

Once Again The Second Amendment Saves Lives While Ignoring It Incites Murder

The natural and God-given right of self-defense is perfectly summed up by the Second Amendment, part of America's fundamental law, which regulates all our civil government institutions:

"The right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

Definitive, bright, unequivocal, and by no stretch of the imagination is the Second Amendment confusing.

Tragically, many criminal laws and regulations have been made by charlatan politicians who see citizens as cattle with no right to defend themselves, while they are fully protected as benevolent masters. This past weekend's tragedies in Chicago where at least 59 people were shot and eight died during a massive outbreak of violence have materialized this Orwellian-era thought process in a city whose leadership brags of some of the most comprehensive gun regulations in our country.

It troubles me as I continue to notice many anti-American sentiments around the topic of innocent Americans protecting themselves. None of these sentiments are logical; none of them are ethical; and certainly none of them have prevented weapons from taking the life of the innocent they are claiming to protect.

George Washington believed, "The very atmosphere of firearms anywhere and everywhere restrains evil interference – they deserve a place of honor with all that's good."

Allow me to cite an example of just how effective this

founding father's wisdom is.

This Saturday, while murderers had free reign in Chicago, shots rang out in Titusville, Florida, where an individual opened fire at a park during a back-to-school event.

However, a bystander, who was licensed to carry a firearm, shot the gunman, who was taken to the hospital with life-threatening injuries, according to police.

Local police expressed gratitude to the bystander for taking action to ensure the gunman didn't injure or kill anyone:

"We are extremely grateful that nobody else was injured in this incident," said Deputy Chief Todd Hutchinson. "This suspect opened fire at a crowded public park, this could have been so much worse."

As seen in every single mass shooting, the government is completely incapable of protecting the citizenry from these kinds of attacks. If the people do not protect themselves, there is no protection. All "gun-control" laws accomplish is to fight or obstruct the people from protecting themselves. This is why state leaders have an obligation to declare any and all federal gun-control laws to be null and void, and boldly declare to the people of their states that they will honor and protect the people's right and duty to defend themselves.

Since the Constitution is the Supreme Law of the Land, and since the Second Amendment declares that the right of the people to keep and bear arms "shall not be infringed," gun control measures ARE NOT law.

Let me repeat, gun control measures ARE NOT law.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

Peroutka Resolution Claims Constitutional Rights For The Unborn

Does anyone doubt that American culture is in a downward spiral?

Shootings in schools, attacks on police, misuse of authority by police, disrespect of teachers, disobedience by children of parents, drugs, gangs, violence...

Why is this happening?

There are many answers, but do these effects trace back to a common thread?

I think they might.

At the risk of over-simplicity, let's try this out:

There is a way that God made the world. His created order involves laws and rules, which are, despite what we think, and despite how we feel – or even how we really, really feel – immutable and unchanging.

God said, "Thou shalt not murder."

In America, in the last 75 years, we have been sold the lie that preborn children are not human and that cruelty and violence against them is a matter of personal choice. This lie is dangerous and dangerously consequential. Not only do preborn Americans suffer mutilation and murder, but induced and surgical abortions have damaging short term and long-term

effects on women. And studies show that many women who undergo abortions have been falsely led to believe that a preborn child is not human.

If you are a father, let me pose a simple question.

When you drove your pregnant wife to the hospital, did you expect anything to be born other than a human being?

Despite his immense hatred for the Jewish people, Hitler couldn't murder six million without significant help.

A witness to the Holocaust, Elie Wiesel described, in gruesome detail, how he, and fellow prisoners were brutally and systematically dehumanized.

Dehumanization is the process of turning a person into an object or an evil existence.

And dehumanization is an essential predicate to mass murder because it absolves the conscience of witnesses allowing them to become accomplices. You see, if one becomes convinced that the evil object is less than human, then it can be killed...if killing it is convenient.

This is the key similarity of the Holocaust and abortion.

As a culture, by default, we consider new life in the womb to be babies – precious children. But as soon as they get inconvenient we downgrade them to “fetuses” and exile them, claiming that they are an unwanted appendage to a woman's body or just a bunch of cells.

In other words, we dehumanize them... then we kill them.

What is needed is a reawakening in the culture regarding the humanity of the preborn. That is why Maryland County Councilman Michael Anthony Peroutka is sponsoring Resolution 30-18 in the Anne Arundel County Council.

This historic resolution acknowledges and declares that preborn children are human beings and have God-given and Constitutionally protected rights, including the right to live.

They can't commit mass murder without our help. Let's stop helping them and commit our prayers, efforts, and encouragement to brave men like Mr. Peroutka who take their oath to secure the rights of the governed seriously and are willing to pledge their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor.

If you would like to lend your support, or just learn more, please contact his office at www.peroutkatownhall.com.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

The Author Of The Great Compromise Still Speaks To Americans Today

This week we honor the passing of founding father Roger Sherman of Connecticut, who went on to eternity on July 23, 1793.

I am reminded of the statement that this giant of a man made regarding the past and present of our miraculous Republic.

“Sad will be the day when the American people forget their traditions and their history, and no longer remember that the country they love, the institutions they cherish, and the freedom they hope to preserve, were born from the throes of armed resistance to tyranny, and nursed in the rugged arms of fearless men.”

This past weekend, I had the privilege of speaking at a home educators convention in St. Louis, Missouri. It was an encouraging and wonderful opportunity to talk with parents and students who are grateful for accurate history and the restoration of constitutional governance. Although the numbers are growing, these parents and students still seem to be the minority while the majority of education in America is a fulfillment of the sad day Roger Sherman expressed.

However, Sherman himself had numerous sad and challenging days. Overwhelmingly, his neighbors and fellow colonists were apathetic at best about the separation with Great Britain.

As an American, a Patriot and a Christian, Sherman labored to reverse this trend, declaring, “Government is instituted for those who live under it,” and, “Let us live no more to ourselves, but to Him who loved us, and gave Himself to die for us.”

Sherman did not only give this advice, but followed it. He was a member of the church pastored by the son of Great Awakening Preacher Jonathan Edwards and worked tirelessly for Independence and even harder to establish Constitutional government that would “secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity.”

Perhaps his most notable accomplishment was the solution he proposed at the Constitutional Convention known as the Great Compromise. This brought a much-needed solution to Representation problem in Congress: The large States wanted proportionate representation, but small states wanted equal

representation. Therefore, Roger Sherman suggested a bicameral Congress – with a House comprised of representatives based on population of the states and a Senate giving each state equal representation of two Senators. Thus saving the Constitutional Convention, and, probably, the Union.

Known to few, he was a member of the Committee of Five selected to draft the [Declaration of Independence](#) and credited by Thomas Jefferson as having never said a foolish thing in his life. Sherman alone was among the Patriots of the [American Revolution](#) who signed all four documents, which gradually assigned sovereignty to the new United States: the Continental Association of 1774, the Declaration of Independence, the [Articles of Confederation](#) and the United States [Constitution](#).

In the words of John Adams, Sherman was “an old Puritan, as honest as an angel and as firm in the cause of American independence as Mount Atlas.”

I think you will agree that it’s time we start expecting our current leaders to be filled with this type of selfless character and love for liberty.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 NWV – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Presidential Pardon For The Hammonds – Another Reason To Love The Constitution

Article 2, Section 2, of the United States Constitution defines one of a handful of powers the President has: “He shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.”

Due to so few limitations, the rule of such pardons is that the pardon may be given before, during, or after indictment or conviction.

Founding Father Alexander Hamilton concluded, “Humanity and good policy conspire to dictate, that the benign prerogative of pardoning should be as little as possible fettered or embarrassed.”

Similar to the amazing grace extended by our Creator at the cross of His Son Jesus Christ, our founders understood the power of forgiveness and redemption and they codified it into our Law.

However, there are also times when a pardon is demanded to ensure the rule of law.

You see one of the main functions of an executive or presidential pardon is to act as a constitutional check against an unrestrained federal judiciary.

Such is the case involving Dwight Hammond, 76, and his son Steven Hammond, 49, who were convicted in 2012 after a prescribed burn on their land spread to nearby public lands in 2001.

The Hammonds had claimed that the fire was to fend off

invasive species, but prosecutors alleged that it was set to cover up evidence of illegal deer poaching and that it posed a grave risk to firefighters. The evidence at trial regarding the Hammonds' responsibility for the fire was conflicting, and the jury acquitted them on most of the charges.

The pair then served their time in jail, but Obama's Justice department wasn't satisfied with this sentence. So in 2015, after being freed from prison, the Obama DOJ increased the penalty of the crime by classifying, charging, and imprisoning the father and son as terrorists!

According to President Trump, the Obama administration filed an "overzealous appeal" and that "This was unjust."

Not only was it unjust, but it was also unconstitutional according to the Fifth Amendment which commands the Federal Government that no, "person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb."

The unconstitutional ruling also sparked many First Amendment protests that left one rancher dead at the hand of federal agents!

The Trump administration concluded that, "Justice is overdue for Dwight and Steven Hammond, both of whom are entirely deserving of these Grants of Executive Clemency."

To conclude, because lethargic and negligent congressmen and women refused to do their jobs by impeaching federal judges like these, there was only one constitutional means to make sure that liberty remained upheld and tyranny was choked.

The President of these United States must uphold his oath of office and check the corrupted judicial branch by issuing a pardon; hence the existence of a constitutional pardon and absolute need for its exercise by President Donald Trump for the Hammond family.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

How Do You Choose A Supreme Court Nominee? Ask Hamilton

Like every other branch of American Government, the Supreme Court is not without its heroes and zeros. However, the Central Judiciary was a desperately needed piece added to the Constitution in Article Three after a season of no Federal judiciary during the time of the Articles of Confederation, America's first Constitution.

Founding Father Alexander Hamilton postulated: “[A] limited Constitution ... can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of courts of justice, whose duty it must be to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void.”

This past Sunday President Trump said that he was “close to making a decision” about who he would nominate to replace retiring Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy tweeting:

“Looking forward to announcing my final decision on the United States Supreme Court Justice at 9:00pmE tomorrow night at the [@WhiteHouse](#). An exceptional person will be chosen!”

So the question is if the president means an “exceptional person” is a “constitutional person.”

The dilemma is that most Americans assume rulings and decisions handed down in cases that come before American courts are based on, and consistent with, "constitutional law", that is to say "real law".

But, regrettably, this is not true.

In American Courtrooms today, court rulings are not based on real law. Rather, they are based on an imitation system, which is commonly called "case law" or "the case law method".

This phony "case law" method of understanding what law is and where law comes from is taught in virtually every law school in America today.

Let me briefly explain.

Prior to the 1880's, those who desired to practice law studied under experienced attorneys. Their apprenticeship included both the study of recognized legal scholars such as Blackstone, Montesquieu and Locke, as well as practical experience in writing briefs and memorandums and observing their masters in actual practice before the bar.

Undergirding that system was the universal understanding that law, like truth, is a fixed and certain thing because it is a part of God's Creation, and that the principles and precepts of law are found in God's Word and in His Creative Order.

But the "case law" system replaces the wisdom of God's Creative Order with the foolishness of men's evolutionary imaginings.

Law students, who, of course, go on to become lawyers and judges and congressmen, are taught that the source of law is the mind of a judge, which is then changed by the opinion of another judge and then, well... you can tune in tomorrow to see what the law might be then...

I pray that the power the President has to appoint is used to

select a Justice who can hear the spirit of founding fathers like Hamilton and see it as their duty “to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void.”

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Celebrate Independence Day, Not The Fourth Of July

This week we celebrate the 242nd birthday of our Constitutional Republic. I would like to suggest that Americans should NOT celebrate the “Fourth of July,” since this is just a day on a calendar. Rather, Americans SHOULD celebrate “Independence Day” and their blessed heritage of “liberty under law,” which resulted from the courageous actions of our founding fathers.

I would also add that the central importance of what our founders did was intricately bound up in what they believed. And what they believed they expressed concisely and precisely in the document they published on July 4, 1776. Essentially they said:

1. There exists an Eternal God
2. Our rights come from Him
3. The purpose of government is to secure our God-given rights

Recalling and celebrating these firmly held beliefs is the essence of our American heritage and the occasion to pass on the “blessings of liberty” to the next generation.

On July 3, 1776, John Adams, known as the Colossus of Independence, in a letter to his wife Abigail, declared that Independence Day:

“...will be the most memorable epoch in the history of America. I am apt to believe that it will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary Festival. It ought to be commemorated, as the Day of Deliverance by solemn Acts of Devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with Pomp and Parade, with Shews, Games, Sports, Guns, Bells, Bonfires and Illuminations from one End of this Continent to the other from this Time forward forever more. You will think me transported with Enthusiasm but I am not. I am well aware of the Toil and Blood and Treasure, that it will cost us to maintain this Declaration, and support and defend these States. Yet through all the Gloom I can see the Rays of ravishing Light and Glory. I can see that the End is more than worth all the Means. And that Posterity will triumph in that Day’s Transaction, even although We should rue it, which I trust in God We shall not.”

When the thirteen colonies of Great Britain in North America said that the king was not fit to be the ruler of a free people, they declared their independence from his government. This was not only dangerous, but for many proved fatal. Yet, despite the certain calamitous outcome, America’s 56 Representatives sealed this declaration with a solemn oath – “For the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.”

So this Independence Day, while you celebrate American liberty, let’s not forget the words of Thomas Paine: “Those

who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it.”

Happy Independence Day, America!

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 NWV – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Trump Fosters The Illegitimate Children Of An Inadequate Congress

America is a Republic

“A Republic is ‘an empire of laws, and not of men,” said founding father John Adams.

The Law of our Land, our Constitution, records in Article II, Section 3, that one of the main duties of the President is to, “...take care that the laws be faithfully executed...” In other words, it is the President’s responsibility to enforce the laws and policies, enacted by Congress.

The Law causing the current uproar of “child separation” is the Clinton-era Flores Consent Decree from 1997. It says that unaccompanied children can be held only 20 days. During Obama’s term, a ruling by the Ninth Circuit extended this 20-day limit to children who come as part of family units. So

this law prevents the Executive Branch from keeping families together. But is that really what this is about?

We all agree that children should be separated from criminal families. That is why no children live with their parents in jail or prison. That would be child abuse, right?

No, the issue right now is certain un-American people have a felonious mentality that believes entering this country illegally is not a crime. To those individuals, crime is only what they believe it is. To them laws are arbitrary and they prefer the uncertainty of anarchy than the security of a Republic.

These same individuals refuse the obvious fact that the Trump administration is not changing the rules that pertain to separating an adult from the child. Those rules started with Clinton and remained through Bush and Obama and still remain. This minor issue of separation happens only if officials find that the adult is falsely claiming to be the child's parent, or is a threat to the child, or is put into criminal proceedings. The real tragedy is that parents and others simply posing as parents are actually using many of these children.

The New York Times has reported that:

Some migrants have admitted they brought their children not only to remove them from danger in such places as Central America and Africa, but because they believed it would cause the authorities to release them from custody sooner.

Others have admitted to posing falsely with children who are not their own, and Border Patrol officials say that such instances of fraud are increasing.

This is tragic! Even more tragic is that when the children cross the border they become the children of our Congress. So

why doesn't Congress change the rules so the Flores Consent Decree will no longer apply, and it can appropriate more money for family shelters at the border. This would be the action of a benevolent parent, wouldn't it?

Well, Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution states, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress."

Congress, it is time to take care of the children bequeathed you from an unsecure border and quit relying on Trump to be your nanny.

Oh, and media, use that First Amendment right and put the pressure on, would ya?

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Asserting Your Rights Produces A Masterpiece Of Liberty While Ignorance Brings Slavery

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be,"

Let me quote Thomas Jefferson again...

“If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be,”

When Jefferson, the principal author of the American Declaration of Independence, wrote these words, he was expressing a truth that relatively few Americans appreciate today.

You see, an elected or appointed official at the local, state, or national level is required to take an oath to defend the Constitution of both his state and the United States. His job, then, is to follow his oath. Fair enough...but what about the rest of us?

What is our job?

As citizens of our State or of these States united, our job is to make sure that office-holders follow their oath so we can remain the “Land of the Free”.

As you probably know by now, my family’s mission is to make sure that the foundational reasons for American liberty are taught and known.

Almost every American I encounter knows that America is different than the rest of the world. Americans generally love America because we have amazing liberties, prosperity, opportunity, peace, education, entertainment, access and infrastructure. The troubling part about this love of country is that it is, for the most part, ignorant of any foundational reasons for the aforementioned.

Recently, my wife and I traveled to Colorado where I had the privilege to present to a number of individuals at the massive Colorado Home School Convention. I later brought some of my students from the convention to visit a champion of God-given rights, Jack Phillips of the Masterpiece Cakeshop.

We should all be so grateful that this man didn't just sit back and ignorantly enjoy his liberty in America. When discriminated against, Jack stood and endured the warfare to preserve liberty for his family and future generations.

Jack understood that one does not have a right to divest themselves of God-given rights. As a matter of fact, by asserting and victoriously defending his God-given right to practice his artistic expression within the moral boundaries of God's Word, he helped defend all of our God-given rights.

But how can you or I do this if WE don't know what the Constitution declares, or what it means? If we don't know the rules, then how can we tell if they are being followed?

If we don't know these essential elements of citizenship – what used to be called “civics” – then it is difficult to object to direct affronts against our liberty.

In short, if we are ignorant, it's not long before we won't be free.

Make no mistake; our American Liberty is simply the blessings of Almighty God and the bi-product of carefully following His Laws, which are the formula for prosperous individual, family, Church, and Civil government.

So let's do away with ignorance and learn our Bible and the Constitution, the true ingredients of the Masterpiece we call liberty.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Accident Or On Purpose, Trump's G7 Withdrawal Is Another Constitutional Executive Action

France released a statement on Sunday condemning President Donald Trump for withdrawing from a previously agreed-upon statement by all seven nations in the Group of Seven (G7).

While it may not be the President's primary motive, the withdrawal from G7 is a constitutional, executive action.

Let me explain.

The premise of the G7 is to have a conference of the leaders from certain countries to make agreements about global economic governance, international security, and energy policy. When America's president attends and makes agreements with other nations, however, he does so by sidestepping the treaty process by which the Constitution designates the American government to make agreements with foreign nations. The reason for the treaty process is that it has the protection of including the Senate body, which are direct representatives of each state.

Article 2, Section 2, Clause 2, explicitly states:

[The President] shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur...

James Madison, Father of the Constitution, asserted, "The

powers of the federal government are enumerated; it can only operate in certain cases; it has legislative powers on defined and limited objects, beyond which it cannot extend its jurisdiction.”

The Constitution never tells the President, or Congress for that matter, that they can tell business owners how much carbon dioxide their company can emit.

But, other countries leaders are doing it.

Once again we are not other countries, and that is what makes us American. *We the People* are not led by the nose of those in power. We have created checks on power and no branch has unilateral authority to pull the American people into agreements or put our liberty under the yoke of other countries.

When more closely examined, it seems that international agreements like these, like exaggerated Climate Change, have little to do with the Environment... but have everything to do with Communism vs. free-market Capitalism.

Consider this:

Ottmar Edenhofer, Vice-chair of the U.N. International Panel on Climate Change says, *“One must say clearly that we... redistribute the world’s wealth by climate policy.”*

Harvey Ruvlin, former Vice Chair of the International Council on Local Environmental Initiatives made the claim, *“Individual rights will have to take a back seat to the collective”* in the process of implementing Sustainable Development.

Are you catching these undercurrents of Marxism?

Many of these so-called global agreements are all about just what the proponents say they are about – a Marxist world economy that pledges no allegiance to America, Americans, or the Constitution. In fact, it desires and requires all others

to pledge allegiance to itself.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1825, “The greatest calamity which could befall us would be submission to a government of unlimited powers.”

We at Institute on the Constitution believe that it’s time to stop frightening our children into Global participation and instead enlighten them to the blessings of the constitutional free markets and individual liberty in America. We are hoping you will join us.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Christian Baker Wins And Constitution Adversaries Finally Want Limited Judicial Authority

Justice Felix Frankfurter said, “The ultimate touchstone of constitutionality is the Constitution itself and not what we have said about it.”

Practicing his Christianity by not participating in a sinful ceremony, Jack Phillips refused to make a wedding cake for a same-sex couple in 2012. The homosexual couple then filed a

complaint, which was upheld by the Colorado Civil Rights Commission (CCRC).

The Colorado Court of Appeals upheld the CCRC's ruling, which Phillips appealed to the Supreme Court, and in a [7-2 decision](#), the Supreme Court ruled that the Colorado Civil Rights Commission violated the First Amendment in its dealings with the Masterpiece Cakeshop in Colorado...and their opinion is correct! This opinion, backed by legal authority, brought vindication to an innocent man. This is the exact purpose the Supreme Court was given authority by our Founding Fathers: to secure the rights of the Governed.

Unfortunately, for years, courts have been issuing opinions and claiming to themselves lawmaking powers that are outside of their legal or moral jurisdiction.

Traditionally, courts have used the "Equal Protection Clause" or the "Due Process Clause" of the Fourteenth Amendment to establish national policy. In effect, they use these clauses to accomplish an "end run" around the clear meaning of the words of our Constitution.

A perfect example of this judicial overreach is when the Supreme Court attempted to redefine marriage for everyone in *Obergefell*, and ipso facto it was wrongly understood to be the new "law of the land."

However, the advocates of *Obergefell* are taking a different approach to the Supreme Court's authority in this recent decision. Adversaries of the Constitution like Sarah Warbelow, legal director with the Human Rights Campaign, don't want to see this opinion become "the law of the land." Ms. Warbelow stressed that the decision "is so narrow as to apply only to this particular baker." And she is right!

But you can't have it both ways, Sarah.

You see, in ruling in favor of Masterpiece Cakeshop, the court is deprived of the authority to make sweeping rulings with regards to state or federal laws.

Ask yourself the question, “How can the courts enforce a law about marriage when Congress doesn’t have the constitutional authority to pass?”

Like referees, the courts are only responsible to judge the game they officiate today. Their calls, whether good or bad, do not affect and have no authority in tomorrow night’s game.

So... stay tuned, America. With more constitutional decisions coming from the Supreme Court, constitutional adversaries might get on board and demand more constitutional, limited government.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Keeping Memorial Day Memorable

What if I asked you, “Do you feel patriotic paying taxes to fund the central government’s nationalization of the banks, the insurance industry, the automobile industry, the health care industry, and now local police forces or the use of the American military for unconstitutional and immoral, wasteful wars for empire?”

I am assuming that if you are a Patriot—a genuine American of good will— you would answer, “No.”

What if I told you government’s only purpose is to secure your rights. That’s correct: our government’s purpose and mandate that God has ordained is so limited that all they are to do is protect the rights He has given you. That’s it! The Declaration of Independence presupposes that all men are created with unalienable rights, and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men. When the American government executes its God given purpose of limited powers and maximum protection of our God-given rights, this will produce [Patriotism!](#)

Of course this Patriotism depends on the strength of our morality as a country.

It was none other than American Patriot and General Douglas MacArthur who informed the world, “History fails to record a single precedent in which nations subject to moral decay have not passed into political and economic decline. There has been either a spiritual awakening to overcome the moral lapse, or a progressive deterioration leading to ultimate national disaster.”

Perhaps one of the only examples left of government following their “moral” or “divine” directive is found in the young men and women in our Armed Forces. As a general rule, they are willing not just to work for the protection of our liberties, but they are willing to die securing them.

We are reminded every year during Memorial Day to honor these men and women, and I do. It is a holy act for any individual to lay down his life in sacrifice for his neighbor. It is what Christ Himself did for you and me. Our children should be taught to honor and have respect for those individuals who practice this sacrifice as a way of life.

In light of the Memorial Day observance, we must reflect on the reality that Americans have been robbed of their loved ones who have answered the call to serve and protect our nation, but instead are being sent as sheep to the slaughter in unconstitutional wars. The tragedy is that while we sleep at the proverbial wheel of entertainment and immorality in America, we allow our own veterans to be used to aggrandize these bureaucratic institutions. This is not patriotic.

Wouldn't it be far better for us to reverence our soldiers' personal sacrifice by keeping them safe and reeling in big, unconstitutional government actions? This is true Patriotism...

God Bless every American soldier, veteran, and citizen who exercises this Patriotism—our hats are off in memorial to you.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Is The Death Penalty Cruel And Unusual Punishment For The Santa Fe Killer?

This Past Friday morning, 17-year-old Dimitrios Pagourtzis opened fire at Santa Fe High School in Santa Fe, Texas murdering ten people, physically wounding 13 others, traumatizing the school full of children, and scaring the moral fabric of America.

The cruel and unusual style this man used to execute his victims was breath taking and barbaric. Before writing this column I had to once again overcome the anguish and grief I feel as these type of tragedies become more prevalent in a culture that I raise my children in. Not even animals commit these kinds of atrocities' on non-aggressive defenseless victims.

There is nothing that can make up for this tragedy or perfectly reconcile victims with crimes on this earth. The only thing that can bring closure to a victim is swift and unequivocal justice for the deplorable criminal. This, is both biblical and constitutional.

Founding Father James Wilson implored his fellow countrymen to understand this timeless principle stating, "To prevent crimes, is the noblest end and aim of criminal jurisprudence. To punish them, is one of the means necessary for the accomplishment of this noble end and aim."

Extracting their wisdom from biblical Law: "Thou shalt not murder" and "he that murders any man shall surely be put to death for in the image of God made he man," the founders believed in and practiced capital punishment for capital crimes against humanity.

However, the tragedy for the victims and families of this recent crime is the state of Texas may acquiesce to the supreme court who ruled [in Roper v. Simmons](#) that imposing the death penalty on persons younger than 18 years old is a violation of the U.S. Constitution's Eighth Amendment, which outlaws "cruel and unusual punishment."

In [2012 the court also determined it is unconstitutional](#) to sentence juvenile offenders to life in prison without the possibility of parole no matter how serious the crime, Justice Elena Kagan writing the majority opinion.

This means the suspected Santa Fe killer could be eligible for parole in 40 years when he is 57 years old!

But not according to the Constitution which is the highest authority of law in the land.

The eighth amendment to the US Constitution states: "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

This term cruel and unusual punishment was used by our Framers to prohibit unreasonable torture; disemboweling, mutilation, and things prevalent in Europe and England where kings and governments would use these tactics to make examples of political enemies or coerce men and women into confessions that often times were not true.

The Framers would not have considered capital punishment cruel and unusual based on the subsequent Fifth Amendment that states a person's life may be deprived them if due process finds them guilty of a capital crime.

So, in this case Dimitrios Pagourtzis has been charged with capital murder and upon conviction he should speedily lose his right to life in this world.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Moving A United States Embassy

President Donald Trump promised during his 2016 campaign to relocate the American Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. This move has enraged Palestinians who claim Jerusalem as their capital and in retaliation many Palestinians have led violent protests, which have caused over 50 deaths so far.

Many Palestinian sympathizers in America have once again found another axe to grind with “the Trump” on this issue, as he successfully made the embassy switch this week.

The naysayers claim that the President does not have this kind of unilateral authority to change the geographic region of the embassy in Israel or anywhere else in the world. Frustrated and upset, they are now looking to the courts to stop the move and restore our embassy back to Tel Aviv.

But just what does the Constitution say about this?

Article II, Section 2, of the United States Constitution states the President

“...shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls.”

In other words, the Senate has authority to confirm or deny the appointment of foreign ambassadors from the United States, but they do not define the terms of where or how that ambassador is to meet with foreign officials.

Article II, Section 3, of the United States Constitution explains the President’s authority on this matter, stating, “(He) shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers.”

This plain and simple wording in the Constitution means that the President maintains authority that is paramount over the other branches with regards to our relationship with other countries. To put a finer point on it, relationships with any and all foreign countries are within the sitting president's jurisdiction.

What the Constitution does not do is give any jurisdiction, whatsoever, to the Judicial Branch.

Just consider, if the Court determines the power to chose the location in which the Executive Branch can meet foreign ambassadors, then who has that power? The Court would have to invent something that does not exist in the Constitution. Furthermore, there is absolutely no connection to the courts regarding this authority or the authority to speak to certain powers of the other respective branches of government.

The United States government does not serve at the pleasure of the Judicial Branch.

So, despite the United Nations, Palestinian sympathizers, or objections from the state of Palestine, the move of the American Embassy in Israel is constitutional, and, therefore, lawful.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Iowa's Declaration Of The Humanity Of The Unborn

TheBlaze.com [reported this weekend](#), "Iowa Gov. Kim Reynolds signed a law Friday that bans most abortions if a fetal heartbeat can be detected, something that typically happens around six weeks into a pregnancy.

The new law scheduled to go into effect July 1, gives Iowa the most restrictive abortion regulation in the country, according to published reports.

At the Institute on the Constitution, we applaud this legislation as a positive step. It is a breath of moral clarity and sanity whereby government is declaring the pre-born to be human, which, by the way, is something the former Democratic nominee for President, Hilary Clinton, has already acknowledged when she stated, "The unborn person doesn't have constitutional rights."

Hilary actually described the treacherous state of affairs we are living in currently in the United States.

Hillary, along with both political parties, understands there is a living child in the womb of every mother.

I have four children. Each time my wife went into labor, I never expected her to give birth to a cat, dog, cell phone, computer, or anything else other than the obvious: a child. Why? Because that is exactly what God created to grow in her womb for the previous 9 months.

This law declares the obvious truth of the matter. This is an act of sanity to declare life exists in the womb, and therefore government at all levels has an obligation to defend it.

With this in mind, Governor Reynolds signed the bill despite affiliates of Planned Parenthood and the American Civil Liberties Union threatening legal action.

Reynolds boldly affirmed, "This is bigger than just a law, this is about life, and I'm not going to back down."

I now pose a question for the good people of Iowa. Are you ready to defend the bill against a federal "Leviathan" that will bribe you with "grant" money and funding from a beyond-bankrupt treasury? Will you still defend life when unconstitutional judges and pretentious courts attempt forcible coercion?

You need to be inoculated against all of these phony forces and attempts to undermine the clearly righteous law the state legislature is passing on behalf of its state's most defenseless citizens.

I entreat you, the citizenry of Iowa, to back the Governor and the state legislature's actions. They are stepping up to the plate that the federal government has long since abandoned. This is the place where the authority of the state can interpose on behalf of the most innocent among us.

When our heroic and resolute founding fathers signed the Declaration of Independence in 1776, they did not win Independence. They had to defend this declaration by winning the war that was being waged against them. It was not until the British fully surrendered their forces to the American army and were transported off our shores were we truly independent.

What you have done, Iowa, is signed a Declaration of the humanity of the pre-born. Now stand strong and boldly assert the dominance of self-evident truth. Win the war!

My prayers and my fight stand with you amazing Americans.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

How Should We Vote?

What should we do now that the elections are approaching? How should we act? What should we know? What should we ask? What are we looking for? And finally, knowing what we know (and don't know), how should we then vote?

Whether we're talking about Dog Catcher, city or County Council, State House, or our national government, it seems to me that, just like the Marines, we are looking for a "few good men."

Let's start with the word "good." Although the people that wrote the commercial for the U.S. Marines probably don't know it, the word "good" derives from the word "God." To be good is to be Godly. A good man is one who appreciates and rehearses the attributes and the characteristics of God.

And so, if our man is someone who understands his oath of office, then he fears God and believes that there is an eternal system of rewards and punishments that apply to him personally.

This is precisely what an oath is all about.

And I think we can assume that if he does not see himself

accountable to God for the truthfulness of his oath, then there is little hope that he will feel himself accountable to you or me once he is elected.

But he needs to show us more than just fear of The Eternal. He also must demonstrate that he understands the Biblical limitations of civil government as well as the limitations placed on him by the State Constitution and the Constitution of these United States. Unhappily, few, if any, of the candidates who come to you asking for your vote and your money, have even taken the time to read either of the documents that they are promising you, before Almighty God, that they will uphold.

Moreover, our candidate must not only show us that he knows what is required of him, but he must also demonstrate that he will act on that which he knows. It won't do us any good electing someone who knows what to do but won't do it, whether out of fear of men or desire to be re-elected, or whatever. This would be a vain thing, indeed.

To summarize, my precious vote can only be spent on a candidate that:

*Acknowledges and fears God

*Demonstrates that he has an American view of law and government

*Demonstrates that he will take actions that are driven by and in harmony with God's law and the limitations of the Constitution

I firmly believe that if I cast my vote for someone who doesn't meet these requirements, then I will stand before God and be judged for my failure to obey Him. To vote for someone who does not meet these criteria is to do a vain thing before God and men. The chaos and incompetence and corruption of our civil government in all three branches is a result of our

failure to choose wisely. When we choose “the lesser of two evils” we continually get evil and we certainly deserve it. After all, we chose it, didn’t we?

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Are Un-American Youth Becoming A Trend?

On my travels throughout America, I have the privilege to speak to youth in public, private, and home schools and occasionally churches. While touring in Iowa I had the chance to address a mixed crowd that included a high school church youth group. My first thought when speaking to youth is, Awesome, I can teach and equip these kids with what they need to stand against the secularists in America’s current culture war. After all, every youth loves to challenge the status quo. At least I did.

During this presentation I asked the question “So what makes you an American?” I believe it is ascribing to the doctrine of what the U.S. Code calls the “organic law of the United States” – The Declaration of Independence.

This amazing document contains the ideology that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. AND to secure these God-given rights, governments are

instituted among men. Therefore, the principal prerequisite to American citizenship is the acknowledgement that there is a God, our rights come from Him, and the purpose of civil government is to secure (protect) our God-given rights.

After devoting 5 minutes to that concept (a concept which I thought would have been a presupposition to all youth that were at this event), I was directly affronted by at least 30% of the Christian youth present. Their 16-year-old spokesperson asserted, "We cannot force a Muslim to listen or learn the Christian value system in a public institution."

I retorted, "The Muslim is free to leave, but you will find he won't because the tolerance of the Christian ethic is what drew him and every other immigrant to America. Tolerance and liberty are anathema in much of our world today, especially Muslim controlled countries."

I loved this young man's tenacity and courage to stand in an auditorium full of people and challenge what he thought was fallacy. We fenced a little on the topic of religious freedom and what that truly meant. His arguments were not very deep because the government school systems are not designed to give understanding but rather simple rhetoric, which is becoming more and more antithetical to American tenets.

I want the youth of this nation to understand you can't subjugate a Christian people. They won't stand for it! A Christian culture will recognize and reject tyranny before tyranny can get a foothold. A Christian people, by virtue of their understanding of God's creation, their knowledge of history, their comprehension of the divine origin of law, and their assurance of heavenly citizenship, will never suffer earthly leaders who do not speak and act lawfully.

In order, therefore, to subjugate and enslave a Christian people, you must first de-Christianize them. You must remove from the culture that which prevents you from conquering them.

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak publicly with this youth, and of course we continued our dialogue privately to an exceptional conclusion regarding history, understanding, and mutual respect. I live to change this anti-Christian cultural tide and I hope you do to.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

A President Is Not A King And States Must Make Sure Of It

Our nation's first president, George Washington, under the newly formed Constitution in 1789, found himself in an uncomfortable position. As the nation's first Chief Executive and Commander-in-Chief he knew the delicate ground between strength and tyranny.

