



Unravelling the New World Order

*An Exposé of How Government, Religious, and Financial Insiders
Are Deciding Your Future*

June 2009

The Case for State Sovereignty - Part II

by Chuck Bates

Charles E. "Chuck" Bates is Executive Vice President and News Director for IRN/USA Radio News. He formerly served as an assistant to the Deputy to the President for Political Affairs in the White House. Chuck is also co-host of the national radio talk show, "News & Views." Chuck writes a monthly column entitled "On the Money," which is published here and in numerous other publications.

In last month's issue, we started looking at the 10th Amendment movement sweeping the country. This is the amendment in the Constitution that guarantees the rights of the states and allows the states to be the ultimate buffer between the Federal Government and the State Government. I want to plant a word into your thinking that will be very important in the days ahead; it is "interposition."

Interposition is defined as, "the action of a state whereby its sovereignty is placed between its citizens and the federal government." Simply put, the state is an additional protection of the individual's God-given and Constitutional rights. They are unalienable; and as such, government is to protect those rights.

Think of it like a jury trial. The Judge represents the law without partiality or grace. The prosecution has claimed an offense by the defendant per the laws of the land set by the legislature. The jury is to be the buffer between the law and the defendant to test the facts and decide the law in the case, protecting the defendant from a wrongful charge or law, thus protecting their rights. The jury is the last stand between the individual and the government. The same can be said of the State v. the Federal government.

This importance of interposition was discussed and debated by both Madison and Jefferson in their authoring of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions. Jefferson noted in the 1798 Kentucky Resolution, "That the several States composing the United States of America *are not united on the principle of unlimited submission to their general government*; but that, by a compact under the style and title of a Constitution for the United States, and of amendments thereto, they constituted a general government for special purposes [and] delegated to that government certain definite powers, *reserving, each State to itself the residuary mass of right to their own self-government.*"

Madison took a slightly more direct tone in the Virginia Resolution writing, "this Assembly doth explicitly and peremptorily declare, that it *views the powers of the federal government*, as resulting from the compact, to which the states are parties, *as limited by the plain sense and intention* of the instrument constituting the compact; as no further valid that they are authorized by the grants enumerated in that compact; and that in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers, not granted by the said compact, the *states who are parties thereto, have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them.*"

Both founders saw the rights of the individual states to be supreme; that the Constitution was a contract between the states and the Federal government and if the Feds overstepped it was the duty of the States to reign in, as Jefferson noted, "a too big and too powerful government."

The Founders could never have envisioned a nation that fought so hard for liberty, sinking as we currently are in the mire of an out of control Federal government. Of course the citizenry has brought a large part of this upon themselves by expecting government to become provider, and by largely abdicating their personal responsibilities. How many times have we heard the phrases, "There ought to be a law" or "What is the government going to do for *me*?" Frankly there are

too many laws; individuals have increasingly been unwilling to govern themselves, and far too many programs beget new problems that require new government “solutions.” Friends, I really don’t want government to do anything for me outside of what is strictly defined in the original US Constitution. As a matter of fact, I probably echo the sentiments of many of you: we need less government and bureaucratic intrusion in our everyday lives.

As we recently celebrated the independence of our Nation, let us not forget why the Founders of this nation fought for such liberty. It is outlined in these short passages in the Declaration of Independence: *“We hold these truths to be selfevident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness . . . That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute New Government . . .”* Mid-term elections that will largely determine the future of our Republic are coming up in 15 months. It is imperative that we, the citizens of this country, understand our rights and responsibilities in order to maintain them.