The Sovereignty Project - Updated

1/27/2024
Interrogative Imperative Institute
Dr. Anab Whitehouse

The Sovereignty Project – page 3
Principles of Sovereignty: Food For Thought – page 13
Free Books of Possible Interest – page 20

What is the nature of a person's obligation or duty today with respect to the Constitutional arrangements that were initiated through the Philadelphia Convention of 1787 and which were further realized by means of the ratification conventions that were held during the several years following the foregoing gathering in Philadelphia? The only honest and defensible answer is: None.

The 1787 Constitutional Convention was entirely extra-legal. In other words, not only did those proceedings fail to abide by -- as well as went beyond -- the provisions and requirements inherent in the Articles of Confederation but, in addition, the 1787 meetings in Philadelphia generated a document which sought to supplant those Articles in a manner that was not recognized as being an expression of the rule of law that had been established by means of the Articles of Confederation.

Of course, one might note in passing, that the aforementioned Articles of Confederation were provisions for governance that had not been agreed to by the American people either, but, instead, those principles constituted a system of power that was imposed on the general colonial populations that, under the control of vested financial and political interests, were turning themselves into self-proclaimed sovereign states that ruled over populations according to the likes and dislikes of a group of political elites with entrenched interests. Both the Articles of Confederation and the 1787 Constitution were arbitrary ways of organizing a system of governance, and this quality of self-serving arbitrariness is just one of the factors which tend to undermine anyone's attempt to claim that the 1787 Philadelphia Constitution and associated ratification conventions possess any sort of moral authority over the people of the United States.

The 1787 Philadelphia Convention, along with the ensuing ratification conventions, served as the Trojan horse through which a coup of the American people was engineered. Indeed, many tricks were played on the American people by way of the ratification process (For example, read Pauline Maier's work: *Ratification*), and this all resulted in a "way of power" taking control of the United States rather than resulting in the founding of a republic which, according to Ben Franklin, supposedly had been established … if we could keep it, and, as it turns out, almost from the very beginning, the republic has been lost.

The claims of the foregoing paragraphs are stated as declarative sentences. However, the arguments and evidence in support of those claims can be found in a number of books (e.g., *Beyond Democracy*, *Quest for Sovereignty*, *Sovereignty and the Constitution*, *Sovereignty: A Play in Three Acts*, as well as *The People Amendments*) that have been written and which are available for free at https://www.billwhitehouse.com/press.htm .)

The primary means through which the American people are currently attached to the Constitution is by an array of stick-and-carrot inducements that are applied in the form of: Judicial force, political force, economic force, religious force, educational

force, corporate force, media force, institutional force, military force, medical force, and/or the force of incarceration. One is required to comply with the so-called "rule of law" that has official oversight concerning behavior in the United States not because anyone (including lawyers, jurists, or politicians) can plausibly or justifiably demonstrate why the people of today have an indisputable duty and obligation to subjugate themselves to the alleged rule of law that was set loose in 1787, but, rather, one is required to comply with the legal fiction known as the "rule of law" because, if one does not do as one is told, one is likely to become the focus of the way of power's inclination to resolve all of its problems via violence of one kind or another (i.e., force) instead of by means of critical reasoning, fairness, character, and a recognition that all human beings have an inherent sovereignty that cannot be abrogated by any form of governance.

America does not operate in accordance with the rule of law but via the rule of force. Indeed, the notion of the rule of law is just a euphemistic cover-story which is intended to veil the wielding of violent power, and this has been true since the founding of America.

In response to the foregoing considerations, the ensuing discussion will be restricted to topics and issues concerning the First, Ninth, and Tenth Amendments. In addition, the provisions of Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution will be critically reflected upon … at least to a degree.

To begin with, we will assume – for the sake of argument – that the 1787 Philadelphia Constitution, along with the Bill of Rights, has some sort of moral claim on the people of today. What follows is a brief overview which indicates that almost nothing that is being done today within the halls of American governance can be reconciled with the original Philadelphia document and its first ten amendments.

Therefore, even if there were some dimension of the 1787 Constitution plus the Bill of Rights that had a moral claim on our allegiance (and, as individuals such as Lysander Spooner and others have pointed out, there is no such dimension), nonetheless, what has been transpiring in government for the last 236 years, or so, has no demonstrable moral or constitutional standing and, consequently, cannot be justified or defended as a basis for governance of sovereign individuals. What is being presented here are just a few of the most important considerations which, for those who are willing to take the time, can be explored in more detail via the list of books that were mentioned previously.

Let's start the discussion by taking a look at the judiciary. For instance, there is nothing in the 1787 Constitution which entitles or requires that the members of the judiciary should be the ones who determine what the Constitution, or any of its amendments, means. One cannot possibly have three equal but separate branches of government as long as only one of those branches gets to say what the Constitution supposedly means.

