

Factions -- The Chains of Oppression

The Greatest Obstacle to Restoration of Constitutional Government

Gary Hunt
Outpost of Freedom
August 25, 2011

Factions

Factions are rather interesting, though often ignored by most, in the world we live in. Factions are "somebody else", and we, individually, have no part in them, except those that we are a part of -- though we don't really see them as factions, only truth. We know what we believe; we know our moral values; we know what right and wrong are; we know what we want to know; everybody else is, if they don't agree with us, simply wrong.

So, let's begin by understanding what a faction is.

Webster's 1828 Dictionary:

A party, in political society, combined or acting in union, in opposition to the prince, government or state; usually applied to a minority, but it may be applied to a majority. sometimes a state is divided into factions nearly equal.

... whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community.

Or, the more simplistic:

A group of persons forming a cohesive, usually contentious minority within a larger group.

Factions are, however, a way of life. We are all in factions and in many different areas.

For the most part, people perceive, with very few exceptions, that there are two political factions in this country; Democrats/Liberals, and, Republicans/Conservatives. What the political philosophies of the two "factions" are is inconsequential, at least at this point, to the discussion. The point to be made here is that we have perceived that there are only two factions, and anything else is hardly worthy of our consideration.

With regard to other aspects of our lives and our society, there are minor factions that we see, all of the time. For example, the queer community is recognized as a faction, though most fail to recognize that there is a large faction, which is opposed to the smaller, recognized, faction. That larger faction is those of us who, whether Christian, or not, understand the necessity for moral values and standards within a country.

However, legislation, political correctness, and/or influence through the press tend to either render illegal, or, at least minimally subject those who are a part of that larger faction, to ridicule for expressing themselves, in dispute with the faction's principles.

The net effect is to render that larger faction as inconsequential, or illegitimate, providing a strong platform for the assertion of the values of the lesser faction, even to the point of additional legislation on their behalf.

Factions in history

We can look at history, and around the world, today, and see the affect of factions.

Let's start by looking at revolutions. After all, there have been many revolutions throughout history, though there has only been one that provided a rather smooth transition of government. And all of them have been lead by factions -- sometimes one, sometimes multiple, and, sometimes, begun by one faction where another faction became dominant before the job was done.

The French Revolution began in 1789, the same year that our Constitution became the framework of our own government. That revolution lasted for a number of years, and during the entire course of it, the control of government passed from hand to hand, each hand being the one that, at any given time, had the most influence and power. Often, those in power for the moment would require the execution (guillotine) of someone that was a partner in power, just months before. The groundwork was laid, as the Revolution needed, to restore monarchy and the emperor, Bonaparte (twice). So much for a smooth transition.

The Russian Revolution began in 1917. The Mensheviks began the turmoil, and, eventually, the Bolsheviks gained control. Then, the Bolsheviks became factionalized, Red verse White, leading, eventually, to Lenin obtaining power. Again, not a very smooth transition.

Revolutions, at least those of the ordinary sort, tend to have factions that vie for power, even while the revolution is going on. The resultant government is, generally, unstable and retains its authority by force.

Today, we see the beginnings of revolution in Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Libya, and Yemen. These "street" revolutions are lead by factions. Most often those factions have a religious foundation, though often, there are factions within a religious group, of an ethnic nature. There can be little doubt that the stronger faction will take control, though the conflict will not cease -- until the opposition is exiled, imprisoned, or killed.

Factions in the United States

So that we can put in perspective the factions and the roles that they play in the maintenance of a country, or its destruction, we must first understand just what factions exist, what their role is, and whether they are acceptable, in terms of maintaining the United States of America, as intended.

In a recent article, ['We the People', but, who are We?](#), a review of the Founding documents, subsequent amendments, and, Supreme Court Decisions, provides us an understanding of just who "We the People" are, and, as Justice Taney described in one Decision, that this country is only for these "We the People", but for no one else".

Now, right there, with that last statement, I would expect that many would cringe and began to react in accordance with the decades of conditioning that we have been subjected to. After all, haven't we been raised to believe that this country was made for anybody who wants to come here, for any reason, even if their purpose is to change the nature and purpose of what the Founders willingly gave their lives for? But, is it in the best interest of this country, our future, and our progeny, to accept that what was created just over 200 years ago should fall prey to changes which will destroy that which is our birthright?

