

the
Outpost of Freedom
Presents:
an explanation
of the
Committee of Safety
(Volume 1)

as recorded in the history of America,
also,
historical examples,
and an
explanation of how to establish
a

Committee of Safety

to provide a means to restore
Constitutional Government
to
the United States of America

by Gary Hunt

July, 1995

A Brief History of Committees of Safety in America

Committees of Safety existed prior to 1692 and were called by various names. The Committee which was created, in that year, in New York is significant in that it was created by the militia. The colonists were dissatisfied with the government of the Crown headed by Governor Sir Edmund Andros. Recognizing that the military (militia) authority must always be subordinate to the civil authority, and having serious concern over the abusive authority imposed by Andros, the militia of New York created its own civil authority in the form of the Committee of Safety.

Representation on the Committee was based upon two delegates being selected by the citizenry to represent each community. The delegates gathered and exercised their authority by, eventually, imprisoning Governor Andros for a period of one year.

On and off, many communities, colonies and provinces exercised their right of "self government" by establishing Committees as the need arose. The practice became even more common after the French and Indian Wars of 1756 - 1758. The Crown had imposed a number of new taxes on the colonies. It was felt that since the French and Indian Wars were in defense of the colonies, the burden of the enormous expense should be borne by the colonists. Of course, few colonists agreed.

As the taxes were imposed, the demand by the colonists for the "rights of Englishmen" was raised. The Parliament had virtually no direct representation from the colonies, although there were some members of the House of Commons who were sympathetic with the colonies.

Each effort by the Crown to raise taxes resulted in the colonies refusing to purchase the goods taxed to raise the revenue. This caused the Crown to impose even more taxes, or replace those that had failed to produce the revenue.

Finally, the Coercive Acts¹ of 1774 caused sufficient concern in the colonies to prompt action. Those communities that had formed Committees sent delegates to the colony or province level in order to respond to the call from the Boston Committee for a Continental Congress. In September, 1774, nine colonies responded to the call and met in Philadelphia to join in actions to counter the increasing imposition of arbitrary control by Britain.

Although during the course of colonial history many Committees of Safety were formed and operated under British government, frequently their actions were outside of the authority granted. They frequently co-existed alongside the "authorized" government of the Crown, creating a parallel government which was the direct representation of the people as opposed to the *legitimate* government of the Crown.

These "parallel" governments formed the nexus that would come together again in June, 1776, comprised of representatives of all thirteen colonies, to form the Second Continental Congress. The outcome of this second congress was the Declaration of Independence.

¹ The Coercive Acts were a number of enactments passed by the British Parliament which closed Boston Harbor, palced Massachusetts under close British rule and extended Canada's boundaries south into lands which the American colonists believed should have been their weatern extensions.



Some Thoughts About Our Representative Form of Government

After the War of Independence, each state was allowed to maintain, under its Constitution, the method for selection or election of representatives which best suited their respective forms of government. The Constitution was modeled after the most common forms in existence in 1787. Thus, from that great document, we have some insight into what method was utilized most often.

If we look at the Constitution closely, there are provisions whose meanings have been lost. Article IV, Section 4, for example, provides that “*The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government...*” There was a limitation of thirty thousand people for each representative (Article 1, Section 2, clause 3), and two senators were to represent each State (Article 1, Section 3, clause 1), and each State's interest. These three concepts have since been obscured by our controlled educational system. When one reads the words of the Founding Fathers, the significance of these matters becomes clear.

The Union was of the states. Each State was a *country* which had chosen to subordinate only certain aspects of its authority to federal powers. To protect the authority of the state in respect to the Union, the senators were selected by the respective state legislatures to protect the interest of the state (states rights). Although we have been led to believe that a state is merely a geographic entity in the country called the United States, we can see that, within the last decade, the Congress perceived the relationship in another way, In the Laws of the 100th Congress - 2nd Session, Public Law (P.L.) 100-702, 297 (b), it makes quite clear that as recently as 1988 each of the states was recognized by the federal government to be a "**country**". These countries, however, have been denied their proper representation by the ratification (if valid) of the Seventeenth Amendment in 1913 (the same year we "acquired" the Federal Reserve Act and the "income tax" (Sixteenth) Amendment).

