

USAreset.net website by James E. White of Okemos, Michigan, USA

Warning, to use this website you must engage your thinking brain. No coasting on just what you've read somewhere or heard from somebody. You will not be presented with perfect answers; only ones that might have some rationality to them and perhaps some possibility of working or otherwise helping you and the rest of the USA (and maybe the world?).

The bottom line is that all current house of Representatives members should be replaced and one third of all Senators (all up for a 2024 vote) should be replaced in the November 2024 elections. Additionally no current Representative should be elected a Senator. All current Representatives and Senators have clearly proven they are for-themselves-politicians first and not representatives of you, "the People." Ask yourself, and/or look it up, have the necessary *annual* government spending bills for 2024 been worked out across party boundaries yet and passed?

Let me begin at the "beginning."

God

This section could just as easily be called "first cause" or "infinite regression" because that is the question that "God" has been presumably "created" to answer. You can somehow detect yourself and you can believe by touch and observation that there is a "universe" around you whether it be a chair you're sitting in, a house, a city, a state, a country, a world, or something grander that you see in the night sky. The question is: Where did the universe come from? A. Has it "always" existed? Or, B. Was there "nothing" then the "universe" started or was started? If it's B then, B.1. Where did the materials come from to make it? Or, B.2. Where did the whatever/whoever(?) that "started" it come from? . . . If it's A or B then where did the GARGANTUAN amount of energy that we see evidence of come from? . . .

It is, at least with currently understood physics, impossible to work backwards and arrive at a definitive "first cause." The questions, as seen above always have an "and before that?" that can be asked in an "infinite regress." Some thinkers postulate that "time" started with "the universe" but that really doesn't get us anywhere either because "started" itself implies a "before" which would be impossible without "time." (And we're still left with that "universe" stuff from "nothing" issue.)

"God" (capital G, or "Allah"¹) with omnipotent powers was clearly "invented" to (sort of) solve the infinite regress because ? ? ?, well . . . , just because, according to some, you had to stop going backward at "God" and not ask more questions. My mother made it clear to me very early on, when I was bold enough to ask at age 7 or 8, that the question "and before that?" should never be asked (of anyone) lest it bring me, or even my whole family, into ill repute. Even before my question to Mom I had decided that "worship" of anyone or anything was about the weirdest and

¹ Other names are used too. I'll stick with "God" or god to represent them all.

most useless thing you could do unless there was definitive proof you got something in return that wasn't just a result of "luck" or deserved and owed earnings. But "worship" clearly wasn't an essential requirement for either.

(In a few minutes you'll see how this brings us to World Peace — or at the very least, to the end of religious strife.)

But ages, many many millennia, before "God" there were spirits and non-monotheistic "gods" (little g) as people projected their own ability to (dimly at first) think onto whatever they saw around them. Tree spirits and sky spirits, etc. But some thinkers were soon somewhat more astute than others and began to call themselves shamans and the like and convince (by arts, not magic or an actual "in" with the spirits) those struggling with how to get something out of those "spirits" they ascribed to the trees and the sky, etc. It didn't take much convincing because occurrences, such as finding deer for food, were pretty random anyway so a shaman that baited a spot in the woods and directed you near there could up your odds of success pretty convincingly. Shamans that learned about poisons, of course, could clearly "demonstrate" that they could cast deadly spells through their spirit contacts.

Then, even more astutely (perhaps, or greedily?) some figured out the shamans (or whatever) were really fakers and perhaps with a few gifts and a promise not to disclose the secret arts of the baiting (or whatever) became "government" leaders "blessed" by the fakers. There are other pathways to the same end of two "elite" classes, the leaders and the shamans (also now often ascribed "priests"). As "God" is purported to be, the shamans were also "omniscient." It's no secret "God" "does" this through parents and the unintentional "guilty" behavior and expressions of their guilty children. The shamans often didn't have the advantage of "parents" (disclosures to "Santa Clause") but they did also have an astute understanding of human motivations (them being human themselves).