The Constitution indicates that power is to be invested in the judiciary in conjunction with all cases of law and equity that arise under: The Constitution; the

laws of the United States; treaties that are made; cases involving ambassadors, public ministers, consuls, as well as cases touching upon matters of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction. In addition, Constitutional power is invested in the judiciary to deal with cases of controversy involving: The United States; disputes between two, or more, states, or between a state and one or more citizens of another state, or between citizens of different states, as well as between a state or the citizens of a state and one, or more, foreign governments.

According to the Constitution, the judiciary shall have original jurisdiction with respect to those cases that concern ambassadors, public ministers, consuls, as well as states. In all other cases, the judiciary shall have appellate jurisdiction both with respect to fact and law unless some other kind of alternative arrangement is established through congressional action.

Given the foregoing guidelines, an appropriate question to ask is the following: Whether power is exercised through original or appellate jurisdiction, how is that power to be exercised? In other words, what principles should serve as the metric or standard for evaluating and deciding cases?

The only directional guidance that is given in the Constitution concerning the power of the judiciary is found in Article IV, Section 4 of that document. The aforementioned section stipulates that the United States government guarantees a republican form of government to the states and their citizens.

Republicanism was a moral philosophy that emerged during the Enlightenment. This philosophical perspective attracted a great deal of interest and many adherents among Americans throughout the 1700s. Republicanism required those individuals who wished to comply with that moral, philosophical framework to operate through principles of: Integrity, honesty, impartiality, humility, financial independence, objectivity, non-partisanship, honor, compassion, reason, judiciousness, egalitarianism, and a willingness to avoid circumstances in which one would be serving as a judge in matters that involved one's own causes.

The moral philosophy of republicanism was at the heart of a revolutionary approach to the idea of governance that was being discussed in the homes, taverns, and tea houses throughout the colonies. Under republicanism, government officials would be required to act in accordance with the moral principles that were at the heart of that philosophical orientation.

In other words, republicanism required that those with political authority could not conduct themselves according to their own personal likes, dislikes, and/or interests as, generally, had been the case in most political environments throughout history. Instead, public officials would be required to abide by a set of moral principles that actually would serve the public rather than the self-serving machinations of government officials. (If interested, one can learn more about the origins, development and impact which republicanism had on colonists with respect to their way of life in Gordon Wood's Pulitzer Prize-winning book: *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*).

Given the foregoing considerations, the power that is invested in the judiciary by the Constitution is predicated on the idea of acting in accordance with the principles of republicanism. As a result, the sole focus of the federal judiciary would be to ensure that the behavior of public officials – whether state or federal – which involved cases that came to the courts through original or appellate jurisdiction would be judged in accordance with the principles of republicanism that had been guaranteed to the states and the citizens of those states by the Constitution.

For members of the judiciary to busy themselves with discerning, or trying to discern, the meaning of the Constitution would be to engage in something that was antithetical to republicanism – namely, that the courts would be acting in a manner which involved the members of the judiciary serving as judges in their own causes. After all, whatever the meaning of the Constitution that was being advanced by members of the judiciary might be, such an interpretation would not give expression to anything but their own causes concerning their beliefs about the nature of the Constitution.

The possible meanings of the Constitution are not what should be the concern of the judiciary. Instead, what should have been at issue in any case before the judiciary is whether or not government officials had been complying with the moral requirements of republicanism that were constitutionally guaranteed to the people of the United States.

Consequently, the hundreds of books that contain judicial rulings concerning the alleged meanings as well as the decisions that established arbitrary precedents concerning such Constitutional meanings are, for the most part, null and void. The application of judicial power only extends to ensuring that the guarantee of republican government which is specified in Article IV, section 4 is being observed in the cases that the judiciary takes on through either original or appellate jurisdiction. Any other kind of judicial consideration or focus besides serving the requirements of the guarantee that is indicated in Article IV, section 4 is nothing but invented legal fictions that have no actual standing or authorization within the Constitution.

For 236 years, the judiciary has continually exercised a form of power – involving meanings and precedents that shift with assumptions, values, and beliefs – to which it is not constitutionally entitled. Moreover, like the Golum in J.R.R. Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* trilogy, once members of the judiciary put on the ring of power, they were reluctant to take that ring of power off irrespective of what the corrupting ramifications of that ring might be for them or for others.

Let's consider, for a moment, or so, the powers of Congress. For example, the First Amendment stipulates that: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof …" Although there might be many ways to talk about religion, in essence, religion appears to refer to any conceptual-emotional undertaking that seeks to determine – and, then, as a matter of duty or obligation, require one to act in accordance with -- what one

considers to be the truth concerning the nature of one's relationship with Being or Reality.

Notwithstanding the manner in which any given individual might conceive of the notion of a Divinity, religion doesn't require that individuals believe in such a notion. Religion is the existential orientation which generates one's sense of duty and obligation in relation to whatever it is that one considers the truth to be concerning the alleged nature of one's relationship to reality or ontology.

Although words such as: Economics, politics, law, physics, cosmology, philosophy, technology, psychology, morality, evolution, epistemology, education, mythology, history, and medicine are used as if they were referring to fields of study that are quite apart from the idea of religion, nonetheless, such a perspective does not really seem to be all that tenable. Each of the words which were mentioned earlier entails conceptual and methodological activities that purport to map out the alleged truth concerning the relationship between, on the one hand, individuals and, on the other hand, the nature of reality.

