

THIS IS AN OPEN LETTER TO SHERIFF RICHARD MACK:

October 15, 2009

To: Sheriff Richard Mack

Of course, Sheriff Mack, the states CAN stop it, and they SHOULD stop it! But they WON'T! Most people don't realize it, but our form of government has been changed! We are no longer a constitutional republic. The change was made before Obama took office. George W. Bush converted us into a dictatorship form of government by using presidential executive orders. When Obama took office, the dictatorship was already formed: a done deal. He was picked to be the first! Stop wondering why we have a foreign born person sitting in the chair in the old 'oval office'. As we are now, we cannot expect that the person sitting in the presidential chair will meet Constitutional qualifications.

You might remember that for over the first 200 years, a sharp line was always drawn in the former United States governing system AGAINST merging the military with the civilian law enforcement. It could never be done and still remain a republic. To violate that prohibition would constitute the creation of a dictatorship form of government. It has been done now, Sheriff Mack. We HAVE been re-structured! Creation of the Homeland Security Agency converted the USA into a dictatorship. We have to face the facts: we have been slowly evolving into an international socialist form of operation! The republic, as our former form of government, has been superseded. All of our civilian law enforcement persons (police officers, etc. are 'on call' under the Homeland Security Agency. International policing systems are emerging and have included us. Agencies are not responsible to the people. We have been revamped so that we are now in accord to military standards on a regional world government basis. We are being called a "democracy," the stand-in word for international socialism/communism. Maybe you can understand why Obama just smiles when the question of being a "constitutional natural born citizen" comes up. It probably isn't necessary now. As the socialists transition us through these alterations, "consent of the governed" is assumed to be achieved as the changes are being made. That's the way the change artists want the record to read: done with the "consent of the governed." But it really isn't! We own the Constitution and public officials do not have our "informed consent" to replace it.

Did you read Obama's speech to the United Nations? Heavy on disarmament! That is not just for nuclear weapons. It includes all handguns privately held by the people. That program is for total and complete disarmament, down to the very last gun!

Sometime soon there will be an order to all Americans to turn in all handguns. Under the international police exchanges that have been structured, the future people checking the homes for guns (not turned in) do not have to be American born police officers.

After a while, even the states will be eliminated which is the intent and purpose behind establishment of the current Ten Standard Federal Regions. The plan to eliminate states was first tried under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Governor Ralph L. Carr, the governor of Colorado in 1943, blew the whistle on the whole unlawful scheme. Gov. Carr made a speech, his Farewell Address on January 8, 1943, delivered before the Joint Session of the Colorado Legislature, and he declared that he had "uncovered a government plan to saddle the American people with "regional dictatorships" within six months." World War II was going on then in 1943, and FDR intended to give this conversion into global government a priority over the war effort! Learned people in 1943 knew that shutting down the states would naturally spell the end of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Word got around into the population, and the people put pressure on the Congress to stop it. The Congress had no choice but to cut off the funding for Roosevelt's National Resources Planning Board and call for it to be shut down. FDR was given 6 months to wind up all the paper work. Most people have heard that FDR did something that was 'unconstitutional' but they do not know that the issue was *elimination of the states!* That goal has not changed.

In the course of time, all this same unlawful planning has quietly resurfaced, and from that time on, the global government planners made sure that the kind of governors that became elected would be "go-alongers" with FDR and all his socialism. Yes, the states COULD stop what is happening to us now, but the states won't, because of the kind of governors we have now, including the kind of representatives that are holding office. Rush Limbaugh talks about 'liberals' and 'conservatives'. Why doesn't he address them as 'communists' versus 'constitutionalists'? That is the battle we are involved in today. Even if we did have a good group of representatives in a state house, the governor will be the one who will stop any action in lots of ways. WHY? The answer is because we have big money behind the election of socialist-regional government-trained people, running for office, that make a lot of promises they don't intend to keep, they are elected, and then they eventually move on to sit in the governor's chair. This is the case in just about every state in this Union! Socialist FDR was one of the most deceptive of all our last twelve presidents, because he set the agenda for what is happening to us now. Today both political parties honor him, and are cooperating with the evolving new world order. There is no difference between republicans or democrats.

If you wish to read Governor Ralph L. Carr's talk it can be found on my website under the Section called "General and Complete Disarmament". Since I am sending this to you as an Open Letter, I am attaching it to your article below called "The States Can Stop Obama'. I would appreciate knowing that you read this Open Letter during your busy agenda. I hope other people will forward this letter to you to be sure you get to see a copy. You know by law it only takes just ONE state to blow the whistle. Please do keep up the good work you are doing, and pray that the people will put up the opposition that once was generated in 1943. As you know, Sheriff Mack, the plans of the socialists today are even more destructive and extensive than in 1943. They intend to do away with elected representation. The intent of the socialists is to destroy all the gains and benefits made for the people by the nation's founding fathers in favor of the socialist planning for cradle-to-grave total management of the people.

Sincerely,

Bernadine



Subject: Fw: The States Can Stop Obama Sheriff Mack
Date: Wed, 14 Oct 2009 18:33:32 -0600
From: Lifeforce <lifeforce43@rockymountains.net>
Please forward to your local sheriff....