"We're all atheists about most of the gods that humanity has ever believed in. Some of us just go one god further" said Richard Dawkins². It doesn't hurt that our no-god knowledge makes us atheists considerably less manipulatable by human powers that be. But we all do believe, if you want to define it as such, the little g god in (almost) each and everyone that understands that good behavior toward each other is beneficial to all and us included. For me, when I think of some things that I could do, a little "voice" in my head (I call it conscience) alerts me that that path leads to anarchy where ultimately only might makes "right." Even the mightiest humans rarely want anarchy where "to avoid being killed by you, I'll kill you first"³ is the asinine rule (substitute what you will for "kill").

Religion

² *The God Delusion* by Richard Dawkins. Highly recommended reading.

³ Also known as "Do unto others before they do unto you."

Odds are very high you have simply “inherited” whatever religion your parents (or at least one) followed and, because of simple rote training, that is what you follow too even though the odds are also pretty near 100% that you are not certain you believe “everything” you are told you should. There’s a reason for both: it’s easy to stick with what one learned and you’re a rational, thinking, person so you can easily see (even when you don’t necessarily want to) the irrationality of some concepts or dogma of “your” religion.

Given whatever your conclusions from reading about “God” above and the behavior of shamans (and government leaders) that you are familiar with from history and your own observations it must be clear by now that there really is no “God” (or “god[s]”) “omnipotent” and “omniscient” and therefore there can be no actual “correct” religion. Particularly one that relies on such powers though there can, of course, be valid teachings in and among religions. You, you, you, and you are the ones that must sort it out each individually though discussion can help.

You have to reason through yourself, perhaps with your little g god conscience, what makes the most sense to avoid anarchy? What way lies the greatest good? Peace and security for yourself, myself, and all others. I, for one of billions, have brain circuits and reasoning in my head that allow me to understand that my conscience is speaking to me for a greater good than my immediate wants. Some far lesser number of people apparently don’t have those brain circuits and falsely ascribe various voices/ideas in their head to external forces; generally, because that’s what they’ve been taught: “God.”

All religions were created by humans for the benefit of (at least some specific) humans. Who does an “omniscient” god (capital or little) benefit? Well, it turns out, everyone! Plus maybe the leader and priest classes a little more which would give them some incentive to support “it.” After all, if people believe a god sees all (omniscient) and has the power to punish (via omnipotence) anyone doing evil, believing people are less likely to do acts (even less than criminal ones) against others and thus lighten the government law and order load.

Bible, Talmud, Koran, Book of Morman, etc.

If all religions were created by an omnipotent (and good) god then why aren’t they the same? Exactly! You’ve hit the nail on the head. Any god that was all powerful (and good) would certainly have made sure to get the correct word out to everyone. Hence, it should be obvious, the religious books no matter what they say were all written by humans with whatever purposes the author(s) had in mind. Some of the authors may have wanted goodness to emerge from all their readers but some very likely (if not obviously) had more nefarious purposes in mind. (A piece of that tithe sound good?) Not just control of “good” (as opposed to “bad”) behavior but to more certainly put readers/believers into a tighter control than what would clearly benefit society.

Want women to be under your thumb? Put some constrictions on them into the book you're writing (or at least your interpretation of someone else's book). Want government to have more power than everyday people? Then put some ambiguity into the book so that the government people (and/or the priests) can make arbitrary decisions (with no recourse until "God," supposedly, evens the score after death). Hence the need to throw into the book promises that the author doesn't have to deliver on, ones that everyday people cannot verify are true or not (they're not), and ones that are so, if true, beneficial to believers (albeit long term) that it seems to make sense to hang on to them as real.⁴ After all, if everyday people cannot win on rightness alone when going up against the "power" classes, belief in whichever (human written) book might and does (along with the forever damnation threat) keep the people from rebelling (for the most part).