Fearing any comparison to the monarchical government from which America had just been liberated, Washington took care to avoid any physical or symbolic references to European monarchs. When the Senate proposed that he be called by the official title "*His Highness the President of the United States of America and the Protector of Their Liberties,*" an abashed Washington opted for the more modest address of "*Mr. President.*"

How far we have come in America. Since Washington's modesty, there has been no implication that the president of these

United States has ever been handed the unilateral authority of kings, monarchs, or dictators.

How unfortunate the present Senate, and all of Congress for that matter, has refused to stop recent presidents from self-nominations to this title.

Many kings and monarchs of antiquity suffered from the dangerous Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) in which a person is excessively preoccupied with personal adequacy, power, prestige and vanity, mentally unable to see the destructive damage they are causing to themselves and others. This is not a disorder that should be left unchecked in our leaders.

Understand, elected state leaders, your duty is to interpose between your citizens and a central government bent on tyranny. Simply put, you must stake a claim. You cannot remain silent, because silence implies consent.

George Washington believed, *“When People shall have become incapable of governing themselves and fit for a master, it is of little consequence from what quarter he comes.”*

The Hebrew prophet Isaiah resolved, *“When God’s judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness.”*

Democrat or Republican, state officials and citizens alike must learn and resist tyranny in all of its forms.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

The Shot Heard Round The World That Prevented Gun Confiscation In America

“What a glorious morning this is!” said Samuel Adams to John Hancock at the Battle of Lexington, Massachusetts, 243 years ago on April 19, 1775. It was the day of the “The Shot Heard Round the World”.

Indeed, that first bloodshed in the American War for Independence was an extremely important event. Due to the modern day revisionist history tactics of education textbooks in America, we are rarely told that this day was really about gun confiscation. You see, King George III was all about gun control for the colonists.

He had instructed his generals to begin rounding up the guns of the colonists in our land for one reason – so he might oppress them with the measures of a tyrant. The fact is the Red Coats went to Lexington and Concord that day to confiscate the guns, ammunition, and gunpowder of the American colonists.

Shocking to many modern-day pastors, ministers, and Christians alike is the location of the guns and munitions of the Colonists. The arsenal of this freedom-loving militia was in the Church Meeting House on Lexington Green. In fact, a militiaman testified that Captain Parker said to his men, “Every man of you, who is equipped, follow me; and those of you who are not equipped, go into the meeting-house and furnish yourselves from the magazine, and immediately join the company.”^[1]

And the Pastor of that church, Jonas Clarke, was a significant voice calling on his people to resist the British. The members of the militia on that Green that April day in 1775, were members of the Congregation, which met at that Meeting House. You might say that this church launched the War for Independence.

Americans need to remember this history, especially today when a new style of Red Coats disguised as educators, politicians, and now many high school students (being manipulated by delusional thinking) are all rallying for federal government gun control. These groups descend upon our nation's capital or on our own village green. The agenda is the same, though the style of clothing has changed. Tragically, these factions in the modern American society have left off true constitutional understanding.

These contingents are walking in a limited tunnel of vision – some on purpose, but most of them unknowingly; yet, both parties remain neglectful. While they practice the right to free speech, peaceful assembly, and petition found in the First Amendment, they seek to do away with the Second Amendment; the very instrument that prevents the annihilation of the First Amendment by a tyrannical power that loathes being reminded of individual God-given rights.

At the close of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, Dr. James McHenry, a delegate from Maryland, noted an individual asking Benjamin Franklin as he left Independence Hall, "Well, Doctor, what have we got—a Republic or a Monarchy?"

Franklin's response was, "A Republic, if you can keep it."

If you desire to live in a free Constitutional Republic please pray with me for the state of affairs in America and work with me to restore sound Biblical, Constitutional thinking in America.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the

Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

Footnote:

[1] ^[1] <http://www.eyewitnesstohistory.com/lexington.htm>

Government Of The United States, How About Some Common Sense

“A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong, gives it a superficial appearance of being right...”

So wrote Thomas Paine in a pamphlet called Common Sense, which aided the cause of American Independence with a logic and a passion that aroused public opinion to hot anger and a firm resolve to resist English tyranny.

Paine’s point is that no matter how long you have been doing a wrong thing, it is still a wrong thing.

This past election Americans seemed to keep this in mind, demanding the limitation and eradication of the numerous and continuous ways that our various governments, at all levels, violate the Constitution and moral law.

As I have discussed in previous articles, the federal takeover of healthcare was one of these violations. However, when lawmakers “got it passed and read what was in it” they knew that the next Congress would almost assuredly allow it to remain because it would take too much work to undo. They also knew that most paper tiger conservatives lack the “chutzpah”

to demand a full repeal of this unconstitutional invasion of federal government into individual healthcare. They are depending on the strategy of doing a “wrong thing with a superficial appearance of being right.”

There are many more examples of this instance that I fear our newly elected leaders do not feel is wrong. Neither the Department of Education, nor the Department of Health and Human Services (which administers the Medicare and Social Security programs), nor the Environmental Protection Agency, are authorized under the Constitution, just to name a few.

These rogue agencies of rogue regimes, are a plague on the populace. They are the cause of great strife, inefficiency, waste, and despair.

Under the American system, our state and local governments are in the best position and are duty-bound to protect us from the tyranny of this central government lawlessness.

Regrettably, our state and local governments, in most cases, are bought off from doing their duty when they accept federal grants that come with strings attached. These “strings” usually involve the compromise of the people’s property or the people’s liberty.

While we continue focusing a great deal on what President Trump will do, I fear we are incrementally losing sight of the tremendous allies we have to keep a president and a runaway court in check through our local and state governments.

Today, we yearn for the clarity and the conviction of a Thomas Paine who, in his own words, made the claim, “These are the times that try men’s souls.” However, “Common Sense” would lead us to exercise our self-governing muscle rather than fall into the arms of the next tyrant who will “take care of everything.” Our president and Congress are still human beings with a sinful nature and need to be held in check once their finger is crowned with the proverbial “ring of power.”

We need local leaders who will stand against the corruption of good-ole-boy politicians and central planners dispersing bribes tempting them to betray their constituents.

While accepting a new variation of federal healthcare, or a conservative head of the Department of Education and Department of Health and Human Services is the lesser of two evils, it remains evil, unconstitutional, and therefore unlawful.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Should We Treat Congress Like An NFL Franchise?

The massive \$1.3 trillion spending bill produced by Republicans and advocated by many Democrats passed early this past Friday morning.

Appallingly, none of the lawmakers from the House or Senate who voted for or against the bill had time to read all the way through this 2,200-page bill they received at midnight the day it was passed.

Americans have been betrayed by both parties into more unconstitutional spending and debt.

Kentucky Senator Rand Paul explained, “When the Republicans are out of power, they are the conservative party. But then

when they get in the majority, there is no conservative party. Democrats don't care about spending any of the time. Republicans seem to care about it when they are criticizing Democrats.

"Republicans are not fiscally conservative on the military. They want unlimited spending on the military. Democrats say, we'll give it to you. We're not really opposed to it. We'll give you the military spending if you give us the domestic spending. So really, the unholy alliance, the unholy compromise has been going on for decades..."

Let me explain what I believe the good senator means.

Imagine you are the new football coach and I am one of your more talented players. After practicing hard all week, you put me in as your starting quarterback. On the very first series of downs, I throw a pass directly to the middle linebacker who intercepts and takes the ball to the end zone.

Well, now we are down seven to zip, but you pat me on the back and encourage me as I trot back out to the huddle.

On first and ten from our own 20-yard line, you see me take the snap, and then take a knee for a three-yard loss. You call a time out and ask me why I did that. I explain to you that this is an away game and the great majority of the fans in the stadium are cheering for the other team. I tell you that I am just trying to please them because I want our team to be well-liked.

Next time we get the ball, you watch in horror as I actually hand the ball off to a defensive lineman as he passes through our backfield on the way to another touchdown for our opponents. Moreover, now you realize that nobody on our team seriously tried to stop him.

At some point, aren't you going to wonder whether I'm really

on your side? And aren't you going to eventually question the real motivation of our team? If, time after time, our actions indicate that we are helping the opponent's cause, won't you eventually conclude that we are not on your side?

In the same way, when so-called "conservatives" only half-heartedly oppose the immoral actions of unconstitutional "liberals," do you start to wonder where their commitment really lies? If conservatism really amounts to nothing more than handing the ball to the other team and purposely losing the game, then how is conservatism any different from its supposed opposite?

If we want to advance the cause of liberty, do we need new players? Or are you thinking that we need a whole new team?

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Student Protests: Good Or Bad?

Hundreds of students across the nation faced punishments for participating in the national student walkout last week in support of increased gun control, according to published reports. There were even some students punished for not joining the protests.

My entire adult life has been spent educating people in America to think American. During this time, I have

experienced peaks and valleys of great hope and despair.

I have experienced hope in the resilience and courage of youth to stand boldly against injustice, and despair when I see their boldness being co-opted by a system of thinking designed to destroy and replace the moral fabric of our American Republic.

Let me be clear, if you can isolate American youth to abandon their constitutional heritage and train them to replace the safety and security of their benevolent Creator with that of their Government, then you can enslave them—or rather—they will enslave themselves.

Tragically, the United States public educational trend has become, “If our Founders say it, you must reject it!”

Quotes from men like Thomas Jefferson who declared, “No free man shall ever be **debarred the use of arms**,” are outright rejected for the feeble ignorance of arms control.

A high school student named Alex, a junior at Downers Grove South High School, [told Patch news](#), “I think our school should be encouraging us to take action as more and more school shootings seem to be happening all over the country.”

Well, Alex, historically speaking, any people group that has been disbarred the use of firearms become slaves to thug governments.

Declaration author Thomas Jefferson again made the accurate diagnosis that, “The two enemies of the people are criminals and government, so let us tie the second down with the chains of the Constitution so the second will not become the legalized version of the first.”

The Second Amendment has always been the reason for the defense of our God-given rights in case the government becomes the enemy of the people.

The problem with Alex, and other students like him protesting gun rights, is their education consists of learning about a new, untried world of peace; where government control keeps us safe from everything. They pontificate about socialized happiness while they enjoy the protection of a Judeo-Christian system of ethics that has held back the ugly reality of secular, socialized despotism.

The wisdom of the Hebrew King Solomon speaks directly to this conundrum when he forecasted, “There is a man who has labored with wisdom, knowledge, and skill, and then he gives his legacy to one who has not labored with them. This, too, is vanity and a great evil.”

In the Preamble to the Constitution, the Founders wrote to future generations that the purpose of this new government by the people and for the people was to “preserve the blessings of liberty to [themselves] and [their] posterity”. They left us a legacy where we have not labored.

In conclusion, I believe the actions of these protestors are Constitutional; but the purpose for the protests, in words of Solomon, is vanity and a great evil.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 NWV – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

The Vitriolic Dialogue Of

Federal Gun Restrictions Continues

Three weeks ago, I discussed how school shootings have become a monstrous epidemic. I also discussed the overshadowed slaughter of American infants that number in the thousands per day.

Last week, I discussed federal gun control restriction laws that are, in fact, breaking the law – not making the law.

Currently, the Trump administration, along with his unconstitutional Department of Education, are coming up with a plan unauthorized by the Constitution that will provide funding to states for improved background checks of gun buyers and fire arms training for teachers in government schools. In order to further his pandering of the gun lobby, Newsmax.com reported the president “has refused to increase age restriction for so-called assault weapons. Instead, a new federal commission school safety will examine the age issue, as well as a long list of other topics, as part of a longer term look at school safety and violence.”

So just where does the president, or Congress for that matter, get the authority to provide funding to state education infrastructures? The answer? Nowhere. The Constitution grants no such authority and there is a specific reason for this.

Ask yourself the question, when has the federal government ever stopped or prevented a school shooting? How can DC bureaucrats effectively keep nearly 100,000 schools safe?

Because they are best equipped, our Founders intended the state and local government agencies to handle these types of circumstances. Your State and sheriffs’ department are the only agencies to this day that are constitutionally authorized

to deal with prevention of tragedies inside of the respective states.

How do I know this? Because I have read the Constitution, and nowhere in Article 2 (which defines the powers of the president) is there any executive authority to administrate a Department of Education, or to appropriate funding to any agencies of the government or schools. Furthermore, Article 2 does not grant the president any authority to provide firearms training for teachers. He is to be the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Armed Forces alone.

To put a finer point on it, you will find nowhere in Article 1, Section 8, authority delegated to Congress to tax and spend for education or school firearms training.

The solution is to keep federal government entanglement out of state school systems and state law enforcement. Allowing the states to handle these critical areas will bring swifter, cost effective, and safer solutions because they are more equipped to deal with their own backyard.

George Washington in his Farewell Address, cautioned Americans that, "If, in the opinion of the People, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

If the President, Congress, the States, or the American population believes the federal government should assume the aforementioned powers that reside in the States, then they should be working to amend the Constitution, NOT usurp the Constitution.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Are Gun Control Restrictions Making Or Breaking The Law?

Are Gun Control Restrictions Making Or Breaking The Law?

In light of the still very recent calamitous shooting in Parkland, Florida, there has been continuous talk about the authority the U.S. government and its agencies have to restrict the use of individual firearms of American citizens. In my travels, I hear individuals in airports, hotels, restaurants, and all over speaking about it. So I felt compelled to make a non-emotional, Constitutional point.

Barring the words of the Second Amendment, “...the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed,” the Constitution is silent on this fundamental God-given right to self-preservation. Furthermore, and more importantly, it grants no authority to the federal government to speak to this issue.

Consider with me, if you will, that there are hundreds of thousands of individuals in the United States serving in an elected public office. As a result, there is constant opposition to the way they behave; and for those who vote on bills or resolutions, the way they vote.

Of course, the First Amendment preserves their unalienable right to voice their grievance in this manner. And I’m glad that it does so.

Understanding no one is perfect, we can all be assured that those in office have certainly made their share of mistakes. But as Americans, we must operate on the assumption that the law-abiding people in any specific geographic region want their representative to represent them in a lawful manner. Likewise, those represented should make this their first priority.

But do you realize that just because the media, public opinion, a political party or, furthermore, a legislature, a court, or another public official declares something to be the law, this alone does not make it so?

In the instance of firearm restrictions, in order for it to be lawful, it must meet two objective standards. One is an eternal standard: the moral law. In the Declaration of Independence, Jefferson calls this the Law of Nature and of Nature's God. An example of a violation of the moral law (or the Law of nature) might be a law against arson or a law against rape.

Similarly, an act of a legislature must also meet the requirements of the U.S. and State Constitutions.

If it fails to meet either of these two standards, then it fails to be a law, and any public official's oath requires that they vote against it. They have no choice but to follow their oath.

And this is true no matter how good it sounds, how politically expedient it is, or how well-intended it might be.

And so, when an elected official disappoints you by voting differently than you demand, I am asking that you consider whether what you are demanding is, in fact, lawful.

Because if you ask your representative to vote for something that violates the Moral Law or the Constitution, then you are asking him to "break the law," not to "make the law."

This is applicable no matter what the legislation is. This is a simple question of authority and whether or not it has been delegated to your representative.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Celebrating The Life Of A Devoted Christian And American – Billy Graham

Why is it not surprising that world-famous evangelist, Billy Graham, who accomplished so much for the kingdom of heaven on this earth, was an American? Of course, much of it had to do with his unrivaled work ethic, his personal testimony, and his bravery to speak to and where others cowered before him, but overwhelmingly it had to do with the foundation of faith, liberty, and the prosperity of free market capitalism that America offered, and God ordained it so!

Let's start with his American, Christian education. From childhood to Wheaton College where the Scriptures were paramount in his learning, Billy identified the culprit of America's modern education failures and famously stated:

"America's founding fathers did not intend to take religion out of education. Many of the nation's greatest universities were founded by evangelists and religious leaders, but many of these have lost the founders' concept and become secular

institutions. Because of this attitude, secular education is stumbling and floundering.”

This quote is a fulfillment of founding father Benjamin Rush’s exhortation who proclaimed, “The only foundation for a useful education in a republic is to be laid in religion. Without this there can be no virtue, and without virtue there can be no liberty, and liberty is the object and life of all republican governments.”

Graham firmly believed what our Declaration of Independence stated: the self-evident truth that “all men are created equal.” He backed up his belief with action as he desegregated his meetings in a segregated south. In support of the equal rights struggle, he also invited the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. to give a public prayer at one of his 1957 meetings in Madison Square Garden.

In our struggle against society’s ills, the main duty of Christ’s Church is to speak God’s prophetic Word to individuals, families and governments. America is one of the few countries that endorse and protect that duty, and, here again, we see the American influence on Graham who felt it his duty to minister to all public servants regardless of party affiliation.

Graham was similar to founding father Benjamin Rush, who served in the administration of various political parties. Rush considered himself a “Christocrat because I consistently advocate the principles of God’s Word and God’s Government. I am a Christocrat because my obedience to God is more important than my loyalty to any political party’s ideology.”

Writer Eugene Scott noted of Graham:

“He was one of the few clergy to have ministered to presidents and first ladies on both sides of the aisle. He is perhaps known as much for his loyalty to Richard Nixon during the

Watergate scandal and visiting George H.W. Bush the night the United States and its allies launched an air attack on Iraq, as he is for helping Lyndon B. Johnson pick his running mate and providing marriage counsel to Hillary Clinton in the midst of her husband's infidelity scandal."

Whether these leaders listened to Graham did not dissuade him from the duty he felt to give these individuals God's Word.

May this man who stood for the precious truths of his God imperfectly embodied in America, Rest in Peace, and may the world hastily bend their knee to the loving scepter of the Christ that Graham preached.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Our Children Are Being Murdered; Of Course We Need More Control

Father God in Heaven, I pray for healing and comfort directly from your throne for the families of the victims at the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, in Jesus name...

Even as I wrote my column this week, I am still in utter shock at the gut-wrenching tragedy of 15 students and 2 teachers at a public school in Parkland, Florida, being mercilessly gunned

down by a psychopath with a high powered rifle.

I am honestly perplexed at this level of evil; senseless, violent, hate without a mask.

This world-wide struggle to protect children from abuse, trafficking, violence, emotional abuse, health risks, bad moral influences, and, perhaps the biggest struggle, the protection of children in the womb will continue through the ages until Christ makes all things new.

However, any person that has any humanity in them at all desires to get this under "control".

Grievously, there are certain factions of America who immediately stood on the bodies of the children before they even had graves, screaming vitriolic insults at Constitutionalsists and Christian patriots that this tragedy is their fault. They correlated two entirely unrelated topics: the preservation of self-defense and the murder of children.

Phrases like, "How can you as a Christian stand for this kind of lawless behavior where people have easy access to guns and kill others? It doesn't make sense – you ought to be for more gun control if you're a Christian!"

These hypocritical assertions come from many who believe the act of murder is okay so long as the child is unborn or infant. This is driving me crazy because I can't even wrap my head around this nefarious, illogical absurdity.

To quote my pastor and friend, Christopher Ogne, "Anyone who votes for politicians that say they want more gun control, but then vote to take public funding to prop up and proliferate the 3000 – that's right – 3000 innocent murders of unborn infants a day in this country, rings completely hollow. The 17 that recently died are horrifying and tragic. And guess what – we've locked up the perp. To kill children was already

illegal. The perp was caught, is charged, and is awaiting trial. Yet, the recent abortion doctor that killed 7 babies yesterday is home drinking scotch. Anyone that thinks that is okay, and votes for politicians that think this is okay, and then attempts to tell me that I'm not Christian for not supporting wider gun control, is never going to change my mind. Ever."

As seen in every single mass shooting, the government is completely incapable of protecting the citizenry from these kinds of attacks. If the people do not protect themselves, there is no protection. All "gun-control" laws do is fight or obstruct the people from protecting themselves.

Our Founding Fathers dedicated our Constitution to "preserve the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our **posterity**" (emphasis added). The Second Amendment was a part of their way to ensure we can accomplish this.

I believe today we need "control" of our leaders and make sure that they advocate, endorse and sponsor the protection of the children and our own God-given right to life, liberty, and property.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Does The Federal Government

Do The Budget “Backwards”?

What was our Founding Fathers’ attitude regarding debt? “We must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt.” Thomas Jefferson later remarked, “I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government; I mean an additional article taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing.”

If you are like many Americans, you might have assumed that the federal budget process begins with a determination of what activities are lawfully authorized by the United States Constitution along with an analysis of what they will cost. And then, you might have assumed that these necessary and authorized activities would form the basis around which to organize personnel and material resources.

But this assumption would not be accurate.

The way to understand what is Constitutional (that is to say “legal”) spending, we need to go the Constitution and read Article 1, Section 8, which outlines what federal funds are authorized to utilize with defined conditions.

Here are a few things Congress is currently unconstitutionally funding outside of the seventeen powers in Article 1, Sec. 8: The BATFE, FDA, Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Energy, National Parks, Wildlife Reserves, and the National Endowment for the Arts.

“Yes, I want a strong national defense,” Kentucky Senator Rand Paul tweeted ahead of the Senate vote on their recent budget bill. “I believe it’s actually the most important thing the federal government does. But you have to ask yourself whether a \$20 trillion debt makes us a stronger country or a weaker

country.”

The newest operating budget bill lifts the sequester spending caps on both defense and non-defense spending, setting top-line budget targets that will add at least \$298 billion to the deficit in the next two years.

In one way or another, the taxpayers of the United States that are alive today could never pay back our current debt. So the logical question is, “Who will do it?” The answer: Americans who are yet unborn will be entering the world with a major national debt hanging over them.

“I ran for office because I was very critical of President Obama’s trillion-dollar deficits,” Paul said on the Senate floor. “Now we have Republicans hand in hand with Democrats offering us trillion-dollar deficits.”

So while it appears both parties are to blame, the tragedy is that blame only leaves future generations, indebted slaves. It does not “secure blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity” as our founders did.

The solution for Americans is to follow the advice of founders like Thomas Jefferson who recognized, “The multiplication of public offices, increase of expense beyond income, growth and entailment of a public debt are indications soliciting the employment of the pruning knife.”

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Did Jesus Win The Super Bowl?

Though I didn't watch much of the Super Bowl, I was able to catch some headlines the day following and noticed quite a few comments on how the victorious Philadelphia Eagles' players were thanking God and His Son Jesus Christ.

After the game, and receiving the MVP honor, Super Bowl MVP Nick Foles told Dan Patrick of NBC Sports, "Unbelievable, all the glory to God." Foles recently explained he is currently studying at Liberty University to earn a graduate divinity degree and plans to become a pastor upon retirement.

Foles wasn't the only one to openly proclaim his faith. Eagles' head coach Doug Pederson also exclaimed on national television, "I can only give the praise to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

This got me thinking about some other amazing individuals who loved Jesus that have come out of this city of "Brotherly Love."

For example, let's start with the city and state of Pennsylvania's founder, William Penn. After being imprisoned for his faith in England, Penn set his sights on America to establish what he described as precedent of liberty for the world. "For the Nations want a precedent and my God will Make it (Pennsylvania) the Seed of a Nation," declared Penn. This, of course, came true as Philadelphia, the state's capital, became our nation's capital and was the location in which the unanimous Declaration of Independence was written and signed!

Penn's design for free governance earned him the honor from Thomas Jefferson, who stated that he was "the greatest lawgiver the world has produced."

Another Philadelphian was Benjamin Franklin, one of the

world's foremost inventors and the only founding father who is a signatory of all four major documents of the founding of U.S.: the Declaration of Independence, the Treaty of Alliance with France, the Treaty of Paris, and the United States Constitution. Franklin stated, "As to Jesus of Nazareth, my opinion of whom you particularly desire, I think the system of morals and his religion, as he left them to us, is the best the world ever saw, or is likely to see."

Dr. Benjamin Rush, was considered by John Adams to be one of America's three most notable Founding Fathers. Titled the "Father of American Medicine" while holding multiple university professorships, he was titled, "The Father of Public Schools Under the Constitution," being an advocate for free public schools for all youth.

He was a founding member of America's first Bible Society, and he helped organize America's first Anti-Slavery society. His love for the Savior was vividly apparent: "It is only necessary for republicanism to ally itself to the Christian religion to overturn all the corrupted political and religious institutions of the world."

So while I don't believe Jesus won the Super Bowl for the city of Philadelphia this year, I do believe by His providential hand through many of his disciples the stage was set for a free-market society where sports and entertainment can thrive. This is just another reason we should all be grateful to Jesus Christ and His gracious love towards us.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Why All The Uproar For This Year's State Of The Union?

It seems everyone in America is aware of or anticipating this year's State of the Union Address by President Donald Trump. That should come as no surprise after last year's near 48 million TV viewers, topping the former president Barack Obama's 31 plus million viewers each of the previous two years.

Of course, many Americans aren't even waiting for the president to address us before they give their opinion.

Campus Reform published a video Monday featuring one of its reporters asking college students at New York University their thoughts on Trump's remarks at the State of the Union Address even though it hadn't even happened yet! Comments such as:

- "I didn't watch it because I couldn't bring myself to watch it."
- "Quite racist, at the very least, if not up there with most racist."
- "It's something that I wouldn't have expected to happen in, like, our lifetime."

Perhaps one of the most shocking criticisms of the current President is that of Nancy Pelosi who has recently complained that Trump's new plans are intended to "make America white again," while conservatives strongly object to amnesty for people who came to the country illegally.

There are also multiple protests being organized against the President from celebrities, black caucus members and democrat

lawmakers.

It appears to me that Americans are out of touch with the jurisdiction and powers of the Executive Branch. So, I would like to take the opportunity to discuss the president's position and authority given by the United States Constitution.

Make no mistake, as the Chief Executive, the president does not run our country, nor is he the primary authority in our Constitutional Republic. The office of the president's few and defined powers are written clearly and succinctly in Article Two of the United States Constitution. These powers include the duties to:

- Pardon offenses
- Be the Commander in Chief of Army and Navy, as well as state militias when called into federal service ONLY when a war has been officially declared by Congress
- Make treaties with the concurrence of 2/3 of Senators
- Nominate and appoint judges of the Supreme Court with the Advice and Consent of the Senate
- Give a traditional State of the Union address which has no legal force, but rather sets the tone for the country.
- Recommend, but not introduce, legislation to Congress
- Convene emergency sessions of Congress
- Receive foreign ambassadors
- Commission all federal officers
- Faithfully execute all laws of the United States made by Congress.

I am certainly grateful for the farsightedness of the Founders and how they delegated such little authoritative jurisdiction to the president while congruently placing the authority in the people's representatives. Whether we agree with his words or not, Tuesday's oration is still only that... words.

If individuals in America are truly concerned about their government, perhaps they should require more than just words from the branch of government with real power: Congress.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

A Shutdown Leads To Limited Government

I am sure you have been made aware of the recent great news for limited government. The U.S. government has closed for business for the 19th time since 1976.

It appears Divine Providence has given the American people a rest from many current regulations of their liberties.

Why should this make you happy? Because, government and their parasitical bureaucracies have often strangled, suffocated, and murdered priceless, divinely born rights.

Let me explain. Imagine that you recently contracted with the security company BIGOV to employ a guard to secure your estate and possessions. You give specific directives that are specifically written out in a Constitution signed by the company and yourself. With your unalienable rights and possessions secured, you take an extended business trip to acquire new opportunities for your personal enterprise. By much labor and exertion you successfully secure the

opportunities you sought and are delighted to return to the security of your personal residence, your private property.

When you arrive, you find all of your priceless family heirlooms have been sold and in their place are new BIGOV articles of propaganda. Your personal office, living room, and bedrooms have become occupied by BIGOV security officers who quickly escort you out of the home into your son's tree fort where you notice 3 or 4 of your belongings necessary for living. Before the agents leave your new residence, they inform you that all the locks have been changed on your doors, and that the security company and its many subsidiary agencies have claimed your assets. However, for an annual fee, they have made them available to you. In order to continue to protect you, they make you aware of the personal tracking system they have placed in your BIGOV issued cell phone. Lastly, you are informed of a daily updated list regulating acceptable uses of your former assets that you now rent.

Shocked into astonishment and perplexed by your new reality, your only source of relief would be found by BIGOV taking a day, a week, or a month off.

Now, imagine that a group of 56 of your neighbors, relatives, friends, and strangers alike banded together and made sure that BIGOV never came back to work but instead replaced them with GOV-UNDERGOD?

Knowing the Divine Author of our rights never takes a day off, this would be a major game-changer. In justification of their actions, one of these 56 men, John Adams, emphatically declared that our rights are "...antecedent to all earthly governments; rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws; rights derived from the Great Legislator of the Universe."

Now the Great Legislator has written in stone the rules that keep our rights protected. We understand them as *The Laws of*

Nature and Nature's God. Now GOV-UNDERGOD has been obligated by the benevolent hand of Providence to be a guard of our individual rights, enforcing the *The Laws of Nature and Nature's God* and never taking a day off.

So while our BIGOV is currently scrambling trying to figure out how to open again for business, as Americans, let's sign our names to a Declaration requiring from among ourselves the return of GOV-UNDERGOD.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

My Next Guests (MLK And Obama) Need No Introduction

This week, while many Americans commemorate equal rights champion Martin Luther King, Jr., I took the time to read my old copy of *Letter From a Birmingham Jail*. I have always been so impressed by his writing prowess, and like my hero, the Apostle Paul, he did this from a primitive jail cell in Alabama.

He emphasizes the Declaration of Independence and demands for more Christlike action from the professing Christian Church with statements such as:

“There was a time when the church was very powerful...In those days the church was not merely a thermometer that recorded the ideas and principles of popular opinion; it was a thermostat

that transformed the mores of society.”

“By their effort and example they brought an end to such ancient evils as infanticide and gladiatorial contests. Things are different now... Far from being disturbed by the presence of the church, the power structure of the average community is consoled by the church’s silent – and often even vocal – sanction of things as they are.”

Former President Barack Obama, who is one such leader of this power structure and fearless of Christian morality, was speaking with former late-night talk show host David Letterman on Letterman’s new Netflix show, “My Next Guest Needs No Introduction.”

During the interview, Obama stated, “One of the biggest challenges we have to our democracy is the degree to which we don’t share a common baseline of facts.”

Obama went on later to pronounce, “If you watch Fox News, you are living on a different planet than you are if you, you know, listen to NPR.”

Aside from his democracy blunder, I believe the former president was right; America has become “delusional”.

This got me to thinking about the implications and consequences of our “delusional” behavior.

Webster’s 1828 Dictionary defines delusional as “a misleading of the mind...an error or mistake proceeding from false views.”

While most in America enjoy pointing the finger at politicians for the woes of America, we might want to consider that the American Church, and Americans in general, just might be the most delusional people in the world.

And our delusions are dangerous. For example:

Delusion #1: We could form our government acknowledging that God is the Source of our rights and our law, then steadily ignore Him for generations and expect to prosper.

Delusion #2: For the sake of our own convenience, we could murder sixty-million of our pre-born children and call it “legal.”

Delusion #3: We could attempt to redefine marriage (or gender) – which God has already defined in His Word – and not suffer the deadly consequences of disobedience.

In all of my travels speaking to youth all over America, I have doubtlessly found King’s conclusion to be the case: “Every day I meet young people whose disappointment with the church has turned into outright disgust.”

Like King, we believe, “If today’s church does not recapture the sacrificial spirit of the early church, it will lose its authenticity, forfeit the loyalty of millions, and be dismissed as an irrelevant social club with no meaning for the twentieth century.”

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

The Bible vs Fire And Fury –

Congress Decided

There has been a lot of talk about book releases recently. There is, of course, Hilary Clinton's new book, which we will discuss in the coming weeks because it is being powerfully overshadowed by a recent release of Michael Wolff's book, "Fire and Fury: Inside the Trump White House".

Though "Fire and Fury" has caused just that among news networks, it is not because of the brilliance of the author, but rather his ability to capture the comments by former Trump advisor Steve Bannon that seemingly question the mental ability of the President.

Now, billionaire investor Tom Steyer has made the claim that he has purchased 535 copies of the book so he can have them hand-delivered to every member of Congress. Apparently this member of the "3 percenters" believes it will lend some credibility to his recent campaign to impeach Donald Trump.

Look, we are wasting our time talking about the mental ability of a man who won against seventeen incredibly brilliant and capable people, taking down both the Bush and Clinton dynasties as well as the entire major media complex with its estimated 90% negative coverage, and finally overcoming billions of dollars in special interest money working against him.

Let's talk about something that matters. More specifically "a book" that matters. The book that has spawned the greatest healthcare, childcare, education, disaster relief, housing, and anti-slavery systems the world has ever seen. That book happens to be the top-selling book in the world and in America.

It is a book that so heavily influenced the inception of our current Constitutional government that our founding fathers

required government action to make sure it would remain a mainstay and place of prominence in American life in the colonies: the Bible.

You see, during the Constitutional framers' era, printers in the American colonies were prohibited from printing any English Bibles by governmental decree. Only three British printing establishments were allowed to do so.

As a result, when the American Revolution began, the supply of English Bibles to America was cut-off.

Distressed about the shortage in July 1777, the Continental Congress responded to a request placed before it by three clergymen: Francis Alison, John Ewing, and William Marshall.

So urgent was the matter that Congress took up the request from the three clergymen the same day –Monday July 7, 1777– and appointed Daniel Roberdeau, John Adams, and Jonathan Bayard Smith a committee to look into the matter.

The conclusion of the committee?

“[T]he use of the Bible is so universal, and its importance so great, ...The Committee recommends that Congress will order the Committee of Commerce to import 20,000 Bibles from Holland, Scotland, or elsewhere, into the different parts of the States of the Union.”

Whereupon, Congress agreed with the Committee, and ordered twenty thousand copies of the Bible to be imported.

America's Founding Fathers, both publicly and privately, were advocates of the distribution of the Bible. Many of these founders worked and financed Bible societies after the establishment of the government of their new nation.

While many current members of Congress might believe “Fire and Fury” be worth the fire, I cannot find one founder in all my research who would denounce the efficacy and importance of the

Bible.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2018 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Another Year to Make American Great Again

“Make America Great Again” has turned into a vibrant, contagious slogan. It is a slogan that has given hope and restored the voice of those in America who had become despondent and discouraged with what many have called the D.C. Swamp.

In their quest for greatness, our founding fathers laid a consistent and discoverable pattern that would establish and ensure the greatness of America.

John Adams, Father of American Independence and second President, asserted, “It is the duty of all men in society, publicly, and at stated seasons, to worship the SUPREME BEING, the ‘great’ Creator and Preserver of the universe.”

As Americans we MUST understand we are only great when we are morally good, that is to say “godly”. The word “good” is derived from the word “God.” To be good is to be godly. A good citizenry is one who appreciates and rehearses the attributes and the characteristics of God. Make no mistake, when America ceases to be morally good she will cease to be great, and #MAGA becomes an irrelevant slogan.

Noah Webster, Father of American Education, understood, "The religion which has introduced civil liberty is the religion of Christ and His apostles, which enjoins humility, piety, and benevolence; which acknowledges in every person a brother, or a sister, and a citizen with equal rights. This is genuine Christianity, and to this we owe our free Constitutions of Government."

