



CONSTITUTION DISSECTED © Authored by PAC info@pacinlaw.us

"The wise know their weakness too well to assume infallibility; and he who knows most, knows best how little he knows." —Thomas Jefferson

Have you ever wondered why a "*constitution*" is entitled a constitution?

Before the *international pact* entitled *the Constitution for the United States of America* was installed, the original confederation of the thirteen states was established and governed by a document that was entitled: *The Articles of Confederation*. There was no "*constitution*".

To illustrate, why a "*state constitution*" cannot be entitled something like the following...

California Articles of Statehood? Well... what do you think?

Do you really think that men could be *rulers* over people if they did not have some kind of secret control over them? To explore this subject, let us explore the concept of *constitution* as it purviews through these two definitions found in *American Heritage Dictionary*:

- **con•fi•dence**, *n.* 1. Trust or faith in a person or thing. *con.* Slang. *tr.v.*, *cons.* 1. To swindle (a victim) by first winning his or her confidence; *dupe.* --*con*, *n.* 1. A swindle. --*con*, *adj.* Of, relating to, or involving a swindle or a fraud: a con artist; a con job. [Short for confidence --*con*•*fi*•*dence*, *adj.* Of, relating to, or involving a swindle or fraud: a confidence scheme.]
- **in•sti•tu•tion**, *n.* 1. The act of instituting. 2. A custom, practice, relationship, or behavioral pattern of importance in the life of a community or society. 3. Abbr. *inst.*, *Inst.* An established organization or foundation, especially one dedicated to education, public service, or culture.

The derivative of both words combined could be looked at as: CON•STITUTION

Now see this information in relation to submission to the laws of government:

"When a change of government takes place, from a monarchical to a republican government, the old form is dissolved. Those who lived under it, and did not choose to become members of the new, had a right to refuse their allegiance to it, and to retire elsewhere. By being a part of the society subject to the old government, they had not entered into any engagement to become subject to any new form the majority might think proper to adopt. That the majority shall prevail is a rule posterior to the formation of government, and results from it. It is not a rule binding upon mankind in their natural state. There, every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen without his consent." EMPHASIS ADDED *CRUDEN v. NEALE*, 2 N.C. 338 (1796) 2 S.E. 70

That was the Supreme Court of North Carolina in the year of 1796 stating that no man is bound to any law without the MAJORITY CONSENT of the fellowmen of his country, as pursuant to a lawful democratic process. Even then *individual consent* is necessary.¹

¹ See the article, *Citizen as a Legal Fiction*, at : www.pacinlaw.us/citizen

With that in mind, did you realize that most all the state constitutions in America were not approved by the *consent* of the American people? They were not. They were just *established*.

In example, look at the famous *Preamble* of the United States Constitution:

“We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

Now, look at this definition from *American Heritage Dictionary*:

- **Ordain.** To order by virtue of superior authority; decree or enact.

And this definition from *Ballentine’s Law Dictionary*:

- **People.** The popular leaders, who in all ages have called themselves “The People”. See *Blackstone’s Commentaries* 438

The majority of the delegates walked out of the Constitutional Convention. So in sense, were the signers really acting in behalf of all *Americans*? Note that the maxim above states that the leaders call themselves “*The People*”.² Consequently, we can gather that “*We the People*” had ordained the *United States* Constitution to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for *themselves* and *their* posterity.³ This should be telling in regard to what you *think* you know.

Here are some common law maxims that may apply to the non-establishment of this law:

- ***Consensus facit legem.*** Consent makes the law. A contract is a law between the parties, which can acquire force only by consent.
- ***Les fictions naissent de la loi, et non la loi des fictions.*** Fictions arise from the law, and not law from fictions.
- ***Quod populus postremum jussit, id just ratum esto.*** What the people have last enacted, let that be the established law.