The representation of no more than more thirty thousand people by a member of the House of Representatives has been modified by legislative acts, not by way of a Constitutional amendment (as required by the Constitution). At the present time there are over 400,000 people represented by each Representative. This is a result of the imposition of a limitation of 435 representatives, which violates the concept of the Founders. Instead, we have a system in which votes are bought (by entitlement programs and through massive advertising campaigns) without regard to the interests of the constituents, as would be true if the thirty thousand limit were recognized.

If we look at these two issues with an insight into some of the concepts understood at the time of the War of Independence, we can find that there was good cause for these restrictions on government. The concept of government, as envisioned then, and which satisfies the primary criteria of "Republican Form", is based upon *delegation*. Each community would *delegate* representatives to the next higher sitting authority. This process is applied in each state, and those delegates become the state legislatures, which, in turn, delegate two senators to represent the interests of the state in the United States Senate.

The representatives were delegated by thirty thousand (small enough to allow personal knowledge of the delegate prior to selection, and not subject to "media" control). Perhaps another level in this process would allow representation at thirty thousand, and subsequent delegation at a state level which would accommodate the 435-member limitation.

Finally comes the Electoral College. This concept has been in place since the Constitution (Article II, Section 1, clause 1) was ratified, and was also based upon delegation. Each state selected delegates equal in number to the number of senators and representatives from that state. These "electors" were the delegates of the

states who carried the wishes of their constituents to the process of selecting the President, who, as the executive, was not the leader, or the lawmaker, rather the administrator who would carry out the will of the people as directed by the Congress through their enactments. Now this "electoral college" is controlled by the primary parties (Democrats and Republicans), and has been removed as a part of our Republican Form of Government. Many states have also opted to a "winner take all" allocation of "electors" This, in essence, deprives the minority of voters within the state their collective selection for President.

We have, since the time of the Founders, seen a gradual but persistent effort to replace the role of President with that of a monarch, with some limitations on power, which is surprisingly similar to what was then true in England. The arbitrary authority of President was not conceived to exist by the Founders, except in times of national emergency, and this only because of the expediency of timely decision-making ability to deal with an emergency.

The leaders of those times were men who had earned their positions, and were appointed by the people. When they achieved that position of leadership, they subordinated themselves to the will of the people. The inherent authority of the people permeated the entire structure of government in those early days. The people spoke, and their delegates or representatives listened.



The Committee of Safety Concept

The concept of Committees of Safety was the forerunner of that principle of government implemented by the states and the federal government. Each committee would delegate its representatives to go to the next higher level, and carry with it the will of the people. Within each group there were chairmen selected to act as *conciliator* to the delegation. His purpose was not to rule, dictate or control the meetings, with the exception of providing order and purpose. Most often, he may have been denied the right to vote to compensate for what additional power he might have as chairman. In Boston, for example, a rather meek and mild Doctor John Warren was chairman of the Boston Committee of Safety. He provided order at the meetings, and otherwise carried out his duties as the administrator of the will of the people.

Since those times, we have subordinated our individual thought process to one which might be best described as "corporate mentality", where the chairman is usually chief executive officer (CEO) and wields an unnatural (but, then, what is a corporation?) authority. His word is assumed 'law', and until he is replaced, he is the *power*.

"The fabric of American empire ought to rest on the solid basis of THE CONSENT OF THE PEOPLE. The stream of national power ought to flow immediately from that pure, original fountain of all legitimate authority. "

Alexander Hamilton, Federalist Papers #22

What has to be understood if the concept of Committee of Safety becomes a tool in our efforts to return to constitutional government, is that the authority of the people be recognized above all else. All "enactments" should come from that source, and finally be approved by that source. Any executive committee actions should be for their ministerial nature, only. The corporate pyramid must be turned over and recognized in its proper

light that the people are at the top, just under God. Next comes the Committee of Safety, and its various subcommittees, which function as the source defined by interest, to generate "enactments". Finally come the delegates, chairmen, and executive committee whose only purpose is to facilitate the orderly determination of the will of the people, and provide the means to implement that will.