"Finally," said Daniel Webster, "let us not forget the religious character of our origin. Our fathers were brought hither by their high veneration for the Christian religion. They journeyed by its light, and labored in its hope. They sought to incorporate its principles with the elements of their society, and to diffuse its influence through all their institutions, civil, political, or literary."

"Great" is not being in the Top 10 international ranking for crime, drug use, murder, rape, or violent crimes.

"Great" is not government condoned or sponsored abortion, international wars for profit, or the breakdown of the sacred biblical family unit of a father and a mother.

I conclude with the assertion of Thomas Jefferson in his second inaugural address as President of these United States, "I shall need, too, the favor of that Being in whose hands we are, who led our forefathers, as Israel of old, from their native land, and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessaries and comforts of life; who has covered our infancy with his providence, and our riper years with his wisdom and power; and to whose goodness I ask you to join with me in supplications, that he will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils, and prosper their measures, that whatsoever they do, shall result in your good, and shall secure to you the peace, friendship, and approbation of all nations."

If you still need a resolution for 2018, #MAGA!

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

New Years Resolution, Eliminate The Tyranny Of Case Law

Most Americans assume that rulings and decisions handed down in cases that come before American courts are based on, and consistent with, the “rule of law”.

But, regrettably, this is not true.

In American courtrooms today, court rulings are not based on real law. Rather, they are based on an imitation system which is commonly called “case law” or “the case law method”.

This phony “case law” method of understanding what law is and where law comes from is taught in virtually every law school in America today.

Indeed, a careful study reveals that the promotion of the “case law method” is the very reason that the modern law schools were established.

Let me briefly explain.

Prior to the 1880’s, those who desired to practice law studied under experienced attorneys. Their apprenticeship included

both the study of recognized legal scholars such as Blackstone, Montesquieu and Locke, as well as practical experience in writing briefs and memorandums and observing their masters in actual practice before the bar.

Undergirding that system was the universal understanding that law, like truth, is a fixed and certain thing because it is a part of God's creation; and that the principles and precepts of law are found in God's Word and in His Creative Order.

But the "case law" system replaces the wisdom of God's Creative Order with the foolishness of men's evolutionary imaginings.

Law students, who, of course, go on to become lawyers and judges and congressmen, are taught that the source of law is the *mind* of a judge, which is then changed by the opinion of another judge and then, well... you can tune in tomorrow to see what the law might be then...

William Blackstone could rightly be called the law professor for our Founders. In his Commentaries on the Laws of England, he concluded that "the laws of nature," having been dictated by God Himself, is superior to all others and "binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times." Therefore no human laws are of any validity if contrary to God's law, and that no human laws have any authority except as derived from that higher law.

Our Founders clearly established a fixed standard of justice for our land; they spoke of an unchanging benchmark. They were not inventing anything new through the War for Independence; they were simply reasserting the ancient rights of Englishmen or more broadly the rights of all men as subjects of the Sovereign Creator of the Universe. So how did we shift off that fixed foundation to the legislative and judicial insanity of our day?

Something has led people who no longer hope to control the

legislatures to look to the courts as expounders of the Constitution, and in some courts “new principles” have been discovered outside the Constitution.

Now, if the “new principles discovered” are actually “outside” the Constitution, are they not therefore unconstitutional? If there is no standard, if we the people no longer have a contract with the government we formed, who has betrayed us?

In the spirit of this up and coming New Year, let’s work to impeach those who have betrayed their Oath to the fixed truths of the Constitution.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

The Political Significance Of Christmas

In their effort to make a point, those who discuss law and government and politics for a living often miss the most crucial – the most critical point of all. So, as we celebrate Christmas, this is a good time to take a deep breath and revisit first principles.

We should remember the political significance of Christmas. Now don’t get distracted by arguments that early Christians latched onto a pre-existing pagan holiday to establish the date of Christmas. That may be true, but it is a distraction from what’s truly important. The important thing is the birth

of the Savior, Jesus Christ.

The birth of the Savior is the most significant political event in human history. This bears repeating. The birth of Jesus Christ is the most significant political event in the history of the universe.

Why? Well, simply put, it is because liberty does not and cannot exist absent the acknowledgement of the Almighty, Omniscient, Living and Everlasting God of the Bible whose Son is Jesus Christ – Who created the world, entered His own creation and sacrificed His life to cover our sins and make us presentable before the Throne of Grace.

For liberty to exist in the world this acknowledgment of Christ's authority must exist in the hearts of the people and it must be the operating principle of civil government.

If it is, then peace on earth will prevail. But to the extent that the hearts of the people are distracted and the civil government forgets that it is a ministry of Jesus Christ, then injustice, chaos, corruption and tyranny will prevail.

And the hearts of the people are, indeed, distracted from this truth; and this is no accident. It is the result of purposeful manipulation of the culture by those who control the major means of communication. The primary tool of this manipulation is the mantra of "Separation of Church and State."

Through the ceaseless repetition of this voodoo mantra, the culture has been conditioned to consider any public prayer, or any private prayer in a public place, or any acknowledgement of the Lord Jesus Christ, as an inappropriate encroachment of the Church. But this is a word trick and a mind trick. A prayer is not a church. An acknowledgment of God's authority over civil government in the form of a prayer before a legislative session, or a court session is not a church. It is rather an expression of a political philosophy. And this

particular political philosophy is the American political philosophy.

It is contained in the Declaration of Independence which is the organic law of these united States.

Therefore, there is nothing wrong or illegal about such an expression. Indeed, the acknowledgement of Jesus Christ as the Source of Law and Government is the very first presupposition of American government. Far from violating any law, worship of or acknowledgement of the authority of the Savior of the World through Christmas Nativity displays, public prayer, Ten Commandment displays and all other forms of Christian witness are consistent with and supportive of the American View of Law and Liberty and are the essence of American government.

Publicly celebrating the blessed birth of the Savior of the World is patriotic in the purest sense and ultimately politically correct.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Can Government Force Businesses To Participate With Sexual Sin?

On Tuesday, December 5, 2017, the United States Supreme Court heard oral arguments in the [Masterpiece Cakeshop](#) case

involving Christian bakeshop owner Jack Phillips.

Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) recounts the story that led to the recent events on their [website](#).

“In July 2012, two men came into Jack’s bakeshop requesting a wedding cake for their same-sex ceremony. In an exchange lasting only a few seconds, Jack declined the request, saying he could not design cakes for same-sex wedding ceremonies. Jack offered to make the couple any other type of baked good or sell them a pre-made cake, but, because of his faith, he could not design a cake promoting a same-sex wedding ceremony.”

However, the American Civil Liberties Union of Colorado said if he’s going to open a business to the public he has to make all services available to everyone in the public.

Mr. Phillip’s attorney rebuffs, “[F]or citizens like Jack Phillips, the court has created a novel exception to the First Amendment – you’re entitled to believe, but not entitled to act on those beliefs. You’re not free if your beliefs are confined to your mind. What makes America unique is our freedom to peacefully live out these beliefs.”

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution tells us that Congress can make no law regarding religion, but also it may not infringe on the exercise of that religious belief. In this instance, the unconstitutional threat of both is being advanced. In essence, the government is attempting to force Jack to sin by disobeying his Christian faith.

Founding Father George Mason, in the Virginia Declaration of Rights, wrote, “That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience.”

Beyond religion and the exercise thereof, Jack's God-given right to contract is also being denied.

Contracts are indispensable to the foundational freedom of choices. Because of this, the Founding Fathers specifically provided in Article I, Section 10, of the Constitution, that state governments could enact no "law impairing the obligation of contracts."

So you see the Constitution prohibits government from stepping between contracting parties and rewriting their agreement such as "No shirt, No shoes, No service."

Unfortunately for Americans' liberty, the government now believes it is a 3rd party in every contract in America.

It is imperative that we understand the government has limited jurisdictions in areas where God has ordained them to protect our individual rights. The homosexuals, in this case, still maintain their rights by refusing to do business with the baker. However, the baker's rights are emphatically denied when he is forced to participate with what his conscience deems sin.

Make no mistake, homosexual marriage, in fact, is not marriage and God's Word declares that practicing homosexual intercourse is sin. Therefore, the government cannot force an individual to celebrate or condone someone else's sin.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

With The November 2017 Elections What Should Republicans Do Now?

With the recent victories by Democrats in the November 2017 elections, there is much talk about what Republicans should learn from this and what they should do now.

One argument is that Republicans must more clearly “embrace Trump.” That is, they should align themselves with the President and demonstrate their allegiance to his policies and his persona.

Others say that it’s time for Republicans to distance themselves from “The Donald” and seek to win more support from liberals and independents.

It might not surprise you that we at the Institute on the Constitution, too, have an opinion to share. Michael Peroutka, our Founder and current member of the Anne Arundel County Council in Maryland, championed this opinion earlier in the month.

“The Donald” is not the standard. Neither, of course, is “The Hillary.”

The allegiance of anyone who holds or desires to hold elective office should be to the Constitution, which includes the Declaration of Independence, and to the Moral Law.

After all, “We hold these **truths** to be self-evident: 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 to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

So you see, nobody takes an oath of office promising to obey the President.

The Oath is before the governed to the God who gave us our rights. Their obligation is to preserve and protect the Constitution and “The Truths” just mentioned above, which are found in the Declaration of Independence.

This is the place to stand.

Make no mistake; “Truth” is not a concept we can disregard because it is part of the way our Creator made the world. If we disregard the concept of “Truth” and adopt evolving definitions of “Truth”, would we have much security for our rights?

It may sound simplistic but I believe people voted for Trump because they were tired of the abuse of a godless and corrupt regime who were arbitrarily creating so-called truths of their own. All the while this new concept of truth fundamentally transformed the foundation of our Biblical, Constitutional Republic.

Unfortunately, the new regime of Republicans has shown themselves largely to be just as bad as those they replaced.

And so, the frustrated people, looking for honest, decent, Constitutional and God-fearing government...are still looking.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

When You Are Falsely Accused, Who Is The Real Criminal And Who Is The Victim?

The Book of Proverbs, chapter 18, verse 17, says this:

“The one who states his case first seems right, until the other comes and examines him.”

It's true that we are apt to believe the first story that we hear, especially if it tends to confirm what we already believe, and especially when it's something that supports our pre-existing agenda.

But this Proverb is a solemn warning to us to be careful to listen to both sides of an issue before making judgment. More importantly, it requires that the one who is accused must have the opportunity to face and to cross-examine his accuser.

This is and has been a crucial underpinning of our system of justice for centuries.

Regrettably, in the current emotionally charged climate surrounding many accusations in our current culture, this foundational principle of American jurisprudence is abandoned by many.

This is a shame, but it is also a dangerous thing; because to jettison due process and fundamental fairness is to put each and every one of us at risk.

Furthermore, the book of Deuteronomy, chapter 19, verse 18, deals with those who bring false charges against the innocent.

It says this:

“The judges shall inquire diligently, and if the witness is a false witness and has accused his brother falsely, then you shall do to him as he had meant to do to his brother.”

Not only is “thou shalt not bear false witness” one of the Ten Commandments that Moses holds in his hand atop the US Supreme Court building, but it is also one of the firmest props of our Common Law legal system in America. A system which is based and wholly influenced by God’s Law.

You see, this commandment is a safety mechanism for all society to be protected against unjust criminal prosecution and penalty. It dissuades parties with personal vendettas and little to no evidence from bringing false accusations for fear that they may wind up on the judgment seat. This, of course, protects the innocent, which is the purpose of the Law.

Now I am sure that most of you reading have been falsely accused –US perhaps you have been accused of something that you not only did not do, but that you would not do and consider to be horrible and heinous?

Well, it happens more often than you might think. And it is a dreadful experience.

Frequently in my travels I have been on the receiving end of many false accusations and if this has happened to you, then I don’t have to tell you that the pain never totally goes away.

The only true healing I have found is by the Blood of the Savior, who also was falsely accused and executed for a crime of which He was innocent.

Regrettably, we are now living through a season of screeching, politically charged accusations demanding justice for the victims of abuse. And if the accusations are true, then punishment is well-deserved so healing can take place.

But the law requires us to “inquire diligently.” For if these very serious accusations are false, then the accuser is the criminal and the accused is the actual victim.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 NWV – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Happy Thanksgiving America Here Is Your History

We are so grateful at the Institute On The Constitution for the wonderful, providential year it has been. In light of this amazing holiday, I would like to give thanks for the opportunity to share the American View with others across this great country. I am especially encouraged by our American Club youth initiatives. Rush Limbaugh’s “Rush Revere Newsletter” recently recognized the efforts of one of our American Club chapters in North Carolina! In order to reinvigorate American youth, Rush featured this group that drew their favorite scene from “Rush Revere and the Brave Pilgrims.”

Statistically speaking, American Millennials’ (ages 18-34) worst subject is history. Many know very little about our European ancestors, the Pilgrims, to whom the first Thanksgiving is attributed. These were the first Christian families to settle on the East coast of America. Contrary to modern-day teaching, the main purpose the Pilgrims came to America was NOT religious freedom. They had already gained

religious freedom twelve years earlier, in 1608, when they fled England for Holland to escape the extreme persecution from a tyrannical King James I. They told us specifically why they decided to come to America in the Mayflower Compact – the first American government document: “...for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith...”

The Pilgrims came to America to set up an entire nation for the purpose of glorifying God and advancing the Christian faith. This radical statement UNITED government with a responsibility to God and left a strategy for future generations to follow that has arguably brought about more liberty, prosperity, and joy to our nation than any other political philosophy in any other country in the history of the world!

The first national Thanksgiving occurred in 1789. According to the *Congressional Record* for September 25, immediately after approving the Bill of Rights, Mr. Elias Boudinot said he could not think of letting the congressional session end without offering an opportunity to all the citizens of America to render their sincere thanks to Almighty God for the many blessings He had poured down upon them.

The resolution was delivered to President George Washington who heartily concurred with the congressional request, declaring:

“Whereas it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor. . . . Now, therefore, I do appoint Thursday, the 26th day of November 1789 . . . that we may all unite to render unto Him our sincere and humble thanks for His kind care and protection.”

This Thanksgiving let us give thanks to the God of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for America’s incredible founding and

pray that our government would never relinquish its God-given duty to preserve our rights.

This is Jake MacAulay with the Institute on the Constitution bringing you the American View and wishing you and your families a Happy Thanksgiving.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Debra Rae – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Beyond Slavery: American Politics At War With Black Lives

Despite being a culture of death, Americans have uncompromisingly (or so we think) done away with slavery in a pursuit of liberty for all men and women.

Noah Webster clarifies that this *“liberty of one depends not so much on the removal of all restraint from him, as on the due restraint upon the liberty of others.”*

Now this restraint on the liberty of others is exemplified in chattel slavery. Webster defines a slave as, *“A person who is wholly subject to the will of another; one who has no will of his own, but whose person and services are wholly under the control of another.”*

This month during a Congressional hearing about the Heartbeat

Protection Act, pro-life leader Star Parker – a black woman who had four abortions early in her life – testified, “In fact, when you put the Dred Scott decision next to the Roe v. Wade decision they read almost verbatim.” Parker continued, “Abortion is the leading cause of death in the black community today.” She went on to explain that since the Supreme Court decision Roe v. Wade, “Twenty-million humans have been killed inside of the womb of black women. And then on Halloween, Planned Parenthood tweets out that black women are safest if they abort their child rather than bring it to term.”

When “Meet the Press” host Chuck Todd queried if an unborn child’s life is wholly under the control of the mother, former presidential candidate Dr. Ben Carson asserted, “During slavery, a lot of the slave owners thought that they had the right to do whatever they wanted to that slave. And, you know, what if the abolitionist had said, you know, ‘I don’t believe in slavery. I think it’s wrong. But you guys do whatever you want to do’? Where would we be?”

Infant murder, as horrid as slavery and lynching, has become an unprecedented abomination in our country, taking roughly 4,000 lives a day!

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 35% of all babies aborted in America in 2013 were black children while blacks make up only 13% of the U.S. population.

In addition, according to the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, in 2012 there were more black babies killed by abortion (31,328) in New York City than were born there (24,758.)

“You shall not murder” is as pertinent today as it was when God created us with the right to life. He created this law as a protection, and violation of His law results in personal and societal consequences.

When we abandon God's Word we abandon all rationality. We instead have to prop up an abstract morality full of contradictions and deceit.

Chattel slavery and infant murder have always been and will always be abominations. Justifying one over the other and maintaining "freedom for the people" is outright duplicitous and diabolical.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

What Is Changing America? Government's Own Education Systems!

My entire adult life has been spent in educating Americans to be... well... American. My mission has compelled me to follow in the steps of our founders to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our Posterity."

During this time I have experienced peaks and valleys of great hope and despair.

I have experienced hope in the resilience and courage of youth to stand boldly against injustice, and despair when I see their boldness being co-opted by a system of thinking designed to destroy and replace the moral fabric of our American

Republic.

Mark Twain put to words an observation that I have long witnessed in the youth culture. "It ain't what you don't know that gets you into trouble. It's what you know for sure that just ain't so."

The United States public educational trend has become, "If God says it, you must reject it!" Our youth are being taught "what just ain't so" and tyranny appears to increase at the exact pace that Christianity has decreased in our education systems.

Piece by piece, Christian beliefs have been removed – along with the memory of those beliefs – from the minds of the people by successful compulsory public education. This process was begun in the 1840s by men like Robert Owen and Horace Mann and later continued by Robert Dale Owen and John Dewey. These men, by their own admission, were socialists and communists who realized that the best way to subvert and destroy "Christian" America was to train America's children to disrespect their parents, and most importantly, their parents' values, beliefs and traditions. Beneath its vacuous rhetoric purporting to "care about the kids," this appears to be the current mission of the National Education Association.

Remember, just because you have education doesn't mean anything if you are educated the wrong way.

Declaration signer and founding father, Dr. Benjamin Rush, also known as the Father of Public Schools, said, "The only foundation for a useful education in a republic is to be laid in religion. Without this there can be no virtue, and without virtue there can be no liberty, and liberty is the object and life of all republican governments."

The Northwest Ordinance, first enacted in 1787, then reenacted in 1789 by Congress and signed by President Washington, stated, "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the

means of education shall forever be encouraged.”

Since the 1850s, this public, government-run school system has become more and more entrenched and more and more expensive. Of course, no amount of money stolen from taxpayers to finance the secular conditioning of their children’s minds can have any effect but to destroy the culture and the country.

Make no mistake, you cannot subjugate and enslave a Christian culture, they will recognize and reject tyranny before tyranny can get a foothold.

Unless and until education is done God’s way, under the influence, control and jurisdiction of the family, not government, there is no hope for any improvement.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Halloween Means Nothing To America, The Reformation Means Everything

The Norman Conquest, the Magna Carta, and even the landing of Christopher Columbus are remarkable events that have thoroughly engrained their principles, discovery, and lessons into the fabric of these United States. The Reformation, however, far outweighs the influence of all those historic

moments.

While many celebrate the pagan rituals of Halloween on October 31st, few even know that day commemorates Reformation Day – a day in history when a brave monk, Martin Luther, asserted the authority of the Bible over the tyrannical authority of a contradicting Pope by nailing his Ninety-Five Theses to the castle church doors in Wittenberg.

The chain of events following what we now call the Reformation, began in Germany where Luther preached that salvation comes through faith alone in the finished work of Jesus Christ on the cross, NOT the assurance of priests or bishops. Assurance came from God Himself. Simplicity, equality, and Scripture created what early Protestants called, “The Priesthood of All Believers.”

Culminating at the Diet of Worms, Martin Luther, the chief catalyst of the Reformation, defied the so-called Holy Roman Emperor Charles V by refusing to recant his writings wherein he was charged with heresy.

Against the top-down authority and divinity of any Pope or man, Dissenters in England, and then colonial America, resisted the so-called “divinely ordained” authority of the monarchy.

Eric Metaxas, in his bestselling book “Martin Luther: The Man Who Rediscovered God and Changed the World”, made the claim:

“If ever there was a moment where it can be said the modern world was born, and where the future itself was born, surely it was in that room on April 18 at Worms. There can be no question that what happened that day unequivocally led to all manner of things in the future, among them the events 254 years and one day later, on April 19, 1775, when the troops at Lexington and Concord took a stand for liberty against tyranny.”

Fearful and loathsome of any individual, or body of individuals, that resembled unchecked or undue amounts of power over the citizens, the impetus was produced, by which the American Revolution was fought.

The founding fathers then took those Protestant, Reformation principles and wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

While signing the Declaration of Independence, Samuel Adams, Father of the American Revolution, declared, "This day, I trust, the reign of political Protestantism will commence."

Later, James Madison, "The Father of the Constitution", boldly asserted, "[America's government] illustrates the excellence of a system which, by a due distinction, to which the genius and courage of Luther led the way, between what is due to Caesar and what is due to God, best promotes the discharge of both obligations. The experience of the United States is a happy disproof of the error so long rooted in the unenlightened minds of well-meaning Christians, as well as the corrupt hearts of persecuting usurpers..."

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Impeaching Trump? What Does

The Constitution Say?

Thomas Steyer, billionaire hedge fund manager, philanthropist, environmentalist, progressive activist, and fundraiser, is currently calling for the impeachment of President Donald Trump.

I must explain that the government of America is not a democracy, but a Republic; “an empire of Laws, and not of men,” as Founding Father John Adams put it. Despite the fact that the authority of law does not come from the majority of unelected people, I do believe that all Americans should rightly understand that no public servant is above the law. Furthermore, “We the People” must understand we have the ability to remove any public servant from a position of power under certain circumstances.

These circumstances can be found in Article II, Section 4, of the United States Constitution: “The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.”

Impeachment is a legitimate Constitutional check-and-balance, a powerful tool to rein in corrupt politicians. Yet it is rarely used today, so it is important to understand what encompasses an “impeachable offense” according to the contextual meaning of the framers’ specific words. We can find these meanings by exploring their definitions as written by Founding Father Noah Webster in his 1828 Dictionary, a primary source document.

Treason means “to levy war against the United States, adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.”

Bribery, also defined by Webster, means “giving or taking rewards for corrupt practices, false judgment, testimony or

performance of that which is illegal or unjust.”

The final term of Article 2, Sec. 4, – “*high crimes and misdemeanors*” – was defined by Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story who said, “The offences to which the power of impeachment has been and is ordinarily applied as a remedy are...what are aptly termed political offences, growing out of personal misconduct, or gross neglect, or usurpation, or habitual disregard of the public interest.”

If this president, or any member of public office, is deserving of impeachment, the following procedures must take place:

First, a majority vote of the House is required to impeach said official.

Following the impeachment vote, a hearing of the Senate will commence with the Chief Justice presiding. A vote will then be taken. If 2/3 or more Senators vote in favor of charges, said official will be removed from office.

This “liberty power” has only been used two times against U.S. Presidents: 17th President Andrew Johnson and 42nd President Bill Clinton.

In both cases the Senate acquitted.

Other than that, impeachment has only been used 11 other times against federal officials, most of whom are judges.

Frustrated with certain public officials in his day, Thomas Jefferson made the cynical statement at one time that “impeachment is scarcely a scare-crow.”

I believe this further compounds the need “We the People” have to understand the powers which protect us from certain harassing fowls in our tremendously fruitful garden of American liberties. This will give us a greater ability to hold our elected officials accountable, and insist on

impeachment proceedings from our legislators wherever, whenever and to whomever they may apply.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Should We Celebrate Diversity As The US Immigration Population Hits New Record?

The Washington Examiner recently reported, “A huge boom in immigration, legal and illegal, over the past 16 years has jumped the immigrant population to over 43 million in the United States, according to a new report by Center for Immigration Studies.”

According to federal statistics reviewed by the Center for Immigration Studies, when you include the immigrants’ children born in the U.S. the number grows to over 60 million, making the immigrant community nearly one-fifth of the nation’s population.

So the natural progression of thought is, “Should we be celebrating diversity as Americans?”

Webster’s 1828 Dictionary defines *diversity* as “difference, unlikeness, or variety.”

The world around us is full of diversity. Most things are more different (or diverse) than they are alike.

This is certainly true with respect to the backgrounds, talents and abilities of people. Men and women are naturally diverse in their skill sets as well as their ideas and their opinions.

There is nothing wrong with this. But it's not necessarily something to celebrate.

Why?

Because diversity, by itself, is not conducive to progress, success, or even peaceful enjoyment of life, liberty or property.

It's only when we take diverse resources and unify them for a common constructive purpose that harmonious and peaceful enjoyment of life can be achieved.

For any culture, it's unity, not diversity that needs to be championed and encouraged.

This is why the Founders of America like Jefferson and Franklin and Adams proposed the phrase "E Pluribus Unum" as our national motto back in 1776. This Latin phrase is translated as, "Out of many, One". This is a public and national statement that promotes and champions unity that arises out of the chaos of diversity.

Many modern day efforts by government, media, academia and corporations that promote "diversity" are, in effect, subversive attacks on America and are designed to destroy unity and harmony in our culture.

There is nothing wrong with diversity. But our peaceful enjoyment of God's creation is dependent on our being united with the American View of government that is expressed in our Declaration of Independence:

- There is a Creator God.
- Our rights come from Him.
- The purpose of government is to secure these God-given rights.

Don't let diversity distract us from this unifying truth.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Does The First Amendment Promote Personal Liberty Or Government Power?

As students of the Constitution, it is always safest to discover the intention and meaning of its architects. One such architect, James Madison, called the “Father of the Constitution,” explained the difference of power and liberty by contrasting the American charter of liberty (the Constitution) and charters of power: that is to say, government power.

*In Europe, charters of liberty have been **granted by power**. America has set the example, and France has followed it, of charters of power **granted by liberty**. This revolution in the practice of the world, may, with an honest praise, be pronounced the most triumphant epoch of its history, and the most consoling presage of its happiness. We look back,*

already, with astonishment, at the daring outrages committed by despotism, on the reason and the rights of man; We look forward with joy, to the period, when it shall be despoiled of all its usurpations, and bound forever in the chains, with which it had loaded its miserable victims.

When speaking of the Constitution, Madison explained that every word “decides a question between power and liberty.”

Words matter. They reveal the difference between power and liberty.

On Friday, the Trump administration [issued](#) new rules, one of which allows “entities that have sincerely held religious beliefs” to opt out of the tyrannical, unconstitutional Obamacare regulations requiring them to provide free contraceptives to employees.

The Departments of Health and Human Services, Treasury, and Labor announced two rules providing “conscience protections to Americans who have a religious or moral objection to paying for health insurance that covers contraceptive/abortifacient services.”

“The second rule applies the same protections to organizations and small businesses that have objections on the basis of moral conviction, which is not based in any particular religious belief.”

The American Civil Liberties Union will be cutting off its nose to spite its face by filing a lawsuit in response to the new rules.

Although the entire Obamacare legislation should be immediately nullified, I want to develop a superb teaching point regarding liberty and power.

Why would the executive branch relinquish some power and return liberty back to Americans? White House Press Secretary

Sarah Huckabee Sanders said Friday, “The president believes that the freedom to practice one’s faith is a fundamental right in this country, and I think all of us do, and that’s all that today was about – our federal government should always protect that right”.

Make no mistake, the First Amendment has everything to do with limiting authority and promoting liberty. Period. “Congress shall make no law” prevents tyranny; “respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof” promotes liberty.

In this rule, we see a fulfillment of Madison’s constitutional aspirations, where government has been “despoiled of all its usurpations, and bound forever in the chains, with which it had loaded its miserable victims.”

Sanders’ advice for the naysayers was imperfectly put; “If people don’t like what the Constitution says, they should talk to Congress about changing it.”

The good news is not even Congress can change or alter a right our Creator commanded.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Christianity Is The Solution for Unimaginable American Tragedy

On Monday morning I watched the President's national address following the mass shooting outside a Las Vegas hotel Sunday night that claimed over 55 lives and injuring over 400. He urged prayer and unity, exhorting:

"Scripture teaches us the Lord is close to the broken-hearted and saves those who are crushed in spirit.

"We seek comfort in those words, for we know that God lives in the hearts of those who grieve.

"To the wounded who are now recovering in hospitals, we are praying for your full and speedy recovery and pledge to you our support from this day forward."

The very act of love and bravery that defines Christianity is the cross of Christ. This action demonstrated by Jesus the Christ is exclusive to Christianity, making it unrivaled and unmatched; the head of any other religion has never sacrificed themselves for the sins of their followers.

Our Separatist English forbearers – understanding this exclusivity and the blessing God promises a nation who acknowledges His Sovereignty – drafted and codified The Articles of Confederation of the United Colonies of New England; May 19, 1643.

Their words were clear and definite: "Whereas we all came into these parts of America with one and the same end and aim, namely, to advance the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ and to enjoy the liberties of the Gospel in purity with peace."

In a circular letter to the governors of the several States in June 1783, our first president, George Washington, wrote:

“I now make my earnest prayer that God would have you and the States over which you preside in his holy protection;... and, finally, that he would be most graciously pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the divine Author of our blessed religion, and without an humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation.”

When self-government breaks down and crimes are committed, the decisive act of justice is required by God; and the civil government, by God’s decree, is required to be the instrument of said justice. This swiftly done brings the necessary mercy, compassion, love, and healing to the victims of evil.

Sadly, Hillary Clinton used twitter to immediately blame innocent parties for the tragedy, stating, “Our grief isn’t enough. We can and must put politics aside, stand up to the NRA, and work together to try to stop this from happening again.”

However, I found hope that others rose above division and united themselves to seek help from the divine Author of our blessed religion. Some of those included former presidents who issued statements on Twitter. [Obama said](#) he is praying for the victims, while [Bill Clinton](#) said such actions “should be unimaginable in America.”

Christianity embodies equality and fairness before the Law. It is unbending from its commitment to defend, protect, and respect the individual rights of all human beings because they were created in the image of their Creator. So long as there is unimaginable national tragedy in America, Christian principles like “love thy neighbor” will always be the solution.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Some Kneel In Protest Others Interpose And Protect

This past weekend has been an interesting one to say the least. Football players are being praised or protested by some for “kneeling down” during the National Anthem, while on another football field coach Joe Kennedy was fired for “kneeling down” to pray before a game.

Despite the paradox we live in, I want to give attention to a subject worth more than the show of multimillionaire entertainers who can't seem to clearly articulate what they are even doing, and that is the concept of interposition.

You see, America was established through interposition, and that very thing keeps us free from tyranny today.

Interposition was birthed around 2,000 years ago when our Savior Jesus Christ, the Son of God, absorbed the penalty of suffering and death on behalf of sinful humanity.

Following Christ's example, this sacrifice has been witnessed generation after generation by Americans who have enlisted in

our armed forces, heeding the call to lay down their lives for our country and her citizens in the cause of freedom.

Many don't realize that interposition is also precisely what the Declaration of Independence was all about. Look at the following words from the Document:

...And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.

This doesn't only apply to our founders and our military. Hazarding everything for the sake of the governed is precisely what we should expect from our state and local officials as well.

Unfortunately, interposition is a seldom-used act. It exists as the proper, legal, and required means of protection for citizens from tyranny at all levels of civil government.

To better understand this concept let's take it to the football field. You see, interposition has everything to do with a victory or a loss on the field. The job of the offensive line is to promote the freedom of forward ball movement by "interposing" itself between the tenacious defenders whose goal is to stop the liberty of the forward momentum of the offense. Now what would happen if after the quarterback received the snap the offensive line, rather than interposing between him and the defense, dropped to their knees in protest, or worse, they joined the defense and attacked the defenseless ball carrier? As a former quarterback, I can still feel the pain of the sack that would follow.

If we translate this to individual rights and liberties, our sheriffs, police, local judges, legislators, and appointed officials are duty-bound to get between the people and the lawless threats to our liberties, including those of lawless federal government agencies.

As Americans we all know our teams will return again and again to compete for the big Bowl. I suggest we take our enthusiasm and resources to discover which state delegates, senators, sheriffs and judges will hold the frontline on their feet, not their knees.

Unlike professional sports, “Liberty is never more than one generation away from extinction.”

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

American Wars Are Disobeying The Constitution

It has been just over 16 years to the day that Congress first passed the authorizations of military force after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks. Although Congress never intended them to serve as the underpinning to combat operations in countries from Yemen to Somalia, much less against groups like the Islamic State, the Senate on Wednesday rejected an effort to repeal them.

Senator Rand Paul, the most Constitutionally intelligent spokesperson for the repeal effort, pleaded, urged, and remonstrated on the Senate floor. “What we have today is basically unlimited war – war anywhere, anytime, any place on the globe,” Mr. Paul told his colleagues in a speech Tuesday

afternoon. "I don't think anyone with an ounce of intellectual honesty believes these authorizations allow current wars we fight in seven countries."

Paul continued, "We are supposed to be a voice that debates and says, 'Should we go to war?' It's part of doing our job. It's about grabbing power back and saying this is a Senate prerogative."

Our Founding Fathers made it very difficult for Americans to be sent to war. They had witnessed centuries of tyranny strengthening itself in countries where kings and parliaments used their own people as pawns and slaves in self-serving wars for more power and self aggrandizements.

So the Constitution they crafted did not grant the president any authority to unilaterally attack other nations.

"The Constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress," said George Washington, "Therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure."

You see, the President of these United States is not the Commander in Chief of the army until Congress declares him so through a declaration of war.

James Madison asserted, "The executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or is not cause for declaring war."

The operative clauses to look up here are [Article I, Section 8, Clause 11](#) of the [U.S. Constitution](#), which grants Congress the power to declare war. The President, meanwhile, derives the power to direct the military after a Congressional declaration of war from [Article II, Section 2](#), which names the President Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces.

So while cooperation between the President and Congress regarding military affairs is required, only Congress has the authority to attack or “declare” war; not the President.

Unfortunately, throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, many Presidents have engaged in military operations without express Congressional consent. The Korean War, the Vietnam War, Operation Desert Storm, the Afghanistan War of 2001 and the Iraq War of 2002 are some examples.

Make no mistake, Congress has the duty and responsibility to debate and discover if, in fact, there is a need for war before they allow the young men and woman of our armed forces to be put in harm’s way.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Trump Advocates For Christian Baker At SCOTUS

I don’t know about you, but I dread continually having to point out what the federal government and its agencies are doing wrong. This week, I’m glad to say I get to bring something they are doing right.

President Donald Trump’s DOJ filed an amicus brief with the High Court Thursday in support of the Christian baker, Jack Phillips, who refused to make a wedding cake for a same-sex

couple in Colorado in 2012.

Jack's business was attacked based on his religious convictions. The 1st Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees protection for one's religious belief and the freedom to act on that belief, so long as it doesn't bring physical harm or danger to anyone. Those simple words, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..." guarantee an American's protection from government tyranny.

Practicing his Christianity by not participating in a sinful ceremony, Phillips refused to make a wedding cake for a same-sex couple in 2012. The homosexual couple then filed a complaint, which was upheld by the Colorado Civil Rights Commission (CCRC). The CCRC found Phillips in violation of Colorado's public accommodation laws for refusing to sell the gay couple "wedding cakes or any product" that he normally "would sell to heterosexual couples."

