

RADICAL FREEDOM

Monkey's Brain Implanted
With Chip to Open Police?
SEARCHED FEB 10 11 15

HUFFING AND PUFFING POST

SCOTUS Throws Out Antique Document!

Supreme Court Rules Today That
the U.S. Constitution Is Old News



**OH CRAP,
THERE GOES THE
CONSTITUTION**

Curt Waldrip



A look at how the concept of liberty as envisioned by the American founders is really quite radical by today's standards, and how that freedom has been slowly vanishing for the last century. Sometimes humorous and sometimes rather acerbic with many disturbing and occasionally funny examples of just how radical our system was supposed to be, and how by means of well-meaning laws and seemingly endless regulations from governmental agencies we are losing our birthright. The book takes a look at such seemingly diverse subjects as: The Political Left and the Political Right, The roots of the Declaration of Independence, The Constitution, Stupid Supreme Court decisions, the Progressive Era, Eugenics, Socialists, Nazis, Mass Murder, and Criminal Charges against Inanimate Objects. This is a book that will amuse and irritate people on all sides of the political spectrum.

Radical Freedom or Oh Crap, There Goes the Constitution

Order the complete book from

[Booklocker.com](http://www.booklocker.com)

<http://www.booklocker.com/p/books/8792.html?s=pdf>

**or from your favorite neighborhood
or online bookstore.**

Enjoy your free excerpt below!

Radical Freedom

Oh Crap, There Goes the Constitution

Curt Waldrip

Copyright © 2016 Curt Waldrip

Hardcover ISBN: 978-1-63491-654-7

Paperback ISBN: 978-1-63491-653-0

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the author.

Published by BookLocker.com, Inc., St. Petersburg, Florida.

Printed on acid-free paper.

BookLocker.com, Inc.

2016

First Edition

You Must Comply...

How many Federal regulations have the word “comply” within them? Does it make you feel good to “comply” with someone’s orders? I heard a commercial on the radio recently where a law office spokesman was saying how they can help bring your business into “compliance” with some regulations. This made me ask myself “is a regulation the same as a law?” What if I don’t wish to comply? Is that a crime? Well, yes, pretty much. Perhaps it is only for “our own good”.

How many laws (and rules, and regulations) are for “our own good” (or for the “greater good”)? Let’s take a look at seatbelt laws for a moment. Seatbelt laws are in effect because our representatives believe that seatbelts save lives. Do they actually save lives? They do without a doubt; it’s just simple physics. When you are in a car, and the car slams into a tree, the car has just violently stopped, but what happens to you, the driver? Due to inertia, you’re still moving at the speed the car was, so you will slam into your steering wheel, dashboard, or windshield at 30, 40, 50 or more miles per hour (and yes that will leave a mark!).

Among fatally injured passenger vehicle occupants, almost half (49%) of those killed in 2013 were unrestrained.... For those passenger vehicle occupants that survived a fatal crash in 2013, only 16 percent were unrestrained. During the daytime, 13 percent of passenger vehicle occupants that survived a fatal crash were unrestrained, thus 87 percent of the survivors were restrained. This compares to the nighttime restraint use among the survivors: 19 percent of the nighttime crash survivors were unrestrained and 81 percent of the nighttime crash survivors were restrained¹.

Those are some pretty convincing numbers. Well then, since seat belts are so good, perhaps we should make a law requiring everyone to wear them, right? The problem with this argument is that it takes us back to that earlier question; what if I don’t want to? What if after being given all the facts, I as an

adult choose not to wear my seatbelt? Do I (and should I) have a right to make such a choice?

Well, funny you should ask. Apparently an adult in the “Land Of The Free” does not have the right to make this choice. If you do *choose* to not wear your seatbelt while you’re driving and a police officer spots you, then you will be pulled over and given a ticket. If you *choose* for some reason not to pay the ticket, then a warrant can be issued for your arrest. If you *choose* to not be arrested, then things can get ugly very quickly. I am not saying that choices don’t have some sort of consequences, but I am saying that in a “free” country, we should at least be allowed to make choices that don’t harm another person’s property or self.

So let me rerun that entire scenario above but with different words. You as an adult make an informed choice to not comply with the seatbelt law (which is there for your safety) and you are seen by a police officer driving with no seatbelt. The police officer then can demand you pay his boss (the city, county, state, etc.) an amount of money. If you choose to not pay, and want to keep what is yours (it is after all your own money), then you can be kidnapped (if I were to grab someone at gunpoint and lock them up somewhere, what would you call it?). If you fight to prevent yourself from being kidnapped, you can be killed. Please remember, that this is all in order to keep you from being injured due to not wearing your seatbelts! Where I’m from, we refer to this as “irony”.

