THE URMIA LECTURES — AN ANALYSIS OF GOVERNMENT IN PAPER 134 OF THE URANTIA PAPERS.

By Philip Eversoul

[Originally written about 1996 and re-written, with a few changes, in 2002]

When the government is the "SOVEREIGN," we are its subjects and its servants. When the government is the "SOVEREIGN," we have no recognized God-given rights. When the government is the "SOVEREIGN," the government itself is God. And this God will want, of course, to be worshiped in some fashion.

During the past few years, I have been making a belated study of American history, law, and politics from a constitutional perspective. Like most people, I never gave our Constitution its proper due and like most people, I was almost completely ignorant of our constitutional system, the "confederated republic," as George Washington called it. After having achieved some knowledge of our uniquely American law and legal history, I applied it to the statements that the Urantia Papers make about American and global government in Paper 134, "The Transition Years." This is the paper that supposedly makes the restatements by the Secondary Midwayers of what they believe would have been Jesus' views about world government on our planet and about the relation of American government to the principles of world government.

When I first and occasionally reread this paper in the 70s and 80s, I took the supposed Midwayers' statements at face value and did not see the socialist agenda implicit in them. I accepted them as accurate because, first, I trusted the authors and second, I had no knowledge of constitutional history or the history of American government. Now that I do have some knowledge of these subjects, I see the statements of the Midwayers (if Midwayers is what they really are) in an entirely new light. I see them as rejections of the validity of American constitutional principles and assertions of the socialist agenda of global totalitarianism. There are in Paper 134 what can only be described as deliberate misrepresentations of the nature of American government for the purpose of advocating socialist propaganda about the virtues of an unconstrained, all-powerful world government. It is only by misrepresenting and denigrating the American system that this version of world government can be advanced. An accurate description of the constitutional structure of American government and its history would expose the globalist propaganda in Paper 134 favoring an essentially unlimited world government and at the same time would confirm the correctness of American constitutional principles as the necessary basis of a properly constrained world government.

I do not believe that there can be found anywhere a legal or constitutional scholar of American history, whether on the right or on the left, who would agree with the statement, on page 1489 of Paper 134, that it is constitutionally proper that the forty-eight states (at that time) "…have surrendered their sovereignty to the federal government, and through the arbitrament of war, they have abandoned all claims to the delusions of self-determination." To a large extent, the loss of state sovereignty that spread after 1865 is indeed what happened, but the clever deception in this

statement is to imply that such a loss was constitutionally proper or constitutionally irrelevant because of the overwhelming advantages to be obtained from surrendering state sovereignty *in toto.* In paragraphs such as these, the political philosophy of the Urantia Papers amounts to Hegelian adoration of the state.

The other clever deception in the above quoted sentence is that it is not clear *when and under what circumstances* this loss of sovereignty occurred. To anyone who knows the first thing about American government, it is beyond argument that the constitution of 1787-1861 certainly did not entail a surrender of the sovereignty, as such and *in toto*, of the states to the national government. On the contrary, the people as a whole, acting in assembled conventions to ratify a pre-planned national compact among themselves, mandated that the states delegate or grant a portion of their sovereignty to the national government, namely, that portion having to do with national affairs and hence national jurisdiction. Articles IX and X of the Bill of Rights specifically ensured that the sovereignty of the states and their people would remain intact in spite of the specific grants of powers to the national government. The basis of this approach is that all sovereignty, and hence all grants or delegations of authority and power, are assumed to be derived from the people and their states. The states did not create the national government, (the people as a whole did), but the states retained, for the benefit of their citizens, all non-federal sovereignty granted to them by their citizens. And the citizens retained all rights, enumerated and non-enumerated, not granted to the various states.

Therefore, for anyone with the slightest knowledge of American history, including a supposed Midwayer, there is no possibility that the "surrender of sovereignty" occurred under the original intentions of the American Constitution that lasted from 1787 to 1861. Yet this possible interpretation is left open, as if to invite the it if the reader is ignorant of American history. The "arbitrament of war" that led to the "surrender of sovereignty" could reasonably only be the so-called Civil War, better named the War of Secession. If we assume that deception and deliberate ambiguity are being used here, it is not strange that this war was not explicitly named in the Midwayers' sentence, because the "arbitrament of war," leading to "surrender of sovereignty," creates only injustices under the Constitution and a deceiver would not want us to know that. The American constitutional system is a balance and interplay of sovereignty between the states and the central government; each has a necessary role to play or the system collapses. Any significant surrender of sovereignty by either side of the dual sovereignty balance endangers the system. The system does not function as it was intended by means of the arbitrament of war to decide questions of sovereignty or of anything else.

The American dual-sovereignty balance seems to be confirmed as correct in the very first paragraph of page 1490 where it says:

"The limited [state] sovereignty of these forty-eight states was created by men and for men. The superstate [national] sovereignty of the American Federal Union was created by the original thirteen of these states for their own benefit and for the benefit of men. Sometime the supernational sovereignty of the planetary government of mankind will be similarly created by

nations for their own benefit and for the benefit of all men."

However, even the above quotation does not explicitly confirm the need for a balanced dispersion of sovereignty. Instead, it is emphasizing that sovereignty, as such and as a whole, ought to proceed upwards from the local to the global. This disparagement of local and national sovereignty is in accord with what we read on page 1489:

"Urantia will not enjoy lasting peace until the so-called sovereign nations intelligently and fully [note: fully] surrender their sovereign powers into the hands of the brotherhood of men — mankind government."

The second paragraph on page 1490 begins with the fully American view that

"Citizens are not born for the benefit of government; governments are organizations created and devised for the benefit of men."