The Colorado Court of Appeals upheld the CCRC's ruling, which Phillips is now appealing before the Supreme Court.

The question to be asked, though, is if Mr. Phillips, or any of us for that matter, are only free to believe and not act, what is the point in your religion?

Attorney General Jeff Session's team argued, "The government may not compel an unwilling speaker to join a group or event at odds with his religious or moral beliefs, otherwise, a graphic designer whose clients include 'a Jewish affinity group' could also be forced to make fliers 'for a neo-Nazi group.'"

Just like in the case of Christian florist Barronelle Stutzman and dozens of other wedding vendors, Jack offered to sell the men anything in his store, but that did not satisfy them – nor did the long list of area bakeries who would have

gladly baked a cake for this homosexual couple.

Instead, they wanted to force Jack to use his creative talents to celebrate a message that violates his beliefs.

Referring to public accommodations laws, the AG's offices rightfully emphasized that they "must yield to the individual freedoms that the First Amendment guarantees."

This type of discrimination is exactly what Samuel Alito warned when the Supreme Court attempted to redefine marriage for everyone in *Obergefell*. Alito stated, "I assume that those who cling to old beliefs will be able to whisper their thoughts in the recesses of their homes, but if they repeat those views in public, they will risk being labeled as bigots and treated as such by governments, employers, and schools."

In conclusion, the President and his DOJ are fulfilling their constitutional oaths to the people and their God. Now it is time for the Supreme Court to use its constitutional authority to stop this crusade against the freedom to exercise one's religion, which it was responsible for starting.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

The Tragedy Of Harvey And The

Need For Constitutional Prayer

Hurricane Harvey first made landfall as a Category 4 storm near Rockport, Texas, on the evening of August 25, 2017. The storm has since devastated communities in both Texas and Louisiana, claiming many lives, inflicting countless injuries, destroying or damaging tens of thousands of homes, and causing billions of dollars in damage.

Authorities raised the death toll from the storm to 50 as the latest statewide damage surveys revealed the staggering extent of the destruction.

The Texas Department of Public Safety said more than 37,000 homes were heavily damaged and nearly 7,000 were destroyed, figures that did not include the tens of thousands of homes with minor damage.

Mirroring the sentiment of our founders – taken from the Declaration of Independence “With a Firm Reliance on Divine Providence” – President Donald Trump recently issued a proclamation designating September 3, of this year to be a National Day of Prayer for the victims of Hurricane Harvey and national response and recovery efforts.

This call for prayer from the Chief Executive of these United States is not only constitutional, it is his duty.

You see, the first role of the President of the United States is to ensure the safety and protection of the People. Doing so requires the aid of our Creator and benefactor of those rights that every individual, regardless of party or creed, cherish.

Thomas Jefferson summarized this sentiment in his second

inaugural address:

“I shall need, too, the favor of that Being in whose hands we are, who led our forefathers, as Israel of old, from their native land, and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessaries and comforts of life; who has covered our infancy with his providence, and our riper years with his wisdom and power; and to whose goodness I ask you to join with me in supplications, that He will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils, and prosper their measures, that whatsoever they do, shall result in your good, and shall secure to you the peace, friendship, and approbation of all nations.”

Our dependence on the God of Heaven is what created, preserved and keeps us united as Americans. Evidence of this can be found in the so-far 144 national calls to prayer, humiliation, fasting and thanksgiving by United States presidents since 1789.

There have been 67 Presidential Proclamations for a National Day of Prayer with many presidents signing multiple National Day of Prayer Proclamations in the same year.

Please understand this is not just a Presidential thing either. The website nationaldayofprayer.org notes that records indicate there have been 1,419 state and federal calls for national prayer since 1775 *and counting*. This, of course, includes Texas Governor Abbott's recent statewide call for prayer.

I conclude this week by asking all of you to continue to pray for the victims and good Samaritans alike of this national tragedy. That the benevolent sovereign power of the Christ King would continue to help, and restore our hearts to His aid and comfort.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and

receive your [free gift](#).

The Constitutional Pardon Of Joe Arpaio

Article 2, Section 2, of the United States Constitution defines one of a handful of powers the President has: “He shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.”

The reason for the exclusion in cases of impeachment is because during the time of our founders, the English king had frustrated Parliament’s impeachment power by pardoning impeached officers and restoring them to their positions.

Due to so few limitations the rule of such pardons is that the pardon may be given before, during, or after indictment or conviction.

Founding Father Alexander Hamilton concluded, “Humanity and good policy conspire to dictate, that the benign prerogative of pardoning should be as little as possible fettered or embarrassed.”

Chief Justice John Marshall, appointee of second President John Adams, concurred with Hamilton by stating, “A pardon is an act of grace, proceeding from the power entrusted with the execution of the laws, which exempts the individual, on whom it is bestowed, from the punishment the law inflicts for a crime he has committed.”

Similar to the amazing grace extended by our Creator at the cross of His Son Jesus Christ, our founders understood the

power of forgiveness and redemption and they codified it into our Law.

However, above all this is a situation where a pardon is demanded to ensure the rule of law.

You see, one of the main functions of an executive or presidential pardon is to act as a constitutional check against an unrestrained federal judiciary.

Such is the case involving former Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Maricopa County, Arizona, who was convicted of criminal contempt for disobeying a federal judge's order to halt an initiative he designed to fulfill his duty in stopping illegal immigration into his jurisdiction.

A federal judge claimed Sheriff Arpaio's policies violated the civil rights of American citizens who had been targeted for their Hispanic appearance.

Facing a maximum of six months in jail for his so called "crimes," Arpaio continued his law enforcement program for more than a year after the judge's order to end it.

This led to the conviction of criminal contempt for allowing his department to continue detaining illegal aliens despite a court order telling him to halt the practice.

Simply put, Joe Arpaio was prosecuted for obeying federal immigration laws instead of a judge's unconstitutional edict.

That's right, the federal judge charged him for obeying the federal law!

To further exacerbate the innocence of this American hero, every witness brought to the stand at the trial, friend and foe, said they did not believe he was violating the law.

Now because lethargic and negligent congressmen and women refuse to do their job by impeaching federal judges like

these, there was only one constitutional means to make sure that liberty remained upheld and tyranny was choked.

The President of these United States must uphold his oath of office and check the corrupted judicial branch by issuing a pardon to an elected official innocent of breaking any laws, or being complicit to any crime; hence the existence of a constitutional pardon and absolute need for its exercise by President Donald Trump.

Schedule an event or learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Does The First Amendment Really Protect Hate Speech?

In this day and age, many believe that “hate speech” must be controlled or censored by someone or some group. Unfortunately, due to the ignorance of so many in our country, terms like “control” and “regulate” ipso facto refer to government control and government regulation.

Perhaps you are a constitutionally-minded individual who believes, like founding father Benjamin Franklin, that “freedom of speech is a principal pillar of a free government; when this support is taken away, the constitution of a free society is dissolved, and tyranny is erected on its ruins.”

No matter what type of political, social, or religious views you may have, it is imperative you understand the government does not grant you free speech. Our founders understood this and that is why “We the People” have delegated the authority to protect free speech to the government.

This protection is found in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which protects “the freedom of speech” from infringement by the government. The drafters of the First Amendment carefully referred to it as “the” freedom of speech. This presupposed that free speech had a pre-political existence – an existence that God created; hence, it pre-existed the government that was prohibited from infringing upon it.

Eugene Volokh of the Washington Post wrote, “There are no hate speech exceptions to the First Amendment. Hateful ideas (whatever exactly that might mean) are just as protected under the First Amendment as other ideas. One is as free to condemn Islam – or Muslims, or Jews, or blacks, or whites, or illegal aliens, or native-born citizens – as one is to condemn Capitalism or Socialism or Democrats or Republicans.”

This is the final question to be asked: Is it permissible to say whatever I want without fear of ramifications?

No.

For example, someone may return your fire with speech that may be offensive or hurtful to your feelings and they have every right to do it.

To put a finer point on it, there are kinds of speech that are unprotected by the First Amendment. Examples of these include: speech presenting clear and present danger to national security or public safety; speech soliciting crime or violence; or fighting words. But those narrow exceptions have nothing to do with “hate speech.”

Indeed, threatening to kill someone because he's black (or white), or intentionally inciting someone to a likely and immediate attack on someone because he's Muslim (or Christian or Jewish), can be made a crime. But this isn't because it's "hate speech"; it's because it is illegal to make true threats and incite imminent crimes against anyone for any reason.

Why? Because they imperil what God has determined to give to the individuals specifically being targeted, which is the protection of their individual life, liberty, and/or property. Because government is God's minister for our good, it must fulfill its one and only purpose: to secure our God-given rights.

Speech is not force; it is merely opinion that needs no physical defense. When speech transcends the bounds of opinion into physical instigation that is the point where the individual leaves off freedom, and government has a duty to protect the God-given rights of the individual(s) being threatened.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

In America Hate Is Taught But The Bible Is Not

I am sure by now you all are aware of the recent devastating event in Charlottesville, Virginia, where a 20 year-old, sin-

possessed man named James Alex Fields, Jr., plowed his car through a crowd of demonstrators practicing their First Amendment right of assembly.

Following this godless event, President Donald Trump made the statement, "Racism is evil... Those who cause violence in its name are criminals and thugs, including the KKK, neo-Nazis, white supremacists, and other hate groups that are repugnant to everything we hold dear as Americans. We are a nation founded on the truth that all of us are created equal. We are equal in the eyes of our Creator. We are equal under the law. We are equal under our Constitution. Those who spread violence in the name of bigotry, strike at the very core of America."

I cannot tell you how important it is for the leader of our country to make such unequivocal and direct statements that condemn sin and exalt truth and the righteous standard on which our country laid its foundation – a foundation outlined in the phrase, "...all men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." This conceptual statement derived its authority from the Bible – the world's foremost authority on law and government, where sacred truths were not only discovered by our founders and ancestors, but where truths still remain to be discovered and applied in our lives and the lives of future generations.

This sacred text written by our Creator placed the following words into perpetual authority: "God created mankind in His own image, in the image of God He created them; male and female He created them."

Because this inviolable concept is acknowledged and codified into the Law of our Republic, America can always be an example of freedom, equality, safety, and the respect for human dignity.

You see, equality depends on the command of our Creator to His creation that we are to "Love the Lord your God with all your

heart, soul, mind and strength,” and secondly, “Love your neighbor as yourself.”

If we as a Republic abdicate ourselves from this covenant made by our founding fathers, mothers, and tens of thousands of those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice for this covenant, we will fulfill what founding father Benjamin Rush penned:

“We profess to be republicans, and yet we neglect the only means of establishing and perpetuating our republican forms of government; that is, the universal education of our youth in the principles of Christianity by means of the Bible; for this divine book, above all others, favors that equality among mankind, that respect for just laws, and all those sober and frugal virtues which constitute the soul of republicanism.”

In the midst of the enormous turmoil, anger, rage, lying media outlets bent on dividing us for profits; I plead with you this week, politicians can and will never save this nation from self destruction. That responsibility, my dear friends and Americans, belongs to us.

Just as hatred is taught, respect and love to our neighbor, our Creator, and His laws can be taught; and with that comes true liberty. Restore biblical morality and our land will be healed.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

Military Transgender Funding Is Unconstitutional

The Declaration of Independence gives us the fundamental philosophy of government in America. As we say at Institute on the Constitution, the Declaration is the “why” document of American government juxtaposed with the Constitution, which is the “how” of American government.

The undeniable basic presupposition of the Declaration of Independence – which transcends all cultures and people groups unequivocally – is that we were Created by God, our rights come from Him, and the single duty of Government is to protect those God-given rights.

Now the authority of the Declaration relies on the Law that preceded all law documents, the Holy Word of God. The Bible declares, “God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.” (Genesis 1:27)

This text bears witness to the human dignity, equality, and liberty given to man by his Creator in this extraordinary and unprecedented act of love and kindness.

God later ordained that government power would protect these basic rights of men and women, and “that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it.”

You see, government has NO right to go outside the bounds God has set for it. These bounds are what the Declaration calls the Laws of Nature and the Laws of Nature’s God, which we call Revealed Law – the Bible.

As we just read, God created man and woman with no in between

or ability to transition out of their sex. The Laws of Nature and science distinguish individuals with 2 X chromosomes as a female, or individuals with X & Y chromosomes, as a male. How then can government be expected to secure God-given rights when it finances and attempts through a so-called sex change to mutilate the nature of the humanity God created?

Rather than being a servant of God and the people, the government would then be found guilty of the eternal crime of establishing itself as their god with boundless power over the people, thus denying the true God and consequently denying their duty to secure the rights He created humanity with.

Not only would this be a breathtaking usurpation, it is the epitome of unlawful and unconstitutional action. Inevitably this will contribute to the destruction of natural liberties and ultimately create an out of control power system that will arbitrarily change the rules according to its own dictates. Please understand this is not fear or paranoia; historical precedent proves it. Just look at the past century and the amount of blood spilled in many countries by their own totalitarian government regimes.

All those in America who desire to change reality and truth, or who are currently suing the Trump administration to change reality and truth, don't realize that inviting our government to fund the mutilation of individual bodies simply because they serve in the military is bringing us to a whole new level of insecurity of rights.

Please join me and pray for those who are victims of this tragic delusion and by love let's seek to preserve the reality that men and women are loved, cared for, and equal in the sight of God and our Constitution.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and

receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

The So-Called “Productive” Illegal Alien Will Break Up To 28 Laws

The blaze.com recently reported:

An illegal immigrant who had been previously deported 20 times was arrested recently after having allegedly sexually assaulted two women and stolen a car.

The man had been previously arrested by a “sanctuary county” in Oregon in 2016 and released by police, who refused to notify immigration officials that they had him in custody.

You see, in December 2016, Multnomah County became a “sanctuary county,” which means it refuses to work with federal immigration officials to deport people who have come into America illegally. This also includes people who have a violent history and have multiple violations of U.S. immigration laws.

I believe we can all agree that immigrants who are here illegally and commit crimes should absolutely be turned into federal law enforcement agencies. That is as “Common Sense” as it gets.

However, what about immigrants who arrive here illegally that

are so-called "productive" citizens...well...except they aren't citizens? What do we do with them?

Can the American government secure an illegal immigrant's rights while at the same time securing a legal American's God-given rights? Well, no. You see, until the illegal immigrant is an American, by legal definition he has broken the laws of the land, making him a criminal, and thereby forfeiting his rights to liberty.

But criminally entering America is not their only crime. Before any illegal alien receives his/her first paycheck or cash payment the potential of at least 28 crimes will be committed by him/her.

For example:

1. Conspiring to cross the border illegally. (1 count)
2. Hiring a coyote or a drug cartel for guided passage into the USA. (1 count)
3. Crossing the border with a coyote and in many cases smuggling drugs. (1 count)
4. Traveling, illegally, to their destination or to a destination determined by their "smuggler." (1 count)
5. Obtaining fraudulent documents via identity theft or manufactured documents...driver license, green card, social security card, birth certificate (each count a felony). (4 counts)
6. Look for work using these documents. (1 count)
7. Fill out work documents falsely, i.e., federal and state IRS forms, SSN forms, immigration forms, workers comp. forms (each a separate felony). (6 counts)
8. Driving on our roads without a legal license, registration, insurance. (3 counts)
9. Getting paid via check or under the table, thus conspiring with the employer to defraud the government(s) via the use of false documents. (2 counts)
10. Opening bank accounts via the use of false documents in

- violation of federal law and the Patriot Act. (2 counts)
11. Obtaining housing via the use of false documents. (1 count)
 12. Obtaining a car or truck via the use of false documents. (1 count)
 13. Obtaining healthcare via the use of false documents. (1 count)
 14. Securing public service benefits via the use of false documents – food, housing, healthcare, etc. (3 + counts)

Rather than simply breaking the law by crossing the border illegally, illegal aliens may be guilty of multiple misdemeanor and criminal acts. In a relatively short period of time they proliferate their violations of identity theft, conspiracy, obtaining false documents, making false statements, fraud, violation of federal and state and local laws, and perjury.

This is not American and it is not “productive.”

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

FDA Protects Americans From Amish Salve

On June 30, 2017, in Lexington, Kentucky, Sam Girod, an Amish farmer, was sentenced to 72 months in prison. Girod’s crime? According to the federal agents going after him, he made a salve without the FDA’s permission. That’s it! A salve so

innocuous that you could make it in your own kitchen. This “felonious” salve consists of rosemary, beeswax, olive oil, peppermint, eucalyptus, and chickweed.

He’s now in prison about 7 hours away from his family – his wife Elizabeth, their 12 children and 25 grandchildren – although Sam has never harmed anyone. There are no victims of the 3 herbal salves he made and sold for over 20 years.

In 2012, someone called the FDA and reported that a store in MO was selling Sam’s products and that medical claims were being made.

The claims turned out to be **customer testimonials contained in a brochure** about Sam’s products. No different than Amazon reviews, yet, since Sam reprinted his customer testimonials in a brochure, the FDA calls these “medical claims,” which puts Sam’s products under their so-called “jurisdiction”. Sam complied and stopped producing any further brochures.

Then the FDA claimed to have found a MO customer who had been harmed by Sam’s bloodroot salve, which turned out to be false – he wasn’t using Sam’s product.

With so many so-called “illicit” infractions the FDA decided to take Sam to federal court in MO in 2013.

The Amish do not use lawyers as a rule and Sam did not. Because he barely presented a defense against federal prosecutors, Sam was convicted on all counts against him.

To quote our friend, Sheriff Richard Mack, founder of CSPOA.org:

“The FDA and several state agencies as well, have already been raiding the Amish who think they can own a few acres of land, grow grass on it, let their cows graze and digest the grass, bring the cows home in the evenings, and milk them. Then the Amish have the criminal audacity to make raw dairy products

and share them with family and neighbors. Many such dairies have been destroyed by our brave public officials and many Amish have been arrested. SWAT teams have raided such 'criminal enterprises' to protect us all from such dangerous people!"

Thanks to constitutional sheriffs or courts with juries who know their real duty, some Americans have been protected from this lawless tyranny.

You see, there is no authority for the FDA found in the constitution. The constitution designates no authority for a Federal Drug and Food Administration.

The FDA has found pretended authority, which they claim appears in the general welfare clause. However, the general welfare clause only applies to the 17 items found in Article 1, Section 8. This is a perfect example of what our founders call "pretended legislation" in the Declaration of Independence. This is a dangerous make-believe. The solution would be for a representative who understands the constitution to call for the impeachment of this federal judge, and finally, the president should pardon Sam so he can return home and be with his family.

You see God is the only one that can give rights. Not the FDA. And the right to health? Well, that's yours and mine.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

What Is The Purpose Of Government?

There is a God. Our rights come from Him. The purpose of civil government is to protect and secure God given rights.

This is the American View of Law and Government. It is also the Christian View. It is set forth very concisely and precisely in our Declaration of Independence.

Under this Christian, American view, civil government is charged with two principle functions.

First, civil government is responsible for protecting the integrity of our borders.

Secondly, civil government is duty bound to administer the justice system. However, in making and enforcing laws, civil government is required to follow God's law as the ultimate standard to determine the validity of all earthly laws.

This ultimate standard which limits what civil government can do is referred to in the Declaration of Independence as "the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God".

Although it was drafted and signed many years ago, the Declaration is still valid today. It is still the law of the land. Because it sets forth the principles upon which the validity of the Constitution and all statutes depend, the US Code refers to the Declaration as the Organic Law of these United States.

The Declaration is not void or invalid because it is old or because it acknowledges the Creator God as the Source of life and law and liberty. On the contrary, its principles are fresh and alive and vital. And both the knowledge of these principles – and their vitality in the hearts of Americans,

are fundamental to the future of freedom.

Now, despite what we hear repeatedly today, the redistribution of wealth is NOT a function of government. There exists no valid authority for civil government to feed, clothe, or shelter anyone.

Frederick Bastiat, author of a famous book called "The Law" wrote the following words concerning redistribution of wealth which he termed "legal plunder":

When plunder becomes a way of life for a group of men living together in society, they create for themselves, in the course of time, a legal system that authorizes it and a moral code that glorifies it.

Legal plunder occurs when government officials, who are charged with protecting our rights to property, actually become the thieves who covet and convert our property to their own uses. In other words, they use the authority of the law to break the law.

Obamacare serves as an example of this. The Constitution provides no authority for the Federal government to regulate any aspect of health care. Nevertheless, Obamacare is used to decimate the economy and destroy the most fundamental property right of all – the right to control our own bodies.

Of course, none of this could occur, without the prior adoption of the perverse moral code that Bastiat referred to. Legislatures, Executives and Courts who believe that they are so wise that they can redefine God-ordained marriage, limit your ability to defend yourself with a weapon, or declare the killing of babies to be legal represents both the lawless state of the civil government and the failure of Americans to keep their government servants "in check".

The rule of law has now become the rule of lawlessness.

While the road back to lawful government is possible it will require not only your education but your painstaking commitment and resolve.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake MacAulay: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Tyrant Sheriff Forces Prayer On His County

My recent travels across America brought me to Ashe County, North Carolina. This sleepy little county tucked in the Appalachian Mountains along the Blue Ridge Parkway was the site of an Institute on the Constitution United States Constitution course graduation.

I have developed a tradition of visiting the Patriots of Ashe County, led by Mary Desautles and Carol Phillips, every year for these graduations. This year we had the sheriff of Ashe County take part in the ceremony and you can imagine how pleased I was to hear of a godly sheriff who realized it was his duty to protect the good citizens who had voted to give him his job as a public servant.

As I discussed the concepts of interposition and our sheriff's course with Sheriff Terry Buchanan, I grew more and more encouraged that the work of Institute on the Constitution members was paying off and taking root in this county. Numerous graduates of past courses included pastors, state

reps, local government members, and now a sheriff.

Unfortunately, many of the godly in seats of power across the nation face daily criticism and resistance to their work as God's ministers to the people for their good. This sheriff was not exempt from that.

You see, a petition has been created to ["Stop the Tyrant Sheriff"](#) of Ashe County. The petition claims...

"Ashe County, NC, is in great danger of a tyrant sheriff which has no regard for separation between church and state. Ashe County Sheriff's Office, with directions from Sheriff Terry Buchanan, based in Jefferson, NC, coordinated a "Time of Prayer" event on Saturday, June 24, 2017. Highlighting the event was a prayer led by Anne Graham Lotz, the daughter of the celebrity evangelist Billy Graham and sister of Franklin Graham...The event took place in front of the Ashe County Sheriff's Office. Applying his government title to promote his personal religious beliefs and the beliefs of Mrs. Lotz, gave the damaging impression that the county supports and endorses those precise religious beliefs. The Establishment Clause prohibits the government from promoting or affiliating itself with any religious doctrine or organization...."

Let's pause this petition to correct an unconstitutional notion. The first amendment actually prevents congress from making laws enforcing religion. The Sheriff is not congress and a prayer is not a law.

The petition concludes...

"We ask for your help in removing Sheriff Terry Buchanan from office to STOP Christian Sharia in Ashe County, cleansing all that do not follow."

Attempting to remove a sheriff for petitioning Almighty God to help him fulfill his oath is not constitutional, smart, or safe. After all, this sheriff, along with every other sheriff

in America, is required to protect the God-given rights of his constituents. What better way to do so than by following the tradition of our founders and thousands of public servants, such as Congress and state legislatures, who regularly asked God to help them fulfill their oath made to God to protect those sacred rights that He gives to mankind?

After all, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, “**Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with his wrath?**”

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Have a Happy Independence Week Celebrating Secession

This week we celebrate the 241st birthday of our Constitutional Republic. Former Congressman Allen B. West comes to my aid when he suggested that Americans should NOT celebrate the “Fourth of July” since this is just a day on a calendar. Rather, Americans SHOULD celebrate their “Independence Day” and their blessed heritage of “liberty under law” that resulted from the courageous actions of our founding fathers.

I heartily agree with Congressman West and would add that the

central importance of what our founders did was intricately bound up in what they believed. And what they believed they expressed concisely and precisely in the document they published on July 4, 1776. Essentially they said:

- 1) There exists an Eternal God;
- 2) Our rights come from Him; and,
- 3) The purpose of government is to secure those very rights.

Recalling and celebrating these firmly held beliefs is the essence of our American heritage and the occasion to pass on the "Blessings of Liberty" to the next generation.

President John Adams, known as the Colossus of Independence, challenged all Americans that the Fourth:

"...Ought to be commemorated, as the Day of Deliverance by solemn Acts of Devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with Pomp and Parade, with Shews, Games, Sports, Guns, Bells, Bonfires and Illuminations from one End of this Continent to the other from this Time forward forever more. You will think me transported with Enthusiasm but I am not. I am well aware of the Toil and Blood and Treasure, that it will cost Us to maintain this Declaration, and support and defend these States. Yet through all the Gloom I can see the Rays of ravishing Light and Glory. I can see that the End is more than worth all the Means. And that Posterity will triumph in that Day's Transaction, even altho We should rue it, which I trust in God We shall not."

Our founders laid down the immutable principles for the foundation of our civil government in that great document we call the Unanimous Declaration of Independence. It was a document of secession. Many are surprised to hear that, but that's what it was; they were seceding from the government of Great Britain, separating to form a new country and a new civil government.

When the thirteen colonies of Great Britain in North America said that the king was not fit to be the ruler of a free people and declared their independence from his government, the British government over those thirteen colonies ceased to exist. They seceded and formed a new civil government, which they designed to secure the God given rights of the people, who had formerly been under the government of the king.

So this Fourth of July, while you celebrate American secession and liberty, let's not forget, in the words of Thomas Paine, "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

Happy Independence Day America!

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

What Do Gun Owners Do When the Supreme Court Won't Acknowledge Right To Self Defense?

Fox News recently reported, "After postponing the order multiple times, the nation's highest court rejected a review of *Peruta v. California*. In the case, gun rights activists argued that a 'good cause' requirement on concealed carry permits is too restrictive."

At issue in this case is concealed carry and whether a county can define “good cause” to carry a weapon outside of one’s home as strictly as some California counties – specifically San Diego – do.

According to the San Diego Sheriff’s department, that “good cause” must be more specific than just a general concern for wellbeing; a person must list a precise fear, such as domestic violence or carrying a large amount of money.

A three-judge panel found the San Diego County Sheriff’s policy unconstitutional, but was [reversed](#) by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. Since the Supreme Court did not take the case, the 9th Circuit’s ruling appears to prevail.

If anyone is to begin discussing the topic of Americans’ right to bear arms we MUST understand it has never been the government’s responsibility to protect us as individuals.

What did you say, Jake?

That’s right. Courts have even ruled to support the fact that police are not responsible to protect individuals. If you call 911 and no police officer shows up and you or someone you know is vandalized, brutalized, or killed, you have no legal right to sue the police department for negligence.

You see, it has always been the people’s responsibility to protect themselves; the government’s responsibility is to protect the right of the people to protect themselves.

The promulgation of emotional ignorance has always been the tool to convince people to give up this right of self-preservation in favor of trusting that criminals will give up their crimes and that government can boundlessly protect you.

As seen in every single mass shooting, the government is completely incapable of protecting the citizenry from these kinds of attacks. If the people do not protect themselves,

there is no protection. All “gun-control” laws fight or obstruct the people from protecting themselves.

What are the two solutions for this disastrous usurpation of Californians’ elementary right to self-defense?

First: It’s time to elect a new Sheriff who knows the Constitution!

Second: Acknowledge that these gun control measures are NOT law. They are what our founders called, in the Declaration of Independence, “pretended legislation”.

This God-given right given to all men to preserve their lives is codified into the Constitution, which is the Supreme Law of the Land. “The right of the people to keep (i.e. ownership) and bear (i.e. carry publicly) arms, shall not be infringed.”

I believe Americans need to call on sheriffs and police officers to declare their intention to uphold the law by refusing to enforce these measures. Moreover, Americans should ask these same oath-takers to keep the oaths they have sworn before God by actively protecting and defending us against those who would violate the law by seeking to enforce these vain enactments.

I leave you with this assertion of founding father Samuel Adams: “The Constitution shall never be construed ... to prevent the people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms.”

Let me repeat, gun control measures ARE NOT law.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Jake: Jake@TheAmericanView.com

Christianity Is, Again, The Uniting Factor To Political Tragedy

Alexandria, Virginia, became the site of a recent horrific shooting, where an avowed socialist man who hated the foundational governing philosophy of America opened fire at a Republican congressional baseball practice, seriously injuring Representative Steve Scalise of Louisiana, and wounding a total of 4 individuals.

The gunman had a “kill list” in his possession, reportedly having three members of Congress on it – all on the “Freedom Caucus” of conservative Republicans.

Rather than retaliation against differing political parties Republican and Democrat members of Congress kneeled at the second base of Washington, D.C.’s Nationals field to pray in a touching dedication to seriously wounded Rep. Steve Scalise during their annual charity baseball game.

The gunman who committed this heinous crime, [James T. Hodgkinson](#), was killed by police after the Wednesday shooting rampage. Having forfeited, as the Constitution states, his right to life, liberty, and property, his judgment was speedy and public.

In a national address, President Donald Trump stated, “We may have our differences, but we do well in times like these to remember that everyone who serves in our nation’s capital is here because, above all, they love our country. We can all agree that we are blessed to be Americans ... and that we are

strongest when we are unified and when we work together for the common good.”

When I watched the President speak these words and witnessed the prayer on second base, I saw the epitome of Christianity. These acts created a foundation of restoration, unity and love from which human and societal blessings can flow. What they have not done is created any acts of protest, vandalism, robbing, looting, or hate. There were no implications to the reduction of individual rights through federal and state gun control laws; instead we saw singing, praying, and forgiveness.

This redemptive message of Christianity continues to set unrivaled precedents of humanitarian charity to the world. For example, Christ’s Church is the single largest healthcare and education provider in the world; it has pioneered orphanages; it has fielded social workers; it has provided protection for children, homes for the elderly, disabled, and terminally sick; it has provided free schooling for poor children, equality, and the ending of chattel slavery and discrimination in multiple societies.

Our Separatist and Puritan English ancestors, along with our founding fathers, hazarded all to establish a nation founded, in their words, to “glorify God” and for “the advancement of the Christian religion” with all of the before-mentioned examples in play, holding the presupposition that “all men are created equal”.

You see, this tragedy in Alexandria, Virginia, is being overcome by the power of God for one reason: the blend of Christian virtue and Constitutional Justice that has been the foundation of American happiness and political prosperity for over 225 years. George Washington gave personal credence to this fact, stating:

“Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political

prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens.”

It would do all Americans well to be patriotic and work for the general welfare of all Americans found in the U.S. Constitution where the religion of Christianity materializes itself in governing principles.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Bernie Sanders Opens The Dialogue Of Christianity's Role In Government

Many people around the world have seen the recent anti-Christian rant of Sen. Bernie Sanders during a Senate hearing for Russell Vought, nominee for deputy director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Calling Vought “Islamophobic,” Sanders took a quote from an article Vought wrote about the distinctions between Christianity and Islam out of context to accuse the nominee of bigotry. The quote he referenced was an article for the *Resurgent* where Vought wrote, “Muslims do not simply have a deficient theology. They do not know God because they have rejected Jesus Christ his Son, and they stand condemned.”

Sanders called the foundational belief of the Christian religion – that Jesus Christ is the way to eternal life – “indefensible” and “hateful.”

While I disagree with the Senator, his outburst allows Americans to once again address the relationship Christianity has to our American form of government.

Make no mistake, the intent of our founders was not to sanction religions outside of Christianity. In the words of Supreme Court Justice and Father of American Jurisprudence, Joseph Story, “The real object of the (First) Amendment was, not to countenance, much less to advance Mahometanism (Islam), or Judaism, or infidelity, by prostrating Christianity; but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment, which should give to an hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government.”

Why were they so exclusive? Simple, because Christianity is the ONLY system of worship designed to bring liberty and freedom to all mankind who were created in God’s image.

Our founding fathers recognized that the role of Christianity in government, with its revolutionary statement, “Love your neighbor as yourself,” was to help people become better citizens, thus resulting in more personal and civil liberty.

The result of this philosophy was known as the American View of Law and Government.

The distinctives of this “American View” are eloquently expressed in the Declaration of Independence by 56 men who supported Christianity and the Bible. Twenty-six of the signers even carried a seminary degree! This American View can be summarized in the following three statements:

There is an Omniscient, Almighty, Creator God whose Son is Jesus Christ, the Savior and the Lord.

Memorable

What if I asked you, “Do you feel patriotic paying taxes to fund the central government’s nationalization of the banks, the insurance industry, the automobile industry, the health care industry, and now local police forces or the use of the American military for unconstitutional and immoral, wasteful wars for empire?”

I am assuming that if you are a Patriot—a genuine American of good will— you would answer, “No.”

What if I told you government’s only purpose is to secure your rights. That’s correct: our government’s purpose and mandate that God has ordained is so limited that all they are to do is protect the rights He has given you. That’s it! The Declaration of Independence presupposes that all men are created with unalienable rights, and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men. When the American government executes its God given purpose of limited powers and maximum protection of our God-given rights, this will produce [Patriotism!](#)

Of course this Patriotism depends on the strength of our morality as a country.

It was none other than American Patriot and General Douglas MacArthur who informed the world, “History fails to record a single precedent in which nations subject to moral decay have not passed into political and economic decline. There has been either a spiritual awakening to overcome the moral lapse, or a progressive deterioration leading to ultimate national disaster.”

Perhaps one of the only examples left of government following their “moral” or “divine” directive is found in the young men and women in our Armed Forces. As a general rule, they are

willing not just to work for the protection of our liberties, but they are willing to die securing them.

We are reminded every year during Memorial Day to honor these men and women, and I do. It is a holy act for any individual to lay down his life in sacrifice for his neighbor. It is what Christ Himself did for you and me. Our children should be taught to honor and have respect for those individuals who practice this sacrifice as a way of life.

In light of the Memorial Day observance, we must reflect on the reality that Americans have been robbed of their loved ones who have answered the call to serve and protect our nation, but instead are being sent as sheep to the slaughter in unconstitutional wars. The tragedy is that while we sleep at the proverbial wheel of entertainment and immorality in America, we allow our own veterans to be used to aggrandize these bureaucratic institutions. This is not patriotic.

Wouldn't it be far better for us to reverence our soldiers' personal sacrifice by keeping them safe and reeling in big, unconstitutional government actions? This is true Patriotism...

God Bless every American soldier, veteran, and citizen who exercises this Patriotism—our hats are off in memorial to you.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The Religion Of Peace Founded

America And Trump Knows It

While preparing for his current overseas tour, President Donald Trump remarked in his weekly address:

“This weekend I begin my first trip overseas as president – a trip with historic significance for the American people.

I will be visiting with the leaders in many different countries to strengthen our old friendships, build new partnerships...In that spirit of unity, I will travel to lands associated with three of the world’s great religions.”

The three regions the President was referring to are Saudi Arabia (Muslim), Israel (Jewish), and the Vatican (Christian).

Countenancing the Christian religion, the President then expressed that while in the Vatican he “look(ed) forward to speaking with the Pope about how Christian teachings can help put the world on a path to justice, freedom, and peace.”