The Committee of Safety concept, in order to operate in a manner which is suggested by history, must operate as committees and the Committee of the Whole. It must never operate as a 'star chamber' or an executive authority under the current concept. It must never operate as a corporation, for a corporate interest might not be the same as the employees or the owners, except if its goal is strictly profit. This is not the goal of the Committee of Safety. The goal that is sought to be achieved is that the will of the people be carried out by those who have sought to assist in that administration, not by those who seek to control that will.

"Resolved unanimously, As our opposition to the settled plan of the British administration to enslave America will be strengthened by a union of all ranks, of men in this province, we do most earnestly recommend that all former differences about religion or politics, and all private animosities and quarrels of every kind, from henceforth cease and be forever buried in oblivion and we entreat, we conjure every man by his duty to God, his country, and his posterity, cordially to unite in defense of our common rights and liberties. "

Resolution of the Maryland Deputies, December 12, 1774

Cambridge April 29, 1775

This may certify that the bearer, Mr. Paul Revere is messenger to the Committee of Safety and that all dispatch and assistance be given him in Instances that the business of the Colony may be facilitated

Jos. Warren, Chair.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

A Proposed Structure for the Committee of Safety

Although those historical committees generally had a single committee, and may have created *ad hoc* committees as the need arose, it might be more appropriate in the more complex and more populated world that we live in to consider a number of committees within the Committee of Safety to deal with a variety of issues. Participation in the committees would be by interest and expertise in specific areas. A proposed list of initial committees might include the following:

Committee of the Whole - is comprised of all adult (age to be determined) Citizens in attendance. Decisions shall be made by vote of all in attendance. The Committee of the Whole is the government; it is the **Committee of Safety**.

Executive Committee - Should be comprised of one or two delegates from each committee (Member, Standing & Ad Hoc, while existing). The delegates should not be the chairman or vice chairman of the committee which they represent, nor an officer of a Member Organization. Duties and responsibilities should not be split. Participation by as many as possible should be encouraged, and each person's duties should be pursued with as much energy as possible. All matters to be presented to the Committee of the Whole should be reviewed and prepared for presentation by the Executive Committee.

Ways & Means - Should be responsible for fund-raising, assessment (if necessary) and acquisition of meeting place and materials. This committee has the responsibility to see that the Committee remains a viable and productive entity by assuring that the needs of the Committee are met.

Historical Research - Should conduct research into historical issues including the United States Constitution, your state Constitution and local history. All information obtained should be made available to the citizens at nominal cost. Issues of Citizenship, Emergency War Powers Act, Thirteenth Amendment, Fully Informed Jury, etc., are issues that have been previously researched. This information can be made available by this committee working with other Committees around the state and country.

Contemporary Research - Should investigate matters of interest occurring around the country, such as sovereignty amendments, other resolutions of importance, legislation, news articles and availability of information. Current issues such as income tax, driving/traveling, and other matters might be addressed by this committee.

Political/Judicial Advocacy - Should review records of judicial and political candidates, local, state and national, and make reports and recommendations on all candidates. May keep watch of voting by government officials and suggest support or opposition by the Committee over issues, incumbents and candidates for office. This committee, when the size of the Committee becomes sufficient, can act as a legislative delegation (as Washington lobbyists do') to meet with government officials and present the will of the People, and promise support or opposition depending on the representative's actions.

Political/Judicial Evaluation - Should investigate record of all elected officers and representatives, local, state and federal. Should stand as a panel (jury) in investigating allegations made against any of those officers or representatives, and shall report, in writing, the results of any such investigation. May also serve as a common law court to those members of the Committee who wish adjudication on a matter (voluntary. as in the People's Court and Judge Wopner). Could also serve to evaluate (jury trial) accusations against any of the Committees' members of a nature that would create concern over the person's true allegiance.