Note: There are many comments and side stories in this book where police are NOT the heroes. That said I am very much a “Blue Lives Matter” person and very pro-police officer. They have a very difficult job and someone has to do that job to maintain our civilization. Sadly within any large group, there are a few bad apples, and sometimes good people end up “just following bad orders”; some may remember an incident about 80 years back that started because people were “just following orders” that included a lot of really nasty things happening to some people just because who their parents or grandparents were. This disclaimer isn’t just to get me out of extra traffic

tickets, but is heartfelt. Now that we have that out of the way, we can continue with our seatbelt law discussion.

Are there good reasons for seatbelt laws? Absolutely! The question is, “As a free adult, do I have the right to make bad decisions?” (If I don’t have a right to make bad decisions, then perhaps there should be a law against me taking out ninety-six thousand dollars in student loans to get a degree in Hispanic Transgender Gay and Lesbian studies²; but as I am so prone to doing, I digress.) Does an adult have the right to do things that can potentially be dangerous? Can an adult choose to use dangerous drugs? The law says no. How about tobacco products? The law currently says “yes, but with limits”. How about alcohol? How about drinking sugary drinks or eating fatty food? How about driving a car? The number of Americans killed in car wrecks every year makes driving an incredibly dangerous method of transportation (21,132 passenger vehicle occupants killed in crashes in 2013, which was actually a decline of 3%³!). My question then is; where does the nanny state end? More importantly, is the nanny state even allowed under the U.S. Constitution?

So, let’s say that you decide to drive without seatbelts and smash up your skull so you have an extended hospital stay. Who pays? And what if you’re injured so badly that you will never be able to hold down a job again, and you become a drain on society; what then? Some would argue that the population of working adults has to support you by way of taxation. Do you, the individual have the right to demand that other people support you because you made a bad decision? This is part of the *social contract* argument that influenced the Founding Fathers so strongly. Their idea being that: you are free to do what you like with your life, as long as you do not impact other people (injuring them, stealing from them, etc.). I realize I am putting words into the mouths of the founders, but based on my readings, I strongly suspect that if they were told that the people might be forced to pay a tax in order to support someone that

made a dangerous decision and was injured from it, they would either start laughing (or more probably) become outraged.

Is there a simple solution for this? How about this: Auto insurance companies include a box on their applications that you must check if you choose to not wear seat belts. If you are injured while not wearing seatbelts and you didn't check the box, the insurance company isn't liable to pay for your hospital time. Certainly your rates will be higher if you check that box, but now you will have the freedom you want exercise but without forcing health care costs up for me. Remember, freedom isn't free and actions do have consequences. If you are injured due to your own choices, what gives you the right to be able to tap into the pocketbooks of other Americans to support yourself? It certainly isn't the U.S. Constitution!

Think that is harsh? Of course it is, but even though actions do have consequences, many Americans today would happily accept such consequences as paying a bit more for insurance premiums in order to be able to have more liberty. Otherwise we have to accept the soft dictatorship of a government nanny state.

Should the government have the right to threaten parents of minor children with jail or fines for not obeying safety laws, or should the parents of a child have the final say so? For me personally this is one of the few instances when the (local or state) government should be allowed to get involved, but with very strict limits. With no limits, the government has shown itself over and over to take away more and more liberty until there is none left to take (they might even make laws against allowing kids to drink a soda or eat a hotdog! Oh, sorry Mr. Bloomberg, I will just move along). Anytime we grant government a little more power, we must put strict limits on it, just as the founding fathers attempted to do regarding the United States federal government by means of the Constitution.

Ok, I know what you're thinking: "the word 'radical' is right there in the title and your solution to the seatbelt law isn't very radical now is it?" It is actually, because I maintain that you

should have almost infinite freedom, right up to where you step on mine.

With freedom also comes responsibilities and you must be responsible for your own actions, including those bad life decisions that we all sometimes make. Let's call this "Responsible Freedom".

I think you should have the freedom to own a machine gun (if that is your thing), but not the freedom to fire off a magazine of bullets into the air where the falling bullets may hit someone else. You own your actions, and with freedom must come responsibility. Apparently this is considered a novel concept in today's society.

Liberty

"The truth is that men are tired of liberty."

Benito Mussolini

"I shall earnestly and persistently continue to urge all women to the practical recognition of the old Revolutionary maxim. Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God."