But how far can the book authors go? I would suggest you, you, you, and you not let them go very far. I don't and that's why the Founders of the United States Constitution made sure the USA was a secular country, not one that would swing to the book/interpretation whims of any temporary majority. As soon as the author's (or their interpreter's) actions start hurting anyone they have gone too far. Believe what you want about (non-existent) spirits (3 are 1, or Hinduism's many united as one, whatever) but "kill others that won't agree to your beliefs" is way, way too far. Tolerance of other people's beliefs is essential and must be reciprocal. Tolerance of any intentionally inflicted injury to others or violation of their rights without the reasonable sanction of the whole of "the People" is not acceptable. Period.

There are places where "control" of people and/or their behaviors might get fuzzy but it should not, with the current level of science understanding, be on the basis of religion whether from a book or personal belief. For example, in the time when trichinosis was a serious health issue the banning of eating pork was all-in-all a good thing. Science would have favored it and obviously some ancients (at least 2,000 years and likely more ago) connected the dots but now we know the cause and how to prevent most *Trichinella* infections (and we can cure them when they occur). Proper cooking of meats is effective for prevention. Circumcision is semi-effective in limiting transmission of a variety of venereal diseases but abstinence, better cleanliness, and various barriers also can help as can cure by modern medications. Vaccinations against a variety of viruses and bacteria can substantially limit the spread, death, incapacity, and other hurts of disease.

Aside from a priesthood or benevolent dictator how can we decide what "control" at the individual level for the greater good of all should be the rule?

"Democracy" or "Republic?"

A democracy is simply a form of government where people have a say in the government and laws through their votes. A republic is one where that say is

⁴ E.g., eternal life of the soul? A place called heaven? Endless damnation for anyone not adhering to the author's intent?

through a layer of representatives voted into position to shape the government and laws on behalf of all the voters. The United States of America is actually a hybrid which can be more fully designated as a Constitutional Democratic Republic with a two-tiered (State and Federal) government each tier (generally) with three power/responsibility balanced branches (Legislative, Executive, and Judicial). “Constitutional” gets in there because the Constitution (necessarily and rightly) places limits on what the government and the designated representatives can do — particularly when it comes to treating all people as equals.

Minorities, such as White men, cannot be discriminated for or against simply based on their being White or male. Duly noted that it has not always been this way; Black men and all women whether they were minorities or not have not always been treated as equal and were not so treated in the Constitution when written. Even today those less than 18 do not have a say except through their parents or anyone they can convince to vote in their best interests and the rights of women are still not fully settled.

Winston Churchill once said that: “democracy is the worst form of government — except for all the others that have been tried.” You should take a look around the world so you can quickly verify that for yourself. Beware that not all governments calling themselves a democracy are actually democracies. Putin’s Russia even Putin calls a “managed democracy” meaning voters know who/what to vote for as do their representatives (that want to live). Winston considered the form of government of the United States to be a “democracy” even though not “purely” so.

There likely can be no perfect form of government and regardless of the form of government at least the politicians, representatives of the voters, government employees, and the rich will all strive to bend “the government” and the “power of the people” to their own ends. It will always be a requirement of the people to be vigilant and correct any bending of the government away from *all* the people that is done. It is nonetheless true that it is unrealistic to expect every act of government to equally benefit (or harm) every individual equally. Compromise must always be the order of the day. All people are *not* actually created equal nor have they come into equal chances but having the government by law siding against them without considered reason is a fundamental problem. There is good reason that Jefferson’s “all men are created equal” was not embedded in the Constitution.

Alexander Hamilton put it very well in Federalist No. 15:

[T]here will be found a kind of eccentric tendency in the subordinate or inferior orbs, by the operation of which there will be a perpetual effort in each to fly off from the common centre. This tendency is not difficult to be accounted for. It has its origin in the love of power. Power controlled or abridged is almost always the rival and enemy of that power by which it is controlled or abridged. This simple proposition will teach us how little reason there is to expect, that the persons intrusted with the administration of the affairs of the particular members of a confederacy will at all times be

ready, with perfect good-humor, and an unbiased regard to the public weal, to execute the resolutions or decrees of the general authority. The reverse of this results from the constitution of human nature.

