

Publius Huldah - [Article V Convention](#),
Is it the Right Answer? – Tin Ship Productions
August 18, 2015
Bradley County House Cleveland, TN

We have a privilege this evening to have Publius Huldah with us as our guest speaker. And, Miss Huldah is a retired [Litigation Attorney](#), and a former [JAG Lawyer](#), who now lives in Tennessee. Before getting a law degree she got a degree in philosophy where she specialized in the political philosophy and [epistemology](#) – I know how to practice that word – epistemology, which is the theory of knowledge. She now writes and speaks extensively on the original intent of the U.S. Constitution. So, I'd like you all to welcome Publius Huldah.

Thank you, thank you. Thank you so much for coming, I'm honored. Our financial system is crashing. A totalitarian dictatorship is being set up in America. How did this happen?

People pushing for an Article V Convention blame it on the Constitution. They say we need a convention to change the Constitution, and that will fix everything. But I will show you why our Constitution is a 5 thousand year miracle. Our Constitution isn't broken, we are broken. Our Constitution doesn't need fixing, we need fixing.

Look, our Constitution only delegates a handful of enumerated powers to the federal government. How many Americans know this? How many Americans can list 5 of those enumerated powers? How many can list 3? How many even know what an enumerated power is? That's the problem, our ignorance.

Thomas Jefferson said, "You cannot be ignorant and free." It is our own ignorance of our Constitution, and the collapse of religion, morality, and personal responsibility, which have brought us to the brink of destruction, and you can't fix that by changing the Constitution.

The left has been pushing for a convention for 50 years, ever since the [Ford](#) and [Rockefeller Foundations](#) produced the [Constitution for the New States of America](#). Read this evil piece of work, and tremble for your country. In the past, there have been periodic pushes for a convention ever since this was produced. In the past conservatives

defeated these pushes for a convention. So the left changed tactics. Now they are marketing a convention to appeal to conservatives. They are telling conservatives that a convention is the only way to rein in the federal government.

These leftists, now wearing conservative clothing, are using the classic techniques of the left. They are not telling the truth, They are smearing their opponents, and they have divided conservatives. Conservatives all over the country who fell for the marketing have been manipulated to hate and revile and silence conservatives who are warning them about the dangers of a convention.

We once believed in free speech in this land. We believed that people should hear both sides of an issue. We would say, "I may not agree with what you say, but I will fight for your right to say it." That is gone. The watchmen on the wall are being persecuted, and Tea Party leaders who support a convention will not let their members hear us speak. This is all over the country. We are not allowed to address Tea Party groups when the leader supports a convention.

We are in the final stages of a Marxist takeover of our country. The last step is to get rid of this pesky Constitution, which doesn't authorize any of what the federal government is now doing, and replace it with a new constitution, which legalizes the tyranny, and disarms us.

So, leftists, [many of] who pretend to be conservatives, have convinced many real conservatives that a convention is the only way to rein in the federal government. At the same time, avowed Marxists, such as George Soros and his numerous groups, also want a convention. Before these leftists can get a new constitution, they need a convention, because a new constitution is introduced at a convention.

We're at the fork in the road. Should we push for a convention, and let others replace our Constitution, or should we do what our framers actually said what we should do when the federal government usurps power? And I'll tell you what they really said. Now I will show you the truth about a convention.

Article V provides two methods of amending the Constitution: Congress proposes amendments, or calls a convention to propose amendments if 34 states apply for it. The first method was used for our existing 27 amendments. Congress proposed them all and sent them to the states for ratification or rejection. Under the second method, congress calls a

convention. We have never had a convention under Article V for good reason, as you will see.

Let's look at the 5,000 year miracle we will lose at a convention. When we ratified this constitution, we created the federal government. It is a federation of sovereign states, united under a national government for those limited purposes itemized in the Constitution, with all other powers reserved by the states or the people. We listed every power we delegated to the National Government. Most of the powers delegated over the country at large are listed at Article 1, (§) 8, clauses 1-16 on this one little page.