But it goes on to explain that

"There can be no end to the evolution of political sovereignty short of the appearance of the government of the sovereignty of all men. All other sovereignties are relative in value, intermediate in meaning, and subordinate in status."

This is simply not true if one accepts, first, that the origin of sovereignty is the People, and second, that the People delegate and grant *only those portions* of their own inherent sovereignty that are necessary for the various levels of government. The People, in principle, retain all rights not delegated as powers to the state, national, and global governments. These levels of government are to have and use only those explicitly granted powers needed to carry on their explicitly defined duties. If a power is not explicitly granted or implicitly implied, it is forbidden to the government. Without these sorts of limits, and without recognition that its powers are derived conditionally from the People, government quickly becomes tyranny. Supernational sovereignty needs to be attained through the granting to it of *only* those powers it needs to function in its sphere. Governments have no rights; they have only specific powers delegated and granted, and conditionally at that.

If a world government is attained though conquest and deceit, thereby destroying the proper separations of sovereignty and jurisdiction, it will be inherently unstable. The means to the end must be acceptable to the principles of justice. The end, in the former American system that has now been overthrown, is a properly dispersed sovereignty based on clearly defined levels of jurisdiction. This is hinted at on page 1489:

"When there are only a few really sovereign powers, either they must embark on the life and death struggle for national supremacy, or else, by voluntary surrender of certain prerogatives of sovereignty, they must create the essential nucleus of supernational power which will serve as the beginning of the real sovereignty of all mankind."

But there is no explicit confirmation of the need to disperse and balance the levels of

sovereignty. The issue is always framed as: how do we move sovereignty, all of it, from the local to the global. There is never any concern for safeguards against tyranny, which is of the essence for any practical and commonsense approach to good government.

In the next paragraph, it is the "power to make war" that must be surrendered. When the great nations are willing to surrender "certain" prerogatives, such as the power to make war, they are moving toward an international government that has a limited and defined international jurisdiction. This is the American way, but it is not the supposed Midwayers' way.

The fallacy of national self-determination, which the Papers decry so strongly, occurs most obviously when a nation presumes to act internationally without limits or restrictions. I submit that there is nothing wrong with national self-determination when it stays within national boundaries and nothing wrong with local (state) determination when it stays within local (state) boundaries. One of the guiding principles of early America was to avoid all foreign entanglements of a political nature. In doing so, the nation could avoid acting internationally as much as possible and could stay within its national jurisdiction as much as possible.

The "surrender of sovereignty" under the "arbitrament of war" occurred in the so-called Reconstruction Era, during which the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments were passed. By any measure of the Constitution, these three amendments were unconstitutional and hence null and void unless they were enacted under martial law. That is precisely what the "arbitrament of war" was in this case: the War of Secession and the subsequent imposition of martial law and the denial of the constitutional rights of the citizenry, in particular the constitutional rights of the Southern white citizens. Under this rule of martial law, the Southern states (except for Tennessee, which had decided to "cooperate" with the North) were denied their statehood. The defeated Southern states had approved the 13th Amendment in 1865, outlawing slavery, but under military occupation after 1867, they were deprived of their statehood. Even though they were considered "non-states," they were told they had to approve the 14th and 15th Amendments, *as if they were bona fide states*, in order to be "readmitted" to the Union as states and to be relieved of military occupation.

Except for the defeat of the South and rule of martial law, the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments would never have been passed. One of the accepted principles of law is that any laws passed under martial law cease to exist when the martial law is declared to be ended. If martial law ever ended in the South, then the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments became null and void. For these amendments to persist, the jurisdiction of martial law must be legally held to continue, both in the South and in the nation as a whole, even to this day. The rule of constitutional law (or any other previously existing law) is supposed to resume when the emergency that precipitated martial law is over.

At this point I want to give the reader some background on how the 14th Amendment was passed, what it meant, and how it was used to derange the entire constitutional system. For the "Midwayers," it doesn't matter that state sovereignty was illegally damaged or destroyed by the War of Secession. What counts for them, is that national sovereignty was increased, even though by atrociously evil means. For surely they must know that the means were atrociously evil. Then you will fully appreciate the significance of the Midwayers' approval of this derangement.

Justice Ellett of the Supreme Court of Utah, rendering his decision in Dyett v. turner (439 P 2nd 266 at 267; 20 Utah 2nd 403, March 22, 1968), gave the following historical account:

"For over 140 years more than 70 justices of the Supreme Court consistently held that the first ten amendments to the Constitution applied as a limitation to the Federal Government only and not in any manner to the states, and for 70 years following the so-called adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment some 35 Justices from every corner of the Nation have held that the Fourteenth Amendment did not make the first ten amendments applicable to the states. Some of those justices had helped to frame the original Constitution and the first ten amendments and had worked to secure the adoption thereof. Others had participated at firsthand with the purposes intended to be accomplished by the Fourteenth Amendment. All of them interpreted the Constitution, including the amendments, with knowledge and wisdom born of intimacy with the problems which had called forth the documents in the first place.

"The United States Supreme Court, as at present constituted [1968], had departed from the Constitution as it had been interpreted from its inception and has followed the urgings of social reformers [read: socialists] which even Congress could not constitutionally pass. It has amended the Constitution in a manner unknown to the document itself. While it takes three fourths of the states of the Union to change the Constitution legally, yet as few as five men who have never been elected to office can by judicial fiat accomplish a change just as radical as could three fourths of the states of this Nation. As a result of the recent holdings of that Court, the sovereignty of the states is abolished, and the erstwhile free and independent states are now in effect and purpose merely closely supervised units in the federal system."

