expressly forbidden to prisoners.
8. In accordance with the Second Amendment, no person may possess firearms without military or equivalent government-approved training.

Rationale: In an ideal situation, the state is the ultimate representation of the will of the people. In a more realistic application, the government/state apparatus is a servant to the people, at their request. In the worst possible scenario, which has happened all too often, the state claims that the lives of its people are its property, to be disposed of at will.

Military conscription is a fine example of the last idea. In no situation of a free state can it be rationalized that the elected representatives of the people are free to dispatch those people without them having violated the social contract in some way. Why is it that politicians, which Dr. Paul points out, "are not known for living beyond moral reproach themselves," would claim the right to arbitrarily send people out to fight for a cause that they do not believe in - as evidenced by the fact that they didn't volunteer?

Vietnam is a superb example of this. While some were convinced that the

cause was just, others found themselves caught up in the idea that the state can dispense with them to fight a proxy war with the Soviets to defend French interests in Indochina, and saw no other option but to give up their lives for this. One finds a similar example in Iraq, where the government feels at liberty to rewrite the contract for military volunteering and extend the tours of duty of its soldiers without consent.

The fact remains that in a free society, people should have the opportunity to volunteer to defend its interests and preserve that state and way of life - when it is under attack. A desire this compelling has motivated many in places without an organized state to stand up and fight for they believe in; Palestine is an excellent example of this. By contrast, we had a situation in a supposed "free" society such as ours that our people were called up to die for the idea that the French had a right to maintain a colony on the other side of the world. Within the last fifty years, the fashion of sending soldiers to fight in undeclared wars of questionable motivation and interest make the idea of conscription that much more odious.

On the same hand, one shouldn't exclude those that do want to fight from doing so. In the past, military segregation was an issue, to prevent those who did want to fight from fighting, for largely arbitrary reasons - race, gender, and more recently, sexual orientation. If there is a need for soldiers (as there always is), why turn willing ones away and ask for support for unwilling ones? If a person is willing to risk their lives for the benefit of all (as would be the case in a declared war, the end result of an exhausting of diplomatic options and agreed to by the representative body of the people), there should be no stopping someone from making this sacrifice. It is a noble cause, and to willfully exclude someone from doing so is both impractical and dangerous, for it then opens the door to a desire to take the law into one's own hands.

Criminals are an interesting case. An incentive to fight and sacrifice for their country is clear, but one must be on guard against those that have already violated the social contract, lest they do it again. If a person is willing to fight for the good of all, depending on the nature of the crime of which they were convicted, it is unclear why it may be considered an unworthy calling to repay one's debt to society. With strict regulation and the consideration of possible freedom upon conclusion of honorable service, a person convicted of a minor crime may prove themselves worthy of society once again through the risking of their life for the benefit of the country. In short, one should never need an excuse not to fight; it is only natural for people to want peace. On the contrary, there should be a clear reason for doing so, and those that support it shouldn't be barred from helping to protect the society at large.

For society's own protection, within itself, the right to bear arms has been a constant subject of discussion. Opinions range from those that demand no limitation on possession of firearms to those that believe firearms should be kept out of the hands of common people. The truth of the matter is that neither of these parties or extreme viewpoints take the time to take the entire content of the

Second Amendment into consideration when constructing their arguments: "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

Let's analyze this for a moment - a "well regulated militia" - in other words, a military force. The purpose of the bearing of arms by private people was clearly stipulated as answer a need of the time, namely, the threat of a thinly populated and new nation to be subject to invasion, and the feeling that the common people being able to bear arms would protect the country from foreign invasion, or in some extreme cases, encroachment by an oppressive government.

Times have changed, of course. The need to keep and bear arms has changed, or if not a need, certainly a desire: namely, that the proliferation of arms and the degradation of culture have created a more violent society. There's no point in debating the cause of these problems, the only thing that matters is that they exist, and the causes are of historical note only (the causes are written off to history, and one cannot solve a problem by attacking the cause if the cause has long since ceased to exist). The fact is, American society has become more dangerous and violent, and many people feel a need to keep and bear arms under the idea that "an armed society is a polite society."

We need to stop conveniently ignoring halves of the Second Amendment. It clearly states its intention of having the right to keep and bear arms was to maintain a certain piece of emergency home defense. It makes sense, then, in modern society, that a military-appropriate training should be a prerequisite for the maintaining of arms; after all, if the nation should have to be defended by a militia, what good is it to defend it with an well-armed militia capable only of sitting in trees and picking off deer one at a time?