So, let's begin by understanding that though there may be smaller factions, with their own respective interest and objectives, that there is, and should be, a Principle Faction -- upon which all else is subordinate.

Principle Faction

As explained in the "We the People" series, there are two classes of people that comprise the Principle Faction. These are those who are described as the cause and purpose of the existence of the United States and its Constitution; and, those who were made citizens, though not fully empowered with the rights inherent within the Constitution, through the enactment of the Fourteenth Amendment, and are, or should be, of the Principle Faction.

However, within both of these classes, there may be many who, though of the nature and class of "We the People" or citizens of the United States, for other reasons, reject the principles upon which the country was founded. These, though they may have rights, privileges and immunities, as described in that series, that do not adhere to the principles are no more a part of the Principle Faction as one who joins an organization to change its nature.

Absent adherence to the Constitution and the principles upon which it was founded, makes one a citizen by birth, though a traitor by attitude -- as much as any spy who endeavors to subvert the country by his actions.

Subordinate, or lesser, factions

Factions are created when a significant number of people, having similar ideologies or purposes, realize that they are sufficient in number to create a "body politic" to champion their purpose.

That purpose can take two forms; First, to achieve a recognition, though in so doing, not to affect the Constitution, the laws, or obtain any favor other than those enjoyed by all of the people; Second, to achieve recognition for the purpose of political gain, changing of laws, and obtaining favor that is not enjoyed by others.

The former has existed in this country throughout its history, and is comprised of people who were born into or have assimilated into the American culture -- without intentions of changing that culture.

The latter, on the other hand, is inclined to adapt the culture to his beliefs, to effect change that is inconsistent with that which the Founders gave us, and, will often employ the pretense of Constitutional right, though the result will be the diminishment of the rights of others, in favor of their object, whether financial, legal, or both. They choose not to assimilate, rather, to force change upon the Principle Faction and force that Faction to subordinate to their will.

Now, as we begin to look at lesser factions (any subordinate to the Principle Faction), they will come under two categories. First will be those who are not in serious conflict with the Principle Faction. Second, those who are in conflict with the Principle Faction.

Factions not in conflict with the Principle Faction

Let's look at some factions that are examples of those consistent with the Principle Faction:

Christians: Our nation was founded, without doubt, upon Christian moral values. Some of those values, however, have been disputed between various sects of Christianity since before the Founding of this great nation. In fact, the First Amendment, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof", was adopted to assure that the ability to practice one's religion, as one might chose to practice it, was a fundamental (God given) right. Even "Mohametmen" were allowed to practice their religion, though the principles established by the Constitution retain the moral values of Christianity. It was never implied that laws could be passed based upon Islam -- only those based upon Christian moral values, and those, only locally, in order to provide a comfortable community for those who chose to live therein. The idea that a law would be passed allowing the wearing of a Burka, contrary to norms for the community and country, was inconceivable. It was the need for assimilation, in order to maintain that which was created by the Revolutionary War, that is necessary to maintain the greatness of the country.

Outlawing prostitution, gambling, alcohol, done at the local community level (often county level), was paramount in the concepts adopted by the Founders. To assume that a state could enact and enforce such laws was not even under consideration during those formative years, and efforts to establish moral laws on a state-wide level were inconceivable.

Many Christians have beliefs that are not consistent with the beliefs of others, though there is a tendency to suppress expressing them outside of one's own circle, in recognition of the rights of others to believe as they wish. However, if we look back in history, we find that these ideals were expressed in newspaper articles, on soap boxes, and by legislators in assemblies, without fear of repercussion or arrest. Absent the ability to express such feelings, we are denied the right to pursue legislation that we believe to be for the good of the country, the state, the county, or the town, in which we live -- not to impose upon others, but rather to refrain from leaving those moral values behind.

So long as Christians adhere to the Principle Faction, and subordinate their beliefs, except as addressed above, to that Principle Faction, they are adherents to, and a product of, the United States. They are what America stands for.

Boy Scouts of America: Why would we even consider discussing a private organization such as the Boy Scouts of America under the heading of factions? Well, they are a faction -- one that has been around for over a hundred years. Their principles are based upon the Christian religion, and the Constitution and principles of this great country. Recently, however, the courts in this country have endeavored to impose upon the Boy Scouts rules of admission and acceptance that are absolutely contrary to the foundation of that organization. They, like Christians, are able to practice as they choose, and allow only those who conform to their beliefs to become members of that organization.