Politicians

Beware of politicians. In fact, beware of everybody. When some people believe they might have even the slightest edge in power over you they are willing to abuse it. Even the more so when they are physically more powerful than you and even more so under the influence of hallucinogens or intoxicating drugs or alcohol. And yet more so when they believe that they have, through wealth or influence, more power in the courts.

I am not a politician. The closest I've come is being President of the St. Joseph, Illinois Community Council (a non-government organization) or holding various offices in miscellaneous membership clubs and similar organizations. On the other hand, I am not financially beholden to anyone for financing repeated Democrat or Republican or Green or Libertarian, etc. campaigns to get me elected to a position of POWER. I'd like to see power used to do right by all, not to enforce a my-party-or-nothing right of might whether it is being used to do something or block something.

Politics

I was a Republican for most of my early voting years but when the "Republican" party started veering away (such as injecting religion into laws) from sound Constitutional policies I switched to being independent occasionally voting Libertarian or Democrat when a specific Republican candidate's policy or platform seemed intended to bend the Constitution. Now I'm clearly a Republicrat Independent selecting each candidate that gets my vote based on what they say they stand for on their website and, when readily findable, what they have actually seemed to stand for with their behavior in office. Too often what they do is not what they claim they stand for. In my college Psychology 101 class I learned "watch their behavior, not what they say" from an instructor who had that point driven home by a kleptomaniac she "cured" (so he claimed) just before he walked off with her tape recorder.

For example, Elissa Slotkin will not be voted for again by me because she apparently has no interest in using her position to check, as allowed and encouraged, if not required, by the Constitution, the Supreme Court. I know because I presented my case where the State of Michigan and the Supreme Court both refused to obey the Constitution. Her responses were via her staff (presumably) and they requested campaign donations and signed me up for her newsletter. Not a squeak about the Constitutional issues I raised in my communication to her office. (Too much like work I presume and what's a single vote anyway?)

Additionally I cannot vote for Gretchen Whitmer, current Governor of Michigan, again because either she, or through ineffective training, her staff have allowed the

State of Michigan to no longer have a “Republican” (with three balanced branches) form of government. She (or her staff) assumes correct arithmetic not to be a Constitutional (9th Amendment) right instead allowing state agencies to invent their own arithmetic. She also permits her administrative agencies and the Michigan Judiciary to completely ignore the laws that the Michigan Legislature has created and that she, or prior governors have signed into law. More on that under “Courts (and My Cases).”

Basically I am a nobody (or a could-be-you anybody, or nearly everybody). I totally agree with the sentiment to kick politicians out of office. Especially so when they continue to permit egregious violations of the Constitution. While I believe that the “ousting politicians” sentiment was rife in the 2016 election I, in looking what Donald Trump stood for, could not vote for him but cast my vote Libertarian (not that I think they are always right either: every road a toll road? ridiculous). My vote would not have changed the outcome and I still cannot vote for him. I will, Republican though my leanings are, vote for any Democrat party candidate for president because third party actions outside their specialties are too unpredictable.

Not that I really want to be such but I am available for President, Vice-President, or Representative (for my Michigan district). I’m perfectly happy to cast a vote for Kamala Harris for President though I’d like to know who is to be Vice-President first. My real goal with this website is to get the Supreme Court throttled into balance via a responsive Congress that takes its balancing power responsibility seriously (i.e., puts it ahead of reelection or Party campaign financial support).

Bio

Born a twin in Champaign County, Illinois on January 8, 1952 making me 72 years old in 2024. Not as old as either Biden or Trump but still what I consider to be past prime age for a president or a representative. (It’s past time for a generational change in upper government people.) I lived in Champaign, Illinois until I was 6 then my dad wanted more rural living so we moved to Mayview, Illinois surrounded by farm fields in the St. Joseph, Illinois school district but still an easy commute for dad. Pretty normal childhood with school and whatnot including Methodist church member, Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, 4-H, and later the Explorer program of the Boy Scouts of America. Stayed in the Explorer program after high school as an Advisor including working with youth attending regional and national events. Wrestled in high school for 4 years lettering twice. Summer employment included walking beans, detasseling corn, bailing hay, Boy Scout summer camp employee, and trimming hedges.

