



# New Frontier Coalition

## September 2005 News

### Judicial Branch Issue - Volume 2.9

## Constitutional Myths and Realities

**Stephen Markman**  
Justice, Michigan Supreme Court

Stephen Markman, who teaches constitutional law at Hillsdale College, was appointed by Governor John Engler in 1999 as Justice of the Michigan Supreme Court and subsequently elected to that position. Prior to that he served as United States Attorney in Michigan (appointed by President George H. W. Bush); Assistant Attorney General of the United States (appointed by President Ronald Reagan), in which position he coordinated the federal judicial selection process; Chief Counsel of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution; and Deputy Chief Counsel of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee. Justice Markman has written for numerous legal journals, including the *Stanford Law Review*, the *University of Chicago Law Review*, the *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* and the *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy*.

The following is adapted from a speech delivered on April 29, 2003, at a Hillsdale College National Leadership Seminar in Dearborn, Michigan.

The United States has enjoyed unprecedented liberty, prosperity and stability, in large part because of its Constitution. I would like to discuss a number of myths or misconceptions concerning that inspired document.

**Myth or Misconception 1:** Public policies of which we approve are constitutional and public policies of which we disapprove are unconstitutional.

It might be nice if those policies that we favor were compelled by the Constitution and those policies that we disfavor were barred by the Constitution. But this is not, by and large, what the Constitution does. Rather, the Constitution creates an architecture of government that is designed to limit the abuse of governmental power. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 sought to create a government that would be

effective in carrying out its essential tasks, such as foreign policy and national defense, while not coming to resemble those European governments with which they were so familiar, where the exercise of governmental power was arbitrary and without limits. Therefore, while the Constitution constrains government, it does not generally seek to replace the representative processes of government.

Governments may, and often do, carry out unwise public policies without running afoul of the Constitution. As a Justice of the Michigan Supreme Court, I often uphold policies that have been enacted in the state legislature, or by cities and counties and townships, that I believe are unwise. But lack of wisdom is not the test for what is or is not constitutional, and lack of wisdom is not what allows me—a judge, not the adult supervisor of society—to exercise the enormous power of judicial review and strike down laws that have been enacted by “we the people” through their elected representatives. Redress for unwise public policies must generally come as the product of democratic debate and at the ballot box, not through judicial correction.

**Myth or Misconception 2:** The Constitution principally upholds individual rights and liberties through the guarantees of the Bill of Rights.

It is not to denigrate the importance of the Bill of Rights to suggest that the Founders intended that individual rights and liberties would principally be protected by the architecture of the Constitution—the structure of government set forth in its original seven articles. The great animating principles of our Constitution are in evidence everywhere within this architecture. First, there is federalism, in which the powers of government are divided between the national government and the states. To the former belong such powers as those relating to foreign policy and national defense; to the latter such powers as those relating to the criminal justice system and the protection of the family. Second, there is the separation of powers, in which each branch of the national government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branch—has distinct responsibilities, yet is subject to the checks and balances of the other

branches. Third, there is the principle of limited government of a particular sort in which the national government is constrained to exercise only those powers set forth by the Constitution, for example, issuing currency, administering immigration laws, running the post office and waging war. Together, these principles make it more difficult for government to exercise power and to abuse minority rights, and they limit the impact of governmental abuses of power.

Many of the Founders, including James Madison, believed that a Bill of Rights was unnecessary because the Constitution’s architecture itself was sufficient to ensure that national power would not be abused. As Alexander Hamilton remarked in *Federalist 84*, “the Constitution is itself, in every rational sense, and to every useful purpose, a Bill of Rights.” And practically speaking, until 1925, the Bill of Rights was not even thought to apply to the states, only to Congress; yet the individual rights of our citizens remained generally well protected.

**Myth or Misconception 3:** The national government and the state governments are regulated similarly by the Constitution.

As the 10th Amendment makes clear, the starting point for any constitutional analysis is that the national, i.e., the federal, government can do nothing under the Constitution unless it is affirmatively authorized by some provision of the Constitution. The states, on the other hand, can do anything under the Constitution unless they are prohibited by some provision of the Constitution. Why then, one might ask, throughout the 19th century and well into the 20th century—before the Bill of Rights was thought to apply to the states—did Michigan and other states not generally infringe upon such indispensable freedoms as the freedoms of speech or religion? How were individual rights protected? Well, in two ways principally: First and most obviously, there was simply not majority sentiment on the part of the people of Michigan or other states to encroach upon such freedoms. Second, Michigan and all other states had their own Constitutions that protected such freedoms.

Today the Bill of Rights has been construed by the U.S. Supreme Court to apply to the states, creating more uniform and more centralized constitutional policy. It remains true, however, that the impact of the Constitution upon the national and state governments varies substantially.

Myth or Misconception 4: Federalism is the same thing as states rights.

“State’s rights” in the constitutional sense refers to all of the rights of sovereignty retained by the states under the Constitution. But in this sense, state’s rights refers to only half of what federalism is, the other half consisting of those powers either reserved for the national government or affirmatively prohibited to the states.

In popular use, “state’s rights” has had a checkered history. Before the Civil War, it was the rallying cry of southern opponents of proposals to abolish or restrict slavery. By the 20th century, it had become the watchword of many of those who supported segregation in the public schools, as well as those who criticized generally the growing power of the central government.

While I share the view that federal power has come to supplant “state’s rights” in far too many areas of governmental responsibility, “state’s rights” are truly rights only where an examination of the Constitution reveals both that the national government lacks the authority to act and that there is nothing that prohibits the state governments from acting. There is no “state right,” for example, for one state to impose barriers on trade coming from another, or to establish a separate foreign policy. These responsibilities are reserved to the national government by the Constitution.

Myth or Misconception 5: The Constitution is a document for lawyers and judges.

The Constitution was written for those in whose name it was cast, “we the people.” It is a relatively short document, and it is generally straightforward and clear-cut. With only a few exceptions, there is an absence of legalese or technical terms. While the contemporary constitutional debate has focused overwhelmingly on a few broad phrases of the Constitution such as “due process” and “equal protection,” the overwhelming part of this document specifies, for example, that a member of the House of Representatives must be 25 years of age, seven years a citizen, and an inhabitant of the state from which he is chosen; that a bill becomes a law when approved by both Houses and signed by the president, etc. One willing to invest just a bit more time in understanding the Constitution need only peruse The Federalist Papers to see what Madison, Hamilton or Jay

had to say about its provisions to a popular audience in the late-18th century.