Instead, the courts have ruled that the Boy Scouts cannot prohibit membership to those who don't espouse the objectives of the Boy Scouts. They are forcing change upon an organization that exists totally within the concept of adherence to the Principle Faction, and have every right, under the Constitution, to allow membership only to those who adhere to the principles of that organization.

The Boy Scouts of America adhere to the Principle Faction, and subordinate their beliefs, except as addressed above, to that Principle Faction, they are adherents to, and a product of, the United States. They are what America stands for.

Jews: Jews don't believe, with few exceptions, that Christ existed, or, that if he did, he was not the Messiah. Well, this is definitely not consistent with Christianity, though it is not inconsistent with Christian moral values. In fact, for many years, many Christians despised the Jews and held them in contempt. Often crimes were committed against them, in the name of Christianity. In those instances, the Christians stepped outside of their adherence to the Principle Faction, though such instances are few and far between.

The Jews have established their own communities where they adhere to the precepts of their religion, and do not endeavor to impose their beliefs into the law, or upon others. They adhere to the Principle Faction, and subordinate their beliefs, except as addressed above, to that Principle Faction, they are adherents to, and a product of, the United States. They are what America stands for.

National Socialist Movement (in certain of its various forms): Much like the Jews, the beliefs of many National Socialists are inconsistent with the general tenor of the country, and though outspoken in their beliefs, they have, for the most part, adhered to the Principle Faction.

Some participants in this faction have stepped outside of the law and impose injury, unjustly, on others. These few, however, do not speak for the whole; the majority adhere to the laws, and their expression of their beliefs is consistent with the Constitution, though, perhaps, not politically correct.

Though they have chosen symbols (swastika and other Nazi representations) that are considered evil by most, what they hold to is not much different than the government's support of Japan and Germany, since the end of World War II. It was the whole of the people of each of those countries that stood firmly behind their governments -- responsible for death and devastation, around the world.

So long as National Socialists do not break the law and adhere to the Principle Faction, and subordinate their beliefs, except as addressed above, to that Principle Faction, they are adherents to, and a product of, the United States. They are what America stands for.

Anarchists (in certain of their various forms): The Founders enacted very few laws that acted directly on the people. For the most part, the laws enacted in the first few decades of the United States were laws to define, enhance, or protect the government. The exceptions were the moral laws, also known as Blue Laws, which generally existed within the confines of a town's ordinance, or, perhaps, even county ordinances, in an effort to establish a moral foundation that was comfortable to the majority of those residing there. Otherwise, a degree of anarchy, at least by one definition, was a part of life of the times.

There is an old adage that Liberty is existent so long as your fist stops before it reaches my nose. Our individual constraint on our own actions, so that we do no harm to others, is, perhaps, the best definition of that which should be.

The modern anarchist, even those who might espouse absence of government, altogether, are not inconsistent with much of what the Founders believed. A minimum of government is, perhaps, best, and, is without a doubt, consistent with the Constitution and most state constitutions, at least as originally ratified.

So long as Anarchists adhere to the Principle Faction, and subordinate their beliefs to that Principle Faction, they are adherents to, and a product of, the United States. They are what America stands for.

The Patriot Community: This is the most loose-knit community within the factions adhering to the Constitution. It is comprised of people who have, generally, taken one issue or aspect of the Constitution, to be their cause. Some of those aspects are taxation, the monetary system, the judicial system, the immigration policies (laws) that are not enforced, the First Amendment, the Second Amendment (either, or both, right to bear arms and militia), and, other lesser and greater causes. They are as diverse, and, perhaps more so, than the Founders, at the beginning of the Revolutionary War, yet they are probably the most vociferous of factions that comprise the adherents to the Principle Faction. They do, without a doubt, adhere to the Principle Faction, and subordinate their beliefs to that Principle Faction. They are adherents to, and a product of, the United States. They are what America stands for.

