

SLIDE	NOTES
1	In this module we discuss an overview of political conflict that has been brewing in America for many decades based on the varying definitions of the constitution discussed in the previous module.
2	<p><b>HANGING BY A THREAD</b> We have been warned...</p> <p><b>Anim1:</b> <b>Quote</b> Christ said (read)            * Christ justifies us in befriending the Constitution.            * Note that this scripture must be taken in context of it describing the United States constitution, because other repressive governments such as the former Soviet Union, China, and Iran all also claim to be constitutional republics but their constitution is not based on Natural Rights.            * This scripture must be accompanied with the other scriptures from the Doctrine and Covenants, clarifying "befriending constitutional law" is based on a Natural Rights definition of justice.</p> <p><b>Anim2:</b> <b>Quote</b> President Benson said: (read)  <b>Anim3:</b> <b>Quote</b> (read)  <b>Anim4:</b> <b>Quote</b> (read)</p> <p><b>Q: What do you think President Benson is warning about?</b>  <b>Q: What do you think is destroying it?</b>            * Whatever is more or less than constitutional law based on Individual Natural Rights is what is destroying the constitution and "cometh of evil".            * On the "less side of the equation, undershooting means not living up to it by failing to protect individual rights.            * On the "more side of the equation" overshooting means reinterpreting it in ways to undercut the original meaning and intent.</p>
3	<p><b>EVOLVING MEANING</b>            * The founding Fathers knew societies change which is exactly why they provided a formal process for altering the constitution.            * However, there is a deadly idea and practice gaining traction of comparing the Constitution to a living, evolving organism.  <b>Anim1:</b> <b>Quote</b> (read)  <b>Anim2:</b> <b>Quote</b> (read)  <b>Anim3:</b> <b>Quote</b> (read)</p> <p>* In other words, if we can change the meaning of the words, we can change the meaning of the Constitution itself, without having to go through the extremely difficult process of formal change as it was originally put in place as a protection.</p> <p><b>Anim4:</b> <b>Quote</b> Wikipedia            * With Judicial Activism, if we can pack the courts with judges who agree with an "evolving meaning constitution" instead of an "original meaning constitution" the job of social change is even that much more easily accomplished.            * It avoids having to put the issue to the people directly or to their representatives in congress as was intended.            * Living evolving meaning at the Higher Court levels makes the Judicial Branch all powerful, undercutting the checks and balances the founders carefully put in place, making the courts like referees changing the meaning of the game as it goes along.</p> <p>* A majority of Americans now believe in evolving meaning.  <b>Anim5:</b> <b>Quote</b> (read)  <b>Q: Could you imagine if in all of our personal contracts like home deeds, and auto loans, if we could just change the meanings of the words without changing the actual contract?</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* No one would dare sign such a personal contract with evolving meaning, yet Americans are allowing government institutions to get away with it on the most important contract of all.</li> <li>* Changing the dictionary, undercuts everything. Constitutional originalists argue you can't do that.</li> <li>* In order to save the constitution, we have to go back to the original meaning.</li> </ul>
4	<p><b>CONSTITUTIONAL ORIGINALISM</b></p> <p>* Q: Do you think the Lord's definition of "the constitutional law of the land" has changed since the time he inspired the constitution?</p> <p><b>Anim1: Quote</b> Justice Scalia said: (read... pause after idiot) Justice Scalia knew the "living organism" argument, and correctly pointed out the fallacy in the comparison.</p> <p><b>Anim2: Quote</b> (read) Q: If the designers of the Constitution intended for "changing meanings" to be a legitimate method of interpreting law, why did they bother to include a formal process for changing the law? * They could have just let the natural corruption of language take its course. But they didn't. They explicitly defined the process for changing the law. Q: Why did the framers of the Constitution spend so much time getting the wording right? * They were very meticulous over the words, debating deeply the language. They did not foresee the corruption of language that was coming. * It is exactly what Lucifer did during the Great Apostasy with religious words such as grace, faith, etc. Q: Why would we think Lucifer would leave the constitution alone in the political arena upon which all religious freedom depends?</p>
5	<p><b>CONSTITUTIONAL ORIGINALISM</b></p> <p><b>Anim: Quote</b> Elder Oaks said (play video) * Notice that Elder Oaks is presupposing an originalist perspective... * Notice also his example of taking a "green light" approach by keeping the conversation focused on political philosophy rather than the red light of discussing specific parties or candidates.</p>
6	<p><b>HOUSE DIVIDED TIMELINE</b></p> <p>Let's consider the timeline of our nation becoming a house divided over the meaning of the constitution.</p> <p>The timeline of becoming a house divided starts with... <b>The FOUNDER'S Era</b></p> <p><b>Anim1:</b> The "Founder's Era" occurred from 1776 to approximately 1900...  <b>Anim2:</b> During this part of the timeline, the governing political principle was <i>Liberty</i>  <b>Anim3:</b> With an originalist interpretation of the Constitution, this meant limited government with specifically enumerated powers.          * The primacy issue is individual "Natural Rights" having primacy over the authority of the State, implemented through a Constitutional Republic.          * The proper role of government during this time was to "Secure Natural Rights".</p> <p><b>Now let's consider the PROGRESSIVE TIMELINE which instituted a fight over socialism and political liberty.</b></p> <p><b>Anim4:</b> The shift to progressivism over time could be considered as a gradual spectrum.          * But we can roughly divide our history into two parts... The first ~100 years representing the Founder's era, and the last ~100 years representing the progressive era.</p>