One reason I believe that the Constitution, as well as our laws generally, should be interpreted according to the straightforward meaning of their language, is to maintain the law as an institution that belongs to all of the people, and not merely to judges and lawyers. Let me give you an illustration: One creative constitutional scholar has said that the requirement that the president shall be at least 35 years of age really means that a president must have the maturity of a person who was 35 back in 1789 when the Constitution was written. That age today, opines this scholar, might be 30 or 32 or 40 or 42. The problem is that whenever a word or phrase of the Constitution is interpreted in such a “creative” fashion, the Constitution—and the law in general—becomes less accessible and less comprehensible to ordinary citizens, and more the exclusive province of attorneys who are trained in knowing such things as that “35” does not always mean “35.”

One thing, by the way, that is unusual in the constitutional law course that I teach at Hillsdale College is that we actually read the language of the Constitution and discuss its provisions as we do so. What passes for constitutional law study at many colleges and universities is exclusively the study of Supreme Court decisions. While such decisions are obviously important, it is also important to compare what the Supreme Court has said to what the Constitution says. What is also unusual at Hillsdale is that, by the time students take my course, they have been required to study such informing documents as the Declaration of Independence, The Federalist Papers, Washington’s First Inaugural Address—and, indeed, the Constitution itself.

Myth or Misconception 6: The role of the judge in interpreting the Constitution is to do justice.

The role of a judge is to do justice under law, a very different concept. Each of us has his or her own innate sense of right and wrong. This is true of every judge I have ever met. But judges are not elected or appointed to impose their personal views of right and wrong upon the legal system. Rather, as Justice Felix Frankfurter once remarked, “The highest example of judicial duty is to subordinate one’s personal will and one’s private views to the law.” The responsible judge must subordinate his personal sense of justice to the public justice of our Constitution and its representative and legal institutions.

I recall one judicial confirmation hearing a number of years ago when I was working for the Senate Judiciary Committee. The nominee was asked, “If a decision in a particular case was

required by law or statute and yet that offended your conscience, what would you do?” The nominee answered, “Senator, I have to be honest with you. If I was faced with a situation like that and it ran against my conscience, I would follow my conscience.” He went on to explain: “I was born and raised in this country, and I believe that I am steeped in its traditions, its mores, its beliefs and its philosophies, and if I felt strongly in a situation like that, I feel that it would be the product of my very being and upbringing. I would follow my conscience.” To my mind, for a judge to render decisions according to his or her personal conscience rather than the law is itself unconscionable.

Myth or Misconception 7: The great debate over the proper judicial role is between judges who are activist and judges who are restrained.

In the same way that excessively “activist” judges may exceed the boundaries of the judicial power by concocting law out of whole cloth, excessively “restrained” judges may unwarrantedly contract protections and rights conferred by the laws and the Constitution. It is inappropriate for a judge to exercise “restraint” when to do so is to neglect his obligation of judicial review—his obligation to compare the law with the requirements set forth by the Constitution. Nor am I enamored with the term “strict construction” to describe the proper duties of the judge, for it is the role of the judge to interpret the words of the law reasonably—not “strictly” or “loosely,” not “broadly” or “narrowly,” just reasonably.

I would prefer to characterize the contemporary judicial debate in terms of interpretivism verses non-interpretivism. In doing this, I would borrow the description of the judicial power used by Chief Justice John Marshall, who 200 years ago in *Marbury v. Madison* stated that it is the duty of the judge to say what the law is, not what it ought to be (which is the province of the legislature). For the interpretivist, the starting point, and usually the ending point, in giving meaning to the law are the plain words of the law. This is true whether we are construing the law of the Constitution, the law of a statute, or indeed the law of contracts and policies and deeds. In each instance, it is the duty of the judge to give faithful meaning to the words of the lawmaker and let the chips fall where they may.

One prominent illustration of the differing approaches of interpretivism and non-interpretivism arises in the context of the constitutionality of capital punishment. Despite the fact that there are at least six references in the Constitution to the possibility of capital punishment—for example, both the 5th and 14th Amendments assert that no person shall be “deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law,” from which

it can clearly be inferred that a person can be deprived of these where there is due process—former Justice William Brennan held, in dissent, that capital punishment was unconstitutional on the grounds apparently that, since 1789, there had arisen an “evolving standard of decency marking the progress of a maturing society” on whose behalf he spoke. Purporting to speak for “generations yet unborn,” Justice Brennan substituted his own opinions on capital punishment for the judgments reached in the Constitution by the Founders. His decision in this regard is the embodiment, but certainly not the only recent example, of non-interpretivism.

Myth or Misconception 8: The Constitution is a living document.

The debate between interpretivists and non-interpretivists over how to give meaning to the Constitution is often framed in the following terms: Is the Constitution a “living” document, in which judges “update” its provisions according to the “needs” of the times? Or is the Constitution an enduring document, in which its original meanings and principles are permanently maintained, subject only to changes adopted in accordance with its amending clause? I believe that it is better described in the latter sense. It is beyond dispute, of course, that the principles of the Constitution must be applied to new circumstances over time—the Fourth Amendment on searches and seizures to electronic wiretaps, the First Amendment on freedom of speech to radio and television and the Internet, the interstate commerce clause to automobiles and planes, etc. However, that is distinct from allowing the words and principles themselves to be altered based upon the preferences of individual judges.

Our Constitution would be an historical artifact—a genuinely dead letter—if its original sense became irrelevant, to be replaced by the views of successive waves of judges and justices intent on “updating” it, or replacing what some judges view as the “dead hand of the past” with contemporary moral theory. This is precisely what the Founders sought to avoid when they instituted a “government of laws, not of men.”

There is no charter of government in the history of mankind that has more wisely set forth the proper relationship between the governed and their government than the American Constitution. For those of us who are committed to constitutional principles and fostering respect for that document, there is no better homage that we can pay it than to understand clearly its design and to take care in the manner in which we describe it.

