

Hitler Never Pulled the Trigger: His Subordinates Said That They Were Just Doing Their Job



Bradlee Dean

“Every law consistent with the Constitution will have been made in pursuance of the powers granted by it. Every usurpation or law repugnant to it cannot have been made in pursuance of its powers. The latter will be nugatory and void.” ([Thomas Jefferson](#), Elliot, p. 4:187-88).

On Nov. 20, 1945, the Nuremberg Trials began, bringing Hitler’s Nazi criminals to justice. By this time, several countries were destroyed, and 50 million people, 2.5 percent of the world’s population, lost their lives – including 12 million Jews, German dissidents, Gypsies, political opposition, intellectuals and others who were exterminated in Nazi concentration camps.

The world watched in horror as the courtroom filled with Nazi criminals watched video footage of famished men, women and children who were mercilessly shot, starved and/or tortured, and then thrown carelessly into mass graves, all because they did not fall in line with the ideology of a monstrous dictator named Adolf Hitler (John 10:10).

During the opening of the court proceedings, it is important

to note that the prosecutor said, "The laws of God and man have been violated (Exodus 18:16), and the guilty must not go unpunished."

I have a question for you, who was responsible for doing Adolph Hitler's murderous biddings? Hitler didn't pull the trigger, his subordinates did. The criminals attempted to divert attention from their own murderous hands with the retort that they "were just doing their job."

I am here to tell you that they were not just doing their job, for if they were they would have dealt with Adolph Hitler in resisting him and his tyrannical regime's directives. If it weren't for them following blindly behind Hitler, the country of Germany and its people would have been spared (Proverbs 14:12).

If they were truly doing their duty, they would have thrown off Adolph Hitler, not the German constitution in upholding the law that would in fact condemn Adolph Hitler and his Third Reich (Deuteronomy 25:1).

[Are We as Asleep as the Germans in the '30s?](#)

[[YouTube Video](#)]

[[YouTube Video](#)]

Let's take it now to America. In a time of propaganda and fear that is being pushed on the people, many are speculating if this government is going to roll out into martial law. We are hearing much of executive orders coming out from the President as well as Governors and Mayor's across the country.

What is an executive order, and are they constitutional?

[United States presidents](#) issue **executive orders** to help officers and agencies of the [executive branch](#) manage the

operations within the federal government itself. Executive orders have the full force of law (Enumerated laws found within the United States Constitution) when they take authority from a legislative power which grants its power directly to the Executive by the Constitution, or are made pursuant to [Acts of Congress](#) (The representatives of the American people) that explicitly delegate to the President some degree of discretionary power ([delegated legislation](#)). Like both legislative statutes and regulations promulgated by government agencies, executive orders are subject to judicial review (Not by them that want to interpret what common sense laws state. Nor are judges there to judge the standard by which they are judged by), and may be struck down if deemed by the courts to be unsupported by statute or the Constitution.

There is NO [constitutional](#) provision nor statute that explicitly permits executive orders. The term executive power [Article II](#), Section 1, [Clause 1](#) of the Constitution, refers to the title of President as the executive. He is instructed therein by the declaration "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed" made in Article II, Section 3, [Clause 5](#) or face impeachment. Most executive orders use these Constitutional reasonings as the authorization allowing for their issuance to be justified as part of the President's sworn duties, the intent being to help direct officers of the U.S. Executive carry out their delegated duties as well as the normal operations of the federal government: the consequence of failing to comply possibly being the removal from office.

An executive order of the President must find support in the Constitution, either in a clause granting the president specific power, or by a delegation of power by Congress to the president.

Consider firstly that the Declaration of Independence, the

Preamble or the seed bed to the US Constitution:

"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..."

[[YouTube Video](#)]

With that said, it is the job of the President, the Governors, the Mayor's, the military men and the police to uphold the enumerated laws found in the US Constitution, not to tear them down in obedience to a dictator. Those that represent us...

"shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States." - Article 2, Section 3, US Constitution

"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States." -Article 6, Section 2, US Constitution

It is not their job to take unconstitutional orders, and if that were to happen, it is their duty and obligation to stand against and resist such an order in dealing with the domestic enemies even if it is the President, The Governors, The Mayors etc. If the laws are upheld the innocent will not be violated.

Furthermore, our said representatives cannot violate anyone if no one is going to violate the law for them. In fact it then puts them into position to be removed and charged for the crime (Article 2 section 4- Article 1 section 3 clause 7 US

Constitution)

Too often, we have seen representatives in government capacity that have been entrusted with power turn and violate the laws which they swore to uphold (Romans 13:3).

[[YouTube Video](#)]

Our founding forefathers and architects made bold and clear statements in our founding documents as to what they defined as to what could and couldn't be done by those who represented us.

"Unlimited power is apt to corrupt the minds of those who possess it; and this I know, my lords: that where the law ends, tyranny begins." -William Pitt

Therefore, if the [executive order is not congruent with the United States Constitution, then it is simply "null and void," period](#). There is no judicial interpretation, no compromise nor debate.

Why? It is because neither this nor any other administration has the power nor the authority to act out of their scope of authority.

"All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void." (Marbury vs. Madison, 1803.)

"Every law consistent with the Constitution will have been made in pursuance of the powers granted by it. Every usurpation or law repugnant to it cannot have been made in pursuance of its powers. The latter will be nugatory and void." ([Thomas Jefferson](#), Elliot, p. 4:187-88.)

"...the laws of Congress are restricted to a certain sphere, and when they depart from this sphere, they are no longer supreme or binding. In the same manner, the states have certain independent power, in which their laws are supreme." ([Alexander Hamilton](#), Elliot, 2:362.)

"This Constitution, as to the powers therein granted, is constantly to be the supreme law of the land... It is not the supreme law in the exercise of a power not granted."([William Davie](#), Pennsylvania, p. 277

"It will not, I presume, have escaped observation that it expressly confines the supremacy to laws made pursuant to the Constitution" ([Alexander Hamilton](#), concerning the supremacy clause *The Federalist Papers*, #33.)

"There is no position which depends on clearer principles than that every act of a delegated authority, contrary to the commission under which it is exercised, is void. No legislative act, therefore, contrary to the Constitution, can be valid." ([Alexander Hamilton](#), *The Federalist Papers*, #78.)

It is a lesson we all best learn before we end up destroying ourselves like that of Germany in the 1930s (Numbers 32:23) with a book similarly written called a book of Lamentations.

Article posted with permission from [Sons of Liberty Media](#)