Implementation: The selective service would be immediately abolished to prevent the possibility of the government compelling those registered, to fight. A review board within the prison system must then be established to review the requests of those prisoners who are willing to fight abroad; this would be a new sort of selective service, whereby the people who are asking for a chance to prove themselves may be reviewed and offered positions in the military when the need for their services arises. Separate prisoner battalions would then be established, wherein the soldiers are more closely monitored. Restrictions on homosexuals in the military would be lifted, and no person would be subject to an inquiry as to orientation. At the conclusion of a predetermined term, the prisoner would be reviewed by the same board that permitted their entry as to whether or not the remainder of their sentence would be commuted. As the states would not be obligated to maintain standing armies, the review board would work strictly on the federal level, and may override the desire of a state court to continue a sentence. Extensions on military service beyond the initial contract would be completely abolished without condition, and those soldiers whose terms have been extended without such a clear contract would be immediately released from service.

Current regulations regarding the purchasing and tracking firearms will

remain in place, and the restrictions on the ownership of assault weapons will be lifted; these will be replaced with a system of licensing similar to that of a driver's license. A basic license will be issued upon the completion of honorable military discharge or the completion of a free arms-bearing class in a Federal vocational school. Subsequent endorsements for different types of arms may be issued only by various state governments for different types of firearms, so that the states may regulate which arms are permissible; should a state not have any state schools of any kind, no endorsements may be issued, and no weapons beyond those accepted under the heading of a basic license may be owned by anyone in that particular state.

Amendment XLI.

1. The Government must provide for its citizens a means of employment when necessary.
2. Federal and State governments are now endowed with the right to establish industry, and hire those citizens trained vocationally in any school, in service of this industry.
3. Welfare payments beyond ninety days for any unemployed citizen is expressly prohibited; all other persons are not permitted to receive welfare payments.
4. The Federal Government must assess all taxes corresponding to this industry that it would on its competitors, and is forbidden to issue to it any subsidies of any kind.
5. Federal and state industry will be administered by appointees of the corresponding legislatures, whose compensation shall not exceed the lowest-paid member of the legislature. Administrators of a state-sponsored industry who oversee its failure may be subject to penalties, criminal or otherwise, as deemed appropriate by their employers, the legislature, who are in turn, employees of the people.
6. Exemptions to punishments for administrators of failed state industries may only be granted by popular referendum.

Rationale: Let us lay the facts bare: government produces nothing except talk. When unemployment is high, the government can do nothing but talk about it. Meanwhile, the economy stagnates and people are left to their own vices, a problem aggravated when the government feels that simply doling out money to support them is acceptable. This is a cornerstone of the social-industrialist philosophy, namely that nobody should receive free money, but that all must be entitled to an opportunity to work for it.

With this amendment, the purpose of the government-sponsored schools is clear: to train citizens for practical service to the state and to themselves. By eliminating the disease that welfare has now become, people may be given a new purpose, and those who are supported by another person wouldn't be able

to draw additional public money when the need is not there. This would encourage people to live within their means, and keep the economy moving by constant industrial production. When demand stagnates for produced goods or services, the government may then offer people jobs in the civil service, or in the military, for projects including construction and facility maintenance.

Safeguards against blocking people out of government jobs would be of paramount necessity, as it is no consistent with a free society to exclude a worthy person from a job due to things as trivial as unorthodox political views. Similarly, one must prevent incompetent people from keeping jobs that they are incapable of doing. While no system will prove infallible to this end, the best one can do to mitigate this circumstance is to tier different jobs by their degree of difficulty, and prevent people from being excluded from the lowest tier for any reason. The demand for skilled labor, as it will always exist, would prevent a pooling of skilled people in the lowest tier.

The operation of the management of this system would devolve on sort of an inverse-feudal system, whereby the people, being the greatest voice, would hold the legislature responsible for the successes and failures of their managers through means of voting them in or out; the legislatures would then be required to hold managers responsible to the commission of their tasks. The people then, if necessary, can override the legislature's actions through popular referendum, if they feel a manager is being unjustly removed from their position. It is absolutely paramount that each group understand its responsibilities in relation to the others, and through the mechanism of earned citizenship, only those that understand this function will have a say in the operation of it. This is not an elitist view; rather one that emphasizes personal responsibility, and gives those that are not interested a free pass out of it.

