

~blind leaders & ignorant pundits keep  
**Missing the Point & Ignoring the Facts**

Finally, after Joe Biden forced the President's hand, he stated publicly that in his personal opinion people of the same sex should be allowed to marry. So that's his official opinion and he can look forward to now nailing down the vote of the homosexual community since Romney has expressed the opposite opinion.

The problem with this situation is that both of their opinions are irrelevant. All that matters is what the law is. Secondarily is the issue of whether or not the law should be changed. And lastly, but of foremost importance, is how must the law be changed if it is to be changed?

The consistent talking-heads dialogue that one hears on radio and TV reminds me of an argument that Anderson Cooper had recently with a doctor who had dared to suggest that something might be fishy about Obama's birth certificate.

To my disgust, Cooper attempted to dishonestly question the presumption of the validity of a Hawaiian birth certificate of an employee of the doctor which he had used as a control for investigating the authenticity of Obama's birth certificate. When it became clear that the repetitive back-and-forth over that lame and unreasonable issue was going nowhere, and both of them were discussing Obama's birth certificate from the same perspective, I had to turn off the TV.

What perspective was that? It was the perspective that it actually exists. The well meaning doctor was clueless as to the fact that Obama has no birth certificate, has not said that he has a certified copy of a Certificate of Live Birth, has not presented one, was not present in the press room while his White House attorney (Baer) shared print with reporters and pretend communications with the Hawaiian government regarding asking

for an exception to its "rules" that "forbid" dispensing long-form certificates of live birth. And when he finally entered the room after the fake letters were removed by his lawyer, he failed to even mention the existence of the so-called birth certificate that was the very reason for him to be there.

Instead he deliberately only referred to the first and previously-claimed "only" birth record, (-the short-form Certification of Live Birth), stating that he had already released his birth certificate in '08 and so everyone should just move on and forget about the "silliness" of where he was actually and provably born.

He avoided any mention of the silliness that he had chosen to engage in by posting on the White House website an inexplicable 9 layer PDF digital image of a Hawaiian birth certificate that came from God-only knows where.

We know that it didn't come from Hawaii because they don't release PDF images, but even if they did, it would only be one layer, and not the nine that scream of forgery.

And he still has not shown a hard-copy birth certificate to anyone other than one specially selected sympathetic female reporter who was clueless as to what she was looking at since she knew absolutely nothing about authenticating birth certificates.

The only conclusion that can be drawn, -the one totally missed by Cooper and the doctor, is that the item being discussed does not even exist as a real object. It exists only in the cyber realm as a computer-created digital image only examinable on a computer monitor, -a Photoshopped concoction without any physical reality to it.

They, as well as many others, have completely failed to grasp reality, -which is that just as the internet holds thousands of images of things that do not exist (digital art), so also the real world contains perhaps tens of thousands of counterfeit

birth certificates which are used to obtain things like passports, citizenship, tax returns of other people, driver's licenses, etc.

So one can, if the stakes are high, have a fake digital image of a birth certificate created, and if everyone is on your side (including those in charge of Hawaiian departments) and gullible, you don't even need to produce a real hard-copy version of the cyber-realm fake, nor show a real one to anyone. Everyone just seems oblivious that that reality (-an actual hard-copy) as if it isn't even an issue, -just as they are doing with the issue of same-sex marriage.

The rule of law in the United States has become so corrupted that everyone from a lowly representative or reporter all the way up to the Vice-President and President are stupidly discussing the same-sex marriage issue as if it were something other than what it is. And what is it? It's a fundamental issue. It's also a State issue and the federal government has no say in the matter.

So why would anyone care what a national politician thinks? Because the nation is far down a slippery slope on which they habitually look to Washington to solve all their problems, and fix whatever they think might be wrong. But even if Washington were to decide to take on the issue, how would it go about doing so?

Regrettably, they'd commit the same constitutional treason that they did in passing the the illegitimate health care monstrosity which was written by unknown people, and read by no one who voted of it. That would mean a simple majority 51% vote of the Congress.

What's wrong with that? Well, if you happen to remember U.S. History then you should remember that when fundamental changes are proposed, they must be agreed to by the People, not just by Congress.

Do our current Congressional leaders even remember or acknowledge that fact? Or do they think that they can pass anything that they want and force it to be law? Do they, and their constituents, think that Congress has the authority to impose fundamental change? If they do, and it seems it's true of many, then we are so far away from our constitutional foundations that we can hardly see them.

To put things in focus, just image this; Congress, by a 51-49% vote ends the legality of alcohol, and tobacco, or driving gasoline-powered cars and eating meat, -or marriage itself. Why can't Congress do that? Why can't Congress require that anyone over a certain age be married or face a fine? Why can't Congress make prostitution and gambling legal nation-wide?

Why can't Congress make it legal for children over 13 to vote and to drive, and to drink alcohol, and to marry? Why are the civil rights of youths not defended by Congress via supportive legislation?

For two reasons, the first one being that such matters are outside of the jurisdiction of Congress to legislate since they're strictly state matters (not that Congress cares about minding only its own constitutional business).