All our Constitution authorizes our national government to do over the country at large falls into 4 categories.

1. military defense and international commerce and relations.
2. immigration and naturalization
3. domestically create a uniform commercial system, weights and measures, patents and copyrights, a money system based on gold and silver, bankruptcy laws, mail delivery, and some road building
4. with some of the amendments, secure certain civil rights.

That's basically it. All other powers are reserved by the states or the people.

This chart, and pick up one before you leave, illustrates two [principles](#) (4 principles) in our Declaration of Independence, and how those principles were implemented in our Constitution, and that rights come from God, and the purpose of government is to secure the rights that God gave us. That's what our Constitution is about.

In 1776, with our Declaration of Independence, we lit a beacon such as the world has never seen. And in 1787 our framers gave us a federal constitution with a national government whose sole purpose was to secure our God-given rights to life, liberty and property by means of exercising the handful of enumerated powers.

When a government merely secures God-given rights, we are never put in conflict with each other because no one has his hand in anybody else's pocket. It is only with respect to the enumerated powers listed in the Constitution that the National Government has lawful authority. If it's on the list, Congress may make laws about it. But if it's not on the list, Congress usurps power, and acts unlawfully when it interferes.

Depending on how you count, Congress only has 18 to 21 powers over the country at large. If we followed our Constitution, most people could live their entire lives without having anything to do with the federal government.

So why is our country becoming a totalitarian dictatorship? Because for 100 years, we the people and those we have elected, have ignored our Constitution. Our Constitution is not the problem, ignoring it is the problem. It was our duty to enforce our Constitution, and make our public servants obey it. But long ago we stopped reading our Declaration and Constitution. And because we didn't know what they say, we were unable to do our duty, our sovereign duty to vet, monitor, and discipline our public servants. We allowed our servants into bribe us into surrendering our liberties. That was the purpose of the unconstitutional government assistance programs in the early 1900s. Social Security in the 1930s, MediCare in the 1960s, to demoralize us, strip us of personal responsibility and make us dependent, so that we would dance to the tune of our servants, instead of making them dance to ours.

Their tune is tyranny, our tune is the liberty enshrined in our Declaration and Constitution. The National Government has usurped thousands of powers not on the list. State governments have collaborated with the usurpations, and we, the people, who ordained and established it don't have a clue about what it says about anything. We don't know that Congress has lawful authority over those 18-21 powers listed enumerated in the Constitution. We believed the lie that the federal government can do whatever they want, except as limited by amendments. Convention supporters exploit our ignorance when they tell us the amendments can limit the powers of the federal government.

But when people learn this short list of the delegated powers, They can't be deceived by those who tell them the remedy for federal government, which has seized thousands of powers, which are not on the list, is to change the Constitution. Think! When the federal government seizes powers which are not on the list, what part of the Constitution do you amend to fix that? Do we need another amendment telling the federal government they can't do things that aren't on the list?

We already did that. It's the [10th Amendment](#). They ignore the 10th Amendment. Even so, Mark Levin, Michael Ferris, Rob Natelson, Mark

Meckler, of the Convention of States Project, insist the problem is the Constitution. They say the solution is [to] mend the Constitution. Yes, even though everyone has ignored the Constitution for 100 years. All we need to do is change it, and that will fix everything. They say amendments will limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government. But our Constitution already limits the power of the federal government to those 18-21 few and defined powers listed in the Constitution.

So, how – HOW – can changing our Constitution limit the powers of the federal government when they are doing thousands of things our Constitution already says they can't do. Look at guns. Our Constitution doesn't delegate to the federal government power to regulate guns, gun sales, ammunition, firearms dealers, do background checks, but they do it anyway, so let's pass an amendment saying they can't do any of this. But, we already did that, it's the [2nd Amendment](#). They ignore the Second Amendment. So the claim that we can control those who ignore the Constitution by changing the Constitution is so absurd they cannot possibly believe it. I suggest the leaders have a hidden agenda for agitating for a convention, and from the absurdity of this claim, and the falsity of their other claims, we may infer wicked intent.