These words jumped out at me and they should to you, too. It is exhilarating for Americans who love the source of liberty to hear their leaders exalt what the Congress of 1854 labeled, “The great, vital, and conservative element in our system...the belief of our people in the pure doctrines and the divine truths of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.”

Founding Father and author of the first American dictionary, Noah Webster, boldly stated, “[T]he religion which has introduced civil liberty is the religion of Christ and His apostles... This is genuine Christianity and to this we owe our free constitutions of government.”

Unfortunately many former and current leaders hold a so-called “politically correct” viewpoint that argues pluralism – the acceptance and celebration of differing religions,

philosophies and ideologies – maintain justice, freedom, and peace in America.

Though diversity of culture and backgrounds is the beauty of America, this is not the source of our blessings; but rather it is the Christian foundation of America which has made our nation so free.

“The general principles on which the fathers achieved independence were the general principles of Christianity”, said John Adams, who also declared, “The Christian religion is, above all the religions that ever prevailed or existed in ancient or modern times, the religion of wisdom, virtue, equity and humanity.”

International diplomat and Founding Father Benjamin Franklin minced no words when he declared, “As to Jesus of Nazareth, my opinion of whom you particularly desire, I think the system of morals and His religion as He left them to us, the best the world ever saw or is likely to see.”

Let me pose a question. When we eliminate biblical standards – When paganism or immoral philosophies of other religions are considered protected, do we have greater freedom?

This is the supposition that the proponents of this new pluralist agenda espouse, along with the notion that we are a more stable, prosperous society because we embrace diversity, toleration and acceptance of anything and everything.

But is this true?

Those who founded and fought for our American culture and our American form of government didn't think so. In fact they had a very different view reflected in another resolute statement by Noah Webster, stating, “[T]he Christian religion... is the basis, or rather the source, of all genuine freedom in government.” Webster was persuaded that “no civil government of a republican form can exist and be durable in which the

principles of Christianity have not a controlling influence.”

This is our America, one defined by the teachings of Christ,
“Love, Liberty, and Justice for all!”

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the
Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

An Illegal Alien at Your Local Movie Theater

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

I believe we can all agree that immigrants who are here illegally and commit crimes should absolutely be turned into federal law enforcement agencies.

However, what about immigrants who arrive here illegally that are so-called productive citizens...well...except they aren't citizens? What do we do with them?

In the American View of Law and Government, the purpose of government is to secure the God-given rights of Americans. Those here illegally have God-given rights but the American Government cannot secure an illegal immigrant's rights while at the same time securing a legal American's God-given rights. You see, until the illegal immigrant is an American, by legal definition he has broken the laws of the land, making him a criminal, and therefore he forfeits his rights by due process as the Fifth Amendment states.

Allow me to clarify.

Say you take a trip to the local movie theater to see a wonderful new film. You purchase your ticket and stroll up to the overpriced concession stand to support free enterprise by making a purchase. Though it is a high cost to pay, you have consoled yourself with the thought of the overwhelming pleasure you will have with this entertainment experience. As you sit in your seat and the movie begins you notice someone from the row behind you run up to the exit door in the dimly lit room and open it for a dozen individuals with candy, soda, and popcorn who stealthily take their seats. A sense of violation instantly paralyzes you as one of these individuals stares you down as if to say, "You better not say anything." You know you are outnumbered for the time being and, with no theater attendee near, you decide to try and just focus on the movie and enjoy the experience as much as you can.

Once the movie is over and the credits begin, the illegal attendees all exit the theater before the attendant appears. Just as you get up and ready yourself to exit the theater the ticket attendant requests an additional \$20 from you in order to cover the cost of those who attended the movie illegally. Of course you appeal to the movie theater owner who informs you, "In order to protect the dignity, liberty, and emotional stability of the illicit attendees and not to risk protest from the individuals, we found it easier to just charge the other attendees such as yourself."

Perhaps the most disturbing thing for Americans to consider on this issue is that many are obstructing justice in order to get the outcome they want rather than working to better legislation to get the outcome. These actions **exemplify the legal doctrine, "aiding and abetting**

a crime," which is punishable by law.

This mentality is targeting the minds of children, like those

in California where the Los Angeles Unified School District unanimously voted for a resolution that designates “any LAUSD campus as a ‘safe place’ for immigrants and their families.” This resolution states that schools cannot inquire about a student or family member’s immigration status. It also allows district employees to refuse, to the fullest extent possible under the law, to share information with immigration agents.

In essence, social engineers are teaching youth in America to normalize lawbreaking instead of making sure the law is fair and upheld.

In this case we will pervert justice, which immediately and perpetually denies the security of rights of all societies, regardless of color, creed, sex, or social status.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The America Healthcare Dialectic Cannot Stop Here

There are many mixed feelings across America about the bill designed to “repeal and replace” Obamacare that the House of Representatives [passed](#) last week.

The current concern from both sides of the isle is what will the Senate respond with?

Republican Sen. Susan Collins told ABC’s “This Week” with George Stephanopoulos on Sunday:

“The Senate is starting from scratch. We’re going to draft our own bill.”

The Senator from Maine later explained, “I would like to see us put together a bipartisan group to solve this problem, of Democrats who acknowledge that there are problems with the current law, that it is not working well in several states, and Republicans who also want to make sure that we’re not reducing coverage and we’re giving flexibility.”

Just what “law” is Mrs. Collins talking about?

In order to restore right thinking about “the law,” I set forth the following analogy by Michael Anthony Peroutka:

Imagine your “Uncle Sam” comes to your home one Sunday afternoon in a new vehicle you haven’t seen before and says, “Hey! Let me take you for a spin in my new car.”

“Sure,” you say, and you hop in and take a tour in his new car.

After he pulls back into your driveway and you re-enter your home, your spouse asks, “Did Uncle Sam drive the car ‘rightly’?”

You think a minute, reflecting on the last 20 minutes you spent in the car. Let’s say, for the sake of argument, that Uncle Sam came to a full stop at every stop sign, he drove within the speed limit, obeyed all the traffic signals, and he refrained from texting while he was driving. So you look at your spouse and say, “Yes, dear, he drove the car rightly.”

Now, let’s add one more fact to this story.

Suppose that, just before your wife asked the question about Uncle Sam’s driving, you received a call from the local sheriff and learned that Uncle Sam had stolen the car earlier that day.

Does this fact change your answer as to whether Uncle Sam drove the car rightly?

I think it does.

You see, if Uncle Sam has stolen the car then he has no right to drive it at all. Therefore, no matter how safely or recklessly he seems to drive it, without the authority to drive it in the first place, he cannot possibly drive it "rightly."

There is no right way to do a wrong thing.

The point I am trying to make with this illustration is that when we consider the rightness or wrongness of any federal government program or agency the discussion of its "rightness" must always begin with the question of authority. Does the federal government have the authority to do this thing in the first place?

Article One, Section Eight, of the U.S. Constitution provides no authority for the federal government to involve itself in health care regulation or financing of any kind. In other words, "Federal Healthcare" is a stolen car. And anyone who drives a stolen car is a lawbreaker.

Therefore, all who have taken an oath to the U.S. Constitution, including federal and state officials, need to do their duty by pulling this stolen car over and arresting "Uncle Sam" or anyone else trying to drive it.

I truly hope that our Congress and President will not rest with this "two steps forward, one step back" conclusion. While gaining one step of liberty is encouraging, this dialectic is not a victory until we regain the liberty taken by both unconstitutional steps.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

Sanctuary Cities Or Sanctuaries For Criminals?

While there is no official legal definition of “sanctuary city,” the term refers to towns, cities, or counties that protect undocumented immigrants by refusing to cooperate completely with federal detention requests.

Advocates of these “safe havens” for individuals who survive outside of American law believe sanctuary cities are safer because they encourage good relationships between undocumented immigrants and law enforcement. This rationale comes from politicians like Zoe Lofgren, U.S. Representative (D-CA), who stated, “When people are afraid the police might ask about immigration status, they are less likely to report crimes and cooperate with investigations. As a result, criminals thrive, and the general public suffers.”

However compelling to some, the truth is sanctuary policies defy federal laws to which state and local governments are bound. 8 U.S. Code § 1373 states that “a Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.”

In light of the Trump administration saying it will appeal a ruling by a federal judge in California that blocked part of the President’s executive order on so-called “sanctuary

cities," I thought it was time to chime in on this hot topic.

In the past, I have regularly, if not frequently, raised objections to what I have considered to be overreaching by the federal government. It seems to be the rule rather than the exception that federal lawmakers and agencies take actions that are beyond the limited and enumerated powers granted to them by the terms of the U.S. Constitution.

In fact, some years ago the conservative CATO Institute estimated that upwards of 90% of the activities of the federal government were not authorized by the Constitution.

So, it must seem strange for you to hear me raise my voice to favor the authority of the federal government. But that is what I find myself doing today. And the reason is really rather straight forward.

You see, in this case, it is the federal government which is acting within the jurisdiction granted by the Constitution and it is these so-called sanctuary cities that constitute an interference with the proper and valid duty that is delegated to the United States pursuant to Article IV, Section 4, of the Constitution.

Let me be clear that the reason I would side with the federal government, or why I would not do so, lies with the fact that it is the Constitution which is controlling.

In this regard it may be helpful to recall that the oath of office which our local and state officials took when elected, was NOT an oath made to the Congress, or to the president, or to a judge or a court. It was an oath to obey AND DEFEND the CONSTITUTION; and that oath was made before God, meaning that they invoke His wrath should they violate it.

So, the Constitution is the test. The Constitution is the standard to look to. I agree with George Washington who, in an address to a group in Boston in July 1795, affirmed, "...the

Constitution is the guide, which I will never abandon.”

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your free gift.

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Should We Build a Wall or a Bigger Table?

By Arthur Fillingim

There is a little idea floating around on social media, “make a larger table not a larger wall.” I find this topic of immigration and the involvement of refugees in the U.S to be a sort of defining chapter in the annuls of this country.



America started as a country of immigrants, yes. America started as a country with expectations of immigrants, yes. America gives citizens the right to religious freedom, yes. America was founded with principles that align, in some ways, with christian beliefs, yes.

Refugees, sojourners and immigrants who abuse this country’s process to naturalization should be removed, yes. A non-citizen is not protected by the Constitution and or the Bill of Rights these are granted to the privileged who call themselves Americans, and if you don’t think so, talk to any American that has temporarily lived outside the U.S and it’s provinces or leave.

Some people have pointed to other countries as examples of

“good” immigration policies and actions towards refugees. When I spent time in Greece and started getting to know the culture and families most were not as accepting of their Middle Eastern neighbors as you may expect. When I asked one of the Grecian men why the refugees were forced to “live” in an abandoned building he said that the refugees (men, I did not meet with the women and children), did not care about Greece all they were doing was causing trouble and generally aiding the deterioration of the society of Patras, Greece. It’s not that they were destroying buildings or killing people but the opposite, they were doing nothing and expecting to be treated as equals in society, not equal as a man to a man at his barest, but equal as in reaping the privileges of a citizen invested in society.

If we decide to build bigger tables, to welcome refugees it can only be in our homes, the American government cannot rely on unpredictable minorities as it’s basis for immigration. The objective of the federal government is to protect the American people from the degradation by foreigners of our country, aka enforcement of borders. Homes should be open to refugees, but not in Ignorance of the obstacles, instead in understanding and love. As far as a wall it’s the same as using soap you wash out the the bodies that don’t help your body thrive.

We as Americans have the power and responsibility to change our country, but “with great power, comes great responsibility”. The forefathers wanted to establish a nation that could have a strong basis, yet still have modification and additions, all the time growing as an example of what a people united for freedom and unity can accomplish.

The U.S has a rich history one we can learn from, these problems of immigrant attacks and issues with the Middle East have been around since our country’s conception, maybe in different contexts or situations but conceptually the same. If we are strong enough to look back and review the decisions and consequences I truly believe that, even “millennials”, have

the makings to build this country to be an even better Country than our forefathers could have imagined.

So why choose? Let's build a wall to help keep this country's occupants American or those actively striving to be, to keep the government more secure in order that we build a country that rightfully takes it's place as a world leader. Let's build a bigger table, learn from people who share our love for America, get involved with refugees in our communities to help them learn why America was such a pivotal country in world history. Let's open our eyes and hearts and love those around us with the love we desire!

Learn more about your Constitution with Arthur Fillingim and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).



Arthur Fillingim is a home-educated high school student who lives in Savannah, Ga with his eight siblings. Arthur's apologetic approach to American government and politics started when he became involved in Teen Pact's various classes and events. Within Teen Pact He was elected Ga state class Governor, by his peers and ran as a national Senator in 2016.

His other interests include playing guitar, mandolin, ukulele and piano as well as playing basket ball and ultimate frisbee. Arthur is currently attending Community Bible Church of Savannah.

© 2017 Arthur Fillingim – All Rights Reserved

Democrat Leadership To Force A Capital Felons Mentality On Their Membership

Abortion is illegal. And protecting, committing, funding, or participating in the act is criminal. Period.

The truth of my assertion can easily be seen in America's founding documents, for example:

In the Declaration of Independence, our founders were acknowledging a "self-evident truth" wherein they stated, "All men are created equal with certain unalienable rights." Did you catch that? They were not "born equal," but rather "created equal" by their Creator with certain unalienable rights – chiefly life. And we all know every human being is created in the womb of their mother.

After Democratic National Committee Chairman Tom Perez said last week that the party's position on abortion is:

"Every Democrat, like every American, should support a woman's right to make her own choices about her body and her health," he continued, "That is not negotiable."

Next, Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer unequivocally asserted, "Let's make no mistake about it, we're a pro-choice party."

This followed by Democratic Sen. Dick Durbin appearing on CNN seeming to back both positions, arguing, "We need to be understanding of those who take a different position, because of personal conscience, but as long as they are prepared to back the law, Roe vs. Wade, prepared to back women's rights as we've defined them under the law, then I think they can be part of the party."

In other words those who are opposed to abortion are only welcome in the party if they are prepared to support policies that safeguard abortion.

And for the unaware Senator in Illinois, there is no legislation that made abortion legal, there is only a Supreme Court "opinion" with no legislative authority.

This ignorance was not shared by America's Founding Fathers. Take, for example, Declaration of Independence signer, Benjamin Rush, who was also a doctor. He stated that life's "first motion is produced by the stimulus of the male seed upon the female ovum ... No sooner is the female ovum thus set in motion, and the fetus formed, than its capacity of life is supported."

In the Constitution we find the framers securing and guaranteeing protection of all life in the 5th Amendment: "No person shall be deprived of life...without due process of law." This applies to every living person, and we know abortion violates this right by killing babies before they're born, let alone before due process.

Today, we know far more about our biological development than Benjamin Rush could; we can actually see our children inside their mothers, we can hear their hearts beating when they're no bigger than jellybeans. We can craft 3-D models of your child's face before they're born.

As an American I work very hard to protect the rights of Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness for my fellow Americans. I have many sincere friends who believe very strongly in the Democratic Party and platform. With equal sincerity I ask of the friends and family members that I love very dearly, "Are you able in good conscience to be counted with this capital felony mindset, that others can choose if you, your children, or your fellow man deserve Life, Liberty, or the Pursuit of Happiness?"

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your free gift.

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Our Government Depends On The Resurrection

As Americans celebrated the death and resurrection of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ this past weekend, I was brought to a state of thankfulness contemplating the significance this moment in history had in framing the philosophy of government in America.

You see, our Framers believed freedom was impossible without virtue and that mankind did not possess virtue by themselves. They also understood, in the words of John Adams, “Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate for the government of any other.”

So how does a society provide the much-needed virtue to its citizens?

Knowing that there was no such role within the civil government to provide this necessary virtue, they relied on the other God-given jurisdictions of government like the individual, the family, and the Church. They whole-heartedly agreed with the words of George Washington, “Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports.”

Our founding fathers recognized that the role of Christianity in government, with its revolutionary statement, “Love your

neighbor as yourself," was to help people become better citizens, thus resulting in more personal and civil liberty.

The result of this philosophy was known as the American View of Law and Government.

This American View rests firmly on Biblical foundations and requires a moral and religious culture for its success. That is to say, it requires a citizenry which is not only knowledgeable regarding the Revealed Word of God and His moral principles and precepts, but it also requires a citizenry which is committed to living liberty by following God's laws.

The distinctives of this "American View" are eloquently expressed in the Declaration of Independence by 56 men who supported Christianity and the Bible. Twenty-six of the signers even carried a seminary degree! This American View can be summarized in the following three statements:

- 1) There is an Omniscient, Almighty, Creator God whose Son is Jesus Christ, the Savior and the Lord.
- 2) Our rights to life, liberty and property come from Him. They are a part of His Creation.
- 3) The sole purpose of civil government is to protect these God-given rights

This is the belief system that forms the underpinning of American government. There can be no expectation of personal liberty, or freedom of speech, or freedom of association, or freedom of movement, or freedom of worship, and no hope of peaceful enjoyment of real or personal property, unless these foundational beliefs are understood by the people, embraced by the people and vigorously defended by the people.

These essential, foundational, structural beliefs can be found in all the official documents of our founding. Moreover, our Founder's papers and their correspondence are replete with references to these beliefs.

Today, our once strong country is being dismantled from within by domestic enemies that do not hide their contempt for these God-honoring beliefs on which our future happiness rests and our liberty depends.

Some of us have recommitted ourselves to learning and living liberty by studying and applying this original, American View of law and government.

We were thinking maybe you would like to join us.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive [your free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Trump's Unconstitutional "Good Idea" in Syria

According to a recent poll conducted on behalf of CBS News by SSRS of Media, Pennsylvania, "President Donald Trump's decision to launch airstrikes against Syria garnered 57 percent approval from Americans."

But, does "approval from Americans" translate into "Constitutional in America"?

My colleague and mentor, Michael Anthony Peroutka, suggested that to say something is "a good idea" and something is "constitutional" is to say two different things. I submit the following analogy to your candor.

Suppose you invite me to your house for dinner and while I'm there I notice that your window treatments are shabby and that

your furniture does not match your wall colors. In fact, it looks rather hideous! So, the next day, while you're not at home, I break into your house and change the windows, the walls, and replace your old furniture. Not only do I approve of this extreme home makeover but your wife and children unanimously agree that what I did was a fantastic idea and will bring lasting happiness to your family.

However, amidst my wonderful action both you and I know that, in fact, I am guilty of the crimes of breaking and entering and trespass.

Do you see that even if it was a good idea to change the décor, it was a crime because it was outside of my authority to do it?

Now let's apply the analogy to Trump's decision to launch airstrikes against Syria. Because we are not a democracy and the Constitution does not grant the president any authority to unilaterally attack other nations, it wouldn't matter if a majority of Americans approved of this recent action.

"The Constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress," said George Washington, "Therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure."

James Madison asserted, "The executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or is not cause for declaring war."

The operative clauses to look up here are Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the power to declare war. The President, meanwhile, derives the power to direct the military after a Congressional declaration of war from Article II, Section 2, which names the President Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces.

So while cooperation between the President and Congress regarding military affairs is required, only Congress has the authority to attack or “declare” war; not the President.

Unfortunately, throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, many Presidents have engaged in military operations without express Congressional consent. The Korean War, the Vietnam War, Operation Desert Storm, the Afghanistan War of 2001 and the Iraq War of 2002 are some examples.

These dangerous trends, I believe, have led to a mentality in America that if it is a good idea, the President should act with force.

We would do well to remember that many people have conflicting definitions of just what is a good idea and that power to execute these ideas does not make them virtuous, constitutional, or legal.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your free gift.

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Why America Needs Family Controlled Education

When flying home from my recent travels where I had the opportunity to share at homeschool conventions in South Carolina and Nebraska, I was perusing the headlines where I saw a school in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, that recently issued 500 suspension notices (nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ the student body) to students who had amassed too many unexcused absences from class.

Another article highlighted the potential lawsuit against the Department of Education to stop 'indoctrinating' kids into Islamic beliefs.

Reflecting on my recent presentation, "Four Centuries of American Education," I shuddered again as I pondered how far we have digressed from America's inception when Puritan parents believed that the education of their children was their primary duty; when their children were schooled in the Scriptures by daily devotions at mealtimes and in sermons.

We have moved from the philosophies of our founding fathers like Dr. Benjamin Rush, the Father of Public Schools, who made clear that "the only foundation for a useful education in a republic is to be laid in Religion. Without this there can be no virtue, and without virtue there can be no liberty, and liberty is the object and life of all republican governments."

Then there were Universities like Yale that admonished students, "Above all, have an eye to the great end of all your studies, which is to obtain the clearest conceptions of divine things and to lead you to a saving knowledge of God in His Son, Jesus Christ."

To the detriment of America, we have migrated to the modern philosophies of education like that of Horace Mann who stated, "The State is the true parent of the child. Society in its collective capacity is a real not a nominal sponsor and god-father for all the children."

This "modern" process was begun in the 1840s by men like Horace Mann and Robert Owen and later continued by Robert Dale Owen and John Dewey. At the time of this "reform" movement, which included a major push for state-supported (and state-controlled) school systems, the literacy rate was much higher in America than it is today without them. So why did there exist a desire for state-controlled schools?

In his book, *A Basic History of the United States*, Clarence B. Carson concluded, “The public school movement was always more than simply an effort to have schools provided at taxpayer’s expense. It wasn’t simply an effort to have an educated electorate as the franchise (to vote) was extended to more people, as is sometimes alleged. The most zealous of the reformers were determined to use the power of the state by way of the schools to break the hold of religious tradition and the inherited culture and to change society through the child’s training.”

The purpose and mission of the public schools, which were to be “free to everyone at the expense of everyone,” was to get rid of Christianity, and to compel parents to give their children over to the state so that they could be trained to disrespect their Christian republic and its moral culture without parental interference. For over one hundred and fifty years now the government-run school system has become more and more entrenched and more and more expensive, all the while purporting to “care about the kids”.

Unless and until education is done God’s way, under the influence, control and jurisdiction of the family, there is no hope for any improvement.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The Prayer of a Righteous

Judge Assailed by Antagonists of America

To paraphrase Founding Father George Washington, religion and morality are essential pillars to American freedom, and you cannot be a Patriot if you work against either of these. It is our duty to uphold them. And I agree.

In his farewell address Washington unequivocally stated:

Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great Pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and citizens.

Now you may have heard of my friend in Texas, Judge Wayne Mack, who ran for the office of Justice of the Peace for Montgomery County, Precinct 1, in 2014. To assist his efforts of establishing justice in the state of Texas, the good judge desired to implement a “chaplaincy program” and practice his ethical and “religious values within the office”. Since his victory in that election, Mack has delivered; and I would like to take a brief moment to share with you a portion of his journey as a Justice of the Peace.

It was a normal day in August of 2014, when a plaintiff appeared in Wayne Mack’s courtroom. Before the normal routine of prayer to open the day’s hearings the good judge reminded the crowd if they did not wish to participate in the prayer, “Your case will not be affected.”

“The guest chaplain then stood and read from the Christian Bible, directing the reading to those present in the courtroom,” after the short sermon, the guest chaplain asked

everyone to “bow their heads for a prayer”.

One woman in the room “did not leave after the invitation to do so out of fear that her actions would prejudice Judge Mack against her. She felt compelled by government authority to demonstrate obeisance to someone else’s religion” and she felt as though “the outcome of her case would be affected by how she chose to react.”

That story highlights the wording of a recent lawsuit filed by the Freedom From Religion Foundation against our American friend Judge Wayne Mack.

The crime?

He has repeatedly violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by holding Christian prayers at the beginning of each session.

So, the legal question I present to you is whether this clause has been violated. In other words, do the voluntary prayers in the courtroom equate to Congress making a law, the effect of which is to establish an official United States religion?

Well, the answer seems to clearly be “NO” for at least two very simple reasons:

1. The local Justice of the Peace for Montgomery County is NOT the “Congress.”
2. Voluntary prayer and Bible reading is not a “law;” in fact, prayer and Bible reading are a part of Congressional sessions.

In order to find Judge Mack in violation of the Establishment Clause, the first thing you have to conclude is that the local office of Justice of the Peace for Montgomery County is, in legal contemplation, the Congress of the United States.

Crazy, you say?

I agree. But this is exactly the conclusion this lawsuit hopes to impress on a federal judge.

In contradistinction to this viewpoint is the American viewpoint shared by George Washington and Wayne Mack.

So we are left to conclude Judge Mack a Patriot, and this lawsuit antagonistic to America.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Who Makes The Law Of The Land



By Jacob N. Schulz

[NOTE: Jacob Schulz is an 8th-grade homeschooled student interested in American government. He will be giving this speech at the 4-H communication arts contest.]

How many of you believe that Congress makes the laws of our land? How many of you believe presidential executive orders are also the law of our land? How many of you believe the Supreme court's decisions are the law of our land?

In the United States Constitution our founding fathers gave the American people a government of checks and balances—a

government of three branches where none is all powerful. Our constitution clearly dictates which of the three branches makes the laws of our land, and what the duties of the other two branches are, regarding those laws.

Article I, Section 1 of the constitution states: *“All legislative power [law-making power] herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States[.]”*

According to our constitution then, all laws are made in the congress. This is how:

1. A congressman drafts a bill.
2. He submits it to the floor.

III. It is sent to a committee.

1. It is discussed and sent back to the floor.
2. It is discussed and voted on.
3. It passes.

VII. It is sent to the other house.

VIII. Same process.

1. If it passes, it is sent to the president.
2. The president can sign the bill, veto it, or do nothing, in which case the bill becomes law after ten days.

There, that’s how congress makes laws—the condensed version.

Now how many of you believe presidential executive orders are the law of the land?

Remember that word *all*? *“All legislative power...shall be vested in a congress.”* That leaves no law-making power leftover for the president. His executive orders are for the sole purpose of *enforcing* the constitution as prescribed in Article II Section 3 *“He shall take care that the laws (made by Congress) be faithfully executed.”* Again I say, the president’s role in the government is to preserve and protect the constitution and

to enforce, not make, our country's laws.

Suppose the president issued an executive order that all Americans had to worship at a Lutheran church. Not only is there no such law passed by congress, but that executive order is a blatant violation of the first amendment, which states *"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."* Since this executive order is not enforcing a law, but trying to make a new one, and because this order would violate the first amendment and deprive citizens of their treasured freedom to worship as they please, the president is overstepping his constitutional bounds, and the order should be struck down.

On the other hand, suppose a president made an executive order restricting immigration from certain countries. Article IV Section 4 states that the executive branch shall: *"Protect each of them [the states] from invasion."* In addition, Congress has passed a statutory law stating:

"Whenever the President finds that the entry of any aliens or of any class of aliens into the United States would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, he may. . .impose on the entry of aliens any restrictions he may deem to be appropriate."

This order to restrict immigration is therefore perfectly legal. Some may disagree with it, but it is still very much in line with the president's first and foremost duty, to protect the American people by enforcing the constitution and the laws of congress.

Finally, how many of you still believe that Supreme Court decisions are the law of the land? Again I remind you, the first sentence of the constitution vests ALL legislative powers in a congress. That leaves nothing left for the Supreme court. The Supreme Court's function is to discover and apply the constitution and the laws of congress to the cases brought

before them, and to strike down laws that violate the constitution. They are not to judge based on their personal bias. They are to judge based on the Constitution. Moreover, they have no jurisdiction unless a case is appealed to them. Even then, their opinions apply only to the case on which they have ruled—not to the entire country. Their opinions are not law!

Consider this, in 1857, Chief Justice Roger Taney ruled in *Dredd Scott v. Sanford* that African Americans had no rights which white men were bound to respect. In 1927, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes ruled in *Buck v. Bell* that mentally disabled women could be sterilized “for the protection and health of the State.”

Dredd Scott and *Buck v. Bell* have never been overturned. If Supreme court decisions carry the force of law, then why do African Americans have rights, and why aren't we forcibly sterilizing every intellectually disabled woman? The answer is this: the Supreme Court does not make laws. Their decisions do not need to be overturned. They are just *opinions*. They are not law, and can be ignored as we have been rightly ignoring *Dredd Scott* and *Buck v. Bell* for decades.

Roe v. Wade, the supreme court decision that “legalized” abortion, is not law. *Obergefell v. Hodge*, the supreme court decision that “legalized” same-sex marriage in all 50 states is not law. These are simply opinions. Congress, and Congress alone makes the laws of our land—not the president, and not the Supreme Court.

When we know how our government is supposed to work, we should be appalled by what we see today. Whenever the courts make decisions not based on the constitution and the law, but instead based on their personal bias, they are neglecting their duties. And when they declare rulings on things over which the constitution is silent, or declare rulings that have no constitutional foundation, they are overstepping their

bounds.

When the president makes executive orders not to enforce the law, but to make new laws, he is overstepping his constitutional bounds. When he refuses to enforce laws that Congress has made, he is neglecting his duties.

When Congress neglects to exercise their constitutional power of impeachment against those who break the law, or when they won't compromise across party lines in order to pass good legislation, they are neglecting their duties.

The president doesn't make laws, he can only enforce them. The Supreme court doesn't make laws, it can only discover and apply them. Only Congress makes laws. Executive orders are to enforce the laws; Supreme Court decisions are opinions about the laws; but Congress, and Congress alone holds the law-making authority in the United States of America.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jacob Schulz and the Institute on the Constitution and receive your [free gift](#).

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Healthcare Rights” in American, Since When?

California Sen. Kamala Harris took to her Twitter account Saturday, asserting her ignorance about the Constitution and healthcare.

She tweeted, “Here’s what I believe: health care is a right, not a privilege. RT (re-tweet) if you agree.”

It seems the rookie Senator is trying to bolster her new position by trying to appear relevant in the continuing dialogue of healthcare in these United States.

While Harris, Bernie Sanders and their ilk continue to push for Americans to embrace “New Rights” like a socialist European healthcare system, they are not the originators of this concept in America.

Franklin Roosevelt, in his annual address to Congress, set the nation on this path.

Here’s what FDR said in that speech:

“This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable rights – among them the right of free speech, free press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.”

Now, up to this point, Roosevelt has said nothing amiss. He is describing the God-given rights that are the subject of the first ten amendments to the Constitution – the Bill of Rights. But listen to what he says next:

“As our nation has grown in size and stature, however, – as our industrial economy expanded – these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness... So to speak, [we need] a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all...Among these are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job...

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation...

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care...

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

All these rights spell security.”

Please note that Roosevelt’s so-called second “bill of rights” is not based on the same premise as the original. In the American view, the purpose of government is to secure, to protect and defend **God-given** rights. But God didn’t grant anyone the right to healthcare, a decent home, a remunerative job, an education, food, clothing or recreation **paid for at the expense others**. Likewise, the right to not be afraid of old age is nowhere granted by God.

You see, in order for government to provide what the second bill of rights guarantees, it must necessarily violate the real Bill of Rights by stealing the money it needs to make the phony guarantees. This is illegal because it is against what the Declaration of Independence refers to as “The Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God.”

This second “bill of rights” is a fraud.

The second “bill of rights” says that government force must be brought to obtain equality of economic outcome.

The second “bill of rights” reflects the premise and philosophy of the Communist Manifesto.

The second “bill of rights” led to Obamacare and Common Core.

Isn’t it time to abandon this dangerous course?

Isn’t it time to return to the original Bill of Rights?

Video Column: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PSKHZHPRQmA>

Why Repeal if We are Going to Replace?

The House Republicans' replacement of Obamacare is here – the American Health Care Act!

[According to the New York Times](#), the new plan would replace Obamacare's individual mandate with a system of tax credits lawmakers hope would incentivize Americans to purchase their own plans, although the credits would eventually be reduced and phased out. It would also roll back Obamacare's expansion of Medicaid.

"We promised the American people we would drain the swamp and end business as usual in Washington," said Utah Sen. Mike Lee. "This bill does not do that."

Worse yet, over the last three major national elections beginning in 2010, Republicans have won congressional races across the country based on the promise to repeal Obamacare with a market-based, non-government-run solution.

Lee added that the proposal "is exactly the type of back-room dealing and rushed process that we criticized Democrats for, and it is not what we promised the American people."

Hmmm, have you ever heard of Jonathan Gruber? He is the MIT economist who was once considered to be the intellectual architect behind Obamacare. In 2009, Nancy Pelosi was quoting him publically and endorsing his published opinions regarding this enormous American debacle.

Later in 2014, Gruber candidly declared that the legislation was written in a way that was designed to deceive the American

people and to exploit “the stupidity of the American voter.”

Gruber was very pleased, and pleased with himself apparently, that he and his cronies were able to fool us all.

It was for our own good, of course, that they did it.

You see, in the socialist mind, the progressive agenda is good for Americans, but Americans are just too dense to see it as clearly as socialists do. So-called “liberals” are therefore reluctant to let the rest of us make our own decisions. This reluctance leads them to lie to us “for our own good” and we now see both parties are guilty of it.

Let me ask the simple question, do you believe that government is a truth-teller?

Do you believe that government intervention in a marketplace makes the market more efficient and just?

Do you believe that government is the solution to our economic problems?

If you do, then maybe Jonathan Gruber is right. Maybe you need someone like him, or your favorite political party, to lie to you for your own good.

But if you believe, as Ronald Reagan said, that government itself is the problem, you would expect that the party of Reagan, the party that has just won a sweeping victory, would use that victory to undo the farce of Obamacare.

But if the Republicans, who now hold both houses of Congress and the Presidency, fail to deliver a full repeal of the Obamacare mess, then we might have to admit that Mr. Gruber was right about our lack of judgment.

The Constitution does not grant the federal government any

authority to meddle in our health care, so it wouldn't matter even if the Republican replacement plan were a good one.

The operative clauses to look up here are Article One, Section Eight of the Constitution and the Tenth Amendment. It will only take you about six minutes to read and understand that any replacement of Obamacare is more than just a Republican betrayal for American health care; it is a dangerous and tyrannical trespass into American homes and lives.

Make no mistake, repealing Obamacare is the Congress's duty, and to replace it is the action of tyrants.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and the *Institute on the Constitution* and receive your [free gift](#).

Should the President Combat California's Sanctuary Cities?

A little over a week ago I visited the home of James Madison, the Father of the U.S. Constitution. I often reflect on his words about this internationally cherished document of governance:

“Every word [of the Constitution] decides a question between power and liberty.”

Last night I had the opportunity and honor to speak to a full house at an Eagle Forum meeting in Huntington Beach, California. A member of the audience told me, “Our Governor is ignoring immigration laws and making our state a sanctuary for illegal aliens that are threatening our life, liberty, and

property.” She then asked me, “Why is Trump not doing anything about this?”

It was a great question. However, it is not Trump that should be doing something about it.

Let me explain with the following analogy:

You’re a good parent. So let’s suppose you think it wise to buy a watchdog so that when your little girl plays in the front yard, the dog can protect and defend her from any intruders who may wish to do her harm.

After a little time goes by the puppy you bought becomes a full-grown animal. His muscles become fully developed, his teeth are big and sharp, and now he towers over your little girl. You are worried that he is becoming too aggressive and one day you look out the door and witness your worst fear – you see the dog attacking your daughter.