What Justice Ellett is referring to here is how the Fourteenth Amendment, passed in the Reconstruction Era, was used by the United States Supreme Court to render decisions to justify the application of the Bill of Rights to the States, thereby forcing the states to adopt the criteria of the Bill of rights for their own conduct of government. Prior to such decisions of the Supreme Court, the Bill of Rights was universally understood to apply as instructions only for and restrictions only on the federal government. This new application of the Bill of Rights made the federal government the judge and overseer of the states, to ensure the supposed "equal protection of the law" described in the Fourteenth Amendment, and this is what began the destruction of their sovereignty. Ellett's point is that such a vast increase in federal power and such a huge change in the relationship of the federal to state government can be valid only if an appropriate constitutional amendment is ratified. The mandating of such changes by the Supreme Court alone is a gross usurpation of power. Nevertheless, this is precisely what the victorious socialists in the North intended to accomplish over the prostrate body of the South. Ellett continues:

"We do not believe that justices of once free and independent states should surrender their constitutional powers without being heard from. We would betray the trust of our people if we sat supinely by and permitted the great bulk of our powers to be taken over by the federal courts without at least stating reasons why it should not be so. By attempting to save the dual relationship which has heretofore existed between state and federal authority and which is clearly set out in the Constitution, we think we act in the best interest of our country.

"We feel like galley slaves chained to our oars by a power from which we cannot free ourselves, but like slaves of old we think we must cry out when we can see the boat heading into the maelstrom directly ahead of us; and by doing so, we hope the master of the craft will heed the call and avert the dangers which confront us."

Dear reader, please reflect on this incredible statement by a justice of the Utah Supreme Court: we are slaves!

"But by raising our voices in protest, we, like the galley slaves of old, expect to be lashed for doing so. We are confident that we will not be struck by 90 percent of the people of this Nation who long for the return to the days when the Constitution was a document plain enough to be understood by all who read it, the meaning of which was set firmly like a jewel in the matrix of common sense and wise judicial decision. We shall not complain if those who berate us belong to that small group who refuse to take an oath that they will not overthrow this government by force. When we bare our legal backs to receive the verbal lashes, we will try to be brave; and should the great court of these United States decide that in our thinking we have committed error, then we shall indeed feel honored, for we will then be placed on an equal footing with all those great justices who at this late date are also said to have been in error for so many years…"

Ellett knows that by defending the original meaning of the Constitution in the case before him, he will be verbally lashed by the Supreme Court. Two pages later in his decision (page 269), he returns to his remarks on the history of the Fourteenth Amendment:

"In regard to the Fourteenth Amendment, which the present Supreme Court of the United States has by decision chosen as the basis for invading the rights and prerogatives of the sovereign states, it is appropriate to look at the means and methods by which that amendment was foisted upon the Nation in times of emotional stress. We have no desire at this time to have the Fourteenth Amendment declared unconstitutional. In fact, we are not asked to do that. We merely want to show what type of a horse that the court has to ride in order to justify its usurpation of the prerogatives of the states…"

To do this, Ellett first explains that in the landmark case of Texas v. White (7 Wall. 700; 19 L.Ed. 227), it was held that the state of Texas, although one of the rebelling states, never left the Union through its presumed act of secession, which was always inherently null and void, and that Texas never lost her statehood, nor her citizens their citizenship. Since the southern states could not constitutionally secede, their statehood remained intact. They never became foreign states, and the war in which they were defeated was therefore not a war of conquest or subjugation but only the

suppression of a rebellion. Ellett lays this groundwork to show how the southern states should have been treated after the end of hostilities: with all due respect as sister states.

"General Lee had surrendered his army on April 9, 1865, and General Johnston surrendered his 17 days later. Within a period of less than six weeks thereafter, not one Confederate soldier was bearing arms. By June 30, 1865, the Confederate states were all restored by presidential proclamation to their proper positions as states in an indissoluble union, and practically all citizens thereof had been granted amnesty. Immediately thereafter each of the seceding states functioned as regular states in the Union with both state and federal courts in full operation.

"President Lincoln had declared the freedom of the slaves as a war measure, but when the war ended, the effect of the proclamation was ended, [Reader, please note: when martial law ends, laws passed under it end] and so it was necessary to propose and to ratify the Thirteenth Amendment in order to ensure the freedom of the slaves.

"The 11 southern states having taken their rightful and necessary place in the indestructible Union proceeded to determine whether to ratify or reject the proposed Thirteenth Amendment. In order to become a part of the Constitution, it was necessary that the proposed amendment be ratified by 27 of the 36 states. Among those 27 states ratifying the Thirteenth Amendment were 10 from the South, to wit, Louisiana, Tennessee, Arkansas, South Carolina, Alabama, North Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Florida, and Texas. [Why they did so is not clear from Ellett's account; presumably they would have done so only under some form of illegal intimidation].

"When the 39th Congress assembled on December 5, 1865, the senators and representatives from the 25 northern states voted to deny seats in both houses of Congress to anyone elected from the 11 southern states. The full complement of senators from the 36 states of the Union was 72, and the full membership in the House was 240. Since it requires only a majority vote [Article I Section 5, Constitution of the United States] to refuse a seat in Congress, only the 50 senators and 182 congressmen from the North were seated. All of the 22 senators and 58 representatives from the southern states were denied seats.

This clearly illegal and unconstitutional action by the North shows beyond a doubt that the Constitution had, in essence, been usurped and that some sort of coup d'etat had occurred. This coup was socialist in nature. Certainly, if the South had been fully restored to its original place in the scheme of things — which legal principle required, as shown in Texas v. White — then all the original arguments that supposedly caused the war in the first place would have remained as unsettled as before, and all the losses of blood and treasure in that war would have been in vain. That, however, is the essential point: constitutionally, the "arbitrament of war" can settle nothing. This is the point that the supposed Midwayers, in Paper 134, completely ignored.