## Term Limits for Supreme Court Justices

By John W. Whitehead

President Bush’s announcement that he is nominating 50-year-old appellate judge John G. Roberts to fill the vacancy left by Sandra Day O’Connor is an excellent opportunity to reopen the discussion on term limits for U.S. Supreme Court Justices. And with 80-year-old William Rehnquist determined to remain as Chief Justice, this is an issue whose time has come. As Jeff Jacoby recently wrote in the Boston Globe (May 26, 2005): “No president can hold power for more than eight years, but the most junior member of the current court—Stephen Breyer—has already been there for 11 years. Two others, John Paul Stevens and Rehnquist, have been on the court for more than 30 years.” Given Roberts’ age, if confirmed, he could end up serving on the court longer than any other justice in history.

Article III of the Constitution states that “judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behavior.” This somewhat ambiguous line has been interpreted to mean that federal judges may hold their judicial offices for life unless removed from office by impeachment and conviction.

Life tenure for federal judges has been part of our constitutional system since the framing of our Constitution. Alexander Hamilton was the leading proponent of this provision in the Constitution. He argued that life tenure was essential to assuring the absolute independence of the judiciary from the influence of the political branches. Of course, Hamilton also described the judiciary as “the least dangerous branch” since it exercised no force or will but only judgment. But today, many are concerned that the federal judiciary has become the most powerful branch, acting as an unaccountable, quasi-legislative body.

Recently, Hamilton’s assertions that lifetime tenure is necessary to securing judicial impartiality and independence have been challenged. Certainly, the judiciary is no longer considered the least dangerous branch.

The role of the modern Supreme Court is much different than originally intended by those who drafted the Constitution. The Court today routinely decides cases of great magnitude. These include school desegregation, state electoral districting schemes and even the outcome of a presidential election. And the Court enters the “political thicket” with increasing frequency. Problematic consequences have arisen as Justices have grown in power, become more invested in their decisions and inserted themselves in the “culture wars.”

Major political leaders from many eras and persuasions have proffered arguments against lifetime tenure for federal judges. These include such diverse figures as Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Johnson, John F. Kennedy, George H. W. Bush and Senators

Orrin Hatch and Dan Quayle. Jefferson advocated four- or six-year terms for federal judges. Andrew Johnson urged twelve-year terms. And Dan Quayle proposed fifteen-year terms.

There are some persuasive arguments against life tenure for judges. Lifetime tenure, for instance, vastly increases the stakes in filling each Supreme Court (and lower federal court) vacancy. Senate battles over judicial nominations would not be so bitter if the consequences of losing were not likely to persist for decades. Supreme Court justices are also tempted by the current arrangement to time their resignations for political reasons—often holding onto their position through bad health until a like-minded president is in office. Life tenure as well encourages presidents to nominate younger candidates with minimal paper trails and maximal potential to shape the future, thereby passing over more experienced individuals whose resumes might trigger an ideological assault. Moreover, life tenure deprives the judiciary of regular infusions of “new blood,” especially given the fact that judges are living, and thus serving, much longer. The result of this is a decrease in intellectual vigor and awareness of contemporary culture among some judges. What’s more, life tenure allows bad judges to remain on the bench indefinitely, and it allows even very good ones to remain on the bench when they are no longer doing their best work.

Life tenure clearly does not insulate federal judges from political pressures. In fact, it encourages Supreme Court Justices to be overly mindful of politics, particularly the partisan political landscape of the White House and the Senate, in deciding when to retire. The average age at departure for Supreme Court Justices from 1789 to 1970 was 68.5 years. From 1971 to 2000, it was 78.8 years. And during those same periods, the average time served by a Justice rose from 15 years to 25.5 years. Thus, mental incompetence has become a more pressing issue within the last 100 years.

The most obvious method of implementing term limits for Supreme Court Justices is by amending the Constitution. Another would have the Senate insist that all future Court nominees publicly agree to term limits or risk nonconfirmation. While legally unenforceable, such commitments by justices would likely be honored.

Along this line, several proposals have been offered. Possibly the most appealing is one that would amend the Constitution to limit Supreme Court Justices to 18-year, non-renewable terms, with one expiring every two years. If a Justice left the Court prior to the expiration of his/her term, the President would nominate (and Senate confirm) a “replacement” Justice who would only serve for the remainder of the retiring Justice’s term. Under no circumstances could a Justice—even a “replacement” Justice who only served for a short period of time—be reappointed to the Court. Once the Justices’ term expired, each former Justice would be permitted to serve for life on the lower federal court of his choice. Arguably, this system will remove the problems of strategic retirements, incentives for young nominees and unfairly distributed appointments.

Regardless of the details of the solution, there are a growing number of scholars who believe that the dire predictions of “Brutus,” one of the leading anti-federalists of the Founding period, have come true: life tenure has placed judges “in a situation altogether unprecedented in a free country,” rendering them “independent, in the fullest sense of the word. There can be no power above them to control any of their decisions. There is no authority that can remove them, and they cannot be controlled by the laws of the legislature. In short, they are independent of the people, of the legislature, and every power under heaven. . . . Men placed in this situation will generally soon feel themselves independent of heaven itself.”

Constitutional attorney and author John W. Whitehead is founder and president of The Rutherford Institute and is author of the award-winning *Grasping for the Wind*. He can be contacted at [johnw@rutherford.org](mailto:johnw@rutherford.org). Information about The Rutherford Institute is available at [www.rutherford.org](http://www.rutherford.org).

## **PATRIOT ACT AND REAL ID: FAREWELL TO LIBERTY**

**Nancy Levant**

**NewsWithViews.com**

It should be very clear to American citizens that we have no rights. We have rules, laws, curtailments, spy technologies, enforcements, easements, buffer zones, ID cards, automobile stickers, passes, swipe cards, and limitations.

Beginning in 2008, we will also have Real Identification Cards – maybe. That will depend upon our ability to produce birth certificates, Social Security cards with current names, photo IDs, verifications of home addresses, a personal IDs, and proof of insurance. Once all this is confirmed by the Department of Motor Vehicles using a crosschecking federal database, you “may” be issued a driver’s license.