Factions in conflict with the Principle Faction

Illegal immigrants: It is often said that the first impression is the most important impression that you will make upon others. Suppose that the first impression that you make is an

unwillingness to abide by the rules/laws of the host, when you are a guest; suppose someone came, invited, or not, into your home and started telling you that the wall colors were wrong, that they didn't like the pictures you had hung, that they didn't like carpeted floors, or that you should prepare them a meal and a bed. It would not be surprising if you caused them to exit your home, and assured them that they would never, again, have entry into your home. That impression that they gave was not what is expected of the guest, and any reaction you had to that belligerence is justified, even if force is necessary to remove them.

We are the collective owners of the country (our collective home), and, as such, have established rules/laws for entry into that home. They were enacted in accordance with the Constitution and are, as such, the law of the land. Those who enter with their first step being a violation of those rules/laws have, as the unwanted guest in your house, established an impression that is lasting, and totally unacceptable.

Those who wipe their muddy feet on your clean carpet are not a part of any acceptable class of people, visitors, or those here by right. They have, by their actions, spit in the face of what this country stands for. It is not a melting pot for the entire world, nor was it intended to be destroyed from within, by a cancer that grows at astronomical rates, and, quite often, at the expense of our own depleted treasury. Each person that enters illegally, or overstays their permitted visit, is a greater threat to the future of our country than any military threat, from any other country, without comparison. The military threat, we have proven, cannot prevail against us. This insidious intrusion, however, eats away at our country's soul with every day that they remain.

Illegal immigration advocates: Those who would advocate forbearance in dealing with these intruders are not adherents to the Principle Faction, nor are they adherents to the laws, concepts, traditions, manners, customs, nor anything else, that we hold dear -- and must continue to hold dear, if we are to survive as the United States, our birthright.

These people, though they may otherwise not be in conflict with the Principle Faction, and may even be of the class of "We the People", or "citizen of the United States", are, by their support of violation of the law of the land, in conflict with the Principle Faction. They have denied the concept of assimilation, and have thereby provided a means of destruction of the entire purpose of the Founders and Framers, for the creation of this great nation.

Anti- religious groups, Atheists, Agnostics: When we understand our heritage, we recognize that the Founders and Framers were religious, though perhaps not pious, men. Both Washington and Jefferson had problems with organized religion, as many of us do today. Regardless, they had beliefs founded on both Old and New Testaments, and adhered to the Christian moral values, without question. Never did they challenge the concept that was, eventually, embodied in the First Amendment.

The Supreme Court Building (built 1932-35) in Washington, D.C., contains over a dozen depictions of Moses and/or the Ten Commandment, sculpted in stone, and permanent not only in that building, but in the hearts and heritage of this country. Congress begins each daily session

with prayer, and has done so from their first gathering. President's have called for days of prayer and thanksgiving, in official proclamations, throughout our history.

However, there are those advocates who have challenged the right of a state, a county, school, or even a small town, to begin with prayer; display the same representation found in the Supreme Court building, or erection of seasonal displays of Christian holidays on public land.

And, in a somewhat surprising response, they have found proponents of their advocacy in those very halls of government mentioned above. All under the guise that such actions and displays are "unconstitutional".

How can that be unconstitutional which was practiced by the very authors of that document, and those who ratified it? Their practices and beliefs were not in question then, and there is the more serious question as to whether even an amendment to the Constitution would be Constitutional if it abrogated the First Amendment.

Surely, we cannot even begin to consider that we may remain as even a vestige of the United States if we allow the denigration of those practices considered by most to be fundamental to the establishment of the country -- by those very people who caused to be carved in stone the underpinnings of the moral compass by which we found our course.

So long as they adhere to the Principle Faction, and otherwise meet the requirements of class, and distance themselves from those who advocate to the contrary, they may be considered to be of the Principle Faction.

Those who continue to advocate legal sanctions, removal of displays, or any other means of undermining that which has stood so long, are in conflict with the Principle Faction, and have no place in this country, since they choose not to assimilate, rather to change that which is our heritage.

Homosexual rights groups: Some will argue that homosexuality is a disease, others that it is a lifestyle choice. Each is a diversion from the crux of the matter. It is considered by the Christian moral values adopted by this country, 220 years ago, to be immoral. Though with the exception of some local jurisdictions, and some states, it has not been considered criminal -- just immoral.