Implementation: Beginning with public works projects, the government may will allocate no more than 10% of the federal budget to the establishment of various industries which are most in demand, in the service and manufacturing sectors. The system of tiering will be established by the legislature immediately, hiring for these positions will begin, starting with those who are receiving federal welfare payments. Following ninety days, wherein the people affected will have a chance to adjust and make provisions either from the elimination of this source of income or for the applications for employment to go through, the operation of these industries will begin. They will not be eligible for public investment, with the understanding that paying taxes will constitute an investment, and an obligation to the public for these industries to succeed.

Amendment XLII.

1. Any budget proposed by the Federal Legislature which is not balanced or yielding a surplus is hereby prohibited.

2. Repayment of loans made by the State or Federal Governments are not to be considered when receipts are tallied for the budget; nor are the speculative sources of income such as fines, taxation on gambling, or the sale of state-owned or federally-owned land.
3. Quotas set to bring fines as a source of income are hereby prohibited to all levels of government, as are any sorts of rewards for meeting a certain standard of income from fines.
4. All income from speculative sources is to be deposited immediately into the treasury of the corresponding State or Federal Government, for consideration of use only in the following fiscal year's budget.
5. Investment or speculation in private business or industry is prohibited to all levels of government.

Rationale: Particularly in recent years, it has been made quite clear to even the most disinterested that deficit spending results in debt and debasement of currency. The consequences speak for themselves: with a federal reserve willing to fund unbalanced budgets and a congress willing to pass them, the supply of money has far outstripped the government's ability to back it, causing a loss of public confidence, reduced personal spending power, and a stagnation of the economy. Through this understanding, campaigning politicians have been able to promise all measure of things, and when they've managed to follow through, the result has been a strain on the budget, which results in increased taxation, which results in more spending, etc., etc.

It's time for both the government and people to come back to reality. A budget certainly cannot respond to the individual needs of every special interest that demands a piece, and politicians must be restrained from exuberant promises. A budget, then, takes a form similar to that of the old Moscow sausage vendors that Shostakovich quotes: "It'll be hot, but I can't vouch for the taste."

While it may prevent the budgets from being as tasty to the special interests, the interests of the people at large will be served by preventing inflation and creating manageable, sustainable projects that will benefit them. Rather than paying billions a year on interest on loans (money spent from the public coffers that buys the government nothing but the privilege to create unrealistic budgets), federal spending may be at last brought under control. The additional benefit to the people will be the prevention of the creation of fine quotas, which will free the police force up to attend to real crime as it happens, rather than waiting around for speeders to pass through a trap so that a state will have the money to pay its legislatures for deeming walking a "state exercise" (this has actually happened in Maryland!) or other such pointless measures. As individuals must live within their means, so must their government.

Implementation: A recall of troops from any or all of the 130 countries in which they're stationed will be immediately necessary to bring the demands on the budget down. For the first two years, budgets must be made especially small to

allow the public coffers to fill up again, and legislators during that term will be compelled to focus on cost-cutting measures. Following this two-year intermediary period, the reductions may be subject to review, and those considered sustainable may be re-implemented (occupational forces, etc.). From then on, budgets will be created in line with their intended purpose: to decide how the money brought in from the previous fiscal year will be spent. The government would then not be compelled to figure out additional sources of revenue, should speculative sources fall short on expectations throughout the year.

Amendment XLIII.

1. Election of the President and other members of the executive branch shall devolve exclusively on the electoral college.
2. Henceforth, citizens will cast votes exclusively for electors, rather than candidates.
3. No elector may receive any emolument or reward from any candidate, nor accept any public office, nor have served in any public office prior aside from that of an elector, nor may serve in any public office after their term as an elector, excluding elector again.
4. Clear violation of section (3) will subject an elector to criminal penalty.
5. The terms of electors will last only insofar as the victor in a Presidential election is undecided. The electors will be permitted to cast only one instant-runoff ballot.
6. Should the electoral college fail to select a President, the decision will fall to the incoming congress, who will convene immediately following their assumption of office, during which time the current President will continue to serve until the day after the decision is made.
7. Electors are permitted to publicly endorse candidates, for the sake of clarity to the people that are choosing them, but retain the option not to do so.
8. Electors are not permitted any contact with any candidate or campaign association, and should they be proven to have done so, penalties pursuant to section (4) will be imposed, and the elector will be removed from the electoral college, and replaced with a vice-elect, also chosen by the people at the same time that the elector is chosen.
9. Electors may not receive any compensation of any kind for their services.
10. Electors may campaign for their office out of privately held funds only. No fundraising is permitted to an elector.
11. If a Presidential candidate or campaign has been known to willfully contact an elector in any way, this is to be considered an impeachable offense.
12. The people, at the time of the selection of an elector, will also cast a secret ballot for their choice of President, the results of which may be revealed only at the request of the incoming congress.
13. Electors will be chosen by instant-runoff ballot, whereby the people may

select up to five electors in order of preference. At the conclusion of the first tally, if no clear majority (51% or greater) is found, measured out to the tenth of a percent and rounded up at half a percent, the lowest-voted elector will be eliminated and the process will repeat until a clear selection has been found.