Started college at the University of Illinois in fall 1970 in engineering but soon switched to business and graduated in January 1975. Went to work full time as a printing press operator in the same offices I’d worked part-time as a student since the summer before starting college. Looked into opening a print shop in Urbana, Illinois in 1978 but discovered a friend from high school had beaten me to it by a few months. Looked at continuing education and found that a combination of

Library Science and an MBA in Management Information Systems best suited my interests. Was accepted to both programs then had to rush to get started discovering that the Library Science program started in the Summer session only rather than the expected fall.

Graduated from both in 1982 and '83 and in the fall started full-time employment at the NASA Scientific and Technical Information Facility near Baltimore, Maryland. First major project was to visit 15 or so NASA facilities across the USA to scope out requirements for automating all the libraries of NASA. Before that project was completed my employer (a "beltway bandit" government contractor) lost the bid for contract renewal. I stuck with my employer and went to work on a variety of projects in downtown Washington, DC including GSA, EPA, NIH, Naval Air Systems, Marines, FBI, HUD, and several other acronyms before leaving a NOAA project in 1991 to become an independent contractor. Biggest project I worked on as an independent was the FDIC/RTC to deal with the Savings and Loan Crisis.

My wife got a teaching/research position at Michigan State University (MSU) in 1997 so I left Washington, DC but continued as an independent contractor until joining Michigan State University as a full-time web and accessibility system developer in 2006. I retired from MSU in 2022.

Campaign Finance

The simple solution to the fantastic growth of big money spending on political campaigns is for you, you, you, and you to simply quit paying any attention at all to the campaign ads, both positive and negative. The vast majority of them are simplistic lies with only maybe the merest thread of fact to (sort of) anchor them. First they characterize something, often something you won't be able to figure out exactly what it is, either all bad or all good and you have to simply take their word for it. You can't pack much meaningful into a 60 second commercial. Then they often somehow extrapolate into the future and boldly state that it will end all good or all bad depending on whether they are building up their side or tearing down the other. Yogi Berra maybe said: "It is difficult to make predictions, especially about the future;" or at least that's one (paraphrase?) of his often quoted paraphrase of a much earlier (and often misattributed) Danish proverb.

I can, however, reliably predict that taxes *will* rise in the USA no matter what anyone says or promises to the contrary simply because they will have to get the national debt under control. Whether Representatives, Senators, or the President will acknowledge such necessity or do something about it depends very much on how they read your, your, your, and your willingness to hear and accept the need. Your great benefit from "free" government services may seem nice but eventually there must be a reckoning. Think for a minute and you'll understand that the very people that percentage- and affordability-wise could pay more in taxes are the very ones plowing the mostest into campaign coffers and campaign ads to convince you to

vote for parties and people that will *not* up their taxes, your taxes are irrelevant to those rich parties.

Yes, it used to be that there were some limits on campaign contributions and advertising but the Supreme Court, under the correct guidance of the First Amendment to the Constitution lifted those. But just because someone advertises (at a very loud volume) a bunch of half (or more likely 10-20%) truths it doesn't mean you have to turn off your thinking brain and accept them at the face value of whatever your current predilections are. You, after all, are "the People" and the government bows to you, not the other way around. Sorry, but accepting your "the People" responsibility takes effort and thinking so please, please, make the effort to do it for both your and my benefit.