As you burst out the front door, she has gotten free and is cowering in the corner of the fence by the tree. The dog is charging across the yard and in a few seconds will be at her throat again. You only have time to do what your instincts tell you to do, and you throw yourself between the dog and the child – between the danger and the daughter.

You don’t stop to think what will happen to you. Your desire and your duty come together in an instant. You thrust yourself between the aggressor and the victim.

What you just did was an act of interposition.

You interposed between the agency that was originally a protector, but had become a threat, and the person you have the duty to protect.

Remember the word – interposition.

The doctrine of interposition is as American as apple pie,

baseball, and jazz.

Interposition is precisely what the Declaration of Independence was all about – our Founders interposed for us against tyranny – and it is precisely what we want our state and local officials to do. Our sheriffs, our police, our local judges, our legislators, and our appointed officials are duty-bound to rush out into the front yard and get between the people and the lawless actions of the federal or, in this case, state government.

Looking to the federal government to fix our state problems is the very reason we have an out of control federal government. We must stop depending on the “Fed” to fix our states, or most assuredly they will take the power and never return the liberty. Remember what Madison said?

What we should be looking for is state representatives and senators and sheriffs and judges who will “rush out to the front yard” and interpose between the “Monster of the State” and us.

Video of this Column:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LpzbFkrVgK0>

What judge has no lawmaking authority?

Following up on my column from two weeks ago where I explained the constitutionality of banning refugees that both presidents Obama and Trump initiated, I chose this week to ask the question, “What judge has no lawmaking authority?”

The answer, of course, is any federal judge in these United States of America.

I realize that many Americans have no earthly idea what the delegated powers in Article III of the United States Constitution are and I encourage you to read them.

So few powers are delegated to the Federal Judiciary that it takes less than 400 words to define them – fewer words than the column you are reading right now – while the powers of Congress and President number over 3,300!

So why are Americans allowing these unlawful court opinions to go into effect, which stop lawful presidential orders, and worse, challenging and appealing them in a higher court as if they have authority to do so?

Understand that the Judicial Branch of our Constitutional government has no more lawmaking power than a referee in a football game has power to make up new rules for the game. Both the court and the referee have a single job to do: discover and apply the rules to the rivaling parties before them.

Unfortunately, Trump's new head of the Department of Homeland Security, General John F. Kelly, appeared to be taking orders from unelected judges instead of the Commander-in-Chief when he issued a statement promising "compliance" with the court order that has challenged the President's executive order. Some have argued that this constituted a "mutiny" against the President. Kelly knows that "the order issued by Trump was both legal and necessary to the security of the United States and that the Commander-in-Chief had the full authority to issue that directive," wrote columnist J.B. Williams.

"It's a mess, a complete mess," is what Trump might say of the rulings against his executive order. But as President, he can do something about it. Yet, he has simply issued a series of Tweets, one of the latest being that "dangerous" foreigners

are being allowed into the U.S. because of the judicial rulings. But since when do judges decide the foreign or immigration policies of the United States? Where is that written in law or the Constitution?

Many legal scholars have clearly explained how the judicial rulings against the order are not based on law or the Constitution. What is lacking is an effort by the administration and Congress to remove or restrict the power of tyrannical judges who present their own personal opinions as expressions of the facts and the law.

Congress should impeach federal judges who make outrageous rulings that have no basis in the Constitution. Why? Because just like in this case, it puts all Americans at risk!

In conclusion, Congress should be called upon to begin Impeachment proceedings immediately against these judges who have stepped way outside the limits of their authority. This is truly "bad behavior" described in Article III, Section 1, that constitutes an impeachable offense found in Article II, Section 4. These judges have directly obstructed (and told others to disobey and disregard) a Congressional Law and Presidential Executive Order to implement it.

Finally, the President and all his administration should begin immediate implementation of Trump's LEGAL Executive Order, while citing its Constitutionality.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his Institute on the Constitution and receive your free gift.

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

University protecting students, The First Amendment?

At the end of February, I will be on my way again to speak on the west coast of California. The last time I was invited to speak there, I spent an evening with a family in the San Francisco bay area. They told me how wonderful it was to speak freely about their values with my wife and me. Apparently their values weren't very welcomed in the public discourse of their geographical location. I can't imagine that things have gotten better in light of the recent Berkeley University protests over the presence of Milo Yiannopoulos at the college.

Winston Churchill made the statement, "Men occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry on as if nothing ever happened".

The First Amendment happens to be that truth for our American universities. Some of these Universities are requiring "Safe Zones" to be set up on the campus to be a place where students can shield themselves from uncomfortable or dissenting viewpoints.

That is why Tennessee lawmakers are introducing a bill in the their legislature this week that seeks to protect freedom of speech in the "Volunteer State" universities.

Both the Tennessee House and Senate introduced the "Tennessee Freedom of Speech on College Campus Bill" last Thursday, which seeks to prevent state universities from adopting policies that "shield individuals from ideas and opinions considered unwelcome, disagreeable or even deeply offensive."

The bill would prevent campus groups and school administrators from "closing off the discussion of ideas no matter how

offensive or disagreeable.”

In addition, the bill would require every state school to “be open to any speaker whom students, student groups, or members of the faculty have invited.”

The founders of America staked their struggle on the ability to speak, assemble, and petition freely. In fact, there would be no America if there were no First Amendment.

To be fair, freedom of speech has always been a double-edged sword. Constitutional law states few exceptions for free speech, such as speech presenting clear and present danger to national security or public safety; and speech soliciting crime, violence, obscenity, and defamation. Americans have always been able to express their values and opinions freely.

Colonial scholars – all scholars for that matter – would agree that having absolute emotional insulation and comfort at all times is extremely elementary and it’s anti-intellectual.

Founding father, author, publisher, and printer, Benjamin Franklin, cherished the freedoms protected in the First Amendment, understanding, “Freedom of speech is a principal pillar of a free government: When this support is taken away, the constitution of a free society is dissolved.”

“Free speech for me, but not for you,” has always been considered fascism, and that is the antithesis of liberty.

My suggestion to college students: quit being babies, use your intellect, speak back to what you disagree with, peacefully demonstrate and petition. Your emotional weakness and destructive tantrums are not a foundation that will sustain freedom.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his Institute on the Constitution and receive your free gift.

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Should a Mississippi town have to remove a Christian flag?

The United States Code refers to the Declaration of Independence as the “organic law” of the United States. And the Declaration clearly claims that there is an Almighty Creator God, that our rights come from Him, and that the purpose of civil government is to protect and defend the God-given rights of the people. The Declaration makes reference to the Bible, God’s Word, as the source of earthly, legal authority.

Civil government includes federal, state, and local city governments like the town of Rienzi, Mississippi, where this past weekend more than 1/3 of the town’s population showed up to a rally in defense of a Christian flag flying over their Veterans Memorial Park.

It seems the Freedom from Religion organization wrote a letter that threatened a half-million-dollar lawsuit against the small town of 300 people if the flag wasn’t taken down.

Some folks like organizer Kevin Nelms responded like Americans, declaring, “We’re not gonna let other people, or a foundation, or anybody else up in Wisconsin tell us that we can’t fly our flag! You’re gonna take one down; we’re gonna put a hundred back up.”

Unfortunately there were city government leaders showing a bit more bewilderment and naiveté. Believing that he had no choice in the matter, Rienzi Mayor Walter Williams pulled the flag down, saying, “I never dreamed that something like this would

have happened in a town this small, but it happened.”

I am sure this mayor is shocked that the First Amendment, which states, “Congress shall make no Law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...” would be used as a legal threat by an assailing organization that hates God.

So, the legal question I present to you is whether the city has broken the law by flying a Christian flag, among others, at a Veterans memorial? In other words, does flying a flag equate to Congress making a law, the effect of which is to establish an official United States religion?

Well, the answer seems to clearly be “NO” for at least two very simple reasons:

1. The city of Renzi is NOT “Congress”
2. A flag being hung is not a “law”

In order to find that a flag hung in Mississippi (or anywhere else) is a violation of the Establishment Clause, the first thing you have to conclude is that the city of Renzi is, in legal contemplation, the Congress of the United States.

Crazy, you say?

I agree. But this is exactly the conclusion that some maintain through a “legal fiction” the courts call the “Incorporation Doctrine.”

George Washington, our First President, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces that won the war for our independence, and the President of the Congress that gave us our Constitution and the First Amendment, insisted:

“Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great Pillars of human

happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and citizens.”

In other words, George Washington would have called dysfunctional organizations like the Freedom from Religion “un-Patriotic” and therefore “un-American”! So along with the city of Renzi, let’s be Patriots and hang our Christian flags!

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his Institute on the Constitution and receive your free gift.

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Sanctity of life sunday – should be every day

Because the Supreme Court Can Be Ignored

On Saturday, feminist abortion rights activists gathered to protest the inauguration of President Donald Trump. The following day, pro-life Americans celebrated the Sanctity of Human Life, a day celebrated as a tradition started in 1984 by President Ronald Reagan in response to the 11th anniversary of Roe v. Wade, in which the Supreme Court issued an opinion that denied the right to life to an unborn child.

Regrettably, even with the efforts of pro-life Americans and presidents, abortion is NOT disappearing in this country and I believe this is, in part, because we are using the WRONG METHOD to attack it; for example, by “trying to overturn Roe v. Wade.”

Why do you say this, Jake? Well, for starters, Article 1, Section 1 of the U. S. Constitution states that ALL

legislative authority rests with Congress. The Supreme Court, as part of the Judicial branch, does not make law, but merely rules on their opinions. Those opinions are relative ONLY to the parties involved, not to the nation.

Congress, who makes law in accordance to the Laws of Nature and Nature's God, has NEVER passed any legislation to "legalize" abortion, THEREFORE THERE IS NO LAW TO OVERTURN.

Even if Congress did pass such "law," it would be what our founders called "pretended legislation" as it violates the Laws of Nature and Nature's God.

Unbeknownst to most Americans, previous horrendous Supreme Court decisions have dissolved because they were ignored, not overruled or overturned. Here are two examples:

Dred Scott: This was a War-Between-the-States-era decision ruling that people of African descent were property and could not be U. S. citizens. Clearly this opinion of the court had no practical or legal authority so it was ignored.

Buck v. Bell (1927): Championed by Oliver Wendell Holmes, the court ruled that incompetent/imbecilic women should be sterilized. Almost 70,000 were sterilized before this was stopped. It was stopped because of public opinion, not because the decision was overturned.

Founding father and First Amendment architect Fisher Ames knew decisively the importance of establishing MORALITY as the heart of public opinion.

"Constitutions," said Ames, "are but paper; society is the substratum of government."

I submit that to stop abortion, going through the courts is irrelevant and even lend credibility to the murderous Roe v Wade decision, which has never had legal legs to stand on.

Instead of lawsuits, it is imperative we increase our efforts

in educating the public on the immorality of killing innocent children of any age, including in the womb.

Truth must define the terms and set the parameters of the argument. For example, if the Supreme Court ruled it was okay to kill any child under the age of three for any reason, would that make it okay? Would their ruling make it legal? How many children would be killed because of a “terrible-2-year-old’s bad day”? How would we view parents who did such a thing?

With the narrative on this foundation of questioning, no legislation is needed. Moral outrage will ensue in the hearts of the people and their representatives, and Roe v, Wade will fade into history, just like Dred Scott and Buck v Bell, while state governors and attorney generals will again enforce the law of our land which protects the right to life and criminalizes abortionists.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his Institute on the Constitution and receive your free gift.

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The first presidential inauguration of these United States

This week I had the privilege to attend the inauguration of President-elect Donald Trump. While this is truly an honorable day and tradition for Americans, did you know there are seven distinct religious activities in the first presidential inauguration that have been repeated in whole or part during

every subsequent inauguration? They include:

- 1- The use of the Bible to administer the oath
- 2- Solemnifying the oath with multiple religious expressions (placing a hand on the Bible, saying "So help me God," and then kissing the Bible)
- 3- Prayers offered by the president himself
- 4- Religious content in the inaugural address
- 5- The president calling on the people to pray or acknowledge God
- 6- Church inaugural worship services
- 7- Clergy-led prayers

The first inauguration under our current Constitution occurred in New York City, which served as the nation's capital during the first year of the new federal government.

The papers reported the activities:

"[O]n the morning of the day on which our illustrious President will be invested with his office, the bells will ring at nine o'clock, when the people may go up to the house of God and in a solemn manner commit the new government, with its important train of consequences, to the holy protection and blessing of the Most High."

The ceremony took place on the balcony at Federal Hall with a huge crowd gathered below watching the proceedings.

Washington placed his left hand upon the open 1767 King James Bible, raised his right hand, took the oath of office, then bent over and reverently kissed the Bible.

As the first-ever presidential address, Washington's precedent began with prayer, explaining:

"It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being Who rules over the universe, Who presides in the councils of

nations, and Whose providential aids can supply every human defect – that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes.”[1]

After concluding his address, Washington offered its closing prayer:

“Having thus imparted to you my sentiments as they have been awakened by the occasion which brings us together, I shall take my present leave – but not without resorting once more to the benign Parent of the Human Race in humble supplication [prayer] that . . . His Divine blessing may be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations, and the wise measures on which the success of this government must depend.[2]

The next activities were arranged by Congress itself when the Senate directed:

“That after the oath shall have been administered to the President, he – attended by the Vice-President and members of the Senate and House of Representatives – proceed to St. Paul’s Chapel to hear Divine service.”[3]

The House had approved the same resolution,[4] so the president and Congress thus went en masse to church as an official body. As affirmed by congressional records.

So you see our Constitutional Government was birthed and covered with a holy Christian cloak and, while this inauguration will likely be an experience I will never forget, I believe there is something more important than ceremonies. My prayer is that posterity will look with honor on our labor to preserve the indispensable supports of political prosperity that Washington attributed to “Religion and Morality”.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his Institute on the Constitution and receive your free gift.

Government control not gun control

The perpetrator in the latest U.S. gun rampage is Esteban Santiago, a 26-year-old Iraq war veteran who just one month ago told Federal Bureau of Investigation agents that he believed U.S. spies were controlling his mind. While blaming government mind-control is not a suitable alibi for many, I believe government gun control is.

Following the tragic shooting in Ft. Lauderdale on Friday, Barack Obama told George Stephanopoulos of ABC News, “We’re heartbroken for families who have been affected,” and, “These tragedies have happened far too often during the eight years that I’ve been president.”

Despite numerous attempts by this administration, their cronies, and their ilk to eradicate what the Second Amendment acknowledges as the God-given right to self defense and arms, Obama has admitted his own failures to protect American citizens.

So, since government gun control is an absolute failure, I thought I would call on more government-control, NOT more gun-control. We need to regulate the government from its insubordination to its God-given duty of “securing the rights of the people.” This insubordination called “gun control” has proven to be far more lethal to American life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness than the criminals from which it claims to protect.

I know this to be a fact: the plurality of American people are disgusted with the attempts of government to dominate their right to self defense. They have not only voted at the ballot box, but convincingly their wallets are talking. Gun manufacturers and retail stores cannot keep up with the demand for guns and ammo. Even the once extremely common .22 rim fire ammunition is as scarce as a dollar in the social security trust fund.

The promulgation of emotional ignorance has always been the tool to convince people to give up this right of self-preservation in favor of trusting that criminals will give up their crime and that government can boundlessly protect you.

As seen in every single mass shooting, the government is completely incapable of protecting the citizenry from these kinds of attacks. If the people do not protect themselves, there is no protection. All "gun-control" laws do is fight or obstruct the people from protecting themselves. This is why state leaders have an obligation to declare any and all federal gun-control laws to be null and void, and boldly declare to the people of their states that they will honor and protect the people's right and duty to defend themselves.

Agreeing with this godly precedent and our Second Amendment, Declaration signer Richard Henry Lee stated, "To preserve liberty, it is essential that the whole body of the people always possess arms, and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them." (Federal Farmer No. 18, January 25, 1788)

I believe today more than ever that our leaders should be advocating, endorsing and sponsoring the protection of our God-given right to life, liberty, and property.

Like John Kennedy I believe that, "Today, we need a nation of Minutemen, citizens who are not only prepared to take arms, but citizens who regard the preservation of freedom as the

basic purpose of their daily life and who are willing to consciously work and sacrifice for that freedom.”

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his Institute on the Constitution and receive your free gift.

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Trumpcare is no solution for Obamacare

President Barack Obama has scheduled an upcoming meeting with congressional Democrats to discuss saving the Affordable Care Act – or Obamacare – from President-elect Donald Trump and congressional Republicans.

With Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell’s call to make repealing and replacing Obamacare “step one” in the GOP agenda this year and House Speaker Paul Ryan’s design to “privatize” Medicare, Obama, Pelosi and their ilk are a bit frantic, and are urging fellow Democrats to hold events to warn voters in their district about the GOP plans.

Many claim that the Obama scheme is a disaster and a very bad idea for America’s future. They say it will bring much debt, suffering, sickness and death for you and for your family. They feel that we need to use unconstitutional government power to replace this broken scheme.

I agree that Obamacare is a bad plan and an unconstitutional plan. But these are not the same thing.

To say that something is a bad idea and to say it is unconstitutional is to say two different things. Let me

explain...

Suppose you invite me to your house for dinner and while I'm there I notice that your window treatments are shabby and that your furniture does not match your wall colors. So, the next day, while you're not at home, I break into your house and change the windows and the walls. For the sake of argument, let's say I actually make it look better than it did before I broke in. I'm still guilty of the crime of breaking and entering and trespass.

Do you see that even if it was a good idea to change the décor, it was a crime because it was outside of my authority to do it?

So all the talking heads and millions of others that are screaming that the government takeover of the health care system is a very bad idea are right. But even if it was a good idea, it would be a criminal scheme all the same, because the Constitution provides no authority for the federal government to involve itself in "health care" or in "health care financing" or in "insurance" of any kind. Furthermore, to replace the current system of health care with a "better idea" will still remain unconstitutional; therefore, illegal and criminal.

The operative clauses to look up here are Article One, Section Eight, of the Constitution, as well as the Tenth Amendment. It will only take you about six minutes to read and understand that Obamacare, or any variation of it, is more than just a bad idea for the health care of Americans. It is a dangerous and tyrannical trespass into American homes and lives.

All the smoke and mirrors about what "Obamacare" costs, or newly appointed head of the Department of Health and Human Services Tom Price's plan to fix the current problems we see with the Affordable Care Act, are irrelevant.

Simply put, there is no right way to do a wrong thing. To

repeal Obamacare is the correct Constitutional solution, but to replace it means we will still have a unconstitutional Federal Healthcare system. Trumpcare is no solution for Obamacare.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his Institute on the Constitution and receive your free gift.

© 2017 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

’Twas the night after Christmas in 1776

The Battle of Trenton was fought early on the morning of December 26, 1776. Humiliating defeats pursued the Continental Army for 5 months and it appeared Washington’s ill-clothed, barely fed, and literally dying troops were near total annihilation.

It was then, as Americans celebrated the birth of our Savior, an act of Providence occurred which has forever changed the world. Washington’s men successfully crossed the freezing Delaware River in sleet and snow to Trenton, New Jersey, determined for victory. The boldness of General Washington exclaimed, “Tell General Sullivan to use the bayonet. I am resolved to take Trenton.”

Listen as I give the play by play of this night written by Institute on the Constitution’s Chapter Leader *Gary Porter as recounted by the defeated Friedrich von Gröthausen:

’Twas the night after Christmas, when through Trenton Town
Not a soldier was stirring, not even Corporal Baum;

The muskets were stacked by the doorway with care,
In case General Washington dared to come there;
The grenadiers were nestled, all warm in their beds;
While visions of lebkuechen danced in their heads;
Colonel Rall in his kerchief, and I, Lt. Friedrich von
Gröthausen, in my cap,
Had just settled down for a long winter's nap.

When out on the outskirts there arose such a clatter,
I sprang from my bed to see what was the matter.

Away to the window I flew like a flash,
Tore open the shutters and threw up the sash.

The moon on the breast of the new-fallen snow,
Gave a lustre of midday to cannon below.

When what to my wondering eyes did appear,
But an army of Continentals and eight ..enormous field guns,
(must everything rhyme?) With a tall, poised Commander, erect
on his horse,
I knew in a moment 'twas the General, of course.

More rapid than eagles his forces they came,
And he whistled, and shouted, and called them by name:
Now Mercer, now Moulder, now Morris and Tilghman!
On Haslet, on Johnson, on Chester and Gilman!
To the top of the hill! to the top of the wall!
Now fire away! fire away! fire away all!"
As smoke from their guns drifted up to the sky,
I wondered whether kegs of our powder had stayed dry.

Up at King Street end, Washington's force
Gave us volley upon volley, on foot and on horse.

And then, in a twinkling, I heard on the street,
Prancing and pawing, dragoons beating feet.

As I drew in my head, and was turning around,

In the doorway, General Washington came with a bound.

He was dressed blue and buff, from his head to his foot,
Shoe buckles tarnished by powder and soot;
A gleaming long sword hung by his side,
And he looked, well, like a soldier, all beaming with pride.

His eyes—how they twinkled! his dimples, how merry!
His cheeks were like roses, his nose like a cherry!
His firm little mouth was drawn up like a bow,
And the hair of his wig was as white as the snow;
The sword at his side now came out of its sheath,
He circled it high, ... and knocked down a wreath;
He had a firm face and a slightly round belly
That looked like it held some of Martha's grape jelly.

He was tall and commanding, a distinguished old skate,
And I laughed, ... then I cried, ... as I considered my fate;
A wink of his eye and a twist of his head,
Soon gave me to know I had nothing to dread;
He spoke not a word, but went straight to his work,
Emptied our wardrobes; then turned with a jerk,
And laying his finger aside of his nose,
And giving a nod, out the doorway he goes;
He sprang to his horse, to his guards gave a whistle,
And away they all flew with a final dismissal.
But I heard him exclaim, so as not to confuse —

“Happy Christmas to you, von Gröthausen, but my men need these shoes.”

The present delivered that morning in Trenton has continued to bless Americans every Christmas. Let's not forget in all the festivities to pass the knowledge of this gift to our future generations.

* Mr. Porter is Executive Director of the Constitution Leadership Initiative, a project to encourage a better understanding of the U.S. Constitution and other Founding

documents among the American people.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The political significance of Christmas

In their effort to make a point, those who discuss law and government and politics for a living often miss the most crucial – the most critical point of all. So, as we celebrate Christmas, this is a good time to take a deep breath and revisit first principles.

We should remember the political significance of Christmas. Now don't get distracted by arguments that early Christians latched onto a pre-existing pagan holiday to establish the date of Christmas. That may be true, but it is a distraction from what's truly important. The important thing is the birth of the Savior, Jesus Christ.

The birth of the Savior is the most significant political event in human history. This bears repeating. The birth of Jesus Christ is the most significant political event in the history of the universe.

Why? Well simply put, it is because liberty does not and cannot exist absent the acknowledgement of the Almighty, Omniscient, Living and Everlasting God of the Bible whose Son is Jesus Christ – Who created the world, entered His own creation and sacrificed His life to cover our sins and make us

presentable before the Throne of Grace.

For liberty to exist in the world this acknowledgement of Christ's authority must exist in the hearts of the people and it must be the operating principle of civil government.

If it is, then peace on earth will prevail. But to the extent that the hearts of the people are distracted and the civil government forgets that it is a ministry of Jesus Christ, then injustice, chaos, corruption and tyranny will prevail.

And the hearts of the people are, indeed, distracted from this truth; and this is no accident. It is the result of purposeful manipulation of the culture by those who control the major means of communication. The primary tool of this manipulation is the mantra of "Separation of Church and State."

Through the ceaseless repetition of this voodoo mantra, the culture has been conditioned to consider any public prayer, or any private prayer in a public place, or any acknowledgement of the Lord Jesus Christ, as an inappropriate encroachment of the Church. But this is a word trick and a mind trick. A prayer is not a church. An acknowledgement of God's authority over civil government in the form of a prayer before a legislative session, or a court session is not a church. It is rather an expression of a political philosophy. And this particular political philosophy is the American political philosophy.

It is contained in the Declaration of Independence which is the organic law of these united States.

Therefore, there is nothing wrong or illegal about such an expression. Indeed, the acknowledgement of Jesus Christ as the Source of Law and Government is the very first presupposition of American government. Far from violating any law, worship of or acknowledgement of the authority of the Savior of the World through Christmas Nativity displays, public prayer, Ten Commandment displays and all other forms of Christian witness

are consistent with and supportive of the American View of Law and Liberty and are the essence of American government.

Publicly celebrating the blessed birth of the Savior of the World is patriotic in the purest sense and ultimately politically correct.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Does a cross on a city Christmas tree violate the first amendment?

Did you know the ACLU is currently suing an Indiana town over a cross that stands on top of the city’s Christmas tree? Yes! The ACLU sued the city of Knightstown on behalf of resident Joseph Tompkins, alleging the cross on the tree violates his First Amendment rights guaranteeing “separation of church and state.” The suit is demanding the cross’s removal and payment of damages to Tompkins for being “forced to come into direct and unwelcome contact with the cross display.”

This phrase “separation of church and state” has been repeated so many times that many actually believe it is part of the First Amendment. Those that use it want people to join them in removing God from everything in our lives today. They also want to remove our godly heritage from our history. The truth is, the words “separation of church and state” are nowhere in the First Amendment or the text of the U.S. Constitution.

The actual words "separation of church and state" are taken from a letter President Thomas Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Baptist Association in 1802. President Jefferson was answering the concerns of the Danbury Baptist Association in the state of Connecticut in regards to the establishment of a State religion or denomination. Our third president assured them that their First Amendment rights would not be infringed, using these words:

"I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; thus building a wall of eternal separation between Church and State."

Jefferson's meaning was one that protected churches from state encroachment; not individuals from seeing municipal references to God.

Couple this with the following words of George Washington's Farewell Address:

"...Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens."

I have often wondered what type of words George Washington would exchange with groups like the ACLU? At the very least Washington would have publicly marked the ACLU as un-patriotic and therefore un-American. Using his own words, I believe our first president would have advised them that:

"The mere Politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect and to cherish them (religion and morality). A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for

property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice?"

Understanding the source of national morality, I will conclude my article with Washington's final exposition on the topic:

"And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that National morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The presidents role with American businesses

Recently President elect Donald Trump has taken to Twitter and made some bold statements such as:

"The U.S. is going to substantially reduce taxes and regulations on businesses, but any business that leaves our country for another country, fires its employees, builds a new factory or plant in the other country, and then thinks it will sell its product back into the U.S. without retribution or consequence, is WRONG! There will be a tax on our soon to be strong border of 35% for these companies wanting to sell their product, cars, A.C. units etc., back across the border. This

tax will make leaving financially difficult, but these companies are able to move between all 50 states, with no tax or tariff being charged. Please be forewarned prior to making a very expensive mistake! THE UNITED STATES IS OPEN FOR BUSINESS.”

So, is Mr. Trump exceeding the Constitutional authority he will soon have as President of the United States?

I must first establish the premise that as the Chief Executive, the president does not run our country, nor is he the primary authority in our Constitutional Republic or of American businesses. The office of the president's few and defined powers are written clearly and succinctly in Article Two of the United States Constitution. These powers include the duties to:

- Pardon offenses
- Be the Commander in Chief of Army and Navy, as well as state militias when called into federal service ONLY when a war has been officially declared by Congress
- Make treaties with the concurrence of 2/3 of Senators
- Give a State of the Union address
- Recommend, but not introduce, legislation to Congress
- Convene emergency session of Congress
- Receive foreign ambassadors
- Commission all federal officers
- Faithfully execute all laws of the United States made by Congress.

Understanding the nature and the limits of the authorities and powers granted to the Executive Branch of the federal government by the Constitution is very liberating unless you countenance tyranny.

Because the Constitution specifically forbids preferential treatment in Article 1, Sec. 9, stating, “no titles of nobility shall be granted by the United States”, the president

cannot create immunities that favor one socioeconomic group over another. In the time of our founders, the entire federal government budget survived on tariffs only, where certain businesses and/or individuals importing foreign goods paid a tariff at a level determined by congress, not the President.

Therefore the constitutional solution for this topic is for the President elect to equally draw back the regulatory powers that he and his administration have on all businesses in America. Next he should eliminate unconstitutional agencies that illegally assume authority over American businesses.

Subscribe to NewsWithViews Daily Email Alerts

Email Address *

First Name

*required field

Finally, if the 16th Amendment was properly ratified as some believe it was, then all business taxes in America should be rolled back and rather than taxing businesses manufacturing off shore and bringing products back in, a 35% tariff should be assessed by Congress to those products. This will truly give the American work force the advantage when bidding for the work and ultimately keep jobs here.

God-ordained Constitutional authority can always be used lawfully to accomplish the general welfare of Americans. It is when individuals in America blur the lines, speak to quickly, and don't pay attention to their words and actions that American liberties are threatened.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

A president is not a king and states must make sure

Our nation's first president, George Washington, under the newly formed Constitution in 1789, found himself in an uncomfortable position. As the nation's first Chief Executive and Commander-in-Chief he knew the delicate ground between strength and tyranny. Fearing any comparison to the monarchical government from which America had just been liberated, Washington took care to avoid any physical or symbolic references to European monarchs. When the Senate proposed that he be called by the official title "His Highness the President of the United States of America and the Protector of Their Liberties", an abashed Washington opted for the more modest address of "Mr. President".

How far we have come in America. Since Washington's modesty there has been no implication that the president of these United States has ever been handed the unilateral authority of kings, monarchs, or dictators.

How unfortunate the present Senate, and all of Congress for that matter, has refused to stop recent presidents from self-nominations to this title.

Many kings and monarchs of antiquity suffered from the dangerous Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) in which a person is excessively preoccupied with personal adequacy, power, prestige and vanity, mentally unable to see the destructive damage they are causing to themselves and others. This is not a disorder that should be left unchecked in our leaders.

Understand, elected state leaders, your duty is to interpose

between your citizens and a central government bent on tyranny. Simply put, you must stake a claim. You cannot remain silent, because silence implies consent.

George Washington believed, “When People shall have become incapable of governing themselves and fit for a master, it is of little consequence from what quarter he comes.”

The Hebrew prophet Isaiah resolved, “When God’s judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness.”

Democrat or Republican, state officials and citizens alike must learn and resist tyranny in all of its forms.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Is this presidency the end of America?

The Executive Branch Up Close

This has been an unforgettable and historical election where the first woman campaign manager in American history was able to bring a candidate to the oval office. Not to mention, this candidate is the first non-politician, non-military veteran to be elected to the high office. Regardless, certain demographics were literally in mourning for days after the election, including desperate crying fits and depression!

For this reason, I have decided to outline why we can

“exchange our mourning for gladness,” because our founders placed so much emphasis on limiting the Executive Branch of government in America.

Understanding the nature and the limits of the authorities and powers granted to the Executive Branch of the federal government by the Constitution is very liberating unless you countenance tyranny. Our founders provided a way in which the different branches can impede each other, thereby slowing down the actions of government, and this is a great protection for individual liberty.

The president-elect must swear an oath to Almighty God (and to the people) to do no other than to “preserve, protect and defend the Constitution.” George Washington started the tradition of the added statement “so help me God” to the oath, further substantiating the dependance of the office on the reliance of Providential aid.

The powers and duties of the president include being the Commander in Chief of Army and Navy, as well as state militias when called into federal service ONLY when a war has been officially declared by Congress. This power over armed forces is shared among Congress, the president, and the States. Congress makes basic rules for armed forces; the president gives day-to-day orders and more specific regulations; the States control militias except when in federal service.

As an executive check on judicial power, a president may pardon all federal offenses (including contempt) during, or after indictment or conviction except impeachment.

The president may make treaties with concurrence of 2/3 of Senators, appoint Supreme Court justices, ambassadors, and major federal officers with advice and consent of Senate majority.

While the president may recommend legislation, someone in Congress MUST introduce it; the president CANNOT introduce

legislation.

Other minor duties include the ability to convene emergency sessions of Congress, receive foreign ambassadors, commission all federal officers, and faithfully execute all laws of United States. This is the extent of Executive Orders. They are NOT laws made by the president, but simply the president seeing to it that the laws made by Congress are faithfully executed. So eliminating all the previous administration's orders that do not comport with the Constitution is the kind of "fairness" all Americans should want.

As a final security that should bring every American "gladness", the president may be impeached and removed from office by Congress on grounds of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story expounded on impeachment, stating, "The offences to which the power of impeachment has been and is ordinarily applied as a remedy are... what are aptly termed political offences, growing out of personal misconduct, or gross neglect, or usurpation, or habitual disregard of the public interest."

Simply put, our founders put in place a form of government that is resistant to rapid change charged by the passions of the mob, or by designing men who hold office, which ultimately results in tyranny.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

So... What of the Supreme Court?

The “crisis” being spoken of now is who will the next Supreme Court Justice(s) be?

Regardless of what party nominates the justices – this problem with the judiciary declaring evil to be good and good to be evil will not be remedied, adjudicated, or fixed in the courts. It is unfortunate, but I feel Americans have a great deal of evidence to believe the courts are the traffickers of injustice and immorality in this nation. For example:

- Millions of Americans have been murdered in the womb.
- Marriage been assaulted by the perversion of homosexuality.
- Students have been harassed and coerced into learning without prayer, singing without Christ, and extra curricular activities with no Bible.
- Once penalized by government for an unlawful action, now Americans are being fined for the inaction of not having government-approved healthcare.
- Gun Ownership has been marginalized and in many instances eliminated!

How do we end such an epidemic trend? The Bible queries, “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?”

To start, Christians, constitutionalists, and “so-called” conservatives need to recognize there is no federal government solution to our nation’s malady. Rather, our solution is found in restoring our Biblical, American View of government found in the Declaration of Independence: there is a God; our rights come from Him; and that civil government, as His servant (and ours) is limited to protecting our rights.

For the purpose of securing our rights, the Constitution grants lawmaking power ONLY to Congress and NOT to the courts;

not even the Supreme Court.

You see, the very first sentence of the Constitution says, "All legislative power herein granted is vested in a Congress..."

So, if all federal lawmaking power is in Congress, then how much is left over for the courts?

The answer, of course, is zero.

Under our Constitution, courts render opinions in cases and controversies that come before them; they do not make laws.

To better understand the role of American Courts, I leave you with this analogy.

You are attending the championship game before the Super Bowl at the home field of your favorite team. At half-time, your team is up 50-0! You are preparing yourself for a definite victory. Meanwhile, as you are getting concessions, the referees are in a deep conversation. They feel that the home team decimating the visitors so badly is sending the wrong signal from your team, the fans, and the state you live in. So, in the name of evolutionary progress and fairness, they make a progressive move. Before the second half starts, the referees make an announcement that they have changed the rules for the game. Your team now gets two downs to move the ball 10 yards for a first down and the visiting team gets 7 downs to do the same.

The outrage and probable violence that would ensue next would be unprecedented. Why? The answer is obvious; Americans love their sports and know the rules. Referees cannot make the rules! They are hired to apply the rules already made to the unique game they officiate.