To those who have been misled by the lies, I say, "God, gave you a brain; he expects you to use it. Thinking is a moral responsibility. We know that Levin and Ferris don't want to limit the power and the jurisdiction of the federal government because the amendments they propose delegate new powers to the federal government, or legalize powers the Feds have already usurped; let's look at 3 of them.

Michael Ferris drafted a parental rights amendment he says would protect parental rights, but it does the opposite. It delegates power over children to the federal and state governments. Here is his amendment: Section 3 says, "Neither the United States, nor any state, shall infringe these rights without demonstrating that its governmental interest as applied to the person (that's your grandchildren) is of the highest order, and not otherwise served.

Who decides whether the governmental interests can only be served by letting the Federal government control your children? Why, the federal government decides. Judges, black robed judges will decide. Ferris' amendment repudiates our founding principles that rights come from God, and are unalienable, and that the purpose of government is to secure the rights God gave us, and adopts the U.N. theory that rights

come from the government, will be determined by the government, and are revocable at the will of the government. Our Constitution does not now delegate power over children to the federal government, but Ferris' amendment gives it to them. My papers on the parental rights amendment are on the Internet; they're easy to find.

Mark Levin's amendments also do the opposite of what he claims. My paper "Mark Levin's Liberty Amendments Legalizing Tyranny" show how six of his amendments legalize powers the federal government's already usurped. Levin's amendment to limit the federal bureaucracy legalizes what are now unconstitutional federal agencies: education, energy, agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Homeland Security, Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, etc., etc., etc. Our Constitution doesn't authorize these agencies—they are not on the list. But Levin's amendment legalizes all such agencies for as long as congress re-authorizes them.

Article 1. (§) 1. of our Constitution says only congress may make laws. But since Woodrow Wilson, federal agencies have been writing rules, the code of federal regulations. All these rules are unconstitutional, as outside the scope delegated, and is in violation of Article 1. (§) 1. But Levin's amendment to limit the federal bureaucracy legalizes these rules, and the rule-making process for as long as congress approves them.

Levin's amendment to limit federal spending is also phony. Our Constitution limits congress' spending to the enumerated powers. If you go through the constitution, and highlight all the powers delegated to congress and the president, you will have a complete list of the objects on which congress is authorized to spend money. That is how our constitution controls spending, but they ignore it. Levin's amendment substitutes a budget for the enumerated powers, and thus legalizes the current practice where congress spends money on whatever they or the president put in the budget. And while it pretends to limit spending to revenues, it actually permits congress to suspend the spending limits, and continue to raise the national debt. The result of Levin's balanced budget amendment is to legalize spending, which is now unconstitutional. It changes the constitutional standard for spending from whether the object is an enumerated power, to a limit on the total amount of spending, but to add insult to injury, the limits on spending are fictitious because they can be waived whenever congress votes to waive them. You must read the proposed amendments and understand how they change the Constitution before

you support them. Don't go by the names of the amendments; the names are chosen to deceive you. Read the paper, it's on the Internet. Levin's other amendments are just as treacherous.

Levin's and Ferris' amendments institutionalize the abuses they purport to correct, nullify the natural rights of the people, and fundamentally change the constitutional design. Even though our Constitution is not now being enforced, it still declares this federal government lawless. The true rule of law is still on our side, but not for long if we foolishly allow our Constitution to be amended.

The leaders of the Convention of States Projects say, "We must amend the Constitution because those in Washington don't understand it." Rubbish! Our Constitution is so simple [that] Alexander Hamilton said, "The people are the natural guardians of the Constitution." Hamilton expected us to be able to distinguish between a lawful exercise, and an illegal usurpation of power. Federalist Paper #16, next to the last paragraph, for clauses the Supreme Court perverted: interstate commerce, general welfare, and necessary and proper clause[s], a quick look into the Federalist Paper shows the original intent. We don't need a convention to draft amendments showing what these clauses mean. Just look it up in the Federalist Papers.