Communications (Correspondence) - Should establish efficient communications within the Committee, such as mailing lists, phone trees, fax networking and radio communications, to those participants interested.. Should establish communications with all other committees of safety within the state, and, until such time as a State Committee of Safety is established, shall communicate with other committees of safety within the

state and between other states. Should be responsible for advertising meetings to members as well as to others to encourage participation. Should act as a public relations office to encourage favorable press coverage, and should work with local media in investigating, issues of interest.

Member Committees - any local organization which consists of a membership greater than 5 people may hold a position as a Member Committee. The chairman of the Member Committee should not be the leader of the organization.



Potential of the Committee of Safety in this troubled nation

If we wish to understand just what potential exists if Committees of Safety were created once again, to deal with the problem of government, we might begin, as the Founders did, with consideration of a voice directed at the government. As fruitless as our organized efforts have been, by writing, fixing calling and by any other means available to us as individuals, to affect the course of legislation, there is hope that these efforts can be harnessed and directed in a manner that is assured to have the desired effect.

In March, 1765, the Parliament enacted what was known as the "Stamp Act." Immediately, scores of resolutions were passed by colonial Committees, directed at the Parliament proclaiming the position of the community in regard to, the Act. The colonists, who were not represented in Parliament, had no member to "petition" for repeal of the Act. The unity they displayed by their numerous methods of opposition resulted, however, in the repeal of the Stamp Act in 1766. Among the proclamations with which we have become most familiar, "**No taxation without representation**" is probably the most well known, and was a result of this effort against the Stamp Act.

Representation, then, is one of the results that evolved from the actions and attitudes of the time. Had representation, chosen by free election, existed then, the outcry against the Stamp Act would surely have been directed at those who represented the colonists, and probably would have reduced, considerably, the amount of time from enactment to repeal.

With the unity demonstrated by the communities, and their respective Committees, the repeal of the Stamp Act was inevitable. Should we apply, through the modern Committee of Safety, a concerted effort at effecting pending legislation, or even initiating legislation, Unity demonstrated by the Committee would become one of the more significant lobbying efforts in the country.

Suppose, for example, that a local representative (House or Senate, state or federal) indicated that he was going to vote to enact legislation that the Committee determined would be detrimental to the best interest of the community. If that Committee represented even one percent of the community, they would be able to influence, by their numbers, many more votes in subsequent elections. And, they would have a memory (suspense file) that would assure that the outcome of the vote would remain relevant come Election Day. A legislative delegation from the Committee, representing the confirmed position of the Committee, meeting with the representative would probably have a much more significant effect than any lobbyist's checkbook in Washington, D. C., or that state's capital. This ability to affect lawmakers would not be unlike what the National Rifle Association (N.R.A.) has accomplished by their representation of gun owners in legislation regarding gun owner's rights, though the need for financial contributions would not exist, just the numbers of People represented.

When the significance of this "lobbying" power is expanded to a number of community Committees within a state, or even a state Committee of Safety, the desires of the people could be expressed in a manner unlike any other since the days prior to the War for Independence.

This ability to affect legislation could easily be applied on local issues, and might become the catalyst to bring together many advocacy groups that have otherwise remained unaffiliated because of their diversity of interests. The common elements of the return of authority to the will of the people, and the restoration of constitutional government, are the only common elements that are necessary to achieve results in effecting legislation to accomplish those goals. Perhaps an anecdote might illustrate the potential of the Committee of Safety:

Shortly after the first meeting of the Central Florida Committee of Safety, I was contacted by a detective from the Orlando Police Department. This was in April, 1995, shortly after the bombing in Oklahoma City. We agreed to meet at a restaurant and talked for quite a while. I had arranged, for my own safety and to avoid any concern over the consequences of the meeting, for a number of fellow patriots to be sitting in a booth adjacent to where the officer and I met.

The officer's concern was what the purpose of the Committee of Safety really was. I explained to the officer that the primary objective was a unified voice, as was outlined above. As the discussion continued, he asked whether there was any affiliation with the militia. My response was that the term "well-regulated" militia, according to what history reveals of the matter, is one that is subordinate to the civil authority of the people, and that this civil authority was, in the early period in our history, the Committee of Safety. I assured him that if all militia in the country were willingly subordinate to the Committee of Safety, as they properly should be, the likelihood of a group of militia taking any action such as what had occurred in Oklahoma City would be absolutely minimal.

I continued to explain that the Committee of Safety could also be considered a double-edged sword. Although restraint would be applied to militia, should the government ever give good cause to the militia to act in defense of enemies (foreign or domestic), the unity created by the Committee of Safety would enhance the ability of the militia to achieve their objective, especially if the action was in response to a national emergency.

We have examined the national potential of the Committee of Safety. Let us go a little further. For the sake of understanding, the Committee of Safety concept, as it is employed by more and more communities, would provide a means of communication and coordination unlike anything existing today. Sharing of information, on nearly any level (especially in the absence of a responsible media!), would enhance our proper understanding of issues. Any research with regard to matters such as income tax, legislation, legal issues, even the results of accurate investigation of news events, could be disseminated, confirmed or verified, and cooperative efforts at reaching proper conclusions to matters would be a result.

Likewise, a concerted effort could be made to deal with legislative issues, as outlined above. Every community would expand their sphere of influence to have the desired effect.

When sufficient communities had established their Committees, a state Committee of Safety could be established to address, in *statewide assembly*, matters of statewide concern. The state Committee would also be in a position to send delegates, or deputies, to national meetings whenever the issue is one of a national concern.

For example, on June 3 and 4, 1995, a Common Law Grand Jury convened in Wichita, Kansas. The Grand Jury was composed of many volunteers from around the country. However, each represented only himself, and was there by virtue of his means and willingness to volunteer to attend. Although the results of the Grand Jury were probably very representative of the sympathies of those with any knowledge of the matter being

considered, the fact is that the assembly in Wichita can only claim to be 'representative', but can not demonstrate this to be true.

Had each state Committee of Safety been able to send one or two deputies to the Grand Jury, the Grand Jury would truly have been an extension of the people themselves, by virtue of a valid historical precedent which achieved similar successful results some two hundred years ago.

Returning, again, to the matter of communication between the Committees, whether within the state or nationally, we can easily understand that the ability to compare information, exchange information, establish meetings of common interest, establish a qualified speaker's bureau, establish verified press credentials, etc., would be enhanced by this process.

Two hundred years ago, Committees of Correspondence dealt with the dissemination of information and active communication between communities and colonies. In this day of telephones, fax machines and computers, an effective network of communication that would exceed the circulation of any newspaper in the world could be created and operated at minimal cost. Information could be broadcast over this network and reach virtually every corner of the country within hours and could operate as a committee of the Committee of Safety.

The ability of the community of patriots/constitutionalists to work together in a united manner would present an awesome obstacle to those who would do away with our Constitution and create a "new world order".

I submit, that if there are any valid objections to what is laid out above that they be brought forward publicly for all to consider. If there are attempts to undermine the implementation of this asset to Freedom and Liberty, the beneficiary of those attempts must surely have other interests than those of We the People.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

A Proposed By-Law for the Committee of Safety

BY - LAWS OF THE [your community] - COMMITTEE OF SAFETY

The following are hereby adopted as the By-laws of the [your community] Committee of Safety:

The purpose and goals of the [your community] Committee of Safety:

To join together as the Citizenry - Which purpose is to affect the course and destiny of our lives, and to actively pursue that end.

I. MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the [your community] Committee of Safety (the Committee) is intended to be as open as possible to those who seek to participate in achieving the goals of the Committee. To accomplish these ends, the following conditions are those by which membership shall be attained:

1. Each potential member must be a state citizen, and/or a citizen of the United States, and may also be a U.S. citizen, and must recognize the existence of these separate forms *of status*.