Furthermore, the sub-text of those sorts of perspectives tends to be that one should act in a manner that reflects, or is consonant with, those alleged truths. Consequently, practices that pursue issues of truth and that entail a sense of obligation concerning those truths but which go by any name other than religion would not only smell as sweet but would, as well, tend to satisfy the essential conditions that constitute what makes a rose a rose or makes a religion a religion.

Therefore, any legislation that is introduced into Congress which seeks to induce citizens to pursue: A particular course of action, a set of policies, or a way of life that gives expression to what members of Congress believe to be the truth concerning the nature of an individual's relationship with Reality is a violation of the First Amendment. Such legislation is both an attempt to make laws "respecting the establishment of religion" – that is, to impose a conception of truth and obligation onto citizens -- as well as an attempt to "prohibit the free exercise thereof" in the case of individuals who do not agree with the notion of reality that is being proposed by government officials.

In light of the foregoing considerations, almost all legislation that has been introduced and passed by one congressional session or another across the 236-plus years of the American republic has been in violation of the First Amendment. In addition, if the judiciary had been doing the one job that its members actually had been authorized to do by the Constitution, then, over the years, the members of Congress would have told, time and time again, by the judiciary that Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution prohibits such congressional actions – that is, the members of Congress have been violating the guarantee of republicanism that had been given to the states and its citizens by the Constitution when Congress seeks to impose on citizens ideas which the members of Congress believe to be the nature of truth -- and, therefore, the source of obligation or duty -- because by passing such legislation the members of Congress are seeking to be judges in their own causes …

actions that are inconsistent with the moral philosophy of republicanism that has been guaranteed to the states and their people.

Congress is not free to do whatever it would like to do. Rather, the activities of Congress are constrained by the moral requirements of republican government that have been constitutionally vouchsafed to the states and their citizens and, as well, Congress is constrained by the very clear prohibitions that are stated in the opening part of the First Amendment concerning the establishment of religion or the prohibition of the free exercise thereof.

In addition, the Ninth Amendment indicates that "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny and disparage others retained by the people." Yet, for 236 years, Congress, the judiciary, as well as the states (and state judiciaries) have been denying and disparaging the rights that are retained by the people even if such rights are not specifically enumerated in the Constitution but, as noted above are alluded to by the word: "others" – that is, other rights – in the text of the Ninth Amendment.

For example, considerations of health, education, sovereignty, conscription, and religion are not among the enumerated rights that have been accorded to Congress. Therefore, every attempt by Congress to introduce legislation concerning such issues constitutes an attempt to deny and disparage the unenumerated rights of the people that are entailed by the Ninth Amendment.

Moreover, when state governments, via their legislatures and judiciaries, seek to co-opt issues involving, for example, health, education, sovereignty, conscription, and/or religion, then, state governments also are engaged in acts which seek to deny and disparage the unenumerated rights of the people. For example, the Tenth Amendment indicates that: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." Consequently, the Tenth Amendment clearly indicates that states are not the only ones with Constitutional standing with respect to powers that have not been delegated to the United States, nor prohibited by the Constitution to the states. If this were not the case, then, there would have been no point for Roger Sherman to add the phrase "or to the people" to the original wording of that amendment.

In addition, seeking to withhold Constitutional standing from the people in conjunction with the sorts of powers being alluded to in the Tenth Amendment, would be another way of trying to deny and disparage the unenumerated rights of the people. After all, citizens have a right – unenumerated though it might be -- to have access to the sorts of reserved, but unspecified, powers being alluded to in the Tenth Amendment which would enable those individuals to be able to actively realize their unenumerated rights under the Ninth Amendment.

The guarantee that is present in Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution not only requires the judiciary to ensure that all members of the federal government are acting in accordance with the moral principles of republicanism, but the array of

cases which the judiciary has been given power to engage via Article III, section 2 of the Constitution indicates that the judiciary has the authority to ensure that cases involving states and citizens will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the moral philosophy of republicanism as well. Consequently, for the last 236 years, the federal judiciary should have been actively restraining state governments from denying and decrying the unenumerated rights of citizens as well as actively upholding the Constitutional standing of the people concerning those powers that have not been delegated to the United States nor prohibited to the states and which, therefore, have been "reserved to the states respectively, or to the people."

Unfortunately, for some 236 years, the federal judiciary has, by and large, failed in its fiduciary responsibilities to the citizens of America when it comes to the issue of ensuring that no branch of government, whether federal or state, denies and disparages the unenumerated rights of individual citizens. Furthermore, the judiciary has also failed to actively protect the Constitutional standing of individual citizens by reminding the federal and state actors in the cases before them about the unspecified, reserved powers that have not been delegated to the United States nor prohibited to the states or to the people.

Article IV, section 4 also requires the United States to protect the states against invasion. Yet, despite the fact that corporations were an anathema to the colonialists who were engaging in a revolution against not only England but the activities of the East India Company, nonetheless, the judiciary and members of Congress have enabled corporations to invade the lives of people and to acquire substantial influence, if not control, over the lives of those citizens.

Corporations are legal fictions. Legal fictions are arbitrary ways that the courts invent in order to, supposedly, solve legal problems, with a wink and a nod, that could not be resolved if one were to abide by the law as it is written.

Corporations exist as a result of charters that give expression to a limited and temporary set of permissions which are granted by governments, and such charters set forth the understandings that are supposed to regulate the existence of those temporary and limited entities. However, starting with the '*Dartmouth College v. Woodward*' decision handed down in 1819 by the Marshall Court (a decision that the judiciary was not constitutionally authorized to make), corporations began to be treated as entities that had a form of life which had contractual rights independent of whatever charter permissions existed.

As a result, via the '*Dartmouth College v Woodward*' decision, the first will-'o-the-wisp apparition of the corporation as a shadowy, person-like entity with certain constitutional protections was, like Frankenstein's monster, given life. One might note in passing that John Marshall had an array of corporate entanglements in his legal past which induced him to look on corporations with favor and, therefore, aside from the fact that the Court had no authority to interpret the Constitution's meaning, he also was violating Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution in the '*Dartmouth College v Woodward*' decision because he was rendering a decision that

allowed him to serve as a judge in his own cause – namely, his favorable opinion concerning the existence of corporations.

Corporations have no reality other than the fictional narrative or legal fiction that has been unconstitutionally assigned to them by the judiciary. Consequently, when the judiciary fails to observe its fiduciary responsibilities to the states and the people under Article IV, section 4, then, corporations are allowed to become person-like entities with rights rather than being restricted to being mere charters with limited and temporary permissions that, under the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, are subservient to the unenumerated rights and powers of the people, as well as the unspecified powers of the states.

Every policy of federal and state governments that seeks to deny and disparage the unenumerated rights of the people under the Ninth Amendment constitutes an act of violence against the people. As such, these acts violate Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution because the United States government is supposed to protect the states and their people against all forms of domestic violence, and, yet, neither the legislature nor the executive will make an application to the judiciary to protect the people in this regard, nor does the judiciary, on the authority of its own original jurisdiction, serve as protectors of, and advocates for, the unenumerated rights of the people under the Ninth Amendment.

Finally, the Executive branch of the United States is also constrained by the guarantee of republican government inherent in Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution. This means that whatever: Executive Orders, fast-tracked treaties, calls for martial law, national security directives, intelligence operations, and/or security classification schemes that are initiated, knowingly or unknowingly, through the Office of the President, or the President's representatives, all of the foregoing practices must (according to the guarantee of the Constitution) be in compliance with the principles to which the moral philosophy of republicanism gives expression.

The judiciary has original jurisdiction when it comes to the behavior of ambassadors, public officials, and consuls as well as cases in which states are involved. With respect to the issue of original jurisdiction, the Supreme Court does not have to be referred cases by lower courts to be able to investigate the conduct of federal employees but has the authority to do so without any such request in order to determine whether ambassadors, officials, consuls, and states are conducting themselves in accordance with the provisions of Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court has rarely exercised its fiduciary responsibility in matters of original jurisdiction when it comes to ensuring that ambassadors, public officials, consuls, and states are complying with the moral requirements of republican philosophy that are guaranteed to the states and the people by Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution. As a result, the CIA, the FBI, the NSA, the military, the IRS, the NIH, the CDC, the FDA, and an array of intelligence agencies associated with different departments in the federal government have

never been called to task for a multiplicity of breaches concerning the aforementioned Constitutional guarantee.

All branches and departments of the federal government as well as the branches and departments of many states have colluded, if not conspired, with one another to try to prevent the people from truly understanding: (1) the nature of the obligations that government officials have under the principles of the moral philosophy of republicanism which have been guaranteed to the states and their people in Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution; (2) the constraints involving religion that restrict the legislative activities of Congress under the First Amendment, and (3) the unenumerated and unspecified rights and powers that have been extended to the people through the Ninth and Tenth Amendments respectively.

However, as remiss as federal and state governments have been in attending to their fiduciary responsibilities to the people for 236 years, the people, themselves, have not made the effort or taken the time to properly understand the nature of the circumstances, opportunities, rights, and powers that have the potential to enable the people to realize their own sovereignty quite independently of federal and state governments. Neither the federal nor state governments have the Constitutional standing to deny and disparage the unenumerated rights and reserved, yet unspecified, powers of the Ninth and Tenth Amendments respectively, but people are going to have to actively seek the realization of such unenumerated rights and unspecified powers because, as history has clearly demonstrated, federal and state officials tend to become drunk on the power and rights that have been usurped from the people and, as a result, such officials will resist the people taking back what has belonged to the latter individuals since the amended Constitution came into existence in 1791.