But, I have already done it! Here it is, on this one sheet of paper, the original intent of those three clauses proved by the Federalist Papers, and you can have a copy.

Now, let's see what Tennessee has done about an Article V Convention. Between 1902 and 1980, Tennessee sent 14 applications for a convention to congress. In 2010, Tennessee had a moment of clarity and rescinded all these applications, HJR30. But last year, Tennessee passed an application for a convention, HJR548. This year, the Tennessee Senate passed HJR67, which is the application for a convention [that] Michael Ferris is pushing. The House will vote on this when they reconvene.

Once citizens and state legislators understand our Constitution already limits the National Government to the 18 to 21 powers on the list, and our Constitution already limits congress' spending to the enumerated powers, they can see the absurdity of the claim, that the remedy for a federal government, which ignores the Constitution, is to amend the Constitution.

For 50 years, leftists have tried to get an Article V Convention. It was the conservatives who stopped them, so they repackaged the push for a convention. They now market it as an issue of states' rights vs. the federal government. They say, "We must amend the Constitution to restore powers the federal government has taken from the states. Rubbish!

The 10th Amendment says all powers not delegated to the United States, the National Government, by the Constitution, are reserved to the states or the people. What happened to those reserved powers? The states sold them to the federal government. The Department of Homeland Security is nationalizing local and state law enforcement. DHS answers to Obama. Tennessee allows DHS to be involved in issuing driver's licenses. In 2004, the Tennessee legislator passed an act putting the county sheriffs under the control of the Department of Homeland Security. The states went along with the DHS controlled fusion centers. Local police are being taken over by the federal government, hooked in by federal funds and free stuff.

Thanks to the connivance of state governments, Obama is getting a national police force, like the East German Stasi, and we are losing local and state control over law enforcement. This is deadly serious.

State governments are forcing children into federal education schemes, such as Common Core. They did it for the federal grant money, and I understand that the state of Tennessee got a half a billion dollars for selling our children to Common Core.

According to the Pew Report, 13.9% of Tennessee's revenue is from federal funds. The states don't want to cut federal spending, they don't want to lose their federal funding. Last year Senator Mae Beavers filed an ObamaCare nullification bill, but the fiscal note said that if her bill passed, Tennessee would lose 6 billion in federal funds. Well, our legislators didn't want to lose all that federal money, so Tennessee didn't nullify ObamaCare.

State governments are not victims of federal Tyranny. They are enthusiastic participants in federal tyranny. So, we must stop electing people who just want to keep those federal funds rolling into the state. There's no such thing as something for nothing. With federal funds come federal control. A half a billion, Tennessee got a half a billion for Common Core, 6 billion for ObamaCare, a half a billion here, 6 billion there, pretty soon you're talking real money. Where do you think the

national debt comes from? It's handouts to the states. Bribes paid to the states to seduce them to surrender the rights and the liberties of the people.

Convention supporters fabricated the preposterous claim that our framers said that the purpose of amendments is to reign in the federal government if it usurps power. Our framers never said that when the federal government ignores the Constitution, our remedy is to change the Constitution. One delegate at the Convention in 1787, George Mason, wanted states to be able to make amendments without the approval of Congress, and in a manner which [that] did not depend on Congress. On the last day of deliberations, Sept. 15, 1787, the Convention method of proposing amendments was added. But since Congress calls the convention, and because of the necessary and proper clause at Article 1. (§) 8., last clause, Congress has exclusive authority to organize the Convention. So George Mason didn't get his way, and was one of only 3 delegates who refused to sign the Constitution; look at the list of signers, Mason isn't there.