Susan B. Anthony

Sometimes it seems that the American people are tired of liberty, or at least all of the responsibilities that go along with it.

Too often I hear people saying that they don't want to vote for candidate X because he or she is "crazy".

Why do they think they are crazy? Oh, right; some newspaper or maybe the television programs *Politically Incorrect* or *Saturday Night Live* said they were. This is the full extent of most Millennial's pre-election research. This really pains me; as such blatant apathy should be commonly looked down upon by the majority of the people. A free society cannot last for long if the majority of the people just don't care one way or another. Some people will say that they are just not interested in politics, but I wonder how many in Germany were not interested in politics in 1932. Unfortunately, one day in 1933 they awoke to find out that Adolf Hitler was the new chancellor. You may not be interested in politics, but I assure you, it is interested in you.

Something that makes me irritated enough for blood to squirt from my eyes (just an expression folks, nothing to see here!) is when a portion of the electorate votes for someone because of his or her physical appearance. I recall during the 2004 election between George W. Bush and John Kerry hearing a conversation at a college campus where two young women were trying to decide who to vote for. It wasn't about issues, or policy, but rather it was about Kerry looking like Lurch from the *Addams Family* versus Bush not being able to give good

speeches. Well, at least they are politically active right? It took a major act of will power on my part to not just beg them both to never vote again in their lives, as obviously they were both too uninformed to do so! I still cringe whenever I see advertisements begging people to vote, and I would frankly like to exclude anyone from voting that cannot pass a basic citizenship test. What is important isn't that we have a lot of voters, but rather that we have *informed* voters, with a clear grasp of the issues.

I know that doesn't sound much like the words of a believer in Liberty, but in order to have real Liberty, all citizens must be *informed* citizens. Knowledge really is power, but we seem to be handing all of our personal power over to the federal government for "safe keeping" at an alarming rate.

Earlier I started to write about what "freedom" means. It seems very straight forward, but it can twist and turn on you. Our founding fathers did not talk about freedom much (except as freedom from things, such as tyranny), but instead they spoke of *Liberty*. So what exactly is this Liberty, and where do I get some?

Liberty is the freedom to act on your own will (without fear of coercion) as long as you do not infringe on the liberty of others. That amazingly enough means that income taxes are anti liberty, as well as seat belt laws, anti-smoking laws, drug laws, and even indecent exposure (A certain unnamed individual currently running for President should probably be charged with indecent exposure even while fully clothed, but I digress). True liberty cannot exist in an atmosphere of coercion, as coercion infringes on others people's liberty. America was set up so that its Constitution would ensure the rule of law, and that law would prevent coercion not only by other citizens, but also by *our own government*; this is what made the United States a government *of, for, and by* the people.

The Constitution itself was designed as a strong framework to protect individual liberties as well as the rights of each of the states in the Union. *Freedom Outpost* stated this very well by

pointing out that: “The rule of law means that the government is not allowed to coerce an individual except through the enforcement of a previously known and explicitly stated principle of *limited government*. This principle places a limit upon the power of government to legislate by calling into question what sorts of laws are legitimate and which are not.⁴” In other words protected liberties must be balanced with what individual liberties must be given up to allow a society to exist. Stated simply, we have (in theory) freedom of speech, but not the right to shout “fire” in a movie theater”. It is often a very fine balance indeed!

When we speak of “coercion” we need to define our terms. An example of coercion would not be a law stating that if you drive, you need liability insurance. You make a decision to drive and if you don’t want to buy insurance then you don’t drive; after all, driving is not a constitutional right. An example of coercion would be the government making a law demanding that you must buy something or be penalized (Obama-Care springs to mind); such as demanding that you buy liability insurance in order to exercise a constitutional right (such as owning a firearm).

But what has happened to the rule of law? It seems that new laws are constantly popping up that limit our liberty. Again quoting Freedom Outpost, they state that the rule of law “looks beyond individual statutes to the very nature of legislation itself. This differs markedly with the modern notion of the rule of law which implies that as long as all the actions of a government comply with the law, then it is meeting that standard. It is well to remember that under this definition both the Nazis and the Soviets operated under the rule of law⁵.”