	<p>* As many American's were returning from being educated in Europe, they brought back with them the political history and philosophy associated with the traditions of <i>Equality</i> being the governing principle.</p> <p><b>Anim5:</b> America then entered into what is called the "Progressive Era"</p> <p><b>Anim6:</b> With a "progressive" interpretation of the constitution, this meant unlimited government, operating through <b>implied constitutional powers</b>.</p> <p>* The primacy issue is the authority of the State having primacy over individuals, implemented through collectivism and socialism.</p> <p>* The proper role of government under progressivism is to "Impose Social Justice".</p> <p><b>Anim7:</b> This leaves us today in our present "house divided" situation...with an ongoing conflict between those adhering to an "Originalist Constitution", vs those adhering to a "Progressive Constitution".</p> <p><b>Anim8:</b> Meanwhile, the American Welfare state is dispensing social spending programs and accumulating debt at a level previous generations never could have imagined, and future generations will not be able to easily pay back.</p>
7	<p><b>PHYSICAL MAP OF PROPERTY CONTROL</b></p> <p>There are lots of ways to divide Americans on this issue.</p> <p><b>Q: What does a house divided look like out in the real world?</b></p> <p>As one example, let's analyze the historical map of the states being admitted into The United States as time progressed.</p> <p><b>Anim1: Map</b></p> <p>* On the timeline of our Nation, as each State joined the Union over time, the % of Federally controlled Lands (shown in red) shows this shift to Collective Statism.</p> <p><b>Anim2: Founders Era</b></p> <p>* During the Founders Era (1776 to approximately 1900)... Looking at the eastern seaboard and the early States in the union, the land is mostly under private ownership.</p> <p>* We see a relatively small percentage of Federally controlled lands (in red) for the states entering the union from the Founders Era.</p> <p>* The political philosophy of the proper role of government at the time of their statehood was to secure natural rights (including property rights).</p> <p><b>Anim3: Progressive Era</b></p> <p>* As additional states were added in the westward expansion during the Progressive Era, the land became increasingly more and more under Federal Government ownership. Today, the United States government owns approximately 47 percent of all land in the Western states.</p> <p>* The political philosophy of the proper role of government during this time was to impose social justice, through socialism and collectivist control of property.</p>
8	<p><b>SPLIT</b></p> <p><b>Q: Where has this left us?</b></p> <p>* Herein is the political constitutional crisis...Where America has become a house divided.</p> <p><b>Anim1: Constitutional Republic</b></p> <p>What was once "Constitutional Republicanism" in the Founders Era, designed to secure individual natural rights...</p> <p><b>Anim2: Welfare State</b></p> <p>Has become "Welfare Statism" since the Progressive Era, designed to impose social justice.</p> <p><b>Anim3: The Hand of Government represents</b> each side implementing its policies according to its own political philosophy perspective.</p>