The Constitution provides only for peaceful means of settling national disputes. Since nothing in the conflict between North and South would have been settled by a simple and constitutional restoration of the status of the southern states, the northern socialists took it upon themselves to apply the methods of intimidation, violence, gangsterism, terrorism in the South,

fraud, and lies to accomplish their goals, even though the Constitution and the ideals of America would be permanently deranged and crippled by such methods. And the supposed Midwayers had no problem with this, and even approved of the result. Ellett continued,

"Joint resolution No. 48 proposing the Fourteenth Amendment was a matter of great concern to the Congress and to the people of the Nation. In order to have this proposed amendment submitted to the 36 states for ratification, it was necessary that two thirds of each house concur. A count of noses showed that only 33 senators were favorable to the measure, and 33 was a far cry from two thirds of 72 [48] and lack one of being two thirds of the 50 seated senators.

"While it requires only a majority of votes to refuse to seat a senator, it requires a two thirds majority to unseat a member once he is seated [Article 1, Section 5, Constitution of the United States]. One John P. Stockton was seated on December 5, 1865, as one of the senators from New Jersey. He was outspoken in his opposition to Joint Resolution 48 proposing the Fourteenth Amendment. The leadership in the Senate, not having control of two thirds of the seated senators, voted to refuse to seat Mr. Stockton upon the ground that he had received only a plurality and not a majority of the votes of the New Jersey legislature. It was the law of New Jersey and several other states that a plurality vote was sufficient for election. Besides, the Senator had already been seated. Nevertheless, his seat was *refused*, and the 33 favorable votes thus became the required two thirds of the 49 members of the Senate. [Note: at this time senators were elected by their state legislatures, not by the people directly — PE].

"In the House of Representatives it would require 122 votes to be two thirds of the 182 members seated. Only 120 voted for the proposed amendment, but because there were 30 abstentions it was declared to have been passed by a two thirds vote of the House.

"Whether it requires two thirds of the full membership of both houses to propose an amendment to the Constitution or only two thirds of those seated or two thirds of those voting is a question which it would seem could only be determined by the United States Supreme Court. However, it is perhaps not so important for the reason that the amendment is only *proposed* by Congress. It must be *ratified* by three fourths of the states in the Union before it becomes a part of the Constitution. The method of securing the passage through Congress is set out above, as it throws some light on the means used to obtain ratification in the states thereafter.

In other words, it throws some light on the illegal means, and the spirit of lawlessness, used to obtain ratification in the states thereafter.

"Nebraska had been admitted to the Union, and so the Secretary of State in transmitting the proposed amendment announced that ratification by 28 states would be needed before the amendment would become part of the Constitution, since there were at the time 37 states in the Union. A rejection by 10 states would thus defeat the proposal.

"By March 17, 1867, the proposed amendment had been ratified by 17 states and rejected by 10, with California voting to take no action thereon, which was equivalent to rejection. Thus the

proposal was defeated.

"One of the ratifying states, Oregon, had ratified [the amendment] by a membership wherein two legislators were subsequently held not to be duly elected, and after the contest, the duly elected members of the legislature of Oregon rejected the proposed amendment. However, this rejection came after the amendment was declared passed."

Justice Ellett now gets to the center of the treachery and treason to the Constitution that caused the Fourteenth Amendment to be passed.

"Despite the fact that the southern states had been functioning peacefully for two years and had been counted to secure ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment, Congress passed the Reconstruction Act [vetoed by President Johnson, to his eternal honor, but his veto was overridden] which provided for military occupation of 10 of the 11 southern states. It excluded Tennessee from military occupation, and one must suspect it was because Tennessee had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment on July 7, 1866. The Act further disenfranchised practically all white voters and provided that no senator or congressman from the occupied states could be seated in Congress until a new constitution was adopted by each state which would be approved by Congress, and further provided that each of the 10 states must ratify the proposed Fourteenth Amendment, and the Fourteenth Amendment must become a part of the Constitution of the United States before the military occupancy would cease and the states be allowed to have seats in Congress."

Thus it was only by means of martial law that the Fourteenth Amendment was passed. It was signed only under duress by the occupied southern states, which had absolutely no constitutional reason to be militarily occupied. The occupation was an act of gangsterism necessary to the socialist agenda. Later this gangsterism plundered the wealth of the South. Justice Ellett continues:

"By the time the Reconstruction Act had been declared to be the law, three more states had ratified the proposed Fourteenth Amendment, and two — Louisiana and Delaware — had rejected it. Then Maryland withdrew its prior ratification and rejected the proposed Fourteenth Amendment. Ohio followed suit and withdrew its prior ratification, as also did New Jersey. California, which earlier had voted not to pass upon the proposal, now vetoed the amendment. [21 votes for it at this point with 7 more needed to reach 28].

"By spurious, nonrepresentative governments seven of the southern states which had theretofore rejected the proposed amendment under the duress of military occupation and of being denied representation in Congress did attempt to ratify the proposed Amendment…

"The Constitution of the United States is silent as to who should decide whether a proposed amendment has or has not been passed according to formal provisions of Article V of the Constitution. The supreme Court of the United States is the ultimate authority on the meaning of the Constitution [a debatable premise — PE] and has never hesitated in a proper case to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional — except when the act purported to amend the Constitution. The duty of the Secretary of State was ministerial, to wit, to count and determine when three fourths of

the states had ratified the proposed amendment. He could not determine that a state once having ratified a proposed amendment could thereafter reject it. The court and not Congress should determine such matters. Consistency would seem to require that a vote once cast would be final or would not be final, whether the first vote was for ratification or rejection.