If you have recently changed your name, moved, or the federal database has old or inaccurate information, much like the infamous credit bureaus and their databases, you will not be issued your Real ID. Be prepared, and well in advance, for another governmentally imposed disaster of unprecedented proportions. Also be prepared for total loss of liberty and rights.

The Real ID Act, passed on May 11th, was passed without Congressional debate. Surprise, surprise. Instead, the Real ID was buried, hidden legislation-style, into an 82 billion dollar military spending bill to support the continuing occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq. Hidden legislation has certainly become the MO of this administration, coupled with at least 181 Executive Orders, to date.

Surveillance and tracking of the American people is, of course, anti-American. It is illegally invasive, scary, and makes citizens

and their Constitutional rights (which do not exist) mere objects of political whim. The real question is this – what if you are denied a Real ID card? What constitutes the denial of a Real ID, and what are your options should our new government deny you the ability to drive to work and possess your federally mandated papers? Were the Social Security cards, driver’s licenses, proof of insurance, proof of residency, birth certificates, and personal ID cards not enough? Of course, they were. The Real ID has nothing to do with a standardized identification system. That system was already in place. The Real ID was created as spy-ware and to serve the trade and territorial melding of the Canadian/American/Mexican nations - nothing more, nothing less.

And then there is the Patriot Act – the Act that is the insult and slap in the face to every American citizen by virtue of its very name. It is the companion Act to the Real ID Act, and the final nail in our civil liberties’ coffin. Good-bye, Constitutional America.

The Patriot Act, which should be called The Communists’ Act, gives our government the power to search without warrants or court orders. It gives our government the right to use “administrative subpoenas,” which allow for the seizure of personal information, including, but not limited to, educational records, medical records, credit and banking records, Internet records, library records, on and on. Farewell, 4th Amendment.

This seizure of information can be used upon individual people, groups of people, or any associations, clubs, or organizations that disagree with the activities of the government. The Patriot Act allows for a DNA Bank to collect physical information about anyone who is “suspected” of being a “terrorist.” Unfortunately for us, the Act also permits American citizens to be classified as “foreign powers,” which, thanks to the Real ID, allows for our electronic tracking and surveillance.

The Patriot Act permits entry into homes and offices without warrants, probable cause, notice, and without you having to be in your homes or offices. It authorized the freezing of your bank accounts and the total demise of financial privacy. The Patriot Act permits the use of “roving wiretaps,” or the tapping of multiple phones at one time used by one person (home, cell, business), AND the “elected” supporters of the Patriot Act attempt to further its powers in secret, closed-door sessions.

So, I ask you the following - while I still can - if our homes, businesses, computer systems, banks, medical records; our library books, our DNA, our telephone conversations, our right to criticize our government’s shredding of our Constitution, our children’s rights to mental and educational safety, pregnant women’s rights to mental safety and reproduction; our rights to travel, our rights to buy and sell without governmental ID and interference, and our rights to possess and share our thoughts and opinions are now subversive and considered as terror, then what rights do we have as American citizens? Better yet, are we American citizens if our Constitutional rights do not exist? Look to history for answers, and look no further than to Nazi Germany. Talk about a scripted

duplication of events. . .

## **CONSTITUTIONAL POWER: WHERE ARE THE CHECKS AND BALANCES?**

**By J.D. Jones**

For those who believe the Republican Party and its agents are the answer to America’s problems, please read the quotes below relating to the checks and balances on the three branches of our government. The answer to unconstitutional laws passed down by the Supreme Court, and lower federal and state courts has been with the American people and the people they elect from the beginning. In fact, no chief executive is bound by the opinions of the judiciary.

In 1819, Thomas Jefferson said that “[E]ach of the three departments has equally the right to decide for itself what is its duty under the constitution without regard to what the others may have decided for themselves under a similar question.”

President Andrew Jackson agreed with Jefferson. He once observed that “[judicial] precedent is a dangerous source of authority, and should not be regarded as deciding questions of constitutional authority.” Jackson also categorically stated that a president (or governor) is bound by his oath of office to decide matters of constitutional right and power according to the executive’s interpretation of the constitution, not according to the judiciary’s interpretation!

Consider also that Alexander Hamilton wrote in Federalist No. 78 that the exercise of judicial power is subject to the check and balance of the executive branch, which, alone, has the power to enforce a judicial order.

What those Founders and great Americans said was that the governors of each respective state and state legislatures have the constitutional authority to decide without Supreme Court interference if any federal laws or court decisions are constitutional in their eyes (and perhaps those who elected them). If not, they had (and still have) the right not to enforce those laws. It also demonstrates that the president can tell the Supreme Court that he and the government will not enforce all decisions handed down by them.

Let’s put that in today’s perspective in light of recent and not-so-recent rulings. It does not take an amendment to the constitution or the election of so-called conservatives to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. It only takes an American president who will publicly announce that the *Roe v. Wade* decision is unconstitutional and that the federal government will not enforce it. This could be done on two counts: the protection of the unborn as the posterity of this nation and on the grounds that the Supreme Court, under our system of checks and balances, has no authority to legislate from the bench. The governors of each state also have the same authority.

We all know that’s not going to happen; and the Republicans are just as guilty

as the Democrats, if not more so, when it comes to not enforcing the constitution. Both vote for and fund abortion. They both have the same agenda, a One World Government in which elite rulers decide who lives and dies and who gets the biggest slices of the pie. There's a lot of money at play in the abortion industry and some of it winds up in the hands of elected officials through campaign donations.

This plays right into another Supreme Court recent ruling: that the property rights of the citizens of America do not exist. That local, state and the federal governments can use eminent domain to take our property and give it or sell it to corporations, multi-national corporations or any developer who say he can bring in greater tax revenues to the local government.

This is a clear violation of the Fourth and Fifth Amendments to the Bill of Rights but how much is being done to protect us from government theft of our property? Where was George Bush when this was handed down; and where was Congress? Why didn't he state that he would not enforce this unconstitutional decision? Why didn't congress start impeachment proceedings against the five Supreme Court justices who handed down that decision? Now it's up to the governors in each respective state to take a stand and refuse to enforce a court-enacted law. How many will take a stand and put the brakes on a Supreme Court that has usurped the power of the president and the federal and state legislatures over the past 50 years? When will this rule by liberal, New World Order judicial fiat stop?