	<p>* Under the "Right Hand" with a Constitutional Originalist political philosophy, America was established with a limited Government and enumerated powers</p> <p>* Under the "Left Hand" with a Statist, social justice political philosophy, America is becoming an unlimited government with all sorts of implied powers.</p> <p><b>Anim4: The Glove of Ethics</b></p> <p>* The moral covering justification for each political hand (right and left) comes from a lower branch of philosophy.</p> <p>* The primacy issues from Ethics provide the "covering glove" to each political implementation.</p> <p><b>Anim5: Duty Ethics</b></p> <p>The moral justification for the collectivism of social justice comes from the altruism of Duty Ethics. Choosing "Otherism" in ethics, logically leads to collectivist, socialist politics.</p> <p><b>Anim6: Value Ethics</b></p> <p>The moral justification for the individualism of constitutional republicanism comes from Value Ethics. Choosing "Selffulness" in ethics, logically leads to an individualist, natural rights politics.</p>
9	<p>What was once a fixed Constitutional structure with specific enumerated powers, protecting individual rights, has become...</p>
10	<p><b>POST-CONSTITUTIONAL ERA</b></p> <p>A "post-constitutional era"...</p> <p><b>THE CRUSH</b></p> <p><b>Anim1:</b> With freedom collapsing under the weight of a modern "Administrative State"</p> <p><b>Anim2:</b> What was once "We The People", meaning each individual citizen with their inherent natural rights...</p> <p><b>Anim3:</b> Has now become "We the Special Interest Groups"</p> <p><b>Anim4:</b> The "Soft Tyranny" of Special Interest groups... has become "Identity Politics" where people identify as part of collective and opposing ethnic groups, who pile on to vote and skew legislation to pick winners and losers according to group identity.</p> <p><b>THE BUREACRACY</b></p> <p><b>Anim5:</b> As the unelected bureaucracy sprawls, nobody can say with complete authority exactly how many federal agencies even exist.</p> <p><b>Anim6:</b> Best guesses estimate hundreds of Federal Agencies.</p> <p><b>Anim7:</b> The last official count of Federal employees (not including the military) from the "Office of Personnel Management" was at 2.7 Million.</p> <p><b>Anim8:</b> Many of these agencies arbitrate claims and hand out benefits to the various competing special interest groups.</p>
11	<p><b>THE FOUNDERS</b></p> <p>The Founding Fathers had a unique vision of what the American form of government should become.</p> <p><b>Anim1: Quote</b> Ayn Rand</p> <p>We as Latter-day Saints honor these inspired men.</p> <p><b>Anim2: Quote</b> President Wildford Woodruff</p> <p><b>Anim3: Quote</b> President Thomas S. Monson</p> <p><b>Anim4: Quote</b> President Ezra Taft Benson</p>
12	<p><b>CANCELLING THE FOUNDERS</b></p>

	<p>There has been a modern movement in recent times to condemn the Founders of America. The argument goes that:</p> <p>Q: If there is something fundamentally wrong with these "Privileged Founders", then isn't there something wrong with the "Privileged" political system they created?</p> <p>Anim1: Quote Popular Historian Stephen Ambrose said:</p> <p>Anim2: Quote Thomas West said:</p> <p>* The argument goes that if Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, etc. were all bigoted there must be something profoundly wrong with the America they founded.</p>
13	<p><b>DEFINITION OF AMERICAN GREATNESS</b></p> <p>Q: To a slave, or those denied natural rights such as our Mormon pioneer ancestors in Missouri, what are the Founding Fathers, or the 4th of July?</p> <p>Anim1: Quote Former Attorney General, Eric Holder said:</p> <p>* Eric Holder is obviously correct that there are self-evident examples of great oppression in our own American History.</p> <p>* But a key issue overlooked in this perspective is "greatness in comparison to what?"</p> <p>* Comparing America to some utopian illusion that has never been a reality at any time, is a fundamental error.</p> <p>* Look around the world at any stage of history and compare the America that has actually existed with any other society that has actually existed and then ask "how does America stack up to all of these?"</p> <p>Q: So what is the greatness of America? Is it possible we are talking past each other with different definitions of greatness?</p> <p>* Perhaps a slave, or the oppressed, are actually the ones with the most experience to answer that question.</p> <p>* In a 4th of July, 1852 pre-civil war speech, Frederick Douglass, who escaped from slavery said the following:</p> <p>Anim2: Quote Frederick Douglas</p> <p>* Frederick Douglas correctly identified the "saving principles" as the greatness of America.</p> <p>* Douglas obviously greatly admires the Declaration of Independence.</p> <p>Q: What do you think Douglas had to say about the Founding Fathers though?</p> <p>Anim3: Quote Frederick Douglas</p> <p>Q: Was Douglas Naïve?</p> <p>Anim4: Quote Frederick Douglas</p> <p>* Douglass was no fool. He knew to differentiate between the "greatness" of eternal principles espoused in our political philosophy, at the same time acknowledging our earned condemnation at failing to live up to those principles in practice.</p> <p>* In accurately understanding who we are and where we are going, we must learn to avoid one-sided historical narratives that only focus on failings compared to some impractical utopian ideal, while ignoring the historical context.</p> <p>* To discover the truth we must accept all of the historical facts, including Americas failing in the historical context.</p> <p>* Greatness? Yes, American principles and ideals have always been great. But there have been periods in our history where we have failed to live up to these ideals.</p>
14	<p><b>Overshooting, Undershooting</b></p> <p>* Using our "Overshooting" and Undershooting" model, the target is a Constitutional Republic protecting individual Natural Rights.</p> <p>* This represents the correct power of the State in which we are justified in the maximal autonomy and the small amount of autonomy we are willing to transfer to the constitutional republic in order to preserve our freedom and civil society.</p>

\* The founders were very stingy with giving up personal autonomy. They tried to define just enough for a peaceful society with all kinds of conditions, checks and balances, in place limiting the power of the government.