"In order to have 27 states ratify the Fourteenth Amendment, it was necessary to count those states which had first rejected and then under the duress of military occupation had ratified [the amendment], and then also to count those states which initially ratified but subsequently rejected the proposal…

"How can it be conceived in the minds of anyone that a combination of powerful states can by force of arms deny another states a right to have representation in Congress until it has ratified an amendment which its people oppose? …

"We have spoken in the hope that the Supreme Court of the United States may retreat from some of its recent decisions affecting the rights of a sovereign state to determine for itself what is proper procedure in its own courts as it affects its own citizens…"

This concludes my lengthy quotation from Justice Ellett on the manner of ratification of the 14th Amendment. Please note that in the very last paragraph quoted above he defends the "rights of a sovereign state to determine for itself. " This concept is of the essence in American government, and Justice Ellett is simply repeating what everyone versed in American government know. We did not lose those rights by realizing one day that we really ought to surrender them to the central government; we lost them through the illegal use of martial law, congressional depredations, and judicial usurpation. In short, we lost them through a deliberate socialist takeover using the methods of gangsters and terrorists.

In the light of this teaching from Justice Ellett, let us look again, with new eyes, upon the sentence of the supposed Midwayers, "They [the forty-eight states] have surrendered their sovereignty to the federal government, and through the arbitrament of war, they have abandoned all claims to the delusion of self-determination."

So, in this one sentence, we see the supposed Midwayers' approving the destruction of the interplay of sovereignty between the states and the central government, approving the imposition of martial law to crush the constitutionally based sovereignty of the southern states (and eventually of all the states, by means of the domino effect) and approving the beginnings of an all-powerful central government that originates in defiance of all lawful procedure for effecting changes in the Constitution. The second half of that very same sentence states that "…they have abandoned all claims to the delusions of self-determination," and this means that even a properly limited extent of local or state sovereignty is a "delusion of self-determination." This further means that all sovereignty comes from the central government, not the people, for it is the people who created the local states under the "delusion of self-determination." The people are required to "abandon their delusions."

Therefore, the people must overcome their belief that they have any sovereignty at all and must learn that all sovereignty really comes from the central government. By surrendering their presumed sovereignty, they are admitting that they never had any right to it in the first place. One does not properly surrender what one *should* have. By use of the word "surrender," there is a de-legitimizing of the very notion of the sovereignty of the People. Otherwise the verb "delegate" would be used, by which the People would retain all original sovereignty. But the verb "delegate" is *never* used in Paper 134.

Consequently, to suppose that one can be politically self-determining *to any degree* is a delusion, for the "Midwayers" speak approvingly of abandoning "all claims to self-determination." Therefore, it clearly follows that we must let the all-powerful State, the Central Government, *determine our lives and goals* to whatever extent the State deems best. If one surrenders one's delusions of sovereignty to the proper sovereign, then one has no right to question, much less to oppose, that proper sovereign. There is no allowance, in this argument, to support and sustain any political opposition. That is the point, is it not?

Does this sound like something you are already familiar with, dear reader? Does the word "communism" come to mind? Does the word "totalitarian"? Are the Midwayers communists? Or is someone else, a human or superhuman deceiver, the communist or totalitarian?

In any political system that favors personal liberty and strives to set up the means to nourish it, isn't personal and local-state determination, within proper limits, the whole point of the exercise?

State sovereignty and self-determination, both before and after the War of Secession, were never rejected by Americans as valid constitutional principles. After 1865, state sovereignty was victimized and diminished unfairly, but the principle, although doomed, remained alive in the law for many more decades. After 1933 and the outright institution of socialism by the Roosevelt administration, state sovereignty began to diminish to the vanishing point. The states were *supposed* to be self-determinative outside of areas of federal jurisdiction. The political trend that began after 1865 has successfully destroyed state sovereignty in our own time — but only, be it well noted, by unconstitutional means. If the people could ever reassert the constitutional system — i.e., proper, legitimate government in place of the outlaw, gangster government we now have — the trend toward statism could be stopped and reversed.

Let us return to page 1489 of Paper 134. The next sentences, after the one we have been analyzing, are: "While each state regulates its internal affairs, it is not concerned with foreign relations, tariffs, immigration, military affairs, or interstate commerce. Neither do the individual states concern themselves with matters of citizenship. The forty-eight states suffer the ravages of war only when the federal government's sovereignty is in some way jeopardized." The first sentence of this quote sounds like a fair statement of the American system, but it is again deceptive. Remember the sentence that preceded it, which we have been dissecting. Because of that previous sentence we know that the forty-eight states here mentioned have no sovereignty, having given up the delusions of self-determination, and are presumably mere administrative units of the federal government. Further, in the original Constitution, citizenship was based on one's state of origin,

not on the idea of federal citizenship. The idea of federal citizenship became necessary after the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment, in order to give the former slaves a kind of citizenship that was not available under the original Constitution.

The next paragraph reemphasizes, “These forty-eight states, having abandoned the twin sophistries of sovereignty and self-determination, enjoy interstate peace and tranquility.” This falsely implies that the states never did and never would enjoy interstate peace and tranquility unless they totally surrendered their sovereignty. But the original American system was not based on this idea, and such an alien political idea was never approved except under conditions of martial law.

It was not the existence of state sovereignty within the Union that caused the War Between the States but the misuse and misunderstanding of it that led certain southern leaders to believe that unilateral secession is constitutional. They saw secession as a right reserved to the states under Articles IX and X of the Bill of rights, but in my view the truth is that all the states are perpetually bound to the Union by the National Compact ratified in constitutional conventions until such time as a new constitutional convention might be held to unbind one or more of the states. The people as a whole bound the several states to the Union, and it follows that only the people as a whole can unbind them. The presumed right of secession does not, in my view, exist on the level of the text of the Constitution and the Amendments. (Note: this line of reasoning assumes that the lawful and proper procedures for establishing a new Constitution to replace the Articles of Confederation were followed. In fact, they apparently were not. See the Addendum).