I think we all know the reason no actions were taken. Both the Democrats and Republicans are all partying in the same boat. There is not a dime's worth of difference between them. That has been proven with every unconstitutional court decision they uphold and enforce. They have the constitutional tools available if they want to bring America back to "we the people," but they forgot that "we the people" are the government until the next election. They're already ruling in true New World Order, elitist fashion. If we don't fight back, it will only get worse and our government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" will cease to exist.

## THE HUBRIS OF WILLIAM REHNQUIST

By: Devvy Kidd

NewsWithViews.com

"[How] to check these unconstitutional invasions of... rights by the Federal judiciary? Not by impeachment in the first instance, but by a strong protestation of both houses of Congress that such and such doctrines advanced by the Supreme Court are contrary to the Constitution; and if afterwards they relapse into the same heresies, impeach and set the whole adrift. For what was the government divided into three branches, but

that each should watch over the others and oppose their usurpations?" —Thomas Jefferson to Nathaniel Macon, 1821. (\*) FE 10:192

Chief Justice William Rehnquist issued his year end report of the Court which should demonstrate to most Americans that allowing Supreme Court Justices to remain in office for two, three, four decades or longer is a dangerous thing. Rehnquist's comments are transparently self-serving, i.e., "I will also focus on the recently mounting criticism of judges for engaging in what is often referred to as "judicial activism."

It would appear the heat from We the People is finally penetrating the conceit of these self-proclaimed Gods on the throne. The people of this Republic are fed up with federal judges and Supreme Court Justices legislating from the bench. How many different ways can you interpret the U.S. Constitution that is only a few oversize pages of parchment? The law libraries are full of thousands of books of decisions from the federal judiciary that most Americans can't even understand.

Here is a sampling of Rehnquist's whining:

### "III. Criticism of Judges Based on Judicial Acts

"Criticism of judges has dramatically increased in recent years, exacerbating in some respects the strained relationship between the Congress and the federal Judiciary.

"By guaranteeing judges life tenure during good behavior, the Constitution tries to insulate judges from the public pressures that may affect elected officials. The Constitution protects judicial independence not to benefit judges, but to promote the rule of law: judges are expected to administer the law fairly, without regard to public reaction. Nevertheless, our government, in James Madison's words, ultimately derives "all powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people." Thus, public reaction to judicial decisions, if it is sustained and widespread, can be a factor in the electoral process and lead to the appointment of judges who might decide cases differently.

"Although arguments over the federal Judiciary have always been with us, criticism of judges, including charges of activism, have in the eyes of some taken a new turn in recent years.....At the same time, there have been suggestions to impeach federal judges who issue decisions regarded by some as out of the mainstream. And there were several bills introduced in the last Congress that would limit the jurisdiction of the federal courts to decide constitutional challenges to certain kinds of government action.

"A natural consequence of life tenure should be the ability to benefit from informed criticism from legislators, the bar, academe, and the public. When federal judges are criticized for judicial decisions and actions taken in the discharge of their judicial duties, however, it is well to remember two principles that have long governed the tenure of federal judges.

"First, Congress's authority to impeach and remove judges should not extend to decisions from the bench." Rehnquist then goes into a long spiel on the Samuel Chase

matter saying in part:

"Chase was by no means a model judge, and his acquittal certainly was not an endorsement of his actions. Rather, the Senate's failure to convict him represented a judgment that impeachment should not be used to remove a judge for conduct in the exercise of his judicial duties. The political precedent set by Chase's acquittal has governed the use of impeachment to remove federal judges from that day to this: a judge's judicial acts may not serve as a basis for impeachment. Any other rule would destroy judicial independence — instead of trying to apply the law fairly, regardless of public opinion, judges would be concerned about inflaming any group that might be able to muster the votes in Congress to impeach and convict them."

What Rehnquist is saying is that members of the U.S. Supreme Court can hallucinate any decision they want without fear of removal from the bench. Who made these people God? I can give you three perfect examples of how the U.S. Supreme Court bastardized the U.S. Constitution, although pro-baby killer, pro-sodomy, anti-Christian advocates will disagree:

First, the *Everson v. Board of Education* decision [330 U.S. 1, 18 (1947)] which started this mythical 'separation of church and state' movement. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the court which had some rather convoluted language justifying their position:

"The New Jersey statute is challenged as a "law respecting an establishment of religion." The First Amendment, as made applicable to the states by the Fourteenth, commands that a state "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ."

The Fourteenth Amendment states in part: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States;" The Fourteenth Amendment created a second class of "citizen," an important distinction few people understand. The 1947 Supreme Court took the position that the freedom to worship is a privilege, not a God-given right.

Second, *Roe v Wade* (1973): The nine member all male court used the 14th Amendment to condone the murder of unborn babies. The majority opinion fell to Blackmun who crafted an opinion which glaringly and miserably failed to identify any specific U.S. constitutional guarantee to justify the court's ruling. Like a magician, he hallucinated up a decision on the right to privacy citing protection of due process under the 14th Amendment. Translated: the court conjured up a right that was not specifically enumerated in the Constitution.

Third, *Lawrence v Texas* (2003). In this case, the question to the court was due process and equal protection under the 14th Amendment regarding a Texas statute that made it a crime for two persons of the same sex to engage in certain intimate conduct (sodomy). Once again, the Supreme Court not only came up with one of the most convoluted, toxic decisions of the past century, it went much deeper than that. This was an all out attack on states' rights.

As a side note that so few Americans seem to care anything about - amendments to

the U.S. Constitution that were clearly not ratified, i.e., the Sixteenth and Seventeenth; I also strongly believe there clearly exists sufficient proof that the Fourteenth Amendment was never ratified. On December 10, 1995, a document authored by retired Judge Lander H. Perez of Louisiana was submitted to the U.S. Congress. This document purported that the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution "is and should be held to be ineffective, invalid, null, void, and unconstitutional" for a long list of valid reasons. Perez' presentation is quite compelling.

It goes without saying that judges and Supreme Court Justices should not be influenced by every special interest group in the country. But, when they ignore the Constitution and issue decisions that clearly comes into conflict with that document, leaving them on the bench is equivalent to letting an employee who steals remain on the job. Why should federal or Supreme Court judges receive blanket immunity for lifetime appointments no matter how destructive their decisions?

In Dr. Edwin Vieira's brilliant work, *How to Dethrone the Imperial Judiciary*, this notion of lifetime appointments and renegade decisions is a fabrication supported only by the parasites who benefit:

"Article III does explicitly provide that "The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour." In other words, judges can be expelled from office by means other than impeachment. Section Two of Article III states:

"The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction;—to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

"In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make."

Judges are not above the Constitution "The question whether the judges are invested with exclusive authority to decide on the constitutionality of a law has been heretofore a subject of consideration with me in the exercise of official duties. Certainly there is not a word in the Constitution which has given that power to them more than to the Executive or Legislative branches." — Thomas Jefferson to W. H. Torrance, 1815. ME 14:303

Referring back to *How to Dethrone the Imperial Judiciary*, "It is pure myth that the

Supreme Court has the last word on the meaning of the U.S. Constitution. Indeed, Article VI makes clear that "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof...shall be the supreme law of the Land...and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution." In other words, the Judiciary is under the Constitution and not over it."

These contumacious, arrogant federal judges have been jailing Americans over the income tax issue, treaty based environmental issues which have destroyed the livelihood of thousands of Americans, giving illegal aliens invading our nation "constitutional rights," and shredding the Fourth and Fifth Amendments.

The Supreme Court Justices for decades have refused to hear critical cases, i.e. the fraudulent ratification of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Amendments and instead, have allowed the Department of Justice and the IRS destroy the lives of innocent Americans. And now the Chief Justice who has been sitting on the bench for 32 years, 11 months and 28 days is whining because the people are demanding their removal? Rehnquist shouldn't worry - no Congress over the past 100 years has had the stones to remove but a couple federal judges and since the American people just voted back in the same gutless wonders to serve in Congress, it's likely judicial terror will continue to reign over We the People.

© 2005 Devvy Kidd - All Rights Reserved

## Modern Slavery

By Robert Williams

The evolution of our great and sovereign nation into a global world organization (New World Order) may be called socialism or communism... but the N.W.O. concept is really just a pretty name for a modern-day version of corporate slavery. For many years, the US worker fought and negotiated with corporations to raise employee wages and improve working conditions. Although worker cost increased, this proved to be beneficial for both the worker and the corporation. The US has proven that a humane and productive relationship can exist between worker and employer.

With the passage of NAFTA, corporations were no longer restricted in movement by huge tariffs and enormous taxes. They have been able to move about from country-to-country in search for the lowest wages and without concern for the environmental protection requirements placed on them in the US. Many of these corporations moved into Mexico. At a glance, one might think that this would be good for these poor Mexican communities. The effect was the opposite. An already drastically low Mexican wage base dropped even further as greedy US corporations re-established themselves in Mexican communities then refused to pay a living wage to the local workers. Wages that are paid to these workers do not even meet the cost of basic necessities of life, forcing multiple families to live single-dwelling,

disease infested slums... or lower.

The nasty and corrupt Mexican government addressed this problem in their usual manner. They became part of the problem instead of the solution. Instead of forcing these greedy corporations to protect the environment and pay a decent wage to the Mexican workers, the Mexican government solved this problem by encouraging (even sponsoring) their young, reproductive population to leave Mexico and illegally enter the United States where they could find a new and better life (and return a portion of their earnings to Mexico). What a great plan... Mexico lowers it's population, empties it's prisons, and receives an enormous amount of US currency in circulation, while doing nothing productive in return.

Working in conjunction with Mexico are corrupt US politicians and US corporations that directly and/or indirectly aid and abet millions of Mexicans each year as they illegally cross the border into the United States. Any person in the United States that works in conjunction with a foreign country to achieve such a goal is not only operating outside the law, but it sounds a lot like treason, to me.

Additionally, the indoctrination by such terrorist groups as La Raza and La Voz de Aztlan lead these new arrivals to actually believe that they are Mexican patriots reclaiming their stolen land from Mexico by the evil United States. The attitude of this indoctrination trains these illegals to feel no obligation to the United States, nor it's laws.

Our Immigration and Naturalization Service has procedures for persons that seek to enter the United States. There are important immigration laws and procedures in place that protect the United States and it's citizens from outside disease, crime, terrorism, economic chaos and ruin, etc. These protective laws have been blatantly ignored and the result of this neglect is reeking massive havoc in the US. Over 90% of the near 20,000,000 illegal aliens in our country work "under the table" and pay no taxes (which forces the US taxpayer to subsidize the difference). Border States nearing bankruptcy, caused by this invasion, have been forced to declare themselves in a "State of Emergency"... Literally hundreds of hospitals and health care centers have been forced into bankruptcy due to the laws that require that services be provided illegals, while denying service to US citizens... Our "lead balloon" Public Educational System has deteriorated to a level that would shame a third-world nation... US workers with excellent and reliable work records are being replaced by a less expensive illegal alien workforce... Over 33% of our prisons are currently occupied by illegal aliens... Mexifornia becomes more than a concept as sporadic towns are permitted to vote Spanish as their official language... and boldly fly Mexican flags over their City Halls and other US buildings... all on US soil and using taxpayer money.

We can no longer ignore the greed and/or idiocy of narcissistic elitists that support a New World Order or we shall find ourselves being governed by the whimsical nature and self-interests of those that sit in the United Nations. We must protect ourselves as the sovereign nation that we were founded to be.

We must start by making a serious effort to protect our homeland. We must reverse this illegal influx by securing our borders, putting an immediate halt to the hiring of illegals, and deporting those that unlawfully reside in the US. Our sovereign freedom will evaporate if it is not protected. Our children must not become the modern slaves of a corporately run world.

The Illegal Immigration Committee of the New Frontier Coalition is comprised of a group of patriotic citizens that are not afraid to stand up for the Constitutional rights of the United States Citizen. The Illegal Immigration Committee has been fighting illegal immigration with revealing documentation, embarrassing letters to corporations that sponsor illegal immigration, and will soon announce the availability of a "Citizen's Handbook". This book will provide current immigration laws, interesting articles pertaining to various aspects of illegal immigration, contact information that a US citizen needs to properly report illegal aliens, as well as any employers that may be hiring illegals... and much more. This Citizen's Handbook is designed to act as an informative guide for anyone that wants to do something to help stop the illegal immigration problem in the US... but doesn't know exactly what, or how to do it. Let us help you become the patriotic citizen that you want to be... Join the New Frontier Coalition at: [www.newfrontiercoalition.com](http://www.newfrontiercoalition.com) and become part of our united force of patriotic citizens.

## A GOVERNMENT OF LAWYERS

**Anthony James Parissi, Jr.**

American colonists may have been annoyed with "Taxation without Representation," but they were downright angry over the English system of law. As jurors, they were commanded to follow the law as mandated upon legislation by lawyer/judges created by lawyers, according a foreign jurisdiction, rather than, according to lay persons, upon common law/biblical principles, Truth (Jasher 29:11), under a Creator's jurisdiction. Sound familiar?

Americans were aware that in England, jurors were jailed for rendering decisions not agreeable to the chartered lawyer/court. Such jurors were jailed until they relented and followed the lawyer-created law. In British Colonial America, if a Grand Jury refused to indict a person, the privileged prosecutor (lawyer) would sign an Information that could have that person confined to a prison cell, rather than his/her fate determined by a jury of laypersons. The judge would then order the American to be tried by a jury in far off England where a guilty verdict was more easily obtained. Jurors there were commanded to follow the law as given by the privileged court officers/esquires/lawyers and legislated upon that which attorneys were educated. The tried and convicted person was then imprisoned according to a monarch, under admiralty jurisdiction, sovereign authority. A lay person's education, according one's Sovereign authority, the Bible, under a

Creator's jurisdiction, Yahweh (YHVH), upon oath, the Bill of Rights, was not employed or didn't exist.

The American people fought the American Revolution to rid the government of the English system of law and all of its lawyers. The people believed, under the new Constitutional system, lawyer prosecutors, lawyer judges, and just plain lawyers should no longer be tolerated. But the lawyers and money trust, i.e., bankers/moneychangers, who support each other, would not surrender their tenacious grip on the powers of all three branches of government. As it turned out, Alexander Hamilton was wrong when he wrote #78 of the Federalist Papers. The Judicial Power would not be the weakest branch of the new government and, as has been seen, judicial officers would instead gain and hold control of all three departments of government.

In June 1788, the American people ratified the US Constitution, which makes no mention of the office of the attorney general, attorney for the government, nor "officer of the court," attorney or lawyer. The people absolutely believed that under the new Constitution, there would be no conducting of any legal business except by a non-lawyer judge and jury under a simple and understandable judicial process based in Truth and common law, Biblical principles, the Bill of Rights, and the US Constitution. Courts would operate under the Creator's authority without benefit of any law created or title of nobility. Under common law jurisdiction the courts would not be able to conduct or assume positions as adversarial parties against Americans as existed in the English system pursuant to Law Merchant in admiralty court, under maritime jurisdiction, for credit. Ours was to be a simple and understandable judicial process based on the Bible.

Colonial Americans despised the legal fraternity. Recognizing this, the lawyer majority that drafted the new Constitution at the Philadelphia Convention, and later the Bill of Rights in the First Congress, made certain they did not once place in either document the words lawyer, attorney, attorney general, United States attorney or prosecutor. Read and then enlighten others on

any Constitutional authority whatsoever, five United States Supreme Court Justices and Chief Justice John Jay, all former crown lawyers, "ordered ... it shall be requisite to the admission of attorneys or counselors to practice in this court, that they shall have been such for three years past in the Supreme Court of the State to which they respectively belong." That was the stealthy reinstitution of government by lawyers for creditors under a foreign jurisdiction.

## THE ART OF POWER IN AMERICA

**By Harsha Sankar**

This writing seeks to reflect on several interrelated issues. First, the display of a portrait of any judge in any courtroom condescends to, patronizes, and insults the alleged "owners" of the judicial branch of the

American government, the people. There are no paintings or pictures of average citizens hanging on the courtroom walls, so why should the bar association attorneys be allowed to post immaculate portraits of fellow bar association members? When the bar association praises one of their own for impartiality, it usually means their hand-picked judge was partial to at least one of them.

Dual loyalties should not be tolerated. Judges should not have the status of "Superior Citizen." Judges should consider it a privilege to serve their fellow citizens by applying the law in accordance with the American Constitution. That's why judges and any other public servant should not be addressed as "Your Honor." The judiciary is supposed to be a passive branch of government.

Like sporting contests, very spectators know or even care to know who the umpires or referees are. A referee's job is to apply the rules with such uniformity and consistency that no one cares about their identities. Yet the display of any individual in a public institution that relies on force symbolizes the dangerous "cult of personalities." This was a sure-fire sign of dictatorial despotism that was part of the former Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, and Baathist Iraq; and it's still prevalent in many other nations. The only items that should be on display are the Declaration of Independence, the American Constitution, and the state constitution. People should respect those documents which are the foundation of this nation, but absolutely no one should be above our system of laws. A nationwide charge should be issued that has a familiar ring to it: "Mr. Judge, take down those pictures!"

In regards to the farcical law day in which the local bar association lectured and talked down to area citizens, the following items must be cited:

1. It is clearly against U.S. Code and Florida law to commit mercy killings and/or engage in euthanasia. So when Terri Schiavo's name was mentioned with a caveat that individuals should put their desire to die if reduced to invalid status in writing makes no sense. The law says they can't be put to death, so why the need for a living will? Dr. Kevorkian obtained written authorization from people who wanted him to assist them in committing suicide, but the law prevailed and he is serving time in prison for his crimes.

2. Much of the advice was common sense at best and at worst reckless generalizations. People are not children, imbeciles, or chattel. It's time to demand that lawyers stop seeing themselves as the intelligent in our society and realize that we're equally intelligent.

3. Then there was the family lawyer who cited complexities in the divorce laws. Perhaps it should have been stated that his is because the same people/organization that makes and administers those laws also practices them using unwitting clients who don't take the time to learn the law themselves. Instead they pay someone to practice what they can't do.

4. Legal fees need to be reviewed, controlled, and made public. Too many Americans are getting hosed at the legal offices while lawyers look for more and more

ways to sue this nation out of existence.

5. Only non-lawyers should be eligible for judgeships, public defender, and prosecutorial positions. If one desires a citizen-based government, then laws should be enacted and applied by the citizens. This should not be restricted to the various bar associations. The interests of judicial advocates in public office will obviously conflict with that of the people who want firm rule of representative law for all at all times.

6. Abolish the Supreme Court rules and replace them with a format created by a non-lawyer legislature that can easily be understood.

7. State judges usually serve lifetime positions. Again this is an acute symptom of kingship and totalitarianism. All judges should be subject to reconfirmation based solely on how they officiate from the bench.

Cloaked with a velvet glove, the legal profession and its co-operators/co-conspirators are ruling with an iron fist. Pride, dignity, and self-respect have given way to hedonism, materialism, and legal theft. Only the people can force our government of the people to return the power to where it rightfully belongs: the citizens of this nation.

## JUDGES THEN AND NOW

By Jill Cohen Walker

If our nation is suffering, it might be because of the liberal judges who can't seem to get things right. In Kansas, for example, a judge ruled that semi-nude lap dancing is a form of freedom of expression and should not be limited to those 21 and older. I believe our Founding Fathers are rolling over in their graves over this one. Never, in the wildest imaginations could they have foreseen that a passel of jurists would give such meaning to the First Amendment . . . but they did.

Our nation is in a moral crisis that actually started before the Roe v. Wade decision, albeit, as has been stated quite rationally, that decision opened the door to a host of privacy issues that again were never in the minds of our Founders. According to modern American judicial thinking, God is dead and you should be able to do whatever you want, especially in the privacy of your home. The problem is that it never stays behind closed doors. What was once, not long ago, considered lewd and lascivious behavior usually finds its way into the public arena until Americans surrender their values and accept it as the norm.

The fact that more than 40 million unborn children have been murdered since Roe v. Wade, which was admittedly decided on lies from the left, should have us shaking our heads in shame. Not only were the unborn the sacrificed in the name of selfishness, our posterity—the generations that follow us—have been torn to shreds. But that's just one decision, like the lap dancing decision, that's a spit in the face of those whose worldview defines it as wrong.

The problem is the rollercoaster effect of such decisions. Once it started, it has careened out of control and nothing the

Republicans have done has stopped it. Oh, maybe they've slowed things down a little, but their lack of backbone against the invading tide of liberalism and immorality has been rather evident over the past five decades, allowing the courts to violate separation of powers a little more during each session.

Well, take a look at what happened to four of the five cities on the plains. You'll have to pull out your Bibles for this one. It was the judges in those cities who made immoral laws that caused their downfall. It was the judges who destroyed all semblance of decency, allowing the casual traveler to be sodomized upon his arrival, the women raped, and the children defiled. It was the judges who determined that what God said didn't matter that caused His hand to move against entire cities to ensure their demise.

We are facing a morality dilemma of extraordinary proportions and the judicial branch of our government has been more than complicit, they've been the authors of the same "legislation" that invaded those four cities. They've trampled the meaning and intent of our constitution so that it resembles a shabby version of the UN Charter—that pagan document that's almost a word-for-word translation of the old Soviet Constitution. They've stolen our land, and while granting privacy to some, have allowed more intrusions into the privacy of others than the Founders ever intended.

I hear it said often that "we are a nation of laws." Well, that's fine when the laws are noble, moral, and promote a decent and upright citizenry. But when judicially mandated laws—handed down in violation of the constitution—turn our society in a carbon copy of Sodom and Gomorrah, God's hand may move just as swiftly with the same results those ancient twin cities experienced. Without judges who will rule with clean hearts and a desire to protect the nation that was once "under God," we will fair no better than even the mightiest empire that came before us and was removed from the face of the earth.

\*\*\*\*\*

Attorney General Alberto Gonzales  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Gonzales:

I will advise you to contact the Congress of the United States and advise them of their rights as to criminal prosecution regarding their failure to declare the 16th Amendment void for fraud.

As citizens we have duly informed and presented evidence that this Amendment was fraudulently declared ratified yet Congress refuses to accept the evidence, refuses to address our redress of grievances, and refuses to meet and answer our questions.

Congress is not fooling anyone in this matter. Especially those of us who have seen the evidence that were presented to them.

You will immediately draw up the necessary paperwork for Congress to

sign to eliminate this Constitutional Amendment from our Constitution. I will remind you that fraud laws apply in this matter. Fraud once duly exposed voids all agreements.

I will advise you now that I have already filed charges of Fraud, Extortion, Grand Theft, and Postal Fraud against the Federal Government regarding this issue.

Sincerely yours,

David L. Buess

Here is some information you should have. Please PRINT and SAVE:

Telephone , or email , or write to express your opinions : President George W. Bush - (202) 456-1414 fax— (202) 456- 2461

The White House 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue  
NW Washington, DC 20500

Phone numbers; Comments: 202- 456-1111,  
Switchboard:202-456-1414, FAX 202-456-2461

email President George W. Bush:  
[president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:president@whitehouse.gov)

Vice President Richard Cheney:  
[vice.president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:vice.president@whitehouse.gov)

**Call Congress Toll Free !**  
**(877) 762-8762 or (800) 839-5276 or (800) 648-5316**

**Participate, your opinion counts. Use it !**

The NFC News is published monthly by the New Frontier Coalition of the United States of America. The articles in this paper reflect the opinions of the individuals who have submitted them and are not necessarily those of the New Frontier Coalition of the United States of America.

Copyright © 2005 New Frontier Coalition of the United States of America. All rights reserved. All property rights for this publication are the property of the New Frontier Coalition of the United States of America. No part herein may be reproduced without prior written consent.

Subscriptions are available for \$25 per year. Payments and donations should be sent to:

NFC Public Relations Committee  
Virginia Brooks, Editor  
1196 Twp. Rd. 2116  
Ashland, Ohio 44805  
419-368-6074  
[vareforms1@bright.net](mailto:vareforms1@bright.net)  
Managing Editor  
Jill Cohen Walker  
[jillwalker@bellsouth.net](mailto:jillwalker@bellsouth.net)  
Visit our website at  
[www.newfrontiercoalition.com](http://www.newfrontiercoalition.com)