14. Electors will choose the President and Vice President (running together) through instant-runoff ballot, whereby they may rank their preferences for this office up through their top five. At the conclusion of the first tally, if no clear majority (51% or greater) is found, measured out to the tenth of a percent and rounded up at half a percent, the lowest-voted Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates will be eliminated and the process will repeat until a clear selection has been found.

15. Candidates for President must be compelled to submit to the public who their choices for their cabinet will be, should they be elected.

Rationale: The current electoral college system is not working, or at least not in a way that was intended originally. The idea that the executive offices must be filled by the choices of the most informed is not a new one (the Papacy is an excellent example of this function), but the people must be free to determine who is the most informed, rather than the political apparatus. In the current situation, we have candidates paying more attention to the needs of "battleground states," which excludes the majority of the country, and in the several cases where popular vote has differed from the electoral college winner, it has been found that the people in states other than the "battleground" ones have had their will completely neglected. It's time for the people to have an equal say in who will run the country, as they do already with the legislature. Through the mechanisms of a dual-instant-runoff vote, a clear winner may be determined without the controversy of having a person with the minority of the popular vote still win through the electoral college.

For the safety of the people, the electoral college must be completely isolated from the candidates, or the campaigns, without require complete anonymity - again, an effective example of this may be found already, through jury trials, whereby impartial citizens decide on the guilt or innocence of the accused.

The mechanism of instant-runoff voting is the greatest weapon against two-party dominance (some would even suggest the current situation is one of one-party dominance, as the differences between the two major parties may be reduced only to sundries that have no real effect on the operation of an overbearing and borderline-oppressive government). This allows smaller parties to form coherent coalitions to address the concerns of the people, and let them have an equal opportunity to receive votes if neither of the major parties can best address the general will. It is not out of the question that this mechanism, should it prove effective to this end, would be then implemented in all elections.

Implementation: Exactly as outlined in the amendment.

Amendment XLIV.

1. The government acknowledges that it has no right to socialize the costs of the cleanup of pollution created by private parties, and those responsible parties will be henceforth criminally responsible for their actions, to be dealt with in a manner prescribed by law.
2. Private citizens or local association reserve the right to negotiate with industry as to an acceptable level of local pollution.
3. This amendment is not construed to extend to the actual action of air travel and transport.

Rationale: The holding of private property is necessary to the security and maintenance of a free state. It's understood that despite this, any person or corporation of persons, when faced with the penalty of only fines, will continue to violate the law if the enterprise remains profitable in the face of these fines.

Industrial pollution, be it public or private, will inevitable infringe upon the property rights of the people. What good is land held, if it is free to be damaged by an industry who isn't responsible to the parties they harm, but to simply buy their way out of responsibility to the government. The notion that the current cap-and-trade system of pollution control is a control at all is actually just an illusion: what right does a company have to buy "carbon credits" from the government which allow them to pollute their local area? The idea that one may buy the right to harm others and lower the value of their property presents a clear moral dilemma to anyone who is aware enough to recognize it as such; government sinks more and more into corporate oligarchy, a dictatorship of the rich who are free to exploit the less advantaged and the fairly-earned property of the same.

Once again, the notion of personal responsibility makes itself clear in the social-industrialist philosophy, namely that if one causes problems for another, the first should have to deal with them in an appropriate manner.

If a local area, however, sees the pollution as no problem at all, and the industry which causes it is vital to the local economy, they should be free to work with this industry to negotiate an acceptable level without federal interference.

Air travel presents a peculiar problem: it is an efficient mode of transportation, that pollutes proportionally to the amount it takes off of the road in conventional transportation. Because its effects are so widely-scattered and affect people in such a manner that conventional ground transportation would, the actual action of air travel would be exempt from this measure; however, the industry itself would be subject to the same regulation (waste cleanup and disposal, manufacturing pollution, etc.).