Even when criminal, it was seldom prosecuted, since it was conducted between consenting parties, in private circumstances. To intrude on that privacy was as much a crime as the behavior itself, at least under the principles of the Constitution. However, if we look at a few of the steps taken to endeavor to assign legitimacy and morality to the practice, we will find an excellent example of the destructiveness of factions. The common terminology used to describe homosexuals was often "queer" (which is rather what their behavior was considered to be), or the more objectionable "fag" or "faggot" (a derogatory term).

As late as the fifties and sixties, homosexual, or, queer, bars and clubs were not uncommon. Their public behavior was normal, and their private behavior, in such facilities, was, to use the

expression of the time, "done in the closet". And, very few had objection to such behavior, so long as it did not "spill onto the streets".

There was an effort in California, back in that period, to establish a homosexual community in the village of Alpine, in the High Sierra. Even then, there was no general outrage, since the village would be their own 'closet'.

Next came a change in terminology. A word that was frequently used to indicate jovial, happy, light, was adopted by the homosexuals. Back then, people would go to a "gay party" meaning that it was going to be sitting around in a light and humorous atmosphere, perhaps telling jokes and stories. However the theft, yes, I mean theft, of that word, which had only positive connotations, was a move to give an air of legitimacy and acceptance to a behavior that was, heretofore, considered immoral. A major coup by this faction managed to change the image of the homosexual, and to remove from usage a word that was commonly used, even then.

Since that time, this once frowned upon group has managed to use the courts and legislative process to provide special protection and special privileges from what was, through most of our history, a subject unworthy of discussion. They have taken a word, "marriage", with millennia of understanding of the definition, and still recognized in US Code as between a man and woman, and have managed to steal that word for their own uses and economic gain.

They have successfully lobbied for legislation that forces the government schools to encourage such behavior, contrary to the wishes of the parents who are clearly among the Principle Faction, and are advocating a moral degeneration of our society.

Those advocates of homosexuality are in conflict with the Principle Faction, and have no place, with the exception of the closet, in our country.

Black rights advocates: As explained in the "We the People" series (linked above), a second class of citizen was established by the Fourteenth Amendment, and confirmed by a subsequent amendment and decisions of the United States Supreme Court. However, through a subtle process of indoctrination, beginning in the late fifties and early sixties, the intent of that Amendment has been converted to an application that has generated havoc, loss of property, and even loss of life.

The "civil rights" movement of that period moved us from a society that recognized the Principle Faction (basically, a fundamentally white culture) to one that has legislated, encouraged, and enforced against, that society, undermining it, in favor of granting privileges to those citizens of the United States, as well as other without such standing, under the guise of equality, greater even than that afforded to "We the People".

Society, itself, had moved in that direction, at the rate that was warranted by the people, not the government. Whether Jackie Robinson, Nat King Cole, or Fats Domino; acceptance of negroes as a part of our culture, was in the works. Society, itself, was approaching a degree of equality, voluntarily.

Instead, it turned to demonstrations (not the preferred form of legislative influence), by both sides. And, since those early days of civil rights demonstrations, they often turned to violence, instigated by both sides. America has been in a near constant state of turmoil, since the time that the government stepped in and tried to privilege the second class even above the first class. And some of that violence, today, perpetrated by those who believe that "change has not come fast enough", is nothing more than rioting and thievery, perpetrated under the guise of equality, couched in phrases about social and economic 'justice'.

These, groups, relying upon judicial intimidation and violence, have proven that their methods and goals are in conflict with the Principle Faction, the Constitution and its principles, and our way of life.

Woman's right advocates: Abigail Adams, wife of John Adams, is probably the best known advocate of women's rights. However, as much as she discussed the subject in correspondence with her husband, he never did advocate such a change in the legal relationship of women within that society.

Over the years, the nation evolved, not turning against the Founding principles, rather, in a social or societal form, with Wyoming being the first to enact women's suffrage laws. Rights of ownership of land and/or inheritance were becoming common, and barriers were falling, as well as advancing women in the society, without intervention by the federal government.

Finally, in 1920, with the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, the federal government intervened in an area that was reserved by the Constitution to the states. As with the Fifteenth Amendment (race suffrage), the right of the states to determine who could vote in elections, both state and national, as protected by the Constitution, was now being assumed by the federal government.

Not that it was a bad move, rather, that it was the abrogation of the right of the states to make such a decision, that was so appalling. It was just seven years earlier that the right of the states to be represented, by senators chosen by their respective legislatures, in Congress, was removed by the Seventeenth Amendment. This was, effectively, the end of states' rights.

As contrary to the original construction of the Constitution as this was, it also opened a means of the presumption of federal authority in manipulating the society to the will of the powers in Washington, D.C., and those who influence such social change.

Over time, unconstitutional legislation has resulted the reduction of the male to a subordinate position in our society, where lawsuits and intimidation work in only one direction, to the detriment, and at the expense of, one half of the society.

Our society, which was based upon rewards for performance, was converted to one where rewards are mandated by quotas, with little regard to ability and performance. This denies to society the making of the choices that were assured and protected by the Constitution.

The advocacy of federal intervention, as opposed to the normal evolution of these norms in our culture, is in conflict with the Constitution and its principles, and is inconsistent with the Principle Faction.

Christian militia: Militia, the right to collective self-defense, is embodied in the Second Amendment, and has been a part of our heritage and culture since the Magna Carta. Since 1215, that right has existed, and, since that time, the Militia have always been subordinate to civil authority and have been geographic in their composition. From the Shires of England, to the counties, townships, villages and plantations of the seventeen hundreds, participation in the militia was a right and was a duty. The only exceptions were exclusions for certain people because of vocation, and those that were "inimical to the cause of American Liberty" (Tories). To exclude people who do not claim to be of the Christian faith is contrary to the Constitution and the principles upon which it was founded.

Christian militia are inconsistent the Principle Faction

Islamic groups: Islam is not just a religion. Islam, in its current manifestation, is a social and political system, as well. It is a social system that includes a number of practices that are considered abhorrent, by our culture. Its social/judicial system manifests extreme punishments for what our culture might perceive to be a minor transgression or no crime at all.

Though two hundred years ago, "Mohametmen" simply practiced as a religion, and were accepted as a religion by the Framers, their character has changed to be anything but just a religion.

We can look to Europe and see the consequences of the intrusion of Islam into a society. Eventually, the demand for change or legal reform to comply with their social/political system takes many forms, including physical abuse against people that oppose them; and the obstruction of roadways so that they can hold collective prayer absent a facility for such service; exercising their form of justice, including capital punishment, contrary to the host country's laws, and often exempt from prosecution for crimes that would otherwise result in incarceration, or worse.

Much like the illegal immigrants, members of the Islamic faith come here with a total disregard for our laws, our culture, and our society. They come with the intention of forcing change, by intimidation, by their numbers, or any means that suits them. Their presence in the country, under their present manifestation, is contrary to the Constitution and its principles, and contrary to the Principle Faction.

The Congress: Congress, especially after their vote for the Debt Ceiling Increase, has demonstrated that they are a faction unto themselves, without regard for the Constitution or the will of the people.

The Congress acts in conflict with the Principle Faction of this country.

The Executive Branch: The Executive Branch, tasked with enforcing the laws of the land, has continued to ignore existing laws regarding immigration, and when forced into enforcing such

laws, does so with a leniency that is more encouraging to the violation of the immigration laws than deterring them.

The Executive Branch has declared that Tea Party members; Constitutionlists; Gun Rights (Second Amendment) advocates, combat veterans, and others, who fall well within the Principle Faction as "terrorist".

The executive Branch of the government is in conflict with the Principle Faction of this country

The US government: The government "erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance", to lie, steal and even murder, members of the Principle Faction, and has done so with immunity from prosecution.

The Administrative Branches of government are in conflict with the Constitution and its principles, and the Principle Faction.

State governments: State governments, with rare exception, do not defy federal intrusions against the Principle Faction, and often participate in the enforcement of unconstitutional polices and laws, receiving compensation from the federal government for the submission to its assumed and unconstitutional authority.

The state governments are acting in conflict with the Constitution and its principles, and the Principle Faction.

Of course, within each of these factions are members who are adherents to the Principle Faction and the Constitution, though they may be facilitating that faction in opposition to the Principle Faction. Rather than suffering guilt by association, they would be well advised to understand that adherence to the Principle Faction and assimilation is imperative.

Utilizing factions for political purposes

Let's suppose that a faction (a group of people with power and control in mind) wanted to create a situation where this country was filled with factions; each being against one or more of the other factions. As in times past, coalitions will be formed, but they will be weak.

However, at that point, it would be easy for those who have the best control, now, to increase that control; under the guise of maintaining "law and order" -- without regard to the Constitution.

This would allow them to manipulate the lesser factions, turning them one against the others.

So, if we were looking from the government's perspective, what is the first step in the implementation of that plan? Well, first we need some factions. However, our immigration policy was designed to foster assimilation, not faction. So, we will have to revise the immigration policy (quotas, education or experience requirements, criminal records checks, etc.) so that we can remove what we can, without exposing our plan. We can even provide amnesty to allow large amounts of people, even those who could care less about being Americans; only

concerned about what they can get for free and how much money they can make to send home. By granting amnesty, we will have removed any requirement, or for that matter, any incentive to learn the language and assimilate into the American way of life.

That, however, will not be enough to get the job done as quickly as we would like. So, what can we do to create factions large enough to generate the conflict that we need to strengthen our control over the people?

Suppose we ignore the laws on immigration that are on the books, and then we can also keep the states from enforcing federal law, since it is "our duty", not theirs. We can allow hundreds of thousands to cross the borders, illegally. If they are caught by the charade we have in front of the people to catch them (U.S. Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement), we can let them go on their own recognizance until their hearing. That will give them the opportunity to 'disappear' and still stay within the country.

Everybody that comes in will be a part of a faction, so we will set no limits on what/who is allowed to bypass our immigration laws. That will shorten the time to the uprising of the factions, considerably.

So, what else can we do? Well, if we can create inflation, the purchasing power of the average citizen will be down, so they will be primed and ready to blame any faction for whatever befalls them. They will not blame us because we are going to act like we know what we are doing, and that it is not the government, rather, the foreigners, who are creating the problem.

We can aggravate the situation even more by having looser laws for immigrants than we have for citizens. We are trying it in California, where when someone is stopped for DUI, if they are a citizen, their car gets impounded. If they are not a citizen, we will let them keep their car -- even if they don't have a driver's license. That should really begin to create tension, and, if it works, we can spread it to other states.

We will also keep the wars going so that people are thinking about waving the flag, while we trample it into the dirt. They think that we are protecting them, though we are actually distracting them and keeping their attention on the wars rather than seeing what is "behind the curtain".

Our final tool has been in place for many years. It includes the sociological implications of "political correctness" and "diversity". We have planted that seed well, so that if anybody steps out of line, those around them will force them back into compliance. We can see how well that is working by not allowing anybody to recognize that different factions with different interests, working at odds with each other, even exist.

I don't believe that it will be very long before we are "forced" to rule this country, with an iron fist. Our plan is so well laid that we cannot fail!

Conclusion

On December 12, 1774, the Deputies of the province of Maryland passed a number of Resolves. Perhaps the most significant was the last, to wit:

"Resolved unanimously, that it is recommended to the several colonies and provinces to enter into such or the like resolutions, for mutual defense and protection, as are entered into by this province. 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."

Four months before the outbreak of war, the colonists had realized the necessity of having a common interest. Avoiding any factionalization that might be detrimental to the cause.

Though the goal at the time was for "rights of Englishmen", over time, it evolved into independence from British Rule. Our goal is much simpler, it is simply restoration of Constitutional government.

However, if we cannot learn from the past, and realize that the Principle Faction is our common element -- and, that subordinate faction issues must be, at least until such time as we have returned to government, in obedience to the Constitution, *buried in oblivion*. We cannot expect the success that Providence granted to the Founders, and us, their Posterity.

Adherence to the Principle Faction, above all else, is the goal that we need to pursue, and achieve, in as short a time as possible. For, until that goal is achieved, and we have identified those who are in opposition to that Faction, we cannot even begin to pursue that ultimate goal of restoration.

To all who are members of the subordinate factions, consistent with the Constitution, it is only necessary to set aside the lesser for the more important faction.

For those who are members of subordinate factions, inconsistent with the Constitution, you have a more difficult decision to make. Can you subordinate your faction so that it is not inconsistent with the Constitution? If not, then you should find a country that allows and supports such a faction as you choose to adhere to.

To achieve the proper recognition of the Principle Faction, we cannot allow ourselves to succumb to the political correctness, which has relegated our Constitution to the back seat. To allow lip service to the Constitution to undermine its very tenets and purpose is to fail before we have begun.

* * * * *