Therefore, I believe that the southern states did go too far in their pursuit of self-determination because they went about it in the wrong way, i.e., unilaterally rather than through a national convention to unbind them from the Union, but this is not an argument against the idea of a proper measure of local-state self-determination. Paper 134 takes advantage of the southern states’ abuse of self-determination to denounce the very idea of it. Of course, the Constitution did not (and does not) provide a way for a state to seek national approval for its secession. Clearly, too, Lincoln did not have explicit constitutional authority to prevent a state from seceding, or to move against a state that had done so, and his own unilateral assumption of the role of preserver of the Union made him a dictator.

The case of Texas v. White, cited above, presumably agrees with my line of reasoning about the way in which secession could be possible, because it concluded that no state had actually left the Union by the means used by the secessionists. The end of hostilities should have meant Restoration of the theretofore existing order, not Reconstruction. Not only was martial law after 1865 not necessary, but the ending of the war should have, in all fairness, seen the return of the states to the same sovereignty they originally had within the Union.

The reason this did not happen was because another agenda was at work. There is a political principle that wars are not fought to achieve victories and to let it go at that. Wars are fought, rather, to achieve a certain fluidity of the social condition, and to use that fluid condition to impose a new regime and a new social order. This was certainly the case in the War of Secession. The new

regime that was established and that gradually spread over the entire country was based on the destruction of state sovereignty so that a nearly all-powerful central government could arise. This central government, existing above and outside of the framework of the prior constitutional system, was a socialist government. The purpose of the War of Secession, at least in the minds of the northern radicals, was to wreck the constitutional system and to begin the establishment of socialism. The secessionists and the abolitionists were *both* funded and supported by the *same* powerful and wealthy groups in England and New England that sought a socialist regime for the United States. Specifically, such groups included the House of Rothschild and international Masonry. Contrary to popular misunderstanding, socialism and communism have always been financed and supported, as a tool, by the wealthiest and most powerful classes to advance their own interests.

There is no understanding from the authors of Paper 134, whoever they really are, that sovereignty inheres in the people inasmuch as the people recognize that they are the sons of God. Sovereignty is a characteristic of sonship. No government, not even the global government, is a son of God. The American government was created on the Christian premise that the people are the sons of God, and its constitutional system can only upon that recognition. It is a government for the conscious sons of God, and the American people of the 17th and 18th centuries arrived at their realization of sonship, in terms of Christianity, through faith and through their devoted study of the Bible.

Because the authors of Paper 134, whoever they really are, show little recognition of the true source of sovereignty, they place it in the government rather than in the people. They have a strange, unsupported belief that if only all sovereignty can be given to a global government, this global government will give us true and lasting peace. Apparently it does not matter who the government consists of, what sort of moral character or spiritual loyalties it may have and what constitutional restraints on power are to be imposed on it, for these considerations are never mentioned. Apparently these mysterious authors want us to believe that there is some sort of magical power released in simply achieving a world government. Given the sort of humans who inhabit this planet and given the sort of humans who lust for the power to impose a world government, the only magic that could sustain it, once achieved, would be ruthless terror combined with technological control. *Note well that the authors have no fear that a global government needs to be carefully limited and restrained in its activities.* For me, this lack of reasonable fear, a constitutional concern for clear limits to government power, is solid evidence of a deceptive propaganda campaign that has contaminated some of the Urantia Papers.

For these authors, the only true source of sovereignty is inanimate, corporate government, not the living people, and since governments must evolve from smaller to greater, they are all "relative in value, intermediate in meaning, and subordinate in status" until global government is arrived at. "There can be no end to the evolution of political sovereignty short of the appearance of the government of the sovereignty of all men." Therefore the absolute of sovereignty is the global government. This is presumably why "SOVEREIGN" is put in all caps on page 1489 in the description of the nature of a world government. In this view, all governmental power and authority comes from the State, not from the People once the People surrender their delusions of self-

determination, i.e., their presumptions about their sovereignty. This is why the government is the true "SOVEREIGN," not the People, not the sons of God. Very few words are put in all-caps in the Papers. Among those few are the "I AM" and the "IT IS." The authors suggest such a parallel to those absolutes.

In a constitutional republican form of government, the world government would receive, from the people, an explicit and enumerated statement of its powers, functions, and methods of operation. In Paper 134, there is no such concern because the people have no right to do this—having surrendered their delusions of self-determination — and have no need to worry about it. True, the authors speak of the world government as "democratic and representative," but the American system was meant to establish a republic, not a democracy. In a republic, the laws of God and nature, and the restrictions and delineations of the constitution itself, take precedence over the desires of the majority for a law that might be enacted by a mere human legislature. We again have to ask ourselves, how do the authors say this government will be arrived at? It is arrived at by the surrender of the abandonment of the twin sophistries of sovereignty and self-determination, and by the turning over of the world's land, air, and naval forces to the global government. There is here no careful delineation, definition, and measuring out of appropriate portions of power. The people simply surrender. The world state takes all sovereignty. Hegel would approve.

The sentence we have been analyzing, "These forty-eight states, having abandoned the twin sophistries of sovereignty and self-determination, enjoy interstate peace and tranquility," can therefore be construed to have only one obvious meaning: the achievement of a form of Marxist socialism in the United States through the destruction of the constitutional system. Paper 134 uses the very next sentence to justify its advocacy of a world government: "So will the nations of Urantia begin to enjoy people when they freely surrender [there's that word again] their respective sovereignties into the hands of a global government — the sovereignty of the brotherhood of men." The only obvious conclusion from this line of reasoning, therefore, is that this global government will be a socialist dictatorship. Note that the Fatherhood of God is never mentioned, only the brotherhood of men. This is typical of socialist, Marxist rhetoric. It is also typical of such rhetoric that a wonderful and peaceful world awaits us around the next bend in the road, if only we will do "the right thing."