In the same way, the courts do not make Law; they discover and apply the relevant law to the facts of each unique case. In

addition, their decision in a particular case applies ONLY to that case. It is not a forced broad brush law that applies to all of America. With no enforcement powers the Court must await the Executive to enforce their opinion.

All three branches of the federal government, if they abide by the Constitution, would guarantee and secure true liberty for Americans. That is what we want from all you who have just been elected.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Chief Justice Roy Moore – the reincarnation of the spirit of our founders

You may remember when Alabama Supreme Court Chief Justice Roy Moore was removed from the bench in 2003 for disobeying an unlawful mandate to remove a Ten Commandments monument in the Alabama Supreme Court building. Ten years later, however, the people of Alabama overwhelmingly voted their heroic defender of liberty back to his position in 2013. This example proves that many American citizens are looking for elected officials who uphold the Constitution and hold moral conviction!

Sadly, the Alabama Supreme Court Chief Justice has again been unlawfully removed from the bench at the hands of liberal activists on Alabama’s Court of the Judiciary (COJ) due to an administrative order issued by Moore that stated, “Until

further decision by the Alabama Supreme Court, the existing orders of the Alabama Supreme Court that Alabama probate judges have a ministerial duty not to issue any marriage license contrary to the Alabama Sanctity of Marriage Amendment or the Alabama Marriage Protection Act remain in full force and effect.”

Chief Justice Moore remarked, “I have been targeted for my belief in marriage, a belief shared by the majority of Americans. No one can point to any illegal, unlawful or unethical aspect of my four-page Administrative Order. That order was a status report on the case. A justice should not be removed from office because of a political agenda.”

You see God created marriage; not man, not governments.

Consider the following analogy. You lease a home in a residential neighborhood for your personal residence. You sign a contract –your vow–and move in to enjoy that new home. Later you decide you want to open a retail business in that home against the owner’s wishes and against your contract. No matter what kind of attorney arsenal you have, you cannot change the zoning of that residence into a business; it is not permissible in the contract, and you don’t own the home.

In the same way, marriage belongs to God and He has given us the benefit of it. For this reason, when you make marriage vows, you are asked to repeat them twice. The first time is a vow to God, who creates the marriage, and the second time is your vow to the other person.

Our founders have long since passed into the annals of history. Their monuments are lifeless stone and can no longer rectify or redeem the champions of their spiritual cause of liberty. That is our job as Americans. To defend and pray for Chief Justice Roy Moore is our duty. Why? Because as Americans, we believe in the “Laws of Nature and Nature’s God” that were set in motion by our Creator to protect the Rights

He has given us.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

“Common sense” what we are forgetting this election

“A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong, gives it a superficial appearance of being right...”

So wrote Thomas Paine in a pamphlet called Common Sense, which aided the cause of American Independence with a logic and a passion that aroused public opinion to hot anger and a firm resolve to resist English tyranny.

Paine’s point is that no matter how long you have been doing a wrong thing, it is still a wrong thing.

This coming election, shouldn’t we keep in mind the numerous and continuous ways that our various governments, at all levels, violate the moral law?

For example, In Article One, Section Eight, the Constitution states that the power to declare war resides in the Congress.

The last time Congress actually voted to declare war was following the bombing of Pearl Harbor back in 1941.

This means that exhausting our federal budget by sending troops to fight in Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan, along with the continuous rhetoric of where to send troops

next for the last seventy-five years, has been unconstitutional and unlawful, and well...wrong.

These violations are not made right simply by ignoring the clear, unambiguous wording of the Constitution, the Supreme Law of the land, for seventy-five years.

There are, of course, many other examples. Neither the Department of Education, nor the Department of Health and Human Services (which administers the Medicare and Social Security programs), nor the Environmental Protection Agency, are authorized under the Constitution, just to name just a few.

These rogue agencies of a rogue regime, are a plague on the populace. They are the cause of great strife, inefficiency, waste, and despair.

Under the American system, our state and local governments are in the best position and are duty-bound to protect us from the tyranny of this central government lawlessness.

Regrettably, our state and local governments, in most cases, are bought off from doing their duty when they accept federal grants that come with strings attached. These "strings" usually involve the compromise of the people's property or the people's liberty.

While we are focusing a great deal, as we should, on the Presidential election, I fear we are incrementally losing sight of the tremendous allies we have to keep a president and a runaway court in check through our local and state government elections.

Today, we yearn for the clarity and the conviction of a Thomas Paine.

We need local leaders who will stand against the corruption of central planners dispersing bribes tempting them to betray

their constituents.

For indeed, in the words of Paine himself, “These are the times that try men’s souls.” However, “Common Sense” would lead us to exercise our self-governing muscle rather than fall into the arms of the next tyrant who will “take care of everything.” Our next president will still be a human being with a sinful nature and will need to be held in check once his or her finger is crowned with the proverbial “ring of power.”

This election cycle, let’s not lose sight of state, local, or personal duties in the midst of voting for presidential duties and judicial appointees.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The Constitutional illiteracy of the people

“It ain’t what you don’t know that gets you into trouble. It’s what you know for sure that just ain’t so.” -Mark Twain

Sunday’s debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton utilized a format where American citizens were asking questions—along with media moderators—regarding things like Islamophobia and the energy crises. This dynamic revealed some tragic constitutional ignorance that has led to the depletion of individual liberties in America.

The source of this ignorance is that people have stopped

thinking like Americans and have resorted to what “just ain’t so.”

Moderator Martha Raddatz asked what the candidates would do for the poor defenseless lives of Syrian refugee children. Syrian refugees? While their plight is desperate, she neglected to ask what the candidates would do about America’s holocaust, the 3,000+ American babies who are slaughtered in the womb every day, to which the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees the protection of life. This legitimate duty belongs to the president, but was not brought up once. Not once.

Americans seem to be out of touch with the jurisdiction of the Executive Branch. I would like to take the opportunity to discuss the president’s position and authority given by the United States Constitution.

As the Chief Executive, the president does not run our country, nor is he the primary authority in our Constitutional Republic. The office of the president’s few and defined powers are written clearly and succinctly in Article Two of the United States Constitution. These powers include the duties to:

- Pardon offenses
- Make treaties with the concurrence of 2/3 of Senators
- Give a State of the Union address
- Recommend, but not introduce, legislation to Congress
- Convene emergency session of Congress

Now, for some of the remaining powers I would like to use questions asked by the public to highlight the constitutional ignorance many individuals exhibited.

According to the Constitution, the president will be Commander in Chief when official war is declared by Congress. So, why all the questions about what the president will do about Syria, Iraq, and Russia? Has Congress declared war on these

countries?

One citizen named Ken made the statement, “[The] Affordable Care Act, known as Obamacare, it is not affordable.” Then he asked, “What will you do to bring the cost down and make coverage better?” Ken is asking about affordable healthcare without realizing federal healthcare is unconstitutional and therefore no authority exists for the president to execute this pretended legislation.

Citizen Spencer Maass queried, “What specific tax provisions will you change to ensure the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share in taxes?” Unfortunately neither Spencer, or either candidate, were aware that Article I, Section 9, Clause 4, provides: “No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.” (Black’s Law Dictionary, 5th Edition, defines “capitation tax” as “a tax or imposition on the person.”) Therefore, IRS agents are not federal officers and there is no authority for the president to determine any tax codes or any authority for the unconstitutional individual federal income taxes.

It is obvious Americans themselves have been influenced more by progressive media talking points than the actual law.

This coming January, one of these two candidates will swear that sacred oath before God to “preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.” I pray our elected officials, and all Americans, turn away from ignorance, and instead uphold the “American View” of law and government.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

American lives matter 1776

Lately, much attention has been given to shameful events including criminals, police, arrest, murder, vandalism, rioting, and protests that have plagued the streets of America.

These events, of course, are not isolated to just our modern times. During the time leading up to the Revolutionary War, there was a tumultuous stirring in the 1700's, a movement which one might label, "American Lives Matter."

This righteous movement occurred after a long train of abuses against all American citizens of every color and nationality. From the Boston Massacre of 1770, the bombing of Boston and burning of Charlestown in 1774, or in the attacks on Williamsburg, Concord, or Lexington in 1775, Americans were attacked with lethal force!

Beyond warfare here is a short list of bigoted and hateful things those Americans were forced to endure:

- The innocent were killed and oppressed
- Americans were being forced at gun point to share their homes with their oppressor's Army where they were forced to take care of all their domestic needs. In many cases, the women in the households were forced to submit their virtue to these savage captors.
- Those "accused" of a crime were tried in courts with specifically appointed discriminatory judges or kidnapped and transported overseas to a prejudice court where they were tried for crimes made up by law enforcement.
- Many were taken slaves to serve in their oppressor's Navy!
- Their money was stolen arbitrarily by the oppressive regime

to expand their political stranglehold and ensure their dominance over Americans.

- A campaign of hate was launched against Americans that promoted internal insurrection and external barbaric warfare from would-be friends whose minds were poisoned by lies.
- A military-enforced moratorium was placed on their businesses, which caused deplorable economic conditions for American families and children – some so bad it brought death!
- The hateful and cruel regime then created law enforcement agencies with one purpose: to continually steal, criminalize, harass and oppress in the midst of misery, prejudice, and dominating hopelessness.

Americans then did what any people group would do: they banded together and formed defenses. What they didn't do is turn to crime, begin to destroy their own cities, or plunder their neighbor's property. Instead, they appealed to Heaven and resisted tyranny to defend their God-given rights.

Believing that they were thus operating under fundamental Biblical principles of self defense, a leader of this "Liberation Movement," Samuel Adams, boldly warned his people's oppressor:

You know that the cause of America is just. You know that she contends for that freedom to which all men are entitled – that she contends against oppression, rapine, and more than savage barbarity. The blood of the innocent is upon your hands, and all the waters of the ocean will not wash it away. We again make our solemn appeal to the God of heaven to decide between you and us. And we pray that, in the doubtful scale of battle, we may be successful as we have justice on our side, and that the merciful Savior of the world may forgive our oppressors.

We all know men like Adams, Washington, and Jefferson prevailed in their fight for equality and liberty for their people. I encourage you to study their methods and the "self-evident" truths of their cause.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The “deplorable” health & human services forcing Planned Parenthood

It has certainly been a “deplorable” week for children in the womb at Planned Parenthood clinics and for states that are restricting funding to these abortuaries. It seems the unconstitutional Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has proposed a new rule that would prevent states from restricting the ability of “specific types of providers” like Planned Parenthood to receive Federal Title X money for family planning and related preventive health services.

Planned Parenthood President and CEO Cecile Richards praised the proposed rule, making following statement regarding “the law”:

“The Obama Administration is protecting access to health care for millions of people. This rule makes it clear that politicians cannot ignore the law as they pursue their agenda to stop women from getting the care they need.”

Just what “law” is Ms. Richards talking about?

In order to restore right thinking about “the law,” I set forth the following analogy by Michael Anthony Peroutka:

Imagine your adult son (let’s call him Barry) comes to your

home one Sunday afternoon in a new vehicle you haven't seen before and says, "Hey, Dad, let me take you for a spin in my new car."

"Sure," you say, and you hop in and take a tour in his new car.

After he pulls back into your driveway and you re-enter your home, your wife asks, "Did Barry drive the car rightly?"

You think a minute, reflecting on the last 20 minutes you spent in the car. Let's say, for the sake of argument, that Barry came to a full stop at every stop sign, he drove within the speed limit, obeyed all the traffic signals, and he refrained from texting while he was driving. So you look at your wife and say, "Yes, dear, he drove the car rightly."

Now, let's add one more fact to this story.

Suppose that, just before your wife asked the question about Barry's driving, you received a call from the local sheriff and learned that Barry had stolen the car earlier that day.

Does this fact change your answer as to whether Barry drove the car rightly?

I think it does.

You see, if Barry has stolen the car then he has no right to drive it at all. Therefore, no matter how safely or recklessly he seems to drive it, without the authority to drive it in the first place, he cannot possibly drive it "rightly."

There is no right way to do a wrong thing.

The point I am trying to make with this illustration is that when we consider the rightness or wrongness of any government program or agency – like the HHS or Title X – the discussion of its "rightness" must always begin with the question of authority. Does the federal government have the authority to

do this thing in the first place?

With respect to government-controlled health mandates and funding, this question is easy to answer. Article One, Section Eight, of the U.S. Constitution provides no authority for the federal government to involve itself in health care regulation or financing of any kind. In other words, "Title X" is a stolen car. And anyone who drives a stolen car is a lawbreaker.

Therefore all who have taken an oath to the U.S. Constitution, including federal and state officials, need to do their duty by pulling this stolen car over and arresting "Barry" or anyone else trying to drive it.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Truth verses the testimony of Hillary Clinton

Winston Churchill is credited with saying, "Men occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry on as if nothing ever happened."

Newt Gingrich was recently interviewed on Fox News' "Fox & Friend." He was puzzled by the FBI's decision not to interview Hillary Clinton under oath, stating, "At this stage of the investigation, I would have thought, they would have wanted to put her into a position where if she lied it was perjury."

The former Speaker of the House also made the claim, "This is

a person who has lied repeatedly. She lies about lying and now she lies about having lied about lying." Gingrich said, "This is the Clinton model, which is to drag it out, to lawyer it up, to say whatever you need to to get through the next interview."

This got me to thinking about the whole idea of truth.

What is the essence of truth? What is "the truth"? Where does the truth come from and how do you know it when it's told to you?

For example, many Americans claim that Hillary Clinton is a liar, and that is the "truth." Then others claim that those Americans are lying about Hillary Clinton lying, and that is the "truth."

My point here is that whatever (or whoever) you may blithely accept as the source of truth is going to determine your opinion and guide your actions.

You may think that the government or a certain political party is the source of truth.

Or, you may think that if you saw it on TV, it must be the truth.

But if your source is false, then your judgments and your actions are doomed to result in error, failure and chaos.

In the 14th chapter of John's Gospel, Jesus Christ says "I am the way, the truth and the life." And, in Hebrews 13, Verse 8, it is written, "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever."

Putting these two truths together, our founders were able to construct a government where law and truth were unchangeable, reliable and just.

Justice is lost today because our legislatures, governors, judges and president have rejected God's Word as the source of

truth.

Lets' exchange our lies and confidence in man's standard for what our Founders termed "self-evident truths."

As Winston Churchill stated, you just stumbled over the truth. Will you pick up and "hurry on as if nothing ever happened," or will you walk in the truth given to you?

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

"Hillary's America" – no! American America

After a weekend of speaking in the great state of Ohio I was encouraged yet again to "go and see Hillary's America: The Secret History of the Democratic Party." Well I had the time Sunday night so I went.

A few comments on the movie itself: It was a very in-depth exposition to the history of what American's know as the Democratic Party. It highlighted the close ties of this political party to slavery, lynching of black Americans, eugenics, racism, and the exploitation of the poor and defenseless. This behavior is abhorrent, abominable; the almighty gracious God hates it and will take vengeance on them that commit such acts and the people who promote and allow it!

But are all Democrats and Americans guilty? And are all Republicans the antithesis of the above criminals I just described? It would appear to some that the movie's creator,

Mumbai, India native Dinesh D'Souza is implying just that, or perhaps he is just trying to expose some forgotten history to Americans in contradistinction to what he believes are authentic American ideals that need to be resurrected in our American body politic.

Whatever his reason I submit that what is most important is that we act like Americans and elect only Americans to seats of power in this nation.

So just what does it mean to be American? What is it that separates us from the rest of the civilized world? What is the American View of law and government?

As we have discussed many times, this view was summarized by Thomas Jefferson and our Founding Fathers in our Declaration of Independence:

- 1) There is a God.
- 2) Our rights come from Him.
- 3) The purpose of government is to secure these God-given rights.

So how do we restore our American Republic?

To start, our favorite candidate should be someone who understands their oath of office, that they are to fear God and believe that there is an eternal system of rewards and punishments that applies to them personally.

This is precisely what an oath is all about.

But they need to show us more than just fear of The Eternal. They must demonstrate that they understand the Biblical limitations of civil government as well as the limitations placed on them by the Constitution of these United States.

Moreover, our candidate must not only show us that they know what is required of them, but they must also demonstrate that they will act on that which they know. It won't do us any good

electing someone who knows what to do but won't do it, whether out of fear of men or desire to be re-elected, or whatever. This would be a vain thing, indeed.

To summarize, your precious vote can only be spent on a candidate that:

- * Acknowledges and fears God
- * Demonstrates that they have an American view of law and government
- * Demonstrates that they will take actions that are driven by and in harmony with God's law and the limitations of the Constitution

No matter what your political affiliation, this must be our resolve if we desire to remain American.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Muslims in America, let's read the constitution

Though Donald Trump and his recent feud with the father of a decorated Muslim Army captain killed in Iraq has brought the discussion about Muslims in America to the public forum, it is not a new discussion.

During the time of our founding, Islam was a major religion in many parts of the world. Therefore, there were numerous Muslims living in America during the time of its founding. Naturally, there was great concern over Muslims taking over

Amer-ica's Christian value system, especially since America was in a war against Islamic terrorists – the Barbary Powers War – that spanned over the presidencies of George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison.

Concerning the fear of Muslims holding high office in America, Supreme Court Justice James Iredell, who was nominated to the Court by President Washington, stated:

But it is objected that the people of America may perhaps choose representatives who have no religion at all, and that pagans and Mahometans (Muslims) may be admitted into offices. . . . But it is never to be supposed that the people of America will trust their dearest rights to persons who have no religion at all, or a religion materially different from their own.

The purpose of the clause found in Article 6 of the U.S. Constitution stating “no reli-gious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States” was born out of the overwhelming concern that our new Republic might establish a national religion. This was extremely dangerous to our founders and reasonably so! Europe and England alike had recently plunged into horrific religious persecutions sanctioned by civil governments!

The Anglican Church of England had at its head none other than the King of England, and the brutal tactics of those under his authority proved to be calamitous and tragic to Americans who often worshiped, taught, and evangelized in churches not sanctioned by the king.

The intent of our founders was not to sanction religions outside of Christianity, but rather in words of Supreme Court Justice and Father of American Jurisprudence, Joseph Story, “The real object of the (First) Amendment was, not to countenance, much less to advance Mahometanism (Islam), or

Judaism, or infidelity, by prostrating Christianity; but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment, which should give to an hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government.”

Lastly, we definitely need to understand that when our founders referred to religion they were referring to the blessed religion of our Lord Jesus Christ – the same Lord they acknowledged when signing the Constitution “in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven.”

Why were they so exclusive? Simple, because Christianity is the ONLY system of worship designed to bring liberty and freedom to all mankind who were created in God’s image.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Democrat platform: you pay for abortion

Abortion is illegal. And protecting, committing, funding, or participating in the act is criminal. Period.

I do not make this statement because the Constitution says it, but because God says it.

The Bible was the chief source of law and morality for the founders of our nation. They understood that God’s protective laws such as “thou shalt not murder” were not negotiable.

The truth of my assertion can easily be seen in America's founding documents. For example, in the Declaration of Independence, our founders were acknowledging a "self-evident truth" wherein they stated, "All men are created equal with certain unalienable rights." Did you catch that? They were not "born equal," but rather "created equal" by their Creator with certain unalienable rights – chiefly life. And we all know every human being is created in the womb of his or her mother.

In direct contradiction to this American Freedom document – and American law document – the Democratic platform specifically states that abortion should be accessible no matter the woman's financial situation and all obstacles to abortion should be removed. To do that, they want to repeal the unnecessary Hyde Amendment, which bans tax dollars from funding abortion through Medicaid, because the murder of an unborn child is illegal already.

Even some in the Democratic party like West Virginia senator Joe Manchin condemned the proposed language in the Democratic platform regarding the Hyde amendment on Wednesday. "That's crazy," Manchin told THE WEEKLY STANDARD, "It's something that I know most of the Democrats in West Virginia and most West Virginians would not agree with. I don't either."

This same un-American platform specifically included support for Planned Parenthood, the nation's largest abortion vendor, who has been caught on undercover camera conducting multiple practices that betray women by harvesting and selling the body parts of their aborted children for profit.

It was not to long ago when Americans argued about whether our preborn children are really human beings. Many thought if we could just prove the child was alive Americans would stop aborting their children and the government would extend protection to the unborn child. I am sorry to say that even with Planned Parenthood admitting freely that aborted babies are "donors" or Hillary Clinton referencing the "unborn person

(who) doesn't have constitutional rights", we are caught now as a country with a major political party filled with individuals who want you to pay for murder!

Now I could understand this madness if our government was a democracy and this is what the majority want, but even the numbers don't support it. A CNN poll in 2014 showed that 56 percent of Americans oppose taxpayer funding of abortion. In 2016, a Marist poll revealed that number was 68 percent.

If you or someone you know supports this ideology, please consider what I was told by a friend of mine who has had an abortion.

Abortion not only kills children, it kills the spirit of the mother who aborted her child. In my case this included (but not limited to) depression, trust issues, binge drinking, and promiscuity. Thankfully Christ heals, but I still am striving to overcome PTSD and flashbacks that negatively affect some relationships and my new marriage.

If you are American then you will stand against this radical, ungodly regime regardless of your political party affiliation!

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The Word of God is legal

Last week I had the opportunity to attend the grand opening of Ken Ham's Ark Encounter, a theme park inside a real sized Noah's Ark in Kentucky. My friend Eric Hovind (CreationToday.org) and I mingled with protesters of the Ark

and give a biblical, constitutional defense for the construction of the theme park.

During my time I had the opportunity to exchange a few words with David Silverman, head of American Atheists organization. I reasoned with him that if there is no God, then we are all slaves to men in power. Liberty only exists because there is a God.

Even one of the heads of the Freedom from Religion coalition was protesting the park on the grounds of "separation of church and state." It was a perfect setting to bring truth about just how important it is for civil government to obey God.

You see, when God created the world, He also created our rights at the same time. It was somewhat later – after the flood – that he instituted civil government (what we sometimes call the State) for the purpose of defending those rights He had previously given.

Later still, as part of His redemptive plan for a fallen and sinful mankind, Jesus Christ – the Son of God and fully God Himself – instituted the Church, of which He is the Head.

Now the church and the state are separate entities and they have separate functions, and separate jurisdictions. For example, Hillary Clinton has no authority to administer the Sacraments; and a pastor has no authority to raise a federal army and declare war. But since God institutes both of these entities, neither is separate from Him.

So, you see, there is absolutely nothing wrong with a State official acknowledging the authority and the Word of God in the civil affairs of men.

Actually, quite the opposite is true. No State action or law is valid unless it conforms to God's law and His Will. This is precisely why the primary document of America's political view

begins with the acknowledgment of God's authority as expressed in the phrase, "The Laws of Nature and of Nature's God".

God is the authority over both the jurisdiction of the Church and the jurisdiction of the State. They are therefore, separate from each other, in terms of their function, but they are NOT separate from Him, for He is their Source of Authority.

Therefore, prayer, Bible reading, and biblical influence in civil government are entirely American and perfectly legal. As a matter of fact, our Founders encouraged it!

At the conclusion of the day's work, twenty-three atheists joined us and attended the ARK Encounter theme park! I hope that each of them will be able see the care God has for them and the lengths American Christians have gone to secure their God-given rights whether they believe in Him or not. What a loving God!

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The Constitution's 3/5 clause agrees, black lives matter

We are barraged again by war in our midst, a war over something as nonsensical as skin color. This war has been with us since the creation of man in God's own image, and its root is an innate hatred towards God, best reflected in the discriminatory destruction of our fellow man due to any

quality, as seen in the case of Cain and Abel. This hatred is a sickness we bring upon ourselves when we agree with the enemy of God that men are not created equal, or endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness.

The Gospel of Peace teaches people of every color and nationality that hate is synonymous with murder. Clearly a stop must be put to incidents of hate of all parties concerned like those in Dallas, but how?

America has always struggled and intermeddled with the concept of equality and liberty to all mankind. There are phrases found in our Declaration of Independence like, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal" or, "Endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights." Massive amounts of resources, tears, and blood have been consumed on this holy and sacred struggle.

I would be so bold as to add that next to the Bible, America's founding documents have remained one of the greatest scourges against inequality that the world has ever seen!

While I realize this issue of inequality, slavery and the Founding Fathers, and particularly the 3/5ths clause in the Constitution, has been a huge stumbling block to blacks and college students, I believe we can find solutions for skin-based hatred when we find the true meaning in this clause and the original intent of our founding documents.

It was Frederick Douglass who provided clarity on this issue. In a speech delivered in Glasgow, Scotland, March 26, 1860, Douglass explained the true meaning of the three-fifths compromise:

"It is a downright disability laid upon the slaveholding States; one which deprives those States of two-fifths of their natural basis of representation. A black man in a free State is worth just two-fifths more than a black man in a slave

State, as a basis of political power under the Constitution. Therefore, instead of encouraging slavery, the Constitution encourages freedom by giving an increase of “two-fifths” of political power to free over slave States.”

Thus, the three-fifths clause was written for the sole purpose of limiting congressional representation of the slave states and denied the slave states additional pro-slavery representation in Congress!

Frederick Douglass also stated, “Now, take the Constitution according to its plain reading and I defy the presentation of a single pro-slavery clause in it. On the other hand, it will be found to contain principles and purposes entirely hostile to the existence of slavery.”

I believe adhering to our founding documents and the Christian God who created all men equal, will continue to provide solutions for the evil sickness of inequality and skin based hatred that continues to plague the human race.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Independence week: an homage to the preachers

Known to the world was the great Christian revival, “The Great Awakening” of the 1740’s. Christianity roared through the colonies and their diverse Christian denominations. Men were reintroduced to the fervent commitment to their Creator,

practiced by their puritan and pilgrim ancestors. As mankind has witnessed all through time, religious (that is, Christian) revival precedes the greatest moves of sustained liberty to man. Man's allegiance to his God and Savior will always produce virtue, which is the essential strength that can overcome tyranny. To use the words of John Adams in a letter to his wife Abigail in 1776, "The only foundation of a free Constitution, is pure Virtue, and if this cannot be inspired into our People, in a greater Measure, than they have it now, They may change their Rulers, and the forms of Government, but they will not obtain a lasting Liberty. They will only exchange Tyrants and Tyrannies."

Let us then speak of this cherished virtue and how it affected our country's foundation.

Out of this virtue sprang many patriots including the Sons of Liberty. The initial goal of the Sons of Liberty, and patriots of all classes and distinctions, was to ensure their God-given rights as Englishmen.

They relayed in print the major events of their struggle for Liberty and would hold meetings to decide which candidates to support—those that would bring about the desired political change. In return, the British authorities attempted to denigrate the Sons of Liberty by referring to them as the "Sons of Violence" or the "Sons of Iniquity."

Now working in unison with the Sons of Liberty for the cause of liberty, colonial preachers espoused resistance and civil disobedience to the unjust rules of despotic kings and the lawless acts of a foreign parliament. These were not anarchists, for they also taught the necessity of obeying legitimate government. Their own colonial legislatures, which had been constituted from the duly elected representatives of the people, instilled a reverence and honor of good government, as well as contempt for tyrants. More than any other element of society, King George feared the preachers. He

called them the “Black Regiment,” because of the black clerical robes they wore when preaching. Were it not for the Black Regiment, it is most unlikely that there would have ever been a Declaration of Independence.

King George’s fears of the Black Regiment were well founded. In all of recorded history, there has never been a more capable and persuasive group of military recruiters. Many a preacher single-handedly raised multiple companies of men, and in most cases, those men then insisted he be their commander. Their power of persuasion was simply irresistible; their love for liberty, and of their men, equally irresistible. The impassioned preacher could enlist more men than George Washington himself. Those who could not go to war often wrote stirring pamphlets to be circulated amongst the troops, so as to keep morale high.

No segment of society deserves more credit for America’s founding and independence than do its preachers. They confronted the tyrant to his face and protested, “No king, but King Jesus!”

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

From Brexit to Liberty

“The dawn is breaking on an independent United Kingdom. Let June 23rd go down in our history as our independence day!” said Nigel Farage, leader of the U.K. Independence Party, after the historical vote for Britain’s Independence from the European Union.

Presidential hopeful Donald Trump declared, "The people of the United Kingdom have exercised the sacred right of all peoples", and that "they have reasserted control over their own politics, borders and economy."

The God of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ is the source of this sacred right of Liberty as written in British foundational freedom documents such as the Magna Carta and later in our own American freedom document, the Declaration of Independence.

When speaking with my wife about "Brexit" she made a very observant comment. "Right action with the wrong foundation can become destructive action."

As I pondered this statement, I reflected upon the dialogue of pundits, politicians, and even citizens, and there has been a missing component: the mention of a Biblical foundation for Independence.

As Americans, we at one time determined to dissolve the political bands which had, quoting the Declaration of Independence, "joined us with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them."

The foundation of our call for Independence was the Laws of Nature and Nature's God.

Since the early 1600's, America was known as the place where people could go to start a new life with freedom of religion, the liberty to choose your own occupation, and a place of refuge from oppressive governments.

The Mayflower Compact states why the Pilgrims came to America:

In the name of God, Amen. We, whose names are underwritten, the Loyal Subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord, King James, by the Grace of God, of England, France and Ireland, King,

Defender of the Faith, e&. Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the Honour of our King and Country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia...

I fear at this time in history we place far too much emphasis on our politics, borders and economy, and too little attention on the One who grafted the fundamental rights to these blessings of liberty into the citizens of every nation.

While I agree with Great Britain's exercise of the sacred right to liberty, I pray that Britain and those around the world with amazing foundational documents – like the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence – return to their foundations so that we may see much needed lasting examples of liberty in our world. As the Proverb says, "If the foundations be destroyed what can the righteous do?"

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserv

How would our founders respond to Orlando tragedy?

As Americans we have experienced a historical weekend in our country.

On Sunday a member of the radical Muslim faction, ISIS, opened fire in a popular homosexual night club in Orlando, Florida, killing at least 49 people – a tragedy unparalleled in America since the horrific terror attack on 9/11.

So many have flooded the public discussion with numerous contrasting solutions such as restrictions or expansion of gun rights, anti-Islam or anti-homosexual notions, all of which are culminating into political hysteria...and understandably so.

We at Institute on the Constitution always desire to bring the original, Biblical, Constitutional, American View to contemporary situations that arise in America. By bringing this view we believe solutions can be found that have helped us as a nation remain unified for well over 200 years.

Through historical revision and outright tyrannical education policies, many in America today do not even know how our Founding Fathers dealt with national tragedies such as we saw this past weekend.

When referring to the Revolutionary War, Benjamin Franklin recalled,

In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for the Divine protection. Our prayers, Sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending Providence in our favor.

President John Adams proclaimed May 9, 1798, a day of solemn fasting and prayer when the United States was on the verge of war with France.

His proclamation included this statement,

“...as the United States of America area, at present, placed in a hazardous and afflictive situation, by the unfriendly disposition, conduct and demands of a Foreign Power...under these considerations it has appeared to me that the duty of imploring the mercy and benediction of Heaven on our country, demands, at this time, a special attention from its inhabitants.”

President James Madison, faced with tragic attacks of the British Empire in the War of 1812, made the following call to American citizens:

Especially of offering fervent supplications, that in the present season of calamity and war, He (God) would take the American People under his peculiar care and protection...that He would inspire all nations with a love of justice and of concord, and with a reverence for the unerring precept of our holy religion, to do to others as they would require others to do to them; and finally, that, turning the hearts of our enemies from the violence and injustice which sway their councils against us, He would hasten a restoration of the blessings of Peace.

We should not be leveraging a tragedy for a political benefit. Our Founders knew that it is futile to trust in man during times of danger. No political law or movement can truly bring lasting peace and happiness. Instead, we should, like our founders, be calling on God in repentance, humiliation, and earnest supplication for the good of our nation and its people.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Clinton queries: "if" the second amendment is a

constitutional right

The natural and God-given right of self-defense is perfectly summed up by this exposition found in America's fundamental law which regulates all our civil government institutions: "The right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

Definitive, bright, unequivocal, and by no stretch of the imagination is the Second Amendment confusing.

Let's look at the words of Jesus on this topic. "Then said He unto them...he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one." The sword Jesus was speaking of was a military grade weapon. It was a very effective lethal weapon. We know Christ would never command something that is intrinsically sinful so this command is clearly an act of love to protect one's life and the lives of those near him/her.

Recently, Presidential hopeful Hillary Clinton was interviewed on ABC News' "This Week". Clinton, who has refuted GOP presumptive nominee Donald Trump's claim that she wants to abolish the Second Amendment, refused to acknowledge that individuals have the right to bear arms!

The question from George Stephanopoulos was, "Do you believe that their conclusion (referring to the recent Heller decision) that an individual's right to bear arms is a constitutional right?"

Clinton responded, "If it is a constitutional right, then it, like every other constitutional right, is subject to reasonable regulations..."

She did later acknowledge, "Reasonable people can say – as I do – responsible gun-owners have a right," but her overall conclusion was, "There are real costs that people incur because of the terrible gun violence epidemic. And we have to

deal with it. And I'm going to be looking for ways to deal with it."

Incidentally this is a duty delegated to the President of the United States and their entire executive team by the Constitution, a duty that I fear this seeker of high office may be derelict.

Referring to anti-gun ownership laws and regulations, Clinton stated, "I do want people to ask themselves, can't we do better than to have 33,000 people killed every year by guns and many thousands more injured? And I think we can."

Considering, the overwhelming majority of public mass shootings occur in places where guns are outlawed and yet criminals disregard those bans, I think we can, too. I believe in the solution of our founders who determined to eliminate King George's "pretended legislation" and legalize liberty and self-defense.

Since the Constitution is the Supreme Law of the Land, and since the Second Amendment declares that the right of the people to keep and bear arms "shall not be infringed," then gun control measures are NOT law, they are what our founders referred to as "pretended legislation".

Let me repeat, gun control measures ARE NOT law.

I believe Americans need to call on sheriffs and police officers to declare their intention to uphold the law by refusing to enforce these measures. Moreover, Americans should ask these same oath-takers to keep the oaths they have sworn before God by actively protecting and defending us against those who would violate the law by seeking to enforce these vain enactments.

This is because unconstitutional acts of legislatures are NOT the law.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Oklahoma’s Senator Nathan Dahm – “the hell-hound of abortion”

Oklahoma Senator Nathan Dahm is likely to override a veto of Governor Mary Fallin who rejected a bill that would make it a felony for anyone to perform an abortion in the state of Oklahoma.

This senator’s fearless zeal for life is refreshingly similar to President John Quincy Adams, nicknamed “The Hell-Hound of Slavery” for relentlessly speaking out against slavery.

As depicted in the movie *Amistad*, Adams defended 53 Africans purchased at Muslim slave markets, accused of mutiny aboard the slave ship *Amistad*. He won their case before the Supreme Court, giving them back their freedom, stating:

“The moment you come to the Declaration of Independence, that every man has a right to life and liberty, an inalienable right, this case is decided. I ask nothing more on behalf of these unfortunate men than this Declaration.”

Adams said he felt “bonded” by the Constitution to work for universal emancipation (freedom for all).

He was so galvanized about the topic, in 1836, Southern members of Congress along with Northern Democrats, got the

House to pass a “gag rule” that forbade discussion of slavery in the House of Representatives. Adams fought tirelessly against the gag rule, and in 1844 he finally succeeded in getting it abolished, by a vote of 108 to 80.