Yet, the Convention supporters claim that George Mason, one of the three dissenters, who didn't sign, is the one who calls the shots at the Convention. We must distinguish between defects in our Constitution, and the government's refusal to obey the Constitution, which it is subject [to]. There were defects in our Constitution: slavery. Amendments fix defects, but our problem is a disobedient federal government, and disobedient state governments; that calls for different remedies, and our framers spell them out, and I'll tell you about them.

What our framers who signed the constitution actually said is that amendments remedy defects in the Constitution, that amendment of errors, and useful alterations would be suggested by experience, and that useful amendments would address the organization of the government, not the mass of its powers.

Convention supporters say the states will appoint the delegates to the convention, control the delegates with state laws, each state gets one vote, and congress has no power over the convention, the states run the whole show from start to finish. And they say they know all this because former law professor Robert Nadelman says, "These were the customs found in conventions during our era." They say congress will follow these same customs at a convention today. But folks, Article V governs, not Nadelman's customs, and Article V does not say the states

control the convention, appoints the delegates, and each state gets one vote.

What Article V says is that Congress calls the convention. A call is the official summons for a convention to take place. It states the date and location, how delegates will be appointed, etc. Article 1 (§) 8., last clause, delegates to Congress the power to make the laws necessary and proper to carry out its powers, including its powers to call a convention. The states have no power over the convention at Article V. All they can do is ask Congress to call a convention. And state laws cannot control delegates. Delegates can vote to make the proceedings secret. That's what they did on May the 29th, 1787, where this constitution was drafted.

This is where they made the rules, making their proceedings secret, and closed to the public. Delegates to a convention today can do the same thing. And if the delegates vote by secret ballot, the states would never know how any of the delegates voted, so it would be impossible to criminally prosecute delegates for violating their state instructions. Congress gets its research from the Congressional Research Service, the CRS. Here is their April 2014 report on the issues under an Article V Convention. CRS confirms that Article V delegates to Congress exclusive authority over both methods of amendment.

The report shows that in Congress' preliminary preparations for Article V Conventions in the past, Congress has provided that the delegates shall receive immunity from arrest, as in Article 1 (§) 6, and has planned to apportion delegates the same as the electoral college. So, California would get 55 delegates, and Tennessee would get 11. And Congress decides who will appoint the delegates. Congress may permit states to select delegates, or Congress may decide to appoint delegates.

Convention supporters insist that they know exactly how a convention will operate, but page 27 of the CRS Report says "In the final analysis, the question, what sort of convention, is not likely to be resolved, unless, or until the 34 state threshold has been crossed, and a convention assembled." Do you see, the congressional research says we'll have to get a convention before we know how it is going to operate. Page 27 of this report, and it's online, and I can show you how to get it.

Convention supporters say a convention is safe because 3/4ths of the states have to ratify whatever comes out. That is a lie! Listen well. If another convention is called, the delegates are invested with that inherent, sovereign right of a people to alter or abolish their form of government. Declaration of Independence, second paragraph. We have already abolished one constitution, and replaced it with another. After July the 4th, 1776. We operated under the Articles of Confederation. This was our constitution until this one was ratified in 1787. This is our second constitution. How did we get from our first constitution to our second constitution? There was a convention to amend our first constitution. Pursuant to Article 13 of the Articles of Confederation, the Continental Congress resolved on February the 21st, 1787—and this is the official resolution of the Continental Congress to call a convention to be held at Philadelphia, “...for the sole and expressed purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation.” “...for the sole and expressed purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation.” But the delegates ignored this limitation, and they ignored the instructions from their states—these are the instructions from the states—the delegates ignored them, and they wrote our second constitution because of the inherent authority of delegates, it is impossible to stop this from happening at another convention. If we have a convention now, George Washington, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and Ben Franklin won’t be there to protect you. You don’t know who the delegates will be, and you won’t find out until it’s too late, but they will have the power to impose a new constitution.