Even though the American Federal Union is upheld at one point, at least, as the model for a global government, there is no mention that this model is based on the proper balance of sovereignties, not the surrender of them to the central government. If there were such mention, it would be in explicit contradiction to the illustrations about how the forty-eight states blissfully surrendered their delusions of sovereignty and lived happily ever after.

Paper 72, "Government on a Neighboring Planet," does not shed much light on the issues we have been discussing, which is surprising. It says that the central government "…consists of a strong federation of one hundred comparatively free states." (p. 809). Does this mean that those one hundred states are still suffering from some degree of the delusions of self-determination? We are not told. The issue of sovereignty — who has it and how much of it — is not discussed at all. It is not clear that the message of this chapter is that we on Urantia should emulate this government. If

we should, we are not told specifically to do so or to what extent to do so. But if we are not to emulate it, why are we told about it?

The Paper says on page 808 that the reason for informing us about this government on a neighboring planet is the similarity of our two worlds.

> "The similarity of the two spheres undoubtedly explains why permission was granted, for it is most unusual for the system rulers to consent to the narration on one planet of the affairs of another."

This is curious. Ironically, the word "undoubtedly" creates doubt (as it usually does) because the author, a Melchizedek of Nebadon, does not really know why permission was granted. Otherwise he would have left out the word "undoubtedly." He adds that this permission was most unusual, suggesting that he was in the dark about it and was only following orders to make his presentation. But if the only reason is to inform us, then all we are being asked to do is to simply absorb some interesting information and to exclaim, "How nice. Good for them."

The real motive is probably in the last paragraph of the Paper, in which we get the big pitch — for world government, of course.

> "The pouring out of the Spirit of Truth provides the spiritual foundation for the realization of great achievements in the interests of the human race of the bestowal world. Urantia is therefore far better prepared for the more immediate realization of a planetary government with its laws, mechanisms, symbols, conventions, and language — all of which could contribute so mightily to the establishment of world-wide peace under law and could lead to the sometime dawning of a real age of spiritual striving…" (p. 820)

It appears that the whole point of this Paper was to set us up for this pitch. There is no other observable reason why we needed to be told about a government on a neighboring planet. The "more immediate realization of a planetary government" could only mean the United Nations, which is the focal point of socialist-communist totalitarianism. Its constitution was adapted from that of the former Soviet Union and a main contributor to it was Alger Hiss, a proven communist.

In terms of the American constitution, the United States is *not* a member of the United Nations because the United Nations is *not* a sovereign body with which the United States could enter into a treaty relationship. No treaty binds the United States to the United Nations, nor could there ever be such a treaty under the present Constitution. It would requires a constitutional amendment to put the United States into a treat relationship with a non-sovereign body.

The issue is dodged by calling our contract with the United Nations a charter or an agreement. But the constitutional requirements for a real membership in the United Nations, assuming for the sake of argument that it would be desirable, are brushed aside by *realpolitik.*

Perhaps the most important point of all about the nature of constitutional government is that the Constitution originates in the People themselves as an expression of their sovereignty and their desire to use their sovereignty to create a proper government. This means that the People, the Body Politic, present *their* Constitution, once it is finished and ratified, to the various levels of legislature (state, national, or global), and those legislatures have no authority whatsoever to alter the meaning and intent of this Constitution by the passage of any laws of their own within their own assemblies. On the contrary, all laws passed by the various levels of legislatures must conform to the dictates of the ruling Constitution.

Nor does the Supreme Court (state, national, or global) have the authority to change the original intentions and original meanings of that Constitution. Its main function is only to clarify, assert, and apply those intentions and meanings to the case at hand. A fatal failing in the American system is that it allows, by tradition starting with Justice Jay, the Supreme Court to declare a law unconstitutional, and it does so without allowing the Legislature the opportunity to correct the law in question. Of course, such a corrected law could not be applied ex post facto to the case at hand, but it would permit the Legislature an essential check and balance on the Supreme Court. The Constitution should never be allowed to mean whatever the Supreme Court says it means, without recourse.

Further, there can be no proper amendment to the various levels of constitutional structure, enlarging the scope of authority of the government, without the ratification of the People themselves in convention assembled. If a law having the essential effect of an amendment were to be passed by action of the legislatures alone, and if that law were to enlarge the scope of authority of the government, it would mean that the legislatures would have acted to enlarge their own power, and this is in violation of the very nature and purposes of the various levels of constitutional structures *except* if there is a clear understanding that any laws or amendments passed under the justification of national emergency or martial law are to be terminated and to become null and void after the declared cessation of such national emergency or martial law.

The same principle applies to presidential executive orders that purport to have the force of law for the whole country. Such executive orders are on their face null and void, and represent a usurpation of power, unless they can be *temporarily* justified by national emergency and the need for martial law. In such cases, the Legislature needs to confirm the state of national emergency and the need for martial law; otherwise, the executive branch would be acting entirely on its own in giving itself huge increases in power.

Constitutional government has its origin in limited and specific grants of authority and power to the government by the People who are the source of all such grants because *they* are the sovereign and the government is their servant. Instead, in Paper 134 the emphasis in on the designation of the global government as the SOVEREIGN, in all-caps.