Infant murder, as horrid as slavery and lynching, has become an unprecedented abomination in our country, taking roughly 4,000 lives a day!

Dr. Ben Carson, former presidential candidate and famed neurosurgeon, correlated the two abominations, stating, “During slavery, a lot of slave owners thought they had the right to do whatever they wanted to that slave; anything that they chose. And what if the abolitionists had said, ‘I don’t believe in slavery, but you guys do whatever you want’? Where would we be?”

Contrasting these three brilliant lovers of humanity and Constitutional rights to life and liberty, consider some of the statements made by avid pro-infant murder advocates in Oklahoma.

State Sen. Ervin Yen described the legislation as “insane” and voted against it.

Amanda Allen, an attorney for the Center for Reproductive Rights in New York, stated, “Oklahoma politicians have made it their mission year after year to restrict women’s access to vital health care services, yet this total ban on abortion is a new low. The Center for Reproductive Rights is closely watching this bill and we strongly urge Governor Fallin to reject this cruel and unconstitutional ban.”

Senate Democratic leader John Sparks called Senator Dahm’s bill “an emotional distraction.”

Emotional Distraction?

That is what the right to life has degenerated into in the

minds of some identifying Americans.

The only reason murder is emotional is because it takes away the fundamental right of a human to have liberty and pursue happiness. When individuals' lives are brutally taken, people tend to get emotional. If one has no right to life, whether we are free or slaves, in the words of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, "What difference does it make"?

I am grateful there is another "Hound of Heaven" on the loose. Senator Nathan Dahm, for the sake of the unborn, override this veto; because in the words of John Quincy Adams, "Duty is ours, results are God's."

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Government transgender public schools

President Barack Hussein Obama issued an order to public schools Friday morning that they must allow transgender students to use whichever restrooms correspond with their gender identity, regardless of their biological sex.

My response: "Who cares!?!"

Well, Jake, that is rather flippant; this will potentially affect millions of families across America!

"It can't!"

Imagine you are at a baseball game and it is bottom of the 9th inning. The winning run for the home team rounds third base and heads to home plate where he slides graciously into the catcher's mitt with ball in hand. Before the umpire makes the call, a home team fan screams out of the bleachers, "Safe!" Should the umpire count the run? Should the umpire turn and start yelling at the fan? No, the umpires duty is to make the call, "You're out!" Though the fan deserves chastisement, he certainly has no relevance when it comes to making the call.

Article 2 of the U.S. Constitution clearly defines the powers of the President. You will find absolutely no section that authorizes the President to have any authority, or spend any money from the Federal treasury, for school bathrooms or education. He is not the commander-in-chief of the public school bathrooms in America.

I realize this is strange to the average American. I have had many opportunities to share "limited government speeches" across the nation. I have found that most adults either agree or disagree with me, but the secondary and university students either agree with me or are so unfamiliar with the topic of Constitutional government that they act like I am from a different country, or another planet. Their education consists of learning about a new, untried world of peace, happiness, and non-threatening moral anomalies, while under the protection of a Judeo-Christian system of ethics that has held back the ugly reality of secular despotism.

Every year states take federal funding to federalize the education systems in their state. The result? They build a new American citizenry that, in ignorance and zeal, promotes the collapse of true liberty, which is found only under the Law of Nature and Nature's God.

This institution daily becomes a Trojan Horse – a 5th column – and it is not clandestine.

The wisdom of the Hebrew King Solomon speaks directly to this conundrum when he forecasted, “There is a man who has labored with wisdom, knowledge and skill, and then he gives his legacy to one who has not labored with them. This too is vanity and a great evil.”

So, while men like Texas Lt. Governor Dan Patrick blame Obama again, I believe the real treachery is being done by the states that are taking federal funding for their schools.

Recall that our delusional fan’s “umpire complex” gave him no authority over the game; and the President with his “transgender policy complex” has no authority in school bathrooms.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The role of government: a fourteen-year olds response

Today I had the privilege of speaking at another Institute on the Constitution American Club where I graduated a host of young people from our U.S. Constitution Course! These clubs are comprised of young people who desire to learn and live the Biblical, American View of Law and Government.

During this presentation I asked the question, “Is abortion legal in America?”

One 14-year-old student named Camden answered “no,” because it was murder and further explained that the courts aren’t

listening to God.

Camden nailed it. And I am so glad, because for years we have accepted what appears to be, rather than what is.

You see, many people have taken stances on issues of morality based on "what appears to be" considered the "law" today, rather than on "what is" the law based on the liberty and equality of the Laws of Nature and Nature's God.

There are many examples of industries in this day and age that are in some way, shape, or form, considered moral from the statutory standpoint of some public officials. They are in turn protected, and anyone seeking by force to put an end to these actions would be criminally prosecuted.

Many would say, "Of course there is nothing immoral about bars or restaurants that have nude dancing, or a doctor killing an unborn child; they are both legal."

Fifty years ago our country would have considered the above to be immoral and unacceptable to civil society. I would submit to you that this is a correct moral stance based on "what is". This is because nature's God has said to His creation, "Thou shalt not kill", or "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and "even if you look on a woman to lust after her, you have committed adultery with her in your heart." This is a FIXED law that cannot be changed or abolished, regardless of what men or governments do or say.

All of you would agree that to lie under oath and cause unwarranted incarceration, or even death, would be immoral. If we were to change our laws to accommodate those who commit perjury, would it still be immoral? What if we stated that the family of a murder victim was required to pay for the rehabilitation of the murderer, no matter what the circumstance, would that be moral? How about a law that stated a woman was protected to kill her child within 2 weeks after giving birth, would that be moral?

Thomas Paine, in his book "Common Sense," stated, "A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong, gives it a superficial appearance of being right..."

Should we judge what is right and moral by "what appears to be" or "what is"?

The lesson for America today has not changed in 200+ years; God does not change in His character or justice. His Law is perpetual, and if we expect to abide secure under what the Preamble of the U.S. Constitution calls His "Blessings of Liberty", we must, with Camden, judge our own morality by "what is," not "what appears to be."

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The pretended offenses of Chief Justice Roy Moore

In June of 2015, the U.S. Supreme court asserted the opinion that gay couples had the right to marry under the US constitution. On the heels of this opinion, last year a federal judge ruled same-sex marriage was legal in the state of Alabama.

Alabama Supreme Court Justice Roy Moore postulated that the US Supreme Court, and the federal judge's ruling, was at odds with a unanimous decision by the Alabama Supreme Court that stated marriage is between one man and one woman. Moore then issued an administrative order to state probate judges stating

they should not issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples.

This sparked a whirlwind for the good Chief Justice who was suspended from his job last week and faces possible ouster after the anti-American Southern Poverty Law Centre (SPLC) filed a complaint with the Judicial Inquiry Commission (JIC); which then forwarded the case to the Court of the Judiciary. What was the crime?

In the Declaration of Independence our Founding Fathers used the term “pretended legislation” to describe legislation that does not square with what the Declaration refers to as the “Laws of Nature and Nature’s God.” As a result, this legislation had no lawful authority. And though our founders were guilty of breaking many pretended laws, they referred to these offenses as “pretended offenses.”

Chief Justice Moore’s legal council recently released a statement that read:

“He did nothing wrong. The politically motivated complaints filed with the JIC have no basis in the Canons of Judicial Ethics.

In other words, if the Chief Justice was drunk on the bench, he would have broke the canons (rules) of Judicial Ethics. Of course the judge has done nothing to break ethical rules, which means the only motivation for the enforcement of these pretended offence is politics.

Moore’s statement continues:

“The Alabama Supreme Court is the only body that has statutory authority to overrule administrative orders of the Chief Justice.”

Simply stated, Moore gave an administrative order to probate Judges to stop issuing licenses. If this was an ethical violation, only the supreme court of Alabama can enforce a

penalty.

What Moore's persecutors are attempting is an end-run around the rule of Law. They want The Supreme Court of the United States to be the author of law and thereby create "Pretended Legislation" in their favor.

So now the same court that removed Moore from office in 2003 for his refusal to follow a federal court order to remove a Ten Commandments monument from the rotunda of the state's judicial building, will decide whether Moore violated judicial ethics, and he could be removed from office if found guilty of this pretended offense.

But thankfully Moore is not laying down on this. He recently stated:

"The JIC has chosen to listen to people like ... a professed transvestite, and other gay, lesbian and bisexual individuals, as well as organizations which support their agenda. We intend to fight this agenda vigorously and expect to prevail."

God knows the outcome, but one thing is certain: His laws are not "pretend" because your rights are unalienable, regardless of what a king or court enforces.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The key to American greatness

– family education

This past weekend I had the tremendous opportunity to speak and participate in a region wide homeschool convention in my home state of Minnesota. As I traveled to this convention, I pondered my own primary education and how drastically different my private and public education was. I never sensed being coerced, even when the crazy, mad biologist tried to tell me we evolved from fish; and we were never taught there is no God, men can be women, or that the government owed you a cell phone, a college degree, or a house. I know, I sound pretty old...

I later spent time with my extended family members at a first communion ceremony and I experienced 4 generations of wisdom, love, and unity. It seemed many of my family members carried a sense of anxiety at the looming secular, humanistic, and pluralistic philosophy our great country is adapting to at neck-breaking speed.

After participating in a convention with over 4,000 Christians who have not blindly allowed the state to do something it is incapable and unauthorized to do – educate their children – one thing became very clear to me, you can't subjugate and enslave a biblically literate, Christian people. A Christian culture will recognize and reject tyranny before tyranny can get a foothold.

A Christian people, by virtue of their understanding of God's creation, their knowledge of history, their comprehension of the divine origin of law, and their assurance of heavenly citizenship, will never suffer earthly leaders who allow those who mock law and justice to lead them.

In order, therefore, to subjugate a Christian people, you must first de-Christianize them. You must remove, from the culture, that which prevents you from conquering them. Piece by piece,

Christian beliefs must be removed – along with the memory of those beliefs – from the minds of the people. This will take time, and has through successful, compulsory public education. This is the system of education we currently know as government schools.

Remember, just because you have education doesn't mean anything if you are educated the wrong way.

Declaration signer and founding father, Dr. Benjamin Rush, also known as the Father of Public Schools, said, "The only foundation for a useful education in a republic is to be laid in religion. Without this there can be no virtue, and without virtue there can be no liberty, and liberty is the object and life of all republican governments."

I agree with Dr. Rush; "Without religion, I believe that learning does real mischief to the morals and principles of mankind."

Unless and until education is done God's way, under the influence, control, and jurisdiction of the family, there is no hope for any improvement.

This is Jake MacAulay with the Institute on the Constitution bringing you The American View from my state of Minnesota where, in the words of native Minnesotan Garrison Keeler, "All the women are strong, the men are good looking, and the children are above average...and its true!"

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Sotomayor's proposed multiculturalism

During a recent talk at Brooklyn Law School, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor expressed, "It is important that we have greater diversity on the Supreme Court" and, "I, for one, do think there is a disadvantage from having (five) Catholics, three Jews, every one from an Ivy League school."

Sotomayor is both a Catholic and an Ivy League school graduate. With regards to her reference of the popularized concept of multiculturalism, I wonder, could this perceivably be a good thing for American Government?

You might not realize it, but this is a very important question.

The current "politically correct" viewpoint argues that pluralism – the acceptance and celebration of differing religions, philosophies and ideologies – contributes to the strength of America. Though diversity of culture and backgrounds is the beauty of America, antagonism towards our Christian foundation is not.

You can see this "modern pluralism" at work in the widespread attempt to sanitize schools, courts and courthouses, and public buildings and places, of any reference to God, Christ and the Bible.

This agenda is based on the notion that we are a more stable, prosperous society because we embrace diversity, toleration and acceptance of anything and everything.

But is this true? Those who founded and fought for our American culture and our American form of government didn't think so. In fact they had a very different view.

You are probably familiar with the name of Samuel F. B. Morse. He was the inventor who developed the Morse Code.

But his father, Jedidiah Morse was a pretty famous person as well. A Yale graduate, he was an educator who is still known as the "Father of American Geography".

Here's what he said about the importance of Christianity to the culture and the administration of government:

"To the kindly influence of Christianity we owe that degree of civil freedom, and political and social happiness which mankind now enjoys. In proportion as the genuine effects of Christianity are diminished in any nation, either through unbelief, or the corruption of its doctrines, or the neglect of its institutions; in the same proportion will the people of that nation recede from the blessings of genuine freedom, and approximate the miseries of complete despotism."

Was Jedidiah Morse right about this?

Asked another way, how is this multiculturalism working out for our culture?

As we see the role of Christianity diminished in our country – as we see our institutions abandon or corrupt its doctrine – are things getting better or worse for us?

When we eliminate biblical standards – When paganism or immoral philosophies of other religions are considered protected, do we have greater freedom?

If Morse was right, America is in trouble.

Our Founding generation fought and died for something. If we now believe that there is nothing that is wrong, then what did they fight against and what did they die for?

Or did they know something we have forgotten?

Psalm 33:12 reminds us, as it informed them, “Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord”.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Clinton’s “person” may die because of their mother

Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton appeared on NBC’s “Meet the Press” Sunday morning. During the interview, host Chuck Todd pressed Clinton on the topic of abortion.

“When, or if, does an unborn child have constitutional rights?” Todd asked.

The aspiring presidential candidate said that the rights outlined in the U.S. Constitution are not applicable to unborn children. Was Hillary invoking the Constitution, Bill of Rights, or any United States law?

NOPE. The go-to reason of her injudiciousness and faintheartedness was *Roe v. Wade*, the ruling that has since been renounced by its former victorious plaintiff Norma McCorvey – A.K.A. Jane Roe. Here is Mrs. Clinton’s statement:

“Well, under our laws currently, that is not something that exists. The unborn person doesn’t have constitutional rights.”
[Emphasis added]

While Clinton acknowledges the created unborn person, in contradiction she does not believe that person has unalienable

rights to life, liberty, or pursuit of happiness.

Agreeing with God, our American framers authorized and established that we are created, not born, equal with unalienable rights – and that according to the Fifth Amendment, no person, government, or court ruling can “deprive us” of life, liberty, or property without “due process of law”. In other words, you must be convicted of a crime to forfeit your rights.

To operate, condone or practice otherwise is to criminally break American Law, and the consequences are fatal!

Let me explain with the following analogy.

After the release of superhero movies in theatres, many young people have an insatiable desire to fly. That’s right...fly.

In an attempt to satisfy young people’s desire to fly, a group of progressives move to make the “law of gravity” illegal.

“What? Why? That’s nonsense,” you say.

Well, you see, gravity is a law that is discriminatory. It won’t let anyone with the genuine desire to fly fulfill his or her passion! A movement begins, the media covers it nonstop, and soon after the legislature passes it, and the president signs and enforces it. The law of gravity no longer exists! Or so they think...

Trusting their government knows best and that there is no fear of harm, the next morning people all over America tragically start jumping off buildings, some equipped with capes, some without.

People find out quickly that, in fact, you don’t break the law; the law breaks you.

Please understand what Hillary, the Supreme Court, and even what we want does not change the consequence of violating a

Law of Nature that God created.

“You shall not murder” is as pertinent today as it was when God created us with the right to life. He created this law as a protection, and violation of His law means self-destruction.

This destruction is now in plain sight. Youth are finding out that 1/3 or their brothers and sisters, classmates and friends have been murdered in the womb.

Victims of this mind-twist philosophy called pro-choice are finding out that 31% of those having abortions report suffering physical health complications, 10% potentially life-threatening. Sixty-five percent of women suffer symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) with suicide rates six times higher than those who give birth.

When we abandon God’s Word we abandon all rationality. We instead have to prop up an abstract morality full of contradictions and deceit.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

© 2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Can Senate reject Obama’s Supreme Court nominee?

Can and should the Senate reject Supreme Court Nominee Merrick Garland?

In the words and overtone of Vice-President Joe Biden, the Senate can and should refuse this nominee. In a speech on the

Senate floor in June 1992, Mr. Biden, then chairman of the Judiciary Committee, said there can and should be a different standard for a Supreme Court vacancy "that would occur in the full throes of an election year." He demanded President George H.W. Bush should follow the example of "a majority of his predecessors" and delay naming a potential conservative replacement.

Mr. Biden also remarked.

"It would be our pragmatic conclusion that once the political season is underway, and it is, action on a Supreme Court nomination must be put off until after the election campaign is over...That is what is fair to the nominee and essential to the process. Otherwise, it seems to me," he added, "We will be in deep trouble as an institution."

Finally Biden concludes that if the president refuses his advice he would "oppose his future nominees, as is [his] right."

James Madison covered this subject in The Federalist No. 51 affirming, "The structure of the government must furnish the proper checks and balances between the different departments."

Article 2, Section 2, of the Constitution allows the President to appoint Supreme Court justices but they may not hold office without the approval of the Senate. It appears the former Senator Biden was determined to use this constitutional check on the executive branch, one that has been used in the past by different political affiliations and parties.

Now that we know Senate can refuse this nominee, should Judge Merrick Garland be refused?

As the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals Chief Judge, Garland is required to apply the Constitution to all cases that come before him.

Has he done this?

In his tenure Garland voted to rehear (and overturn) the D.C. Circuit's pro-gun Heller decision. The result, had he won, would have been a Second Amendment which didn't convey any individual rights to Americans – merely the right of states to form a militia.

Another troubling revelation for anti-crime Americans is when a panel of the D.C. Circuit issued an anti-gun decision in *Seegars v. Gonzales*, Garland, in 2005, voted against rehearing en banc., a jurisprudence where the government has no gun grabbing boundaries, and the citizenry has no rights to defend themselves with firearms.

A basic analysis of Garland's judicial record shows that he does not respect our right to keep and bear arms.

William Blackstone, an English jurist whom our founders frequently referenced while framing our Constitution, knew the need for individual citizens to enjoy the right to self-defense. In his *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, he asserted that the right of self-defense “may be considered as the true palladium of liberty...”

If your concern is the preservation of liberty, I believe the decision of Garland's refusal is clear.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

How should we vote?

What should we do now that the elections are approaching? How should we act? What should we know? What should we ask? What are we looking for? And finally, knowing what we know (and don't know), how should we then vote?

Whether we're talking about Dog Catcher, city or County Council, State House, or our national government, it seems to me that, just like the Marines, we are looking for a "few good men."

Let's start with the word "good." Although the people that wrote the commercial for the U.S. Marines probably don't know it, the word "good" derives from the word "God." To be good is to be Godly. A good man is one who appreciates and rehearses the attributes and the characteristics of God.

And so, if our man is someone who understands his oath of office, then he fears God and believes that there is an eternal system of rewards and punishments that applies to him personally.

This is precisely what an oath is all about.

And I think we can assume that if he does not see himself accountable to God for the truthfulness of his oath, then there is little hope that he will feel himself accountable to you or me once he is elected.

But he needs to show us more than just fear of The Eternal. He also must demonstrate that he understands the Biblical limitations of civil government as well as the limitations placed on him by the State Constitution and the Constitution of these United States. Unhappily, few, if any, of the candidates who come to you asking for your vote and your money, have even taken the time to read either of the documents that they are promising you, before Almighty God,

that they will uphold.

Moreover, our candidate must not only show us that he knows what is required of him, but he must also demonstrate that he will act on that which he knows. It won't do us any good electing someone who knows what to do but won't do it, whether out of fear of men or desire to be re-elected, or whatever. This would be a vain thing, indeed.

To summarize, my precious vote can only be spent on a candidate that:

*Acknowledges and fears God

*Demonstrates that he has an American view of law and government

*Demonstrates that he will take actions that are driven by and in harmony with God's law and the limitations of the Constitution

I firmly believe that if I cast my vote for someone who doesn't meet these requirements, then I will stand before God and be judged for my failure to obey Him. To vote for someone who does not meet these criteria is to do a vain thing before God and men. The chaos and incompetence and corruption of our civil government in all three branches is a result of our failure to choose wisely. When we choose "the lesser of two evils" we continually get evil and we certainly deserve it. After all, we chose it, didn't we?

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Alabama's full faith and credit in law not Obergefell

Faced with the impossibility of consummating and thereby conceiving children, two women living as a couple in Alabama set up a second residence in Georgia where lesbians are allowed to adopt children. These children were conceived in one of the lesbians by insemination from an anonymous male donor.

Later in 2011, the two women split up, and the non-parent lesbian (V.L.) sued in an Alabama state court, accusing biological lesbian mother (E.L.) of denying her access to the children, one now 13 and 11-year-old twins.

The case made its way to the Alabama Supreme Court, which refused legal standing for V.L. The U.S. Supreme Court then issued a 6-2 ruling, to summarily overturn the Alabama order.

While the press and V.L. are making the argument this recent case is about a rejection of the full faith and credit clause, it is not! This goes back to the SCOTUS opinion of Obergefell not being based on legal reasoning, history, tradition, the Court's own rules, or the rule of law, but upon the empathetic feelings of the "five lawyers" in the majority.

As Americans we find ourselves in another philosophical conundrum with many people believing the courts have already determined the definition of marriage. Well if they are talking about earthly courts, they are grossly misled.

Here is the definition of marriage given by our Creator incarnate, Jesus Christ, as recorded in the 19th chapter of Matthew:

"Have you not read that He Who made them at the beginning 'made them male and female,' and said, 'For this reason a man

shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh?'"

The jurisdiction over this sacred institution is the family and the Church. Government's duty is to recognize and defend the institution of marriage.

For just a minute, think about the pretension that it takes for mere human beings to think that they have the authority or ability to change what is eternal and forever fixed by the Creator. To attempt such a foolish and vain thing is to do nothing less than to make the claim that you are God.

Random courts, legislatures and governors all over America have already done exactly this.

Chief Justice Roberts put the court's self-aggrandizing claim of power in historical context: "Those who founded our country would not recognize the majority's conception of the judicial role. They, after all, risked their lives and fortunes for the precious right to govern themselves. They would never have imagined yielding that right on a question of social policy to unaccountable and unelected judges."

I am reminded of a prophetic warning given by Paul, an original apostle of the Christian Church:

"For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but according to their own lusts, because they have itching ears, they will heap up for themselves teachers; and they will turn their ears away from the truth, and shall be turned aside to fables."

Fables.

The notion that a court can change the sin of sodomy into a substitute for marriage is a dangerous, destructive fable.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

Apple, FBI and a new slavery

I was recently on a speaking tour in the Dakotas and was asked the question, “What relevance does the FBI/Apple issue have with the Fourth Amendment?”

As I attempt and answer, keep in mind I rely on my iPhone for my Constitutional work all over the country and I am currently using it now if you are watching my video column this week.

The Fourth Amendment clearly defines individual privacy limits on the government, stating that government may not conduct any searches without a warrant, and such warrants must be issued by a judge and based on probable cause.

Apple’s General Counsel Bruce Sewell delivered the following statement to Congress this week:

“The FBI has asked a Court to order us to give them something we don’t have. To create an operating system that does not exist – because it would be too dangerous. They are asking for a backdoor into the iPhone – specifically to build a software tool that can break the encryption system, which protects personal information on every iPhone.”

Now just in case you fall for the thought that this would only be used on this isolated phone and case, Sewell continues:

“District Attorney Vance has also said he would absolutely plan to use this on over 175 phones. We can all agree this is not about access to just one iPhone?”

So just what is FBI asking Apple to do from a technical

standpoint?

Well, weaken the security of every iPhone user. Hackers and cyber criminals could use this to wreak havoc on our privacy and personal safety. It would set a dangerous precedent for government intrusion on the privacy and safety of its citizens.

Carson, Rubio, and Cruz disagree with Apple's stance, and they have the right to be wrong, because they are!

Perhaps the aspiring presidents have not considered the Thirteenth Amendment, which explicitly prevents "involuntary servitude". Neither an individual, nor corporation owned by individuals, can be forced into the service of another unless he/she/they have committed a crime.

Apple has committed no crime and lets be unmistakably clear, they have no software that can break the encryption system. For Government to compel Apple to invent and then build something that does not exist is claiming they not only own their labor, but also their intellect. This is an oppression that goes beyond chattel slavery, which only owns one's labor; this coercion is claiming ownership of one's intellect, transcending the bounds of slavery, pushing it into a realm that has never been practiced!

If Government is allowed to do this to a private company owned by individuals then soon to come, on this slippery slope, Big Brother will force individuals to do their bidding. Some may make the assertion that it is back to the plantations for Americans.

However, a glimmer of hope may be found. The propensity of Americans for liberty is unquenchable because its source is God-given. My prayer and work is dedicated to keeping the God-ordained blessing of Government within its jurisdictional boundaries where it secures, not dictates, our individual rights.

Perhaps a better government solution to this very real threat of terrorism is securing our borders, securing the right to self defense found in the Second Amendment, and for America's sake, stop being scared to label Islamic terrorists what they have labeled themselves: terrorists and haters of America.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Bernie Sanders, the "legal" criminal

Imagine you and I are strolling down the street one fine day on our way to have a nice lunch and we come across a woman who is truly destitute. She needs many things including food to feed her baby. Imagine also that you just cashed a check and you know, and I know, that you have \$200.00 in your pocket.

Now imagine that I decide that you should give the \$200.00 dollars to the woman. (Remember, she is truly needy.) So I take out my handgun and I order you, at gunpoint, to turn over the \$200.00 to the woman.

Not wanting your brains splattered all over the street, you comply, but it's not over. Let's just say that I am so moved by this woman's situation that I order you to come to my house tomorrow and the next day and every day until you die and give me more money so that I can provide for her and her children and her grandchildren indefinitely. Furthermore, I make it clear to you that if you do not do as I command, I will use force against you and your loved ones.

Of course, if I behaved this way toward you, I would be acting criminally because I have no right to force you to part with your property even if the cause is a worthy one. The question then becomes, would this action on my part be legal and righteous if it was done not just by me, but collectively? Let's say, everybody on the whole street agrees that we should take your money and give it to the needy woman. Is there any moral principle that makes COLLECTIVE force acceptable when the use of force INDIVIDUALLY would be a crime?

The answer is, of course, no.

Now since men are fallen creatures and work is required for making a profit it will naturally occur to some that it may take less effort to steal the profit that other individuals earn rather than to take the time and expend the effort to earn profit for themselves. Unfortunately people will tend to do this so long as the effort and risk are minimal.

Tragically those we trust with authority have the same fallen nature with the same temptation to steal and it is both common and natural that they will invent "laws" which allow them to steal the profit and the substance of others by means of the very laws they have created.

Let's be clear, this is exactly what Bernie Sanders desires to impose on America. In contradiction to your charitable giving, the spoils of Bernie's plunder will be awarded to whomever he decides.

What are the consequences of such a perversion? In the first place, it erases from everyone's conscience the distinction between justice and injustice. When law and morality contradict each other, the citizen has the cruel alternative of either losing his moral sense or losing his respect for the law. These two evils are of equal consequence.

Out of our love of our Country and for the honor of God, we must weed out the evil of socialism... first in our own

thinking, and then, in our civil government.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Scalia and what The Supreme Court is not

With the recent passing of Justice Antonin Scalia, America is truly bereaved of one of her greatest defenders of justice.

Justice Scalia was a historic jurist, an exceptional legal scholar, and a stalwart defender of the Constitution as it was written by our founders.

The “crisis” being spoken of now is who will the next Supreme Court Justice be, and if he isn’t nominated by a Republican, will that sabotage America as we know it?

Regardless of what party nominates the justices – this problem with the judiciary declaring evil to be good and good to be evil will not be remedied, adjudicated, or fixed in the courts. It is unfortunate but I feel Americans have a great deal of evidence to believe the courts are the traffickers of injustice and immorality in this nation. In my lifetime alone America has experienced horrific consequences by its obeisance to Supreme Court opinions. For example:

- Millions of Americans have been murdered, ripped limb from limb in the womb.
- The American family unit has been assaulted by the perversion of homosexual marriage.

- Students have been harassed and coerced into learning without prayer, singing without Christ, and extra curricular activities with no Bible.
- Once penalized by government for an unlawful action, now Americans are being fined for the inaction of not having government-approved healthcare.

How do we end such an epidemic trend? The Bible queries, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

To start, Christians, constitutionalists, and "so-called" conservatives need to recognize there is no federal government solution to our nation's malady. Rather, our solution is found in restoring our Biblical American view of government found right in the Organic Law of our country, the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration clearly recognizes there is a God; that our rights come from Him; and that civil government, as His servant (and ours) is limited to protecting our rights.

For the purpose of securing our rights, the Constitution grants lawmaking power only to Congress and NOT to the courts, not even the Supreme Court.

You see, Article One, Section One – the very first sentence of the Constitution – says this: "All legislative power herein granted is vested in a Congress..."

So, if all federal lawmaking power is in Congress, then how much is left over for the courts?

The answer, of course, is zero.

Under our Constitution, courts render opinions in cases and controversies that come before them, they do not make laws.

Scalia understood that the courts do not make laws and have absolutely no law-making power. Yet, through so-called "Judicial Supremacy" the federal courts claim to be the lone and final arbiter of what is constitutional and what is not.

So what is the justification for this subversion? They claim the “Supremacy Clause,” found in Article 6, paragraph 2, of the Constitution. But in reading this article we find no mention of the Supreme or any federal court. We do find, however, it is the Constitution itself that has supremacy.

Thomas Jefferson wrote extensively against this judicial tyranny. He stated in a letter to William Jarvis in 1820, “You seem . . . to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions; a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy.”

You see the Constitutional authority of the courts is to apply the laws of Congress. But ask yourself the question, “How can the courts enforce a law that Congress hasn’t made?”

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

Obama’s \$4 trillion federal budget with morphine provision

While many people in America may have been distracted by Cam Newton’s mystifying two-minute defeat interview, and Beyoncé’s “Black Panther” shuffle, Americans were strategically set up again.

Over Super Bowl weekend, President Barack Obama was working on his new \$4 trillion budget set to be released on Tuesday’s New

Hampshire primary, which will likely ensure it gets minimal attention.

WASHINGTON (AP) reported, "Typically these type of budgets are released on a Monday, but White House press secretary Josh Earnest says Tuesday's release allowed hard-working administration employees and journalists a chance to watch the Super Bowl."

"The 2017 budget for the fiscal year beginning Oct. 1 will combine proposals for new spending on infrastructure, education and combating opioid abuse with tax increases on corporations and wealthy individuals to keep deficits down. This will avoid proposing cuts to popular programs like Medicare, student loans or food stamps."

Big Government Morphine economic solutions sound like a broken record, making statements such as: "We can't cut Medicare, student loans, or food stamps," or, "We have to increase taxes on corporations and successful Americans that generate wealth in our country."

The temptation to covetousness is a very real sin to humanity and to the Constitution of We the People of the United States.

You see, stealing from certain socio-economic groups to provide for other socio-economic groups is, and always has been, sinful and destructive to the soul of man and any nation.

The Bible states unequivocally, "You shall do no injustice in judgment; you shall not be partial to the POOR nor defer to the great, but you are to judge your neighbor fairly."

Seeing as the Bible is the source of authority for law in American Jurisprudence, I would say our economic policies are in a perilous position – which will bring retribution from the divine Author of Rights.

Thomas Jefferson forewarned us, "Congress has not unlimited powers to provide for the general welfare, but only those specifically enumerated."

Our Founders understood this, which is why Article One, Section Eight, of the Constitution enumerates no powers to the federal government to redistribute wealth.

With no lawful authority this redistribution of wealth becomes an exercise of breaking the law, the crime being "legal plunder," a term coined by French economist Frederick Bastiat.

What is the consequence? We create a society addicted to the morphine of government entitlements, and once authorized we become too stoned to pursue a virtuous solution.

Morphine is a treatment used to help certain "so-called" heroin addicted people. The morphine acts as a substitution for the coveted drug, heroin.

For the sake of the comparison, lets call "heroin" the addiction of Americans who sinfully desire what does not belong to them. "Morphine," or unauthorized entitlements, becomes the solution. Utilizing sympathy for the poor, emotional pleas for the less fortunate, and empathy for people who are not rich, the federal government treacherously steals wealth, property and the ability to pursue happiness from most Americans and instead gives the "morphine" of entitlement to addicted people among their ranks.

The legendary Robin Hood solved this problem by recovering from government what it had stolen and then redistributing it to those who were victimized.

I believe our solution is much more simple than the bow-and-arrow tactics of our friend from Sherwood Forest. We must reinvigorate Americans with the morality of a Biblically harnessed government and we sure could use your help to do this.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved

The snowstorm secured our rights

I am sure you have been made aware of the recent great news for limited government. A record-breaking snowstorm hit the Washington, D.C., area this past weekend, with more than 75 million people on the east coast feeling the impact of this weather phenomenon.

How does this translate into good news and limited government? Well, the weather forced the federal government to shut down all its offices; Senate will not be returning until Wednesday; and the House will not return until next week!

It appears Divine Providence has given the American people a rest from additional regulations to their liberties.

Government and their parasitical bureaucracies have often strangled, suffocated, and murdered priceless, divinely-born rights.

Let me explain. Imagine that you recently contracted with the security company USGOV to employ a guard to secure your estate and possessions. You give specific directives that are specifically written out and signed by the company and yourself (i.e. U.S. Constitution). With your possessions secured (i.e. unalienable rights) and your house in order, you take an extended business trip to acquire new opportunities

for your personal enterprise. By much labor and exertion you successfully secure the opportunities you sought and are delighted to return to the security of your personal residence (i.e. private property).

When you arrive, you find all of your priceless family heirlooms have been sold and in their place are new USGOV articles of propaganda. Your personal office, livingroom, and bedrooms have become occupied by USGOV security officers who quickly escort you out of the home into your son's tree fort where you notice 3 or 4 of your belongings necessary for living. Before the agents leave your new residence, they inform you that all the locks have been changed on your doors, and that the security company and its many subsidiary agencies have claimed your assets. However, for an annual fee, they have made them available to you. In order to continue to protect you, they make you aware of the personal tracking system they have placed in your USGOV issued cell phone. Lastly, you are informed of a daily updated list regulating acceptable uses of your former assets that you now rent.

You would likely be perplexed, astonished, and perhaps thrilled at the prospect of the USGOV taking a day off.

Thankfully, the Divine Author of our rights never takes a day off. Our rights are, in the words of Founding Father and President John Adams, "Antecedent to all earthly governments; rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws; rights derived from the Great Legislator of the Universe."

Drawing on the example given by the Great Legislator, there was one branch of Federal Government that maintained its work through the weekend's tumultuous weather. You could find them at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the oldest active infantry unit in the U.S. Army, the 3rd U.S. Infantry Regiment (The Old Guard). A tweet this weekend resounded:

I will guard everything within the limits of my post and quit

my post only when properly relieved.

Like the heroic Old Guard Sentries, “The Laws of Nature and Nature’s God” have been obligated by the benevolent hand of Providence to be a guard of our individual rights, never taking a day off.

Following these examples, don’t let your rights atrophy for lack of exercise. Government is not God and we are not born slaves. Take your post of vigilance that liberty would perpetuate in TRUTH and may posterity bless your name.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his “Institute on the Constitution” and receive your free gift.

2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved