

December 17, 2009

Senator John Thune  
Repr. of the  
State of South Dakota  
Fax # 202 228 5429

**OPEN LETTER:**

SUBJECT: The Health Care legislation  
must be declared unconstitutional

Dear Senator Thune:

Many people watched as you were interviewed on Fox TV last evening, December 16, 2009. The subject dealt primarily with the Health Care issue that is now before the Senate. Today I phoned your office in Washington, D.C. to oppose this legislation and to express the unfairness of the direction in which we are being forced by those who seek to exercise unlimited power over all people. The Health Care legislation will add more grievous changes in our form of government. Why haven't some senators brought up the charge of unconstitutionality? It certainly qualifies for the title.

The main reason for this letter is to obtain an answer to this question: "Why haven't the sincere representatives in both houses of the Congress initiated a formal charge of total unconstitutionality, followed by an action, against passage of this socialistic legislation?" It only takes one state to bring the Supreme Court to answer and pronounce a decision. Anyone can see that the Health Care legislation is not good for the people. It will further add to the change being made in our form of government.

There is no basis in Constitutional law for socialists in the government to be allowed to change our form of government. There is no permission from the people for representatives to do this.

What will happen to this legislation is that it will be placed under each of the 10 federal regional headquarters and will be enforced in each of the ten regions. (The United States was "officially" divided into these revised Ten Federal international Regions.) The people did not give their permission for these Ten overlaying regions to be laid. They were ordered to be implemented in 1972 by a presidential executive order (Pres. Nixon E. O. #11647) with the intent in the future to replace the states. (When the states are abolished, just think what this will do to the existence of the people's Constitution and the Bill of Rights!)

The American policing and general operational standards were revamped in 1975 so that the nation is in accord with military concepts for its operation on a regional basis. *Civilian law enforcement systems* (the state police) *are now merged with the military and controlled*

under the Homeland Security Agency (Department). This unconstitutional arrangement alone enables a militarized dictatorship system to operate the whole country.

Roosevelt began aligning the country in regions during his administration using various versions since 1935. Those regions were set with different border lines than those being used today by Barack Obama. We need to take a lesson in what happened to upset the planners once before so that we may benefit today from their experience.

Some years ago, Ralph Carr, the out-going governor of Colorado in his Farewell Address to his state legislature blew the whistle exposing the whole regional socialistic planning, plus other changes that were being installed by then-president Franklin D. Roosevelt. Governor Carr's efforts got attention and brought results when his Farewell Speech reached the ears of the general public. Carr revealed the details and direction of F.D.R.'s plans. F.D.R. was preparing for the elimination of the states, and recasting them into regional components of a world government. The same objectives underlay the difficulties we are witnessing today under federal direction. The expose' by Governor Carr occurred in 1943, when most of the young men were outside the country, involved in fighting in WWII. At that time, the public well understood how hazardous it would be to the Constitution if the states disappeared. The outcry that came after Governor Carr's Farewell Speech was sufficient enough to gain adequate support against the unconstitutionality of F.D.R.'s plans. F.D.R.'s deliberate effort was to convert the U.S.A. using regionalism to move it under world government (socialistic) management.

After Governor Carr's warning, all funding for F.D.R.'s National Resources Planning Board was immediately cut off by the Congress. Congress gave F.D.R. six months to wind up all the paperwork needed to completely shut down the unconstitutional N.R.P.B. This event proves that if you give the people the information they need, they will be able to protect themselves. The people today face the same set of circumstances, as they undergo inappropriate legislative enactments they do not want, and which are leading them ever further down the path to global socialism.

The Congress and the Executive Branch of the U.S. government have no authority to change the form of American form of government; nor, to do so in slow degrees! The unconstitutional Health Care Legislation will increase the power of unlimited global government. What we need today is a repeat of the experience that happened when a loyal representative had the courage to speak out and tell the people what is happening to them and their government.

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights rightfully belong to the people. The people have not given their informed consent to the revamping of their government. The

unconstitutionality behind these acts has yet to be exposed. Barack Obama is now engaging in unconstitutional treaties which next will attempt to ban the right of the people to keep and bear arms.

A disarmed people are no longer sovereign and free; nor are they a republic! A sharp line must be drawn against the unauthorized and unconstitutional alterations being made into the operation of the American governmental system. If as our representatives, you are not able to properly defend us against the medical socialization of Americans, what makes you think that you will have the proper defense to be able to protect us when many of your colleagues in the Congress begin the next push for the elimination of privately owned handguns, without which there can be no true freedom and liberty?

*Adherence to the guarantee in the Constitution of a republican form of government, with each public official's obligation to support and to defend the principles within the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, is a requirement by the oath of office taken by each representative in the Congress and the president.* It is against the law for unconstitutional laws, treaties, and executive orders to be drafted and sustained, especially while the effect is such that they change our form of government and deteriorate our liberty, rights and freedom! When are our representatives going to evaluate unconstitutional actions for the damage they do?

If you will check the work and intention of the founding fathers as they drafted the Constitution, note that their document over and over again refers to itself as "this Constitution". It uses the words "this Constitution" ten times throughout the document. (Elsewhere, the only other appearance of the word Constitution is preceded by the word "the"—meaning the Constitution). The intent was that all laws, treaties, and executive orders had to conform to the principles within the document they designed -- specifically, this Constitution.

We have fallen short too many times in challenging and stopping social damage and unlimited power. The duty of our representatives is to support "this Constitution" as the founding fathers intended. Things that are unconstitutional are not a part of "this Constitution". Neglect by our representatives to draw a sharp line against the usurpation of power by other public officials may be equated as being equally injurious to that damage which an invading army can do.

If Congress allows the substitution of international law for Constitutional principles; or is intent upon changing our form of government; or if legislators and/or the president fails to abide by the oath they have sworn to uphold, or by not using the charge of unconstitutionality against those in violation of "this Constitution", our representatives are

also guilty of violating their oath of office. By omission of duty, they are just as guilty as those who intended to deceive the American people from the onset.

There are predominately more people attending “Tea Parties” in this our time, than there were in the number of people that sent the outcry in 1943 against the N.R.P.B. If the people in 1943 were granted the cooperation of Congress for labeling that which is un-American as being un-American, why isn’t the 2009 Congress calling the Health Care bill, the Homeland Security Agency (Department), and upcoming treaties planning to take away the people’s right to arms equally as deserving of wearing the “un-constitutional” label? Why aren’t the Congressional representatives able to call it like it is?

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Derraldine Smith". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'D'.

cc: Randall Stufflebeam  
Jim Guest Rep. Missouri  
Chuck Baldwin  
Jack McLamb  
Don Rogers – Former State Senator  
John Stadtmiller  
David James  
Ken White  
And many others

Permission to reproduce granted.