To repeat: When the government is the “SOVEREIGN,” we are its subjects and its servants. When the government is the “SOVEREIGN,” we have no recognized God-given rights. When the government is the “SOVEREIGN,” the government itself is God. And this God will want, of course, to be worshipped in some fashion.

ADDENDUM

ESSENTIAL NEW INFORMATION

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION WAS FRAUDULENTLY ESTABLISHED

In the essay above I have used the Constitution as the standard against which to measure the political proposals of the Urantia Papers. In the interests of fairness and honesty I must report the findings of a new book, published in 1995, entitled "the Constitution That Never Was," by Ralph Boryszewski. It is only in the last month (March/April 97) that I read it. Its thesis is that the Constitution was foisted on the American people by the fraudulent activity of lawyers, including James Madison.

Chapter 7 (pp. 134-135) of Boryszewski's book gives a good summary of the situation. The members to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 were appointed by respective state legislatures, not by the people. Their express purpose was to revise the Confederation's structure and nothing more.

"Resolved That, in the opinion of Congress, it is expedient that, on the second Monday in May next, a Convention of Delegates, who shall have been appointed by the several States, be held at Philadelphia, for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation, and reporting to Congress and the several Legislatures, such alterations and provisions therein as shall, render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government, and the preservation of the Union."

Rhode Island was the only state whose legislature did not send delegates to the Convention. This in itself was enough to void the activities of the Convention under Article XIII of the Confederation, which required the confirmation of every state for any alterations in the Articles.

With Rhode Island absent, the delegates were without authority to proceed, and should have declared so and reported back to Congress and their respective states that they could not continue. At this juncture, Boryszewski says,

"The Convention should have resolved: That a Convention of people elected by the various states should assemble at a place and time specified by the Congress for the purpose of drafting a new plan for a central government to be administered by the elected representatives of the people. That was never done because the lawyers did not want a government of the people, they wanted a government of lawyers. This is the reason they voted for strict secrecy during the Convention. If the state legislatures had known that the delegates were exceeding the authority granted by their commissions, they could have been recalled." (p. 135)

The lawyers had made plans to jettison the Confederation months before the Convention. It was really nothing less than a coup d'etat that they had arranged. Edmund Randolph had prepared his Virginia Plan for the Convention's consideration and had brought the popular George Washington on board as President of the Convention to give it a measure of respectability. Of the 55 delegates, 34 were lawyers, and their numbers gave them control of the Convention. Moreover, most of these delegates were Masons, and the whole operation smells of a Masonic conspiracy. Boryszewski comments:

"The founding lawyers [sic] did not want the state legislatures to ratify the Constitution because the states, if called upon for ratification, would have rejected the newly proposed Constitution because of the incomplete and ineffectual Judicial Article which read:

" 'The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.' " (p. 136)

The states would not have wanted Congress to be in control of completing the Supreme Court because they did not want so much power for the federal judiciary through the establishment of the lower federal courts (district and circuit) by the Congress. Because the lawyers at the Convention knew this, they were forced to leave out any provisions completing the Supreme Court. They created a subterfuge whereby (1) they would preoccupy the people with plans for electing delegates to state conventions for the purpose of ratifying the incomplete and non-representative constitution; (2) they would also preoccupy the people with the promise that any changes they wanted in the constitution should be submitted as proposed amendments *after* the incomplete and non-representative constitution was ratified; and (3) they intended to sign into law a Judiciary Act *after* the constitution and any amendments were ratified, and this Judiciary Act would complete the definition of the Supreme Court. In this way the Judiciary Act could escape the people and their state legislatures. This is why Boryszewski called this convention non-representative and its proposed constitution incomplete.

But without a complete definition of the Supreme Court in the proposed Constitution that the

people were supposed to passively ratify, any ratification would be null and void on its face because such an incomplete Constitution would not be able to provide a complete government. As Boryszewski put it,

"The Constitution could not be ratified without the three departments of government ready and able to function. For example, if Congress passed any law that the people or the states believed to be unconstitutional, there would not be a court available where the acts of Congress could be challenged." (p. 136)

The second problem with the Judiciary Act, which passed into law in 1789, was that it was really an amendment to the Constitution and not a law because it filled out the weak and vague provisions for a judiciary in the Constitution. Congress by its nature as a legislative body does not have the authority to amend the Constitution, and therefore it cannot approve laws such as the Judiciary Act. In effect, the First Congress of 1789 was deviously turned into a constitutional conventional in which an act of law amended the Constitution. Ironically, without such a false law, the Constitution would never have completed its definition of the judicial branch and there would have been no fully functioning government.

The Judiciary Act created the offices of Attorney General and a U.S. Attorney in each judicial district. The purpose was to provide for adversarial proceedings in the federal courts — the lawyers wanted employment. The Constitution ratified in 1788 provided only hearing courts, and adversarial proceedings require lawyers.

Lastly, the Judiciary Act introduced the entire body of English Common Law into our courts. Boryszewski says,

"The American people were abused under the English Common Law and greatly despised it. Had the term 'Common Law' appeared in the text of the Constitution, it would have been rejected as once. The Common Law itself was a threat to trial by jury and a challenge to the sovereignty of the people." (p. 141)

The English Common Law is a vast and complex body of law, and of course only lawyers know how to navigate it.

In short and in sum, the American Constitution was not created by proper authority and was not ratified by proper or adequate means. In theory, this means it is null and void and that we are still living under the Articles of Confederation. As a practical matter, the new Constitution and the states with their own new constitutions completely replaced the original Confederacy under the Articles of Confederation. Because too much time has passed, we have no choice but to accept the coup d'etat that gave us the new system. We simply need to be aware that it was not arrived at, or properly defined, in a fair and open manner, but by a conspiracy. We have an unconstitutional Constitution, and we will just have to live with that realization.