Now listen well. A third constitution will have its new mode of ratification—whatever mode will assure approval. Our first constitution required the Continental Congress, and all of the states—then 13 to ratify amendments. But our second constitution drafted at the “Amendments Convention” of 1787 provided at Article 7 that it would require only 9 states for ratification—13 states, and the Continental Congress to ratify amendments to the Articles of Confederation, but only 9 states to ratify the new constitution. If we have a convention today, there is nothing, nothing, nothing, to stop delegates from proposing a 3rd constitution with its own new mode of ratification.

New constitutions are already prepared and waiting. Here are 3. The Constitution for the New States of America is ratified by a referendum called by the president. Oh, the moths will be cant no at the voting machines. No, no, perfectly safe. The Revolutionary Communist Party, U.S.A. has a new constitution for the New Socialist Republic in North

America. One hundred pages of hell. It's online, you can read it. The Constitution 2020 movement is funded by George Soros, and supported by Eric Holder, Cass Sunstein, and Marxist law professors all over the country. They want a Marxist constitution in place by the year 2020. Change agents of every breed have the same goal—a convention, so they can get rid of this Constitution, and impose a 3rd constitution. If there was a convention, the only issues will be whose constitution will be proposed by the delegates, and what will the new mode of ratification be? The Ford and Rockefeller Foundation's constitution, the Communist Party's constitution, George Soros' Marxist constitution, or the re-written constitution, the leaders, the Convention-States Project have in mind, and they intend to rewrite our constitution if there is a convention. So whether Congress or the states set up or organize a convention is not the critical issue because in either case, the delegates, whoever selects them, are vested with that inherent, sovereign right to throw off this constitution, and propose a third constitution with a new mode of ratification.

Just as the delegates to the convention of 1787 overthrew our first constitution, delegates to a convention today can overthrow our second constitution, and you won't like the third constitution. And remember that a new constitution has its own, new mode of ratification. It can be anything. A majority vote in congress, signature of the president, or, as with the new states constitution, a referendum called by the president. By the way, under the new state's constitution, the states are dissolved and replaced by regional governments, answerable to the new national government.

Look behind the curtain the convention supporters have put up. Progressives, Fabian Socialists, have been trying for 50 years to get a new constitution. That's why they have been agitating for an Article V Convention, because it's the only way they can get rid of this constitution, and replace it with their constitution from hell, is to have an Article V Convention. And that is the hidden agenda behind this push for a convention. A new constitution is introduced at a convention.

Brilliant men have warned that delegates to a convention can't be controlled. James Madison, Father of our Constitution, said in his November 1788 letter to Turberville that he trembled at the prospect at a second convention, and that if there were an Article V Convention, the most violent partisans, and individuals of insidious views would

have a dangerous opportunity of sapping the very foundations of the fabric of our country.

In Federalist Paper #49 Madison warns against a convention to correct the breeches of the constitution. He said, the legislators who caused the problems would get themselves seats at the convention, and would be in a position to control the outcome of a convention.

Former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg said in his September 14, 1986 op. ed. in the Miami Herald—he reminded us that at the convention of 1787 the delegates ignored their instructions of the Continental Congress, and instead of proposing amendments to the Articles of Confederation, wrote a new constitution, and “Any attempt at limiting the agenda would almost certainly be unenforceable.”

Former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Warren Burger said in his June 1988 letter to Phyllis Schlafly. “There is no effective way to limit or muzzle the actions of a constitutional convention. After a convention is convened, it will be too late to stop the convention if we don’t like its agenda. A new convention could plunge our nation into constitutional confusion and confrontation at every turn.

Yet, convention supporters ridicule these warnings as fear mongering. Are there violent partisans and individuals with insidious views among us today? Yes, and they want a convention. But convention supporters assure us that only moral and wise people will be delegates. They do. They claim that. Let’s look at that. There are 3 ways to select delegates: Congress; does anyone trust Congress to appoint only moral and wise people as delegates? State Legislators; does anyone trust State Legislators to appoint only moral and wise people as delegates? Popular election; does anyone trust the people to elect only moral and wise people as delegates? We have done such a great job in electing presidents, people to Congress into our State Legislatures. This is the most corrupt period in our history. Lying, oath breaking, baby killing, malice, dripping smearers, and responsibility shirking everywhere.