2. Each potential member must acknowledge that the Constitution is the Law of the Land, and is a *limitation* on the authority of the United States Government.
3. Each potential or existing member must not have been excluded from participation, for cause. Exclusion hearings shall be upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and shall be heard by a panel of five members of the Political/Judicial Evaluation Committee, sitting as a jury of peers, to hear evidence against any person so recommended. The hearing shall allow the accuser and the accused to present evidence and witnesses on their behalf. A 4/5 vote is required to exclude any existing or potential member.
4. Each potential member must not have lost his citizenship as a result of the Titles of Nobility (Thirteenth) Amendment² (this would include bar attorneys, bankers, active duty law enforcement officers, or any other person who has acquired a position of privilege or honor which would be included under the intent of that Amendment).

II. MEETINGS

1. Meetings will be held [specify frequency], except holidays recognized by the Committee, and except when advance notice of two weeks has been provided to the Committee of the Whole.
2. Meetings will:
 - begin at [time] as the Assembled Committee of the Whole;
 - be opened with prayer;
 - submit instructions (new business) will be submitted, in writing, by the various committees;
 - allow the various committees (including Executive) to form and meet for business until 8:30 p.m.;
 - have the Committee of the Whole assemble for business (if any business for the Committee of the Whole has been approved by the Executive Committee);
 - require that a vote will be taken on any issue submitted to the Committee of the Whole, for approval or rejection, without discussion, unless discussion is called for by the Executive Committee;
 - allow any announcements which have been approved by the Executive Committee to be made.

III. COMMITTEES - GENERAL

1. Committees shall be formed, as necessary, as standing committees, member committees and ad hoc committees.
 - a. Standing Committees shall be those necessary for the function of the Committee of Safety as intended by the goals and objectives. Standing Committees may also be created, upon approval by the Executive Committee, when sufficient members of an existing committee wish to break away from the parent committee and deal with more specific issues.

² ARTICLE XIII

If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honour, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatsoever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.

Ratified on or before March 12, 1819

b. Member Committees may be formed when five or more members determine a need and agree to become the committee. These committees are anticipated to be representative of other organizations already existing in the community, and provide both a liaison and input into the Committee of Safety.

c. Ad hoc committees shall be created whenever circumstances warrant the creation of a committee to study a specific area not addressed by the existing committees. Ad hoc committees may be made permanent by a vote of the Committee of the Whole.

2. Each committee shall:

(a) Select a Chairman and a Vice-chairman, and shall reselect or replace each every six months.

(b) Require that the chairman of said committee shall not be an officer of any organization, unless that organization is business in nature, and not with foundation in constitutional issues.

(c) Select a delegate and an alternate delegate to sit on the Executive Committee, who shall meet the same criteria as the chairman, and shall be reselected or replaced every six months.

(d) Delegate both a vice-chairman and auxiliary representative, to assume responsibility in the absence of the primary.

(e) Determine the goals and objectives of the committee and submit them to the Executive Committee for approval and incorporation into the goals and objectives of the Committee.

(f) Establish liaison with other committees, as necessary when matters before the committee warrant a cooperative effort of other committees.

(g) Perform its duties with diligence and good faith.

(h) Allow each committee to determine what vote is required for any action of that committee, and may remove members in a manner of their choosing.

IV. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee shall function as a moderating body. Its purpose is not to control, dictate, enact or otherwise make decisions for the committees or the Committee, except as outlined below.

1. The Executive Committee shall be comprised of a delegate and alternate delegate from each of the committees.

2. The Executive Committee shall select from its number a chairman who shall act in the capacity of moderator (as described by Robert's Rules of Order), and shall not have a vote on the Executive Committee.

3. The Executive Committee shall select from its number a vice-chairman who shall act in the capacity of chairman during the absence of the chairman. The vice-chairman shall have no vote only when acting in the capacity of chairman.

4. The Executive Committee shall select from the Committee of the Whole, a secretary, a parliamentarian and a Sergeant at Arms, none of whom shall have a vote on the Executive Committee.