[The States Can Stop Obama](#)

Sheriff Richard Mack

Infowars [<http://www.infowars.com/the-states-can-stop-obama/>]
October 14, 2009

By now we have all heard the clichés and seen the posters from the “Tea Parties” espousing freedom, less government, and perhaps most of all, how the federal government had better back off trying to shove their national healthcare down our otherwise healthy throats. The truth of the matter is all the slogans of “Don’t Tread On Me” or “Give Me Liberty Or Give Me Death” or “We’re Mad As Hell And We’re Not Taking It Anymore,” don’t mean a thing when compared to reality; the real and actual answer to all the protests, marches, and outrage. The answer is in our own backyards! *The States can stop every bit of it!* That’s right, the individual States can stop “Obamacare” and all other forms of out-of-control federal government mandates and “big brother” tactics. If Arizona, Hawaii, New Hampshire, Texas, etc. want nothing to do with

National Healthcare as proposed by Barack Obama or Congress, then all they have to do is say “No!”



If we are to take back America and keep this process peaceful, then state and local officials will have to step up to the plate.

For you skeptics who think the States could no more do this than fly to the moon, let's look at the law. First, the U.S. Constitution is the ultimate and supreme law of the land. More specifically, the Bill of Rights was established, because some of our Founding Fathers, feared that the Constitution did not go far enough in restricting or limiting the central government. Hamilton was one of a select few who wanted a bigger and powerful federal government. However, several key states and powerful delegates such as Patrick Henry, said they would not support the formation of a new government if the Constitution did not contain a Bill of Rights, a supreme law to establish basic and fundamental human rights that could never, for all future

American generations, be violated, altered or encroached upon by government. So the Framers of our

Constitution came up with ten; ten God-given freedoms that would forever be held inviolable by our own governments.

The last of these basic foundational principles was the one to protect the power, sovereignty, and the autonomy of the States; the Tenth Amendment. This amendment and law underscores the entire purpose of the Constitution **to limit** government and forbids the federal government from becoming more powerful than the “creator.” Let's be very clear here; the States in this case were the creator. They formed the federal government, not the other way around. Does anyone believe rationally that the States intended to form a new central government to control and command the States at will? Nothing could be further from the truth. Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution details what duties the federal government will be responsible for under our new system of “balanced power.” Anything not mentioned in Article 1, Sec. 8, is “reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” (Tenth Amendment) Hence, the federal government was not allowed creativity or carte blanche to expand or assume power wherever and whenever they felt like it. The feds had only discrete and enumerated and very limited powers. Omnipotency was the last thing the Founding Fathers intended to award the newly formed federal government.

They had just fought the Revolutionary War to stop such from Britain and their main concern was to prevent a recurrence here in America.

In perhaps the most recent and powerful Tenth Amendment decision in modern history, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Mack/Printz v U.S.* that “States are not subject to federal direction.” But today’s federal Tories argue that the “supremacy clause” of the U.S. Constitution says that the federal government is supreme and thus, trumps the States in all matters. Wrong! The supremacy clause is dealt with in *Mack/Printz*, in which the Supreme Court stated once and for all that the only thing “supreme” is the constitution itself. Our constitutional system of checks and balances certainly did not make the federal government king over the states, counties, and cities. Justice Scalia opined for the majority in *Mack/Printz*, that “Our citizens would have two political capacities, one state and one federal, each protected from incursion by the other.” So yes, it is the duty of the State to stop the Obamacare “incursion.” To emphasize this principle Scalia quotes James Madison, “The local or municipal authorities form distinct and independent portions of the *Supremacy*, no more subject within their respective spheres, to the general authority than the general authority is subject to them, within its own sphere.” The point to remember here is; where do we define the “sphere” of the federal government? That’s right; in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and anything not found within this section belongs to the States or to the People. So where does health care belong? The last place it belongs is with the President or Congress. It is NOT their responsibility and the States need to make sure that Obama does not overstep his authority.

Just in case there is any doubt as to what the Supreme Court meant, let’s take one more look at *Mack/Printz*. “This separation of the two spheres is one of the Constitution’s structural protections of liberty. Hence, a double security arises to the rights of the people. The different governments will control each other...” What? The Constitution, the supreme law of the land, has as a “structural protection of liberty” that States will keep the federal government in check? No wonder it was called a system of “checks and balances.” The States (and Counties) are to maintain the balance of power by keeping the feds within their proper sphere.

So do the States have to take the bullying of the federal government? Not hardly! The States do not have to take or support or pay for Obamacare or anything else from Washington DC. The States are not subject to federal direction. They are sovereign and “The Constitution protects us from our own best intentions.” (*Mack/Printz*) Which means the States can tell national healthcare proposals or laws to take a flying leap off the Washington monument. We are not subject to federal direction!

In the final order pursuant to the *Mack/Printz* ruling Scalia warned, “The federal government may neither, issue directives requiring the States to address particular problems, nor command the States’ officers, or those of their political subdivisions, to administer or enforce a federal regulatory program. Such commands are fundamentally incompatible with our constitutional system of dual sovereignty.” It is rather obvious that nationalized healthcare definitely qualifies as a “federal regulatory program.”

Thus, the marching on Washington and pleas and protests to our DC politicians are misdirected. Such actions are “pie in the sky” dreaming that somehow expects the tyrants who created the tyranny, will miraculously put a stop to it. Throughout the history of the world such has never

been the case. Tyrants have never stopped their own corrupt ways. However, in our system of “dual sovereignty,” the States *can* do it. If we are to take back America and keep this process peaceful, then state and local officials will have to step up to the plate. Doing so is what States’ Rights and State Sovereignty are all about.