The second is that even if Congress unconstitutionally claimed jurisdiction over such State matters, it still could not legitimately pass legislation regarding such issues because they are all fundamental issues. That means that Congress would have to abide by Article 5 of the Constitution. That's the one that prescribes the means by which the Constitution is to be amended.

Amending the Constitution is not simply altering the Constitution. Most amendments do not change the Constitution but instead add to it. But several important ones grant a right that some sector of the populace once did not possess

even though that was not due to any prohibition in the Constitution.

Just as slavery was legal by state law and tradition, so also, women possessed no right to vote by an overwhelmingly firm tradition. To gain the right to vote did not require repealing a ban on women voting because there was no such ban. It required that the tradition be overthrown by a clear statement being added to the Constitution. That overthrow of tradition was a fundamental change. And fundamental legal change, -as well as fundamental social change, requires the direct agreement of The People.

They give their approval, or not, by passing an amendment to the Constitution. Congress could not simply pass a bill granting women the right to vote. Women had to struggle and suffer rejection and scorn for 50 years before Congress was willing to offer the issue to the American people as a proposed and approved amendment to the Constitution.

The men in Congress who voted for that amendment knew that they had no authority to legislate such a fundamental change as a mere Congressional bill. It was the same with the proposal to make alcohol illegal. The American people had to approve such a fundamental change before a natural, legal and social right could be abridged.

But what do we hear from both sides? Do we hear that the federal government is banned by the Constitution from meddling in the matter of marriage? Do we hear that only States have the authority to decide the issue? Or most important of all, do we hear that States have no authority to legislate the issue either?

Where are the supporters of the rule of law who are declaring that everyone should shut-up who dares talk about making fundamental changes without changing the Constitution of

each and every State that wants to legalize same-sex marriage? Has anyone heard such calls to defend the American way of bringing about fundamental change? Listen to the conversation with that question is mind.

There's another issue concerning same-sex marriage that has seemingly-intelligent people speaking nonsense, missing the mark and being oblivious to reality. Once you think about it, it will strike you as the height of stupidity.

It's when reporters and pundits speak of State laws and propositions "banning" same-sex marriage. Apparently they don't have a clue as to what a ban is. No thing can be called "banned" without ever mentioning it. A ban is a rule or law that specifically outlaws something.

Legally defining something whose definition has been set in stone for thousands of years is in no way a ban on behavior that has never been permitted in the history of the Western, (and probably the Eastern) World. A State law that simply codifies the everlasting common definition of what marriage is and always has been, (and is described as in every dictionary ever printed) is not a law that's in the banning business.

It merely serves to affirm that which already is and cannot legitimately be changed without the consent of the governed, though even with their consent, the meaning of English words cannot be legitimately altered to suit the current direction of the socio-political wind.

If a word like marriage can be redefined then what words can't be? Can the word Christmas be redefined to include Halloween? Can there be two forms of Christmas?

That questions raises another issue. If marriage can be redefined by a mere majority vote, (or even a constitutional amendment) to include the union of two people of the same sex, then

why can't it also be redefined to include the union of three or more people of either sex, or the union of adults and children, or of immediate family, -brothers & sisters, -parents & children?

What exactly are the rules for redefining words to suit a new agenda that has never been sanctioned in any nation of our Judeo-Christian past? There *are* no rules for redefining words, so any attempt to do so is inherently illegitimate and a bastardization of the true meaning of a word.

Will these points be recognized by all the partisan voices that are for or against same-sex marriage as it continues to be an issue across the land? Will the Supreme Court ever have to ask and answer the questions raised, -questions that are going unrecognized and apparently ignored by all?

With the awareness of the real questions being almost nonexistent, one can't but fear that it's more likely than not that in most States their Constitution and its amendment process will be ignored or forgotten and few, if any, will even raise the issues.

But when the People follow proper procedure and support the age-old definition of marriage, as California did with Proposition 8, then the will and choice of the People can be overthrown and cast aside by traitors to the rule of law reigning in the Supreme Court of the State as gods. They can do whatever they want, including finding rights where none exist and have never existed.

No person in America has a right to alter deeply entrenched tradition by their own personal choice in opposition to the constitutional choice of the people unless that tradition violates an actual civil right, -one that really exists, -not one that simply "should" exist.

Fundamental rights must always be balanced by fundamental prohibitions. Some things are inherently wrong. That can be due to a clear condemnation by holy scripture, by the tradition that resulted from that condemnation, or due to a natural revulsion that rejects certain unnatural behaviors.

When all three are aligned against any particular action, "right" or behavior, then legislators and judges alike lack legal and moral authority to overturn the natural social order, -an order that denies no one a right that humans have widely or universally recognized.

Only the People have the right to alter such a social order. They are the source of the legitimacy of the government, including the Constitution and the courts that interpret it. But judges can usurp that rightful authority of the People and put themselves in their place, as their gods and masters. Does any fair-minded thinking person think that that's right or justifiable?

by A.R. Nash May 2012  
[obama--nation.com](http://obama--nation.com)