Seeking the realization of unenumerated rights and unspecified powers is not a call for anarchy but a demand for sovereignty. Sovereignty is not about the unrestrained exercise of freedom that some libertarians might suppose is the case but, rather, sovereignty is about having the protected opportunity to seek to discover and realize the nature of one's essential nature.

Sovereignty is about decentralization of power rather than the centralization of power. However, sovereignty is also about ensuring that such decentralized power is capable of protecting everyone's opportunity to realize their unenumerated rights and unspecified powers in a manner that is mutually consonant with one another.

One way of engaging the foregoing issues can be accessed for free through https://www.billwhitehouse.com . Just go toward the bottom of that web page and click on the link entitled "Sovereignty".

In whatever manner the foregoing issues are tackled, there is going to have to be some sort of institutional medium or dynamic through which people can come together to have an opportunity to explore, discuss, formulate, and actuate possible ways of resolving those matters. Whether this is in the form of grand jury-like bodies or is in the form of some kind of healing-circles, or in the form of some other

alternative possibility, the institutional format or dynamic will be independent of federal and state governments but, at the same time, will have to find ways of working with those levels of governance.

The federal and state governments can help people with the sovereignty project. Nonetheless, those forms of governance cannot solve the challenges that are entailed by that project.

The sovereignty challenge can only be resolved by the people themselves. That challenge cannot be resolved through: Voting, elected representation, or the activities of various branches of government but, instead, must be engaged by the people themselves through: Discussion, debate, critical reflection, constructive exercises of character, reciprocity, compromise, and fairness in conjunction with the aspirations of the participants.

It is not enough for people to speak about freedoms and liberties. The people must come together in an array of settings to actively engage in the difficult, nuanced work that is entailed by the challenge of developing an understanding about what freedom looks like – in actual lived terms – within the context of a multiplicity of people that are each seeking and have a right to conditions and principles of sovereignty being applied to their lives.

The current Constitution does not have to be jettisoned to accomplish the foregoing project. Nonetheless, constitutional provisions that are present in Article IV, section 4, along with the First Amendment's restrictions concerning the establishment or prohibition of religion by Congress, as well as the authority inherent in the Ninth and Tenth amendments concerning the sovereignty of the people must be acknowledged, honored, and judiciously protected as well as supported by federal and state forms of governance.

Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons, time is running out. If we, the people, do not act on the aforementioned sovereignty project soon, we might well lose the capacity to do so altogether or have that opportunity taken away from us by parties that have no interest in the people becoming truly sovereign.

Pursuit of the sovereignty project is the only way in which a sense of duty and obligation might arise in the context of the Constitution. Absent such a project, the potential of the Constitution that was introduced in 1787, ratified over the next several years, and amended in 1791, will continue to erode as it has been doing for the last 236 years.

If things continue on in the way they are going, then, at some point, a tipping point involving the American republic is going to be reached. When that happens, the promise and guarantee of abiding by the principles of republican moral philosophy will disappear and, as a result, complete tyranny or complete arbitrariness will reign.

We have a quickly evaporating opportunity to stop such a tipping point from taking place. The choice is ours, but without the establishment of an authentic sovereignty project, whatever decisions are made will come to nothing and our

choices will do nothing but increase the distance between our existential circumstances and the possibility of leading sovereign lives.

Principles of Sovereignty: Some Food For Thought

Many people - on all sides of the issue - have been consumed with the: 'Who', 'why', and 'how' of the events on 9/11, but some twenty-two years later those questions are not foremost on my mind. Instead, I am concerned with what the events of 9/11 have set in motion with respect to the systematic stripping of rights, freedoms, and sovereignty that occurred in relation to American citizens, not to mention the millions of individuals who were adversely affected elsewhere in the world due to the collateral damage that ensued due to the forces given expression through the events of 9/11.

Americans - as well as individuals and communities elsewhere in the world -- have been swindled out of sovereignty by an array of scoundrels both known and unknown. America has become a failed nation because none of its essential institutions -- such as the three branches of federal government, the military, the Federal Reserve Bank, the media, and academia -- have, for the most part, done anything to prevent tyranny, oppression, and injustice from conducting a blitzkrieg of America, as well as communities elsewhere in the world.

While the events of 9/11 helped pave the road to the foregoing sort of dissolution, the problem actually began more than 225 years ago with the coup d'etat that was set in motion in the summer of 1787 in Philadelphia when a group of people -- sometimes referred to as the 'Founding Fathers' or 'Framers' -- decided to swindle Americans out of the opportunity to work toward establishing something that was far better than a republic or a democracy. Those individuals helped to establish a republic, and, unfortunately, almost from the very beginning, they began to betray the idea of a republic by failing to live in accordance with the moral principles of republicanism that are at the heart of the form of governance that was manipulated into existence through the process of ratification by the 'Founding Fathers.'

From there, things went from bad to worse. The so-called 'Founding Fathers' -- especially James Madison who came up with the Virginia Plan that served as the template for the Constitution - were appalled by the idea of democracy because, among other things, that mode of government often tended to oppress minorities in order to appease majorities who were inclined to operate out of arbitrary, volatile perspectives. Indeed, it is important to understand that the mode of government known as a republic is not at all synonymous with the notion of a democracy ... representative or otherwise.