5. The Executive Committee shall select a delegate and an alternate delegate to represent the Committee at any function, assembly, state or national Committee of Safety as the need arises. If such positions are permanent, they shall be reselected or replaced every six months.

6. The Executive Committee, by 3/4 vote (not split), may recommend that any person to be reviewed by the Political/Judicial Evaluation Committee, in order to be excluded from participation from the Committee of Safety. Recommendations can only be considered if an accuser comes forward with a written complaint, naming

the accused and giving cause as to why the member should be excluded. The Executive Committee will not judge fact, but shall only determine if the allegations made, if true, would warrant exclusion. If it is determined that the allegations would warrant such action, the matter shall be submitted to the Political/Judicial Evaluation Committee as soon as practicable.

V. METHOD OF ENACTMENT

1. Any matter to be addressed by the Committee will be submitted to the Executive Committee, in writing and with only written discussion, to be assigned to the proper committee, or, a matter may be proposed by any committee, without approval of the Executive Committee.

2. The proper committee shall take under advisement any matter which is submitted by the Executive Committee, and shall provide a report of their findings within thirty days of submission. The findings may take any of the following forms:

(a.) Recommendation to the Executive Committee that the issue does not warrant the consideration of the Committee.

(b.) Progress report on the review of the matter.

(c.) A "bill" may be submitted to the Executive Committee for consideration by the Committee, which includes the following:

(1) A motion, complete in form, which is clear, concise and addresses the matter completely.

(2) Written arguments in support of the passage of the motion.

(3) Written arguments of dissent, if offered by members of the committee.

(4) Any attachments necessary as a part of the motion, or in support of the motion.

3. A "bill", once submitted by a committee to the Executive Committee as outlined above, shall not be changed by the Executive or the Committee of the Whole.

4. The Executive Committee shall review a "bill" for completeness, as outlined above, and shall take one of the following actions:

(a.) Approve the "bill" to be submitted to the Committee of the Whole, providing at least two copies to each of the committees for their review prior to voting.

(b.) Return the "bill" to the submitting committee for insufficiency, along with written comments explaining deficiencies.

(c.) Submit the "bill" to another committee for review, if the "bill" proposed might have bearing on, or require input from the other committee.

(d.) The Executive Committee shall not determine that a bill cannot be submitted to the Committee of the Whole. Its purpose is to facilitate, not to enact.

(e.) Any vote on the "bill" by the Executive Committee shall require a vote of 2/3 of those present and able to vote. The method of determination of what constitutes 2/3 shall be based upon the colonial principle of no split vote. This means that for every three members present and voting, two would have to vote "aye." (i.e. 2 votes would be required to pass an action where there were three, four or five members voting, the theory being that until a whole [3] is existent, you cannot count a portion of the whole to require a complete [1] vote).

(f.) If a 2/3 vote cannot be achieved, the matter shall be submitted to the Committee of the Whole, as is.

5. The Committee of the Whole shall vote on ALL matters, and a 3/4 vote (no split vote) shall be required for passage.

6. Requests for funds by a committee shall be submitted in writing to the Executive Committee, which shall direct said request to the Ways and Means Committee for consideration and comment. The Executive Committee shall have the sole authority for appropriation of funding with a 3/4 vote (no split vote); however if the vote fails, aye or nay, to achieve a 3/4 vote, the matter shall be submitted to the Committee of the Whole, which may allot funds by a vote of one more than half of those voting.



An Explanation of the Limitations on Membership

It is recommended that the Committee act, as soon as practicable, on recognizing the ratification of the Thirteenth (Titles of Nobility) Amendment. Information as to the ratification can be obtained through a number of sources (Outpost of Freedom, Brian March, David Dodge and Thomas Dunn).

The Executive Committee should submit to the Committee of the Whole the bill that the [your community] Committee of Safety does hereby acknowledge the ratification, on or before March 12, 1819, of the real Thirteenth Amendment (Titles of Nobility Amendment) to the Constitution for the United States of America. To wit:

If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honour, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatsoever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall all be in capable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.



