

A Constitutional Crisis, Part 2

Our nation has operated under the most successful government document devised by man in the history of the world and has made us the most successful, prosperous and powerful nation the world has ever seen yet Democrats hate it. For example, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg, speaking to Egypt's new government in 2012 stated that the US Constitution was not one that should be used as a guide: Just last week, for example, Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg told an Egyptian TV station that she would not recommend the U.S. Constitution as model for Egypt's new government.

The problem, you see, is that the U.S. Constitution is "a rather old constitution." Ginsburg suggested that Egyptians should look instead to the Constitution of South Africa or perhaps the European Convention on Human Rights. All these are "much more recent than the U.S. Constitution."

Ginsburg's comments echo those by Washington University professor David Law, who published a study with Mila Versteeg on the U.S. Constitution's declining influence worldwide. In an interview, Law unfavorably compared the Constitution to "Windows 3.1"—outdated and unattractive in a world of sleek and sexy modern constitutions. Such obsession with the age of the Constitution is both absurd and irrelevant.[1] Keep in mind that she has sworn to uphold this Constitution, yet this modern court has used international law to adjudicate cases before it. In the Lawrence vs Texas, Texas' sodomy law, they used an international treaty the United States had not agreed to yet to decide the case. Keep in mind the liberal jurists on the Supreme Court favor homosexual marriage and since they could not find anything in our Constitution to overturn Texas' law, they went outside the United States to do so. In her own words: In terms of her own views, Justice Ginsberg did not

mince words:

On judicial review for constitutionality, my own view is simply this: If U.S. experience and decisions may be instructive to systems that have more recently instituted or invigorated judicial review for constitutionality, so too can we learn from others now engaged in measuring ordinary laws and executive actions against fundamental instruments of government and charters securing basic rights. . . . The U.S. judicial system will be the poorer, I have urged, if we do not both share our experience with, and learn from, legal systems with values and a commitment to democracy similar to our own.

And the rest of the speech continues in a similar vein, with Justice Ginsberg raising and then contesting the views of foreign/international law opponents (including Justice Scalia, Judge Richard Posner, and Professors Eric Posner and Adrian Vermeule) while citing a series of “examples” of recent cases where the Court reached a decision with the aid of foreign and international law sources (e.g., Atkins v. Virginia, Lawrence v. Texas, Boumediene v. Bush, Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, and, of course, Roper v. Simmons).[2] So much for upholding the US Constitution. Four other Supreme Court jurists joined with her on this vote. All five should have been removed from the bench but nothing was done to uphold the integrity of the Supreme Court.

The Democrats are constantly ignoring our rights and passing laws that violate those rights. In Colorado this year our Democrat controlled legislature and homosexual governor have passed laws that give our votes in a national elect to people other than who we might vote for. If Colorado votes to elect a Republican president but the popular vote is won by a Democrat our Electoral College votes go to the Democrat. That violates the Constitutional process and violates the will of the people. They have also taken parental rights from parents in public school by not allowing them to pull their child out of the forced teaching of the homosexual lifestyle. They passed

what is called a Red Flag bill that allows an anti-gun citizen to declare that a pro-gun citizen could be a threat to himself or someone else and without due process, the pro-gun citizens firearms can be confiscated without being charged with anything.

Nancy Pelosi is pushing through the House a bill called the Equality Act that takes the religious rights of a person and subjugates them to a person's sexual orientation. The Equality Act, a sweeping new piece of legislation that elevates sexual orientation and gender identity above religious freedoms, passed the House Judiciary Committee last week and could face a floor vote as early as next week.

"Essentially, the Equality Act gives people of faith an ultimatum: Change your faith-based practices or face government punishment," ADF's Sarah Kramer of Alliance Defending Freedom, wrote on the organization's website.

The bill would amend the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in employment, housing, public accommodations, public education, federal funding, credit and the jury system. One congressional aide said the Equality Act is scheduled for a vote next week, according to a gay publication covering the bill.

ADF and other prominent Christian and conservative groups, including Judicial Watch, James Dobson Family Institute, Liberty Counsel and the Heritage Foundation, are warning of widespread repercussions for believers since it eliminates Christians from relying on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to uphold their religious rights, according to World Net Daily.

"Religion is no excuse for discrimination when it comes to sexual orientation or gender identity," Nadler declared. 2 I'm sorry but this fool, Representative Nadler, is confusing

discrimination with morality. Democrats do not want to allow even the opinion of a moral person to be heard. In Colorado a few years back they passed SB100 which makes it illegal to put anything in print that offends a homosexual which makes it effectively illegal to print a bible in Colorado.

FaceBook and Twitter constantly ban conservative postings and accounts like James Woods but defend accounts by Hamas and other real hate groups. Has no one ever informed FaceBook and Twitter that this is America and we have the First Amendment that guarantees us free speech. If you notice it is the conservative voice that is silenced on college campuses, it's the conservative voice that is silenced on the social media platforms, it's the conservative voice that is silenced in print media. Justice William O. Douglas stated "A people who extend civil liberties only to preferred groups start down the path either to dictatorship of the right or the left." This is what the Democrats are doing. They demand that only their voice be heard. They have gone as far as to demand that Trump's MAGA hats be made illegal because the left hates them so much. Notice that conservatives NEVER attacked the idiots that wore Hillary's pins and tee shirts. We let them look stupid in front of everybody. We allowed them their free speech.

© 2019 Roger Anghis – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Roger Anghis: roger@buildingthetruth.org

FootNotes

1. Justice Ginsburg I would not look to the US Constitution
2. Equality Act elevating sexual orientation over religious freedom passes house judiciary committee