However, by the mid-to-late 1790s, democracy had overrun republicanism as the form of governance that became dominant in America, and one of the signs of this transition was the formation of political parties ... something that was actually inconsistent with the moral principles of republicanism (enshrined in Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution) that required people in government to be impartial, objective, and unbiased in their deliberations and, therefore, indicates that belonging to a political party constitutes a conflict of interest with the moral duties of someone in government as far as the political philosophy of republicanism is concerned.

Relevant to the foregoing considerations is something that might be referred to as: The *Anaconda Principle.* This notion refers to the way in which most, if not all, governments engage in a process of increasingly and progressively squeezing the political, emotional, spiritual, social, educational, economic, and physical life out of citizens over a period of time. More specifically, each time the citizenry exhales in relief from having survived some arbitrary, unjustified, problematic exercise in public policy that was imposed on those citizens by government, the coils of power become wrapped even more tightly about the people through the next round of arbitrary and unjustified policies that are leashed upon the people.

Since 9/11, we have witnessed the introduction of: The Patriot Act (2001 - plus its reauthorization in 2005 that made many of its provisions permanent); The John Warner Authorization Act (2006); the Military Commissions Act (2006); as well as the National Defense Authorization Acts of 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 and continuing on. In addition, there have been a slew of Executive Orders (e.g.,10990, 10995, 10997, 10998, 10999, 11000, 11001, 11002, 11003, 11004, 11005, 11921, and more) that authorize the government to control virtually every aspect of American society whenever the government deems this to be appropriate.

The Anaconda Principle is being applied ever more rigorously and persistently to the American people. In the process whatever constructive elements of republicanism and democracy that still were hanging on for dear life after several hundred years of abuse have been squeezed, for the most part, from political existence.

The following set of principles outline a possible social/political framework of self-governance that goes beyond the possibilities inherent in tyrannies, republics, and democracies. The time for change is upon us, and I believe that the kind of change to which I am alluding - monumental though it might be - can be accomplished peacefully and without violence.

I invite you to reflect on the principles of sovereignty that are briefly noted below. Then, I invite you to reflect on the form of governance in existence today and compare it with the principles of sovereignty.

Sovereignty does not require force. It requires the broadening and deepening of understanding concerning the human condition, and when understood, sovereignty has a natural appeal to human beings because it reflects something that is integral to their own identity and sense of being human.

There is a significant difference between, on the one hand, the ways of republicanism, democracy or power and, on the other hand, the way of sovereignty. We each have a duty of care to carefully and critically reflect on the nature of the choices we might make with respect to the foregoing possibilities.

The following principles are in response to a question that someone once asked me - namely, "What is sovereignty?"

(1) Sovereignty is indigenous to, and inherent in, the potential of human beings. It is not derived from society or governments but, in fact, exists prior to, and independently of, the formation of society and governments.

(2) Sovereignty is the right to realize essential identity and constructive potential in ways that are free from techniques of undue influence (which seek to push or pull individuals in directions that are antithetical to the realization of sovereignty) but, as well, in ways that do not infringe on the like rights of others.

(3) Sovereignty entails the human capacity (and corresponding duties of care) to be able to push back the horizons of ignorance concerning the nature of reality.

(4) Sovereignty encompasses the right to the quality of food, shelter, clothing, education, and medical care that are minimally necessary to realize identity and constructive potential through the process of pushing back the horizons of ignorance.

(5) Sovereignty is rooted in the duties of care that are owed to others to ensure that those sovereignty rights are established, protected, and nurtured.

(6) Sovereignty is the right to choose how to engage the dynamics of: 'neither control, nor be controlled'.

(7) Sovereignty entails establishing local councils that constructively promote and develop principles of sovereignty and, if necessary, those councils would help mediate disputes that arise along the boundary dynamics involving the principle of: 'Neither control nor be controlled'. The composition, selection, and nature of the council would be similar to that of a grand jury.

In other words, council members would not be elected but chosen through an agreed-upon random-like process and, then, subject to a vetting process to determine the suitability of a given individual for taking on the responsibilities of the aforementioned council ... much like prospective jurors go through a voir dire process. In addition, the length of service would be for a limited time (6 months to a year) before new members would be selected through the sort of non-manipulated manner and vetting process that was noted earlier. Like a grand jury, the members of a local sovereignty council would be empowered to investigate whatever issues and problems seem relevant, but, unlike a grand jury, that council would have the authority to research issues, subpoena witnesses, and present their results directly to the community for further deliberation without having to go through the office of a prosecutor or attorney general.

(8) Sovereignty is the responsibility of individuals to work toward realizing their own individual sovereignty within a collective context that gives expression to the idea of sovereignty being writ large for the community as a whole.