The demand for pollution-reduction would spur the growth of the clean, renewable fuels industry and have the benefit of, with proper research and implementation, reduce the demand for foreign or domestic oil sources.

Research into climate change would then be a moot point, because if it does turn out to be a natural movement of the earth, there would be nothing to stop it, and if it is man-made, the demands of the new regulation technology would effectively change the question from what's causing it to how it may be stopped - specifically, through the proliferation of clean fuels. The United States may then assert its global dominance not through military power, but from being the wellspring of new technology.

Implementation: Regulation for pollution control would devolve immediately on state governments, and federal agencies such as the EPA would be reduced to the suggestion of certain standards and research into methods of control, rather than mandating controls. The EPA would take on an additional task of environmental forensics (a suggestion proposed by Dr. Paul), whereby local governments may petition it for research into locating the causes of certain pollution; the local governments would then reserve the right to deal with the offending party appropriately, through means other than fines or taxation for the person or persons found responsible for such, and taxation on the corporation, if necessary, for violation of clearly defined standards.

A new division, or a subdivision within the EPA would be created for research into clean, renewable fuels. All research and procedure would be publicly-available to any person or corporation worldwide that would desire to implement it; contributions from foreign funding sources for this would be accepted, as they impact and benefit all nations.

Amendment XLV.

1. The compensation for the services of all staffers in the service of legislators, executives, and judiciary, must come out of the compensation of the public servant for whom they work.
2. Compensation for all concerned parties should be adjusted or increased to account for this difference.
3. Increases in compensation for public servants is subject to popular referendum, and will last only through the term of that particular public servant.

Rationale: "This one's coming out of your pay!" - dreaded words for anyone in a commission-based industry, but just and sensible when it's considered that they're paying for causing a problem.

In this case, the problem is a bloated, inefficient government, caused by those very people who were elected to run it and straighten it out. Personal management, and the threat of personal loss are the keys to efficiency in business, and there's no reason why this same principle should be applied to members of government. Little wonder how it happened - public servants are free to take on any number of staffers, paid for by public funds, not by their own. With

an unlimited pool of resources, where's the motivation to restrain it? Obviously, none exists. In the effort to streamline government, it is then expected that the public servants will take better care to manage their staffers, or will appoint an appropriate person to manage the actions of the staffers in their care. Only in this case, will the ablest and most efficient of legislators have an incentive to earn greater rewards for themselves through proper and efficient management. This demand will also encourage the growth of volunteerism in government, which is eminently beneficial for increasing public efficacy, and bringing forth staffers most devoted to the cause of running government correctly.

Obviously, an official requires a certain number of staffers to run their office efficiently, and if they're going to be paying for their staffers, it is reasonable to increase their pay to account for this - by a reasonable amount. If a particular public servant may make a convincing enough case to his or her constituency that more money is required to run a more effective staff, the public should be free to approve this increase; however, if the public feels that the official should have enough money to effectively do their job, they will be compelled to make do with what they have. Through this means, if an official is able to make do with a smaller staff than is standard, they may keep the additional pay for themselves - a reward for governing efficiently and effectively.

Implementation: A standard pay grade will be set for staffers to all branches of government, and the legislatures of the states will decide what the standard number of staffers for representatives from their state shall be allowed, and the pay of each public servant will be increased to reflect this, effective on the term of the next incoming House of Representatives. Compensation for the executive and judicial branches will then be determined by the Federal Legislature, and all increases in pay will be subject to review and referendum for each succeeding election. The base pay of any public servant may not be diminished, but the standard number of staffers may be changed by proposal of the state legislature and reviewed by the people in the following election.

Amendment XLVI.

1. Trade in vices will no longer be under the determination of the Federal Government, but rather, should be reserved to the states to regulate appropriately.
2. Trafficking of controlled substances, that is, those substances found to be particularly harmful to the public at large, may be regulated and controlled by the Federal Government, but the regulation of possession thereof must devolve to the states, in a manner most appropriate to the public opinion.

Rationale: The "War on Drugs" has been a complete failure. Not only has it been able to keep drugs out of prisons, the most tightly-controlled environment society

has to offer, but it has wasted untold billions on trying to eliminate things desired by the public (independent of the harm they may cause) and assured a supply "by the most dangerous means," as Dr. Paul puts it. It has caused drug dealers to prosper and kill, allowed gangs to establish a separate economy for their own questionable benefits, and put thousands in jails - to what end? It has not succeeded in its only task, which was to eliminate drug use in this country, and it doesn't look like it's going to any time soon. As the government takes on more police-state trappings, justified by this "war," when it proves itself incapable of even keeping them out of prisons, really, are these police-state functions for? A case may be made that they are for the entrenchment of a political class, and for the suppression of civil liberties to the first end: these are measures destructive to a free state.

