

Joseph Healy
Ohio Patriots Alliance
May 24, 2022
SJR 4
Opponent Testimony

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Members of the Committee,

Getting right to the point—in considering the magnitude and the prospect of assembling a Constitutional Convention, I take the view of Patrick Henry regarding the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, “I smell a rat.” Thomas Jefferson admonished us to no more put confidence in man, (quote) “but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.”

And observing quite clearly that our national problems have arisen due to disregard and disobedience to the Constitution, not to deficiencies in it, I have a natural suspicion toward attempts to change it. Why not first obey it, and obey it as the Framers intended it? Or do they have hidden motives to replace it entirely.

Since the Progressive Era of the late 19th and early 20th Centuries, powerful and influential forces have dreamed and schemed to replace our Constitution, calling it outdated, cumbersome, inefficient. From the days of Woodrow Wilson and his chief advisor, Edward Mandel House, who penned the novel *Philip Dru Administrator*, describing a military coup, scrapping of the Constitution, and the imposition of an administrative dictatorship, as well as the creation of a world government under the League of Nations, Progressive elites in the Establishment have followed this blueprint, albeit gradually and incrementally, in their quest to remake America in a very different image than that devised by the Founders of our Republic.

A couple generations later, their ideological descendents proposed the Constitution of the New States of America, which quite embodies their Progressive ideals for an empowered administrative state. It was promoted in a 1974 book by Rexford Tugwell entitled *The*

Emerging Constitution. It was the work of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, underwritten by the Ford Foundation and other powerful interests, and linked to the Aspen Institute, a globalist think tank for the elites.

This new proposed constitution is accommodating for the promoters of the Big Bureaucratic Administrative State. It positively grants rights, and adds exceptions clauses for the state to cancel or curtail them. (For example, when I read the first clause after the preamble I nearly fell off my chair laughing: *Freedom of expression, of communication, of movement, of assembly, or of petition shall not be abridged except in declared emergency.*) This is the opposite of our Constitution, which only recognizes pre-existing rights and prohibits the government from denying or disparaging them. It also creates additional branches of government, namely the Planning and Regulatory departments; so it permanently authorizes bureaucratic largesse. Under our current framework we can at least call the alphabet soup of bureaucracies what it is, unauthorized expansion of government. It also nationalizes control of Elections. Conspicuously absent is the individual and state right to keep and bear arms; only authorized agents of the government may have weapons. There is also a preoccupation with emergency powers; states of emergency may be declared by the legislature, the President, and other officials.

After the dystopian nightmare we have experienced over the last two years, the last thing I want to hear about is a state of emergency. Let me state for the record, there are no such things as emergency powers. There are only constitutionally authorized powers which we the People grant. The very concept of declaring an emergency is a mere artifice of tyrants and dictators to run cover for the assumption of raw fiat powers, which amount to criminal usurpations.

Perhaps you will say such a constitution is too extreme; it would never gain approval. Well then, consider a more recent and

moderate revision called *The Conservative Constitution*, one of several possible new constitutions submitted for a study project at the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia. It too grants power to declare an emergency. It also grants power to create a central bank. Other than that it keeps much of the current language. But here's the kicker. Instead of the 2nd Amendment, it has this:

Neither the States nor the United State shall make or enforce any law infringing the right to keep and bear arms of the sort ordinarily used for self-defense or recreational purposes, provided that States, and the United States in places subject to its general regulatory authority, may enact and enforce reasonable regulations on the bearing of arms, and the keeping of arms by persons determined, with due process, to be dangerous to themselves or others.

Some Conservative Constitution!

So you see, it's not as if no one is talking about totally revising or replacing our beloved, hallowed Constitution. Revisions are floating around out there; and they are being floated by not insignificant actors. Do you think there's a chance they might be floated into a Convention by moneyed interests. I mean, we have Klaus Schwab and the World Economic Forum meeting in Davos as we speak to foist upon us their Great Reset. We have the illegitimate Biden Administration trying to subordinate our sovereignty to a global health commissar at the WHO. These megalomaniacs are already proceeding as if our Constitution didn't exist. Don't you think they and their associates, the George Soros', the David Rockefellers', the Bill Gates' of the world wouldn't jump at the chance to scrap it once and for all. Believe me, they are working on it.

So rather than naively risking such a dreadful scenario in an Article V Convention, we should be doubling down to actually enforce our

Constitution as currently written. We begin by following Jefferson's prior advice from the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798. State governments must bind the federal government down from mischief by interposing themselves between their citizens and federal overreach. They must nullify all unauthorized and illicit federal acts. Citizens and officers, and public officials at all levels must keep their oaths by resisting and opposing those who are unfaithful to their's. Resistance to tyranny and interposition are not new concepts. They go back to Biblical times. From the Hebrew midwives who defied Pharoah, to the Apostles who said, "We must obey God rather than men," the Sacred Writings are replete with examples of the principle of defiance against the unjust and wicked abuse of authority. That is why our Forefathers believed "Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God." It is not a change in the Constitution that is needed, it is the will to forcibly impose obedience to the Constitution on those we ourselves have chosen to be ministers of our Government.

Thank you.