(9) Sovereignty is rooted in economic activity that serves the principles of sovereignty, not vice versa. Corporations should be permitted to exist only as temporary charter arrangements devoid of any claims of personhood and they should be designed to serve specific purposes of value to both individual and collective sovereignty. Whatever profits accrue from corporate activity should be shared with the communities in which the corporation operates.

(10) The constructive value of money is a function of its role in advancing the principles of sovereignty for everyone. The destructive value of money is a function of the way it undermines, corrupts, and obstructs the principles of sovereignty.

Money acquires its value through the service it provides in relation to the establishment, enhancement, and protection of sovereignty. The money-generating capacity of banks should serve the purposes of sovereignty both individually and collectively. Banks should be owned and regulated by local communities as public utilities. Moreover, whatever profits are earned in conjunction with bank activities should be reinvested in the community.

(11) Capital refers primarily to the constructive potential inherent in human beings and only secondarily to financial resources. The flow of capital (in both human and financial terms) should serve the interests of sovereignty, both individually and collectively.

(12) Sovereignty is not a zero-sum game. It is about cooperation, not competition.

(13) Sovereignty is rooted in the acquisition of personal character traits involving: Honesty, compassion, charitableness, benevolence, friendship, objectivity, equitability, tolerance, forgiveness, patience, perseverance, nobility, courage, kindness, humility, integrity, independence and judiciousness.

(14) Sovereignty is not imposed from the outside in but is realized from the inside out through struggle by the individual to come to grips with the meaning of the idea of: 'Neither control nor be controlled'.

(15) Sovereignty is rooted in struggling against: Dishonesty, bias, hatred, jealousy, greed, anger, selfishness, intolerance, arrogance, apathy, cowardice, egocentrism, duplicity, exploitation, and cruelty.

(16) Sovereignty is the process of struggling to learn how not to cede one's moral and intellectual agency to anything but: Truth, justice and character in the service of realizing one's identity, and constructive potential, as well as in the service of assisting others to realize their identity and constructive potential.

(17) Sovereignty can never be defended, protected, or enhanced by diminishing, corrupting, co-opting, or suspending the conditions necessary for the pursuit, practice, and realization of sovereignty. Sovereignty should not be subject to the politics of fear.

(18) Sovereignty is rooted in the principle that no person can represent the sovereign interests of another individual unless the sovereign interests of everybody are equally served at the same time.

(19) The activities and purposes of: Governments, nations, institutions, and corporations should always be capable of being demonstrated -- beyond a reasonable doubt - to be the service of the sovereignty of the people, taken both collectively and individually.

(20) Sovereignty is rooted in the principle of decentralization whenever doing so would serve the interests of sovereignty better than some form of centralization would be able to accomplish in a clearly demonstrable manner.

(21) Efficiency and wealth should be measured in terms that enhance the way of sovereignty, not the way of power.

(22) The principles of sovereignty should be rooted in the notion of sustainability, and those principles should not be pursued or realized at the expense of destroying the environment ... either with respect to the short term or in conjunction with the long term.

(23) Sovereignty is rooted in the cautionary principle. In other words, if there is a reasonable doubt about the safety, efficiency, judiciousness, or potential destructive ramifications of a given activity, then that activity should be suspended until a time when those doubts have been completely, successfully, and rigorously addressed.

(24) The defense of sovereignty is best served through the cooperation of de-centralized communities of sovereign individuals ... with only occasional, limited, and secondary assistance from centralized institutions and groups.

(25) Standing armies do not serve the interests of sovereignty but, rather, serve the interests of the bureaucracies that organize, fund, equip, and direct those standing armies. Being able to defend one's country and communities from physical attack does not require standing armies but, instead, requires sovereign individuals who understand the value of defending the principles of sovereignty that help a community and network of communities to flourish.

(26) The police should serve and protect both individual, as well as collective, sovereignty. The police should not be the guardians and enforcers of arbitrary laws that are designed to protect centralized governments, corporations, institutions, and other bodies that tend to operate in accordance with the way of power and, therefore, in opposition to the way of sovereignty.

(27) When done correctly, the practice of sovereignty creates a public space or commons that is conducive to the pursuit and realization of the principles of sovereignty by everyone who is willing to struggle toward that end.

(28) Sovereignty is rooted in the principle that the commons - that is, the resources of the Earth, if not the Universe - cannot be proven, beyond a reasonable doubt, to belong to anyone. Therefore, the commons should be shared, conserved, and protected by all of us rather than be permitted to be treated as individual, institutional, corporate, or government forms of private property.

(29) Whatever forms of private property are considered to be permissible by general consensus, that property should serve the establishment, enhancement, and protection of the principles of sovereignty, both individual and collective.

(30) Aside from what is necessary to operate a business in an effective and productive manner, as well as what is necessary in the way of resources to be able to improve that business through research and development, and/or is necessary to provide a fair return for the employees of such a business for their collective efforts, then any profits that are generated by a business should be shared with the community or communities in which that business resides. The shareholders of a business should always be the entire community in which a business is located and not just a select number of private shareholders.