**Anim1:** The "more" side of the scale is represented by Tyrannical Authoritarianism Government regimes, in which we have minimal autonomy.

**Anim2:** The "less" side of the scale represented by total lack of Government Authority is Anarchy with its unlimited autonomy.

\* Either side of the scale (more or less) is destructive to constitutional rights and "cometh of evil".

**Anim3:** **Scale**

\* Throughout history, societies have been all over this scale that represents the power of the state.

\* On the scale, constitutional Liberty via limited government with specific delineated powers is the target...

**Anim3** **Too Weak**

On the "Too Weak" side of the scale we have "too much autonomy" or Anarchy without government protections. Complete autonomy is a losing argument... It just degenerates into the law of the jungle or survival of the fittest examples of societal breakdown such as war-torn Somalia, or Rwanda.

**Anim4:** **Libertarianism**

\* Lesser versions of "Too Weak" on the libertarian scale, include tribalism, militias, gangs, and the special Interest groups of identity politics.

\* This comes about because as the people get tired of "anything goes" anarchy, they naturally band together forming tribes and factions.

\* **Identity Politics:** is "A tendency for people of a particular religion, race, social background, etc., to form exclusive political alliances, moving away from traditional broad-based party politics."

**Anim5:** **Too Strong**

On the "Too Strong" side of the scale we have "Unlimited Government" or dictatorship such as the authoritarian regimes of the National Socialists of Germany, or the Communists of the Soviet Union.

\* Unlike anarchy, tyranny offers peace by giving up all autonomy.

**Anim6:** **Egalitarianism**

\* Lesser versions of "Too Strong" on the egalitarian scale, include everything associated with the welfare state and the forced redistribution of wealth programs of Europe and America today.

\* The progressive movement has over the last century slowly moved American society in the general direction of "Welfare Statism".

\* Generally those seeking the "Tyranny" side of the scale, also employ the tactic of playing both sides of the "cometh of evil" scale. That is, they stir up "Tribalism" with "Identity Politics" then out of the chaos step in and provide tyrannical order.

15

**Constitutional Crisis (What is at Stake)**

At the same time, freedom as we once knew it is constantly under attack.

**Q: Does you know what this is a picture of?**

**Free Speech Zones**

\* This is an actual picture, of a real sign, and a real place called a "free speech zone".

\* Free speech zones (also known as First Amendment zones, free speech cages, and protest zones) are areas set aside in public places for the purpose of containing political protesting.

\* The existence of free speech zones is based on court decisions stipulating that the government may reasonably regulate the time, place, and manner – but not content – of expression.

	<p>* Everyone who objected to what was going on and wanted to protest the government action was corralled here.</p> <p>* The idea of corraling and shrinking down our first amendment rights is a dangerous development. The 1st amendment does not have a fence. The whole point of the constitution was to coral the government, not have government coral us.</p> <p><b>Q: If an over-reaching government can constrict any one such right, what is to stop it from similarly reigning in all other rights?</b></p> <p><b>Anim1: Post-Constitutional Era</b></p> <p>* This is what it will look like if the era of constitutional government comes to an end...This is what is at stake.</p> <p>* Over the last 100 years or so, with the growth in the federal government, the Executive branch has accumulated vast powers...</p> <p>* Over the same period, Congress has not only been legislating beyond its authority but delegating ever more of those powers to the 450 or so executive branch agencies it has created (the exact number is unknown)...</p> <p><b>Q: And where have the courts been in all of this?</b></p> <p>The Supreme Court has failed to provide oversight by developing "deference doctrines" that have enabled the President and Congress to act beyond their Constitutional authority...</p> <p><b>Q: Practically, what does this mean for us?</b></p>
16	<p><b>RESPONSIBILITY</b></p> <p>It means we have a responsibility.</p> <p><b>Anim1: Quote</b> Thomas Jefferson We pay attention and do not let laws or our government become tyrannical.</p> <p><b>Anim2: Quote</b> President Benson</p> <p><b>Anim3: Quote</b> Thomas B. Griffith We maintain both the original meaning and original intent.</p> <p>If we want to keep our freedoms, we have the responsibility of protecting them. If we want to protect them, we must first understand what we are protecting.</p>
17	Questions?