Background of the prohibition of Titles of Nobility

Articles of Confederation:

"...nor shall the united states in congress assembled, or any of them, grant any title of nobility."

Article VI, Articles of Confederation, March 1, 1781

Constitution:

"No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State. "

Article 1, Sec. 9, cl. 7, Constitution

"No State shall grant any Title of Nobility.

Article 1, Sec. 10, cl. 1, Constitution

Federalist Papers:

"Nothing need be said to illustrate the importance of the prohibition of titles of nobility This may truly be denominated the cornerstone of republican government; for so long as they are excluded there can never be serious danger that the government will be other than that of the people. "

Alexander Hamilton - Federalist Papers #84

Participation in the Committee of Safety:

The Committee of Safety, to truly represent the people, must acknowledge that all People (Citizens) have the right to participate in the republican form of government guaranteed in Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of Government..."

Article IV, Sec. 4, Constitution

Any limitation on participation in the Committee of Safety must have foundation in Constitutional principles, or when appropriate, on expediency based upon common sense principles.

Recommendations for participation:

- Must be a state Citizen; and/or a Citizen of the United States, and may also be a U. S. citizen
- In *Crosse v. Board of Supervisor of Elections*, 221 A.2d 431, at 433 (1966):

"Both before and after the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution, it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the United States in order to be a citizen of his state..."

- Must acknowledge that the Constitution is the Law of the Land, and is a limitation on the authority of the United States Government.
- Must not have been excluded from participation, for cause (by vote of Executive Committee).
- Must not have lost citizenship as a result of the Titles of Nobility Amendment (this would include bar attorneys, *bankers* (Federal Reserve Bank officers), active duty law enforcement officers, or any other person who has acquired a privilege indicating an aristocratic relationship to the citizens).

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

A Thought on Leadership

One of the most important tools utilized by those who have sought to take our freedoms and our country from us is the control of public education. By these means they have been able to *remove* aspects of our history which would have enabled us to both perceive and deal with the problems of today long before now.

We have a group of *leaders* in the Patriot Community, many who have proclaimed their position by methods of public relations which are founded on promulgation of sensationalism. Perhaps their positions are merited, yet if we look at history; we will find that these are not the means by which leaders were selected two hundred years ago.

Jefferson, Adams, Washington, Henry and the rest of those who gave us the nation we seek to restore today were well established in their respective communities, and recognized by their efforts to be men of sincerity. Their efforts extended, in most cases, over many years of guidance to their neighbors. The respect that was earned by these efforts, and their willingness to represent the will of the people, propelled them into the delegations which formulated the course that the colonies would pursue.

Would it be possible for the government to anticipate the desire of the Patriot Community to return to Constitutional government, and infiltrate agents into the community to say what patriots want to hear and acquire a position of leadership? By what we know, the One World Government people have achieved this very goal in our Congress, Courts and even in the Presidency. Are we foolish enough to allow the same to happen to us?

The 'War of 1812 was first declared by the British. The President sent to the Congress a Declaration of War which gave six reasons for which he requested the Congress to agree that a state of war existed. The Declaration was approved by the House on June 4, 1812 and the Senate on June 18. Of the six causes for war, probably the most significant is the fifth, which reads:

"Fifthly. Employing secret agents within the United States, with a view to subvert our government, and dismember our union. "

The selection of members of the community who have proven themselves to those they know and live with as local leaders will minimize the possibility of infiltration by those who might otherwise have objectives different than our own. Under the scrutiny of their neighbors, their true self will be much more apparent. Their positions will not have been achieved by expertise in promotion, rather by the efforts they have expended in the cause.

It should be understood that when seeking our "leaders", we should look to those who ask questions, listen to the answers, and seek to understand others rather than to attempt to impose their will on others. Outspoken advocates are suited for private associations which are gathered for specific purposes, but are absolutely unsuitable for the form of government our Founders granted to their posterity.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

E n d