In exchange for foregoing kind of arrangement, there should be no taxes assessed in conjunction with businesses. At the same time, both businesses and the community become liable for whatever damages to individuals, the environment, or other parts of the community that are adversely affected by the activities of those businesses.

(31) A market in which all of its participants are not sovereign individuals is not a free market. Markets that exploit the vulnerabilities of participants are not free. Markets that are organized by the few in a way that undermines, corrupts, or compromises the principles of sovereignty are not free.

Markets in which the participants are all equally sovereign are free. Nonetheless, the freedom inherent in those markets should serve the interests of sovereignty for those who are both inside and outside of those markets.

(32) Sovereignty is only realizable when it is rooted in a collective, reciprocal, guarantee that we will all treat one another through the principles of sovereignty.

(33) Violations of sovereignty are an impediment to the full realization of the principles of sovereignty. However, those violations should not be primarily or initially be subject to punitive forms of treatment.

Instead, violations of sovereignty should be engaged through a process of mediated, conflict resolution and reconciliation intended to restore the efficacious and judicious functioning of sovereignty amongst both individuals and the collective. This mediated process is, first and foremost, rooted in a rigorous effort to determine the facts of a given situation before proceeding on with the process of mediation, conflict resolution, or reconciliation.

A community has the right to defend itself against individuals who violate, and show a disregard for, the sovereignty rights of other individuals. The aforementioned right to self protection might assume the form of: Treatment, exile, incarceration, paroled supervision, community service, and other forms of negotiated settlement with respect to those who undermine the principles of sovereignty.

(34) Alleged scientific and technical progress that cannot be rigorously demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt to enhance the pursuit and realization of principles of sovereignty by everyone is subject to being governed by the precautionary principle.

(35) Sovereignty is not a form of democracy in which the majority rules on any given issue. Rather, sovereignty is a process of generating consensus within a community that can be demonstrated, beyond a reasonable doubt, to serve the sovereignty interests of everyone.

(36) Sovereignty is rooted in the principle that with respect to any given practice, then, before making a community decision concerning that practice, then a community should take into consideration what the impact of that practice is likely to be on generations seven times removed from the current one.

(37) Everyone should underwrite the costs of pursuing, establishing, enhancing, realizing, and protecting sovereignty - both individually and collectively -- according to his or her capacity to do so.

(38) Sovereignty is not a function of political maneuvering, manipulations, or strategies. Rather, sovereignty is a function of the application of: Reasoned discussion, critical reflection, constructive reciprocity, creative opportunities, and rigorous methodology in the pursuit of pushing back the horizons of ignorance and seeking to establish, enhance,

realize, and protect sovereignty, both individually and collectively.

(39) Sovereignty is not about hierarchy or leadership. Advisors and technical consultants who are capable of lending their expertise and experience to a given project that serves the interests of sovereignty in a community are temporary facilitators whose responsibilities do not extend beyond a given project or undertaking. Those facilitators often tend to arise in the context of a given need and, then, are reabsorbed into the community when a given need has been met.

(40) Education should serve the interests of establishing, developing, enhancing and protecting the principles of sovereignty - both individually and collectively - and not serve the interests of the way of power. Education should not use techniques of undue influence that push or pull individuals toward accepting, or rejecting, specific philosophical, political, economic, or religious perspectives.

(41) To whatever extent taxes are collected (and the issue of taxes needs to be considered and justified - to the extent that this can be accomplished - in a critically, rigorous fashion), those taxes should be assessed only on a local basis and only after all sovereignty needs of an individual for a given period of time have been addressed. Those taxes should be proportional -- within generally agreed upon specific limits -- to a person's capacity to pay those taxes without undermining a person's ability to fully pursue realizing the principles of sovereignty.

Whatever taxes are collected can only be used in conjunction with projects of which the individual taxpayer approves. Disputes concerning the issue of taxation should be handled through mediated discussions and not through punitive or coercive policies.

The foregoing statements of principle concerning the idea of sovereignty mark the beginning of the exploratory process, not the end. We all need to critically reflect on the foregoing set of principles because what we have today is working for just a very small number of individuals that follow the way of power and, as a result, seek to prevent people in general from being able to pursue, establish, enhance, realize, and protect the principles of sovereignty.

Sovereignty is not something new. The idea of sovereignty has been inherent in human beings for a very, very long time, but, unfortunately, as events have demonstrated again and again for thousands of years, people's aspirations for sovereignty have been thwarted persistently and rigorously by the way of power at nearly every juncture of history.

A person can commit one's moral and intellectual agency to the cause of sovereignty or an individual can cede that moral and intellectual agency to those who belong to the power elite - economically, militarily, socially, intellectually, politically, and religiously. A great deal hangs on the nature of the judgments one makes with respect to the issue of how one decides to cede one's moral, intellectual, and spiritual agency.

The following books are available for free in PDF format at:
https://www.billwhitehouse.com/press.htm

Sovereignty and the Constitution
Beyond Democracy
Quest for Sovereignty
The People Amendments
Sovereignty: A Play in Three Acts
Searching For Sovereignty
Educational Horizons