Consequently, the Constitution was not installed by a democratic representative process. That is to say, a majority of the *people* and/or the delegates of each American nation approving such institutional/corporate bylaws of the *Federation State*. The Constitution for the United States of America is only in existence due to the *confidence* of people that make up the *current* body politic. Simply put, in sense, they accept it by their silence or acquiescence. Moreover, it is an historical and documented fact that bodies politic of the several states did not have a hand in enacting the *Fourteenth Amendment* of the Constitution, nor did the *so-called* representative government. This was done in violation of *Article V* of the same Constitution. Accordingly, this maxim of law could be seen as applying: *When the foundation fails, all fails.*

2 See the article, *These are Your Servants?*, at : www.pacinlaw.us/servants

3 Look at this telling statement by justice Marshall in *Barron v. Baltimore* using the phrase “the people” in reference to *the popular leaders*:

“The Constitution was ordained and established by the people of the United States for themselves, for their own government, and not for the government of individual States. Each State established a constitution for itself, and in that constitution provided such limitations and restrictions on the powers of its particular government as its judgment dictated. The people of the United States framed such a government for the United States as they supposed best adapted to their situation, and best calculated to promote their interests.”

Barron v. City of Baltimore, 32 U.S. 243 (1833) www.laws.findlaw.com/us/32/243.html

One could say that what has been gone over herein is a confidence scheme instituted against the American people. Essentially a *CONstitution* lacks lawful authority due to the absence of a proper democratic process. That is to say, it really should have been established by referendum by people who are considered to be the body politic (*or* ‘state’). In other words, a constitution is the instituting of a fraud, or maybe stating it more lightly: It is a confidence scheme. Ergo: One could say that all American constitutions ultimately have no absolute authority.

Now that you understand *the People* were the ones who signed the Constitution, such people are the actual men who have the obligations to their contracts.⁴ One of the purposes of the document was to make all “citizens” in the [U]nited States of America *their* constitutors.⁵

Of course the information in this paper may be a bit hard to swallow or understand, and you may think this conjecture; but this is how law operates. Another thing to take notice of in this *con-game* is, the President gives the *State of the Union* Address, not the State of the Nation Address... Accordingly one must ask himself: A union of what? *Nations*, perhaps?

That noted: nation = state, *in international law*, i.e., *the status and/or [e]state of a nation*.

Judge Robert Bork was right: Every man (*and* woman) in America is in prison by his consent. That is because he had submitted himself to an inferior authority: *The ‘State’*.

On that note... The Constitution is the “Supreme Law” of the Land, not the *Paramount Law*.⁶ Understand? Here is a clue by William Penn: “*Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.*”⁷ Another clue: People live in the *country*, not in “The State”.

IN CLOSING: The Coalition uses the CONstitution of the United States to its best advantage. Ultimately, the constitutions are the contract between the government officers/officials⁸ and people that makeup the body or *bodies politic* of any given state.⁹ The officers are subject to the documents pursuant to their oaths of office. They are the ones mandated to protect us under rules of international law and any other provisions that are incorporated into the document.

To learn more, study legal fictions or *fiction*:

- **FICTION.** An assumption of supposition of law that something which is or may be false is true, or that a state of facts exists which has never really taken place. *Black’s Law Dictionary, 4th Ed.*

PEOPLE’S AWARENESS COALITION WELCOMES YOU!

Please join us in appropriating education and freedom that the republics provide!



Visit People’s Awareness Coalition at : www.pacalliance.us



Join us at the PAC Open Forum :
www.pacgroups.us/register

4 See the writing of Lysander Spooner, No Treason www.lysanderspooner.org

5 **CONSTITUTOR.** *In civil law.* One who, by a simple agreement, becomes responsible for the payment of another’s debts. *Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition*

6 **PARAMOUNT.** Above all. *Ballentine’s Law Dictionary, 3rd Ed.* Also see *2 Bl Comm. 59*

7 See this paper if you really want to understand how deep the deception goes: www.pacinelaw.us/doj

8 The term “officer” may be used to define government *elected* people in their *private law* capacity, while the term “official” may be used to refer to the same people in their *public law* capacity. Yes, *‘tis the art of law.*

9 See this paper to understand the somewhat deceptive use of *state*: www.pacinelaw.us/usage