And Americans have been so dumb to down they will fall for anything and anybody, and moral and wise people haven’t been in charge of anything in this country for 100 years.

So, what did our framers say we are supposed to do when the government usurps power? They never said that when they violate the constitution, we amend the constitution. They never said, “File a lawsuit and let federal judges decide.

They advised two remedies. The first remedy. Elect faithful representatives who know the constitution. James Madison said that our constitution depends on the people having the virtue and intelligence to select men of virtue and wisdom to office. But we keep electing people who know nothing about our constitution. We vote for them because they tell us what we want to hear, and we fall for it. We must vet candidates for office, conduct forums and test candidates on the knowledge of our constitution. But you must learn it before you can get real candidates. Study the handout chart, and read the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution until you know what they say. It's not difficult. We cannot be ignorant and free.

I have friends in Texas who conduct candidate forums. They grill their sitting congressman, Joe Barton, republican. They said, Mr. Congressman, do you know the constitution, and he said, "Well, well, yes, I've been in Congress for 28 years, I think I know it pretty well."

"Well, Mr. Congressman, how many articles are in the Constitution?"

"Oh, we have I think about 5. (There are 7.)"

"How many amendments are in the Constitution?"

"Oh, at least 20." (We have 27.)

I say, "Shame on the people of his district who re-elected this blithering ignoramus, some 14 times.

If you study the handout chart, and read the Constitution, you'll be able to see that none of the leading candidates for the republican nomination for president seem to have a clue what our constitution says about anything.

I made a list of all the things that the Constitution authorizes Congress to spend the money on. Here it is. It's a short list, and you can have a copy to take home with you tonight. Any candidate who supports a balanced budget amendment doesn't know that our Constitution already restricts Congress' spending to these items, or he thinks the Feds ought to be able to spend money on whatever they want.

The second remedy is nullification. Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison said "When the Federal Government asks the states to do things, which are not on the list, each state has the natural right to nullify, of their own authority, all such acts of the federal government. I'll show you why states have this natural right.

Where did the Federal government come from? It was created by the Constitution. Who ratified the Constitution? We, the people, acting through special ratifying conventions called in each of the states. So the federal government is merely the creature of the Constitution, and is completely subject to its terms. That is why the states, as the creators of the federal government, are the final authority on whether their creature, the federal government, has violated the constitutional compact the states made with each other. The federal government is not a party to the contract, it is merely the creature of the compact. That is why the states have the natural right to nullify unconstitutional acts of their creature. The states in the Constitution never gave their creature authority over the issue. The creature doesn't dictate to its creator. So when the federal government asks states to do things, which are not on the list, the proper response is either "NO!" Or, "Hell NO!".

The Declaration of Independence says at the 7th paragraph that the colonials "oppose with manly firmness" the kings' invasions on the rights of the people. What we need in this country today is more of that manly opposition, and we are finally starting to see it. Hundreds of nullification bills are being filed in state legislatures. The Tenth Amendment Center website keeps you up to date on this.

My recent paper on nullification gives you the ammunition to win every argument with the nullification deniers. It's on the Internet: Nullification, the original right of self defense, or contact me and I'll give you the link. Convention supporters attack nullification because they want you to believe the Article V Convention is the only way out. But we cannot fix federal usurpations of undelegated powers by amending the constitution to say the Feds cannot do what the constitution never gave it the power to do in the first place. We must stop a convention. Talk with Tennessee's legislators; they've been getting only the pro-convention side. Urge them to rescind the application Tennessee passed last year, and to vote against the Convention of States application pending in the House.

My exhibits prove everything I've told you. Contact me, and I'll get you hyperlinks, so that you can see the exhibits for yourself.