No government may legislate its citizens into morality, as the current drug war shows, and as the prohibition on alcohol proved. Therefore, possession of controlled substances must be an issue to be dealt with the states, in line with popular opinion. Trafficking, then, becomes an issue of interstate commerce, where the Federal Government has a free hand in preventing undesirable substances from entering a state that doesn't want them. Freeing up the capital wasted on this "war" allows it to be channelled to other, more productive projects: public works, federal industry - things that keep people employed, active, and encourages economic growth.

Similarly, vice control - vices such as prostitution and gambling come to mind, are issues of personal choice. If a person should choose a certain career, it is not for the government to say that they cannot do so because it is "immoral," rather, they can seek to mitigate the risks involved, rather than legislate on the basis of an arbitrary value judgement. The decisions to pursue certain careers, and the decisions to patronize them are issues of personal choice, and the government can not force a person to make a "morally acceptable choice," no matter how hard it tries. In the case of gambling, not only is it a matter of personal choice, but the possibility for benefit to society by the free contribution of income into the government makes a prohibition by that same government even more questionable. Moral questions, by their very nature, should be localized as much as possible; the passing of a moral code by parents, the understanding of moral codes by children, and regard for the law by all, the law being the state's mechanism for the protection of well-being of its people, intruding on their personal freedoms as minimally as possible. Venturing into the realm of moral judgement isn't the responsibility of government. As quoted earlier, Dr. Paul points out most correctly that it's a dubious proposition to grant moral authority to politicians and other public servants who are, being fallible humans, "not known for living beyond moral reproach themselves."

Implementation: Federal restrictions on vice control will be immediately rescinded, and the government will return to its nominal and constitutional function of regulating interstate commerce. States will then assume the

responsibility of determining which substances are to be restricted in possession and controlled in distribution, backed by clear medical evidence of their harm without any conceivable benefit, or a clear record that any substance has resulted in occupational downtime. Punishment would follow for possession of controlled substances in an amount that it could be plausible that the intent of its possession is distribution, or underaged possession, the limits of which would be all determined by state law, and interstate trafficking of such would be tightly controlled.

Prostitution would be turned over from a moral issue to a medical issue. Those people that opt for such a career will be subject to licensing, regulated by the state medical board; such a measure will require frequent screenings; all of these measures would be subject to review by state legislatures, and they would be either confirmed as a whole, or refused as a whole; no state would be permitted to decriminalize prostitution without also approving appropriate licensing and medical examination laws.

Gambling would be subject to increased taxation in the cases of private corporations on the Federal level, and different state governments would have the right to tax such establishments differently; however, it would not be permitted to forbid such establishments from operating, and a gambling establishment would be closed only for obvious illegalities or tax evasion. The funds of state lotteries would be redistributed differently: winnings would not be subject to any abnormal taxation other than standard income taxes at the normal established time of payment within the year. However, drawings for state lotteries would be daily, and in the event of no winner claiming the prize, all of the proceeds of tickets purchased that day would be deposited immediately into the state treasury, but to be specifically allocated for educational programs in the following year's budget. Should there be a winner, their winnings would be drawn exclusively from the receipts of the state-run lottery with deductions only for the administration of the program.

Through careful consideration and implementation of these suggestions, and the addition to and building of them in the same spirit in which they were conceived - that is, one of the desire for national unity without class-related exploitation and equal opportunity for all citizens - the United States may again be made strong and powerful not just through might, but through example. Our current example leaves little to be admired: draining one's own country dry to maintain an international empire (how is this any greater than a mother state draining a satellite state dry?), preaching freedom to other nations, while curtailing one's own, willfully debasing currency and encroaching on the freedom of the working class - the majority? Only through clearly defining the role of a government, and the necessary limitations to it, and establishing newer, more effective methods of checks on this government (when all branches of

government conspire against the people, what checks are there?) by the people can a government take on its true role; that of a manager, and not a ruler; a government that operates only by the request of the people, and responds to their needs only at their demand. At long last, where the government and establishment sought to the control people through their disunity and through arbitrary distinctions and social demands, the people may now split apart the government monolith, for the protection of their own futures.