Freedom Outpost is very correct in its statement, and the last line should be clearly remembered regarding the Nazis and the Soviets (and every other mass murdering dictator of the twentieth century for that matter), that they were operating within their laws. You might question if those laws were just (and they clearly were not, as they allowed for mass murder),

but they were the law. Recall all those old movies where the German being accused of war crimes says how he was “only following orders”? Now, with that in mind, how many times have you encountered some minor official that tells you that they are only following the rules/the law/policy when they are doing something clearly wrong (or clearly stupid). Have you ever encountered or read of a police officer who says “I don’t make the laws, I only enforce them”? There are currently rules in elementary schools all across America stating that holding your fingers like a gun on the playground is an act of violence, and also rules that say “if a kindergarten student kisses another, it is sexual assault”. Does this seem to have any relationship to common sense for you?

In the case of Nazi Germany, Adolf Hitler passed a law called “the Enabling Act”, which made anything legal that he said was legal⁶. Does this remind you a bit of how the President of the United States sometimes uses executive orders in order to bypass congress (in a way that is clearly not what the Constitution had in mind? Note: While I am not doing a serious comparison of Adolf Hitler to any POTUS in American history, there are lessons to learn from reading about him, and hopefully an understanding of those lessons can help us as a people keep the same thing from happening here. If you don’t believe that an American version of National Socialism (or Communist Socialism, etc.) is possible in this country, then you are clearly too stupid to continue reading this book. Perhaps you can find one that has pictures to color instead? (Yes, I went there!)

Our Constitution was intended to set up a rule of law that was above any legislation that Congress might enact or executive orders of any president.

Unfortunately no one in 1787 envisioned that the Supreme Court would give itself the power to effectively rewrite any part of the Constitution it wanted by “reinterpreting” it. Using the words “Living Document” to describe the Constitution is a way of saying that it changes over time (which it was designed to do by way of amendments), but apparently it has now changed

enough to allow the government to force you to buy things (health insurance), protect late term abortion, and allow the NSA to monitor your telephone and computer traffic without a warrant.

One can also make the argument that since the Federal Government at the time of writing this book has made choices about which statutes to enforce and which not to, that decision has effectively rendered all legislation completely voluntary so that we can all choose which laws to follow based on our whims. I don't recommend trying this however as we now live in a society where the Washington elite do as they will and the rest of us live by a separate set of rules.

In fact, when I examine it, I am reminded of how the French nobility treated the rest of the population in the late 1700's, and I wonder when our own Bastille Day will come (and if it comes, will it be to re-establish the actual Constitution, or will it only be a prelude to something even worse?).

It is important to remember that any time legislation can be changed or repealed by a single branch of the government (such as by presidential fiat); it is then by its very nature nonbinding and subject to the whim of those that govern us.

The rule of law is only maintained when the principles of that law are a part of our common culture. The laws must come from commonly held beliefs and standards of most of the people or they will be gotten rid of (or simply ignored: for example, prohibition in the 1920s) as soon as they stop the majority of the people from doing what feels right and natural to. If the laws are part of the common belief of the people, then the laws will be followed closely, but if they are seen as getting in the way of life as the *majority wishes to live it*, then the system of laws will be rejected and replaced (historically, this often occurs violently). Historically when an entire system of laws is overthrown, such a society often gladly embraces tyranny and dictatorial rule as long as they are convinced that they can now live as they want to live.

Historical examples of nations casting off the “shackles of oppression” (or even perceived oppression) only to voluntarily put on even more oppressive shackles can be seen following the French Revolution, following the Russian Revolution, in the rise of the Third Reich (the Nazis convinced their followers that the democratic Weimar Republic was oppressing them), and in a seemingly endless parade of third world countries that overthrew their tyrannical masters only to raise up new masters that shout socialist slogans while they grind down the general population of the country.



A look at how the concept of liberty as envisioned by the American founders is really quite radical by today's standards, and how that freedom has been slowly vanishing for the last century. Sometimes humorous and sometimes rather acerbic with many disturbing and occasionally funny examples of just how radical our system was supposed to be, and how by means of well-meaning laws and seemingly endless regulations from governmental agencies we are losing our birthright. The book takes a look at such seemingly diverse subjects as: The Political Left and the Political Right, The roots of the Declaration of Independence, The Constitution, Stupid Supreme Court decisions, the Progressive Era, Eugenics, Socialists, Nazis, Mass Murder, and Criminal Charges against Inanimate Objects. This is a book that will amuse and irritate people on all sides of the political spectrum.

Radical Freedom or Oh Crap, There Goes the Constitution

Order the complete book from

[Booklocker.com](http://www.booklocker.com)

<http://www.booklocker.com/p/books/8792.html?s=pdf>

**or from your favorite neighborhood
or online bookstore.**