Unfortunately your ignoring the big campaign advertising blitz will substantially (when the donators of the money get wise to your ignoring them) reduce the advertising revenues that your local, and even national, papers and other news media depend on to stay alive. That means that one of the things you can do to help is to subscribe to at least some local and national media — preferably electronically though old-fashioned paper will do too. And I strongly urge you to "cross-pollinate" your subscriptions, or at least the media you pay attention to, to ones with various points of view. Not all "news" media are honest unbiased reporters of actual news. Yelling "Horse race, Jones is closing in..." is, after all, good clickbait.

Spread your news media attention around so that it will discourage news commentators, authors, reporters, journalists, whatever and their publishers from pandering to biased groups from whence they can glean the biggest (targeted) advertising revenue stream. "Journalists" who are seeking large "salaries" aren't actually "earning" those salaries for honest, high integrity, news reporting; they are receiving those payments to keep delivering the advertising dollars. In selecting news media, research who the actual owner is. Getting multiple streams from a single owner generally simply works to the owner's advantage, not yours. If the owner has found a formula that generates the profits they will use that formula as a core, directing, with minimal extra expense, the same biased "news" to all of their media.

Courts (and My Cases)

Today's courts (at least Michigan courts and the U.S. Supreme Court) no longer adhere to the law, as I found out when I needed honest, high integrity judicial support to stop Michigan State University's theft of some of my earned vacation time (or its equivalent in dollars) or to collect an Unemployment Insurance Benefit guaranteed by Michigan law but denied via a Michigan State University (MSU) fraud supported by the Michigan courts, without themselves actually reading the law.

Which of the following are guaranteed by the Constitution (and plain Justice before that): 1) correct arithmetic, 2) valid logic, 3) prompt and fuss free correction of mistakes, 4) law interpretation in English (or the language it is/was written in), 5) self-defense, 6) court awarded damages for violation of one's rights? I (and maybe you) would think "all 6." But the U.S. Supreme Court to date has only endorsed #5 as being a right. Granted that most lower courts will throw out #1 cases and such cases won't be appealed and that success of appeals often rest on a higher court overturning a lower court's #2 invalid logic (or, unfortunately, using invalid logic themselves to thwart real Justice). Recall Hamilton's "love of power" paragraph above.

Further, while you might believe that for civil suits you have a right to a jury trial, that (according to the government, Federal and Michigan) is not true, the Constitution's 7th Amendment plain language be damned. The courts have now written very subordinate rules (i.e., way below "supreme Law of the Land"⁵) so that the courts, and government parties, can simply pretend they don't understand how you're following (or not?) those rules to simply pitch you out of court without trial on the merits of the law thus totally violating the very reason the 7th Amendment was written in the first place, for "the People" to have a check on the power (or its abuse) of judges and Justices⁶.

In my case the Michigan Courts never looked at the arithmetic: \$5,087.39 per month times 12 months equals annual pay of \$61,048.68 which, divided by 2,080 hours in a pay year, yields a rate of \$29.35 per hour and multiplying that times 102 hours of earned vacation results in a correct pay amount of \$2,993.70 thus a discrepancy of \$389.44 from the \$2,604.26 that MSU calculated. MSU did acknowledge part of their mistake in that they subtracted 94 from 102 hours and originally arrived at 0 rather than the correct 8 which they promised to pay for but then did not. They didn't even try to address the \$154.64 discrepancy of 94 times \$29.35 = \$2,758.90 rather than \$2,604.26.

Further MSU, the Michigan UIA, a Michigan ALJ, the Michigan UIAC, and the Michigan courts all chose to ignore Michigan law, in particular the "*However...*" sentence of MCL 421.48(2). [*my emphasis in all*]

MCL 421.48(1) An individual shall be considered unemployed for any week during which he or she performs no services and *for which remuneration is not payable...*

(2) All amounts paid to a claimant by an employing unit or former employing unit for a *vacation or a holiday ... as the result of the separation...* shall be considered *remuneration ...* under section 27(c) *However, payments for a vacation, ... or the right to which has irrevocably*

⁵ U.S. Constitution Article VI paragraph 2.

⁶ See Federalist No. 83 (search "federalist papers" at gutenberg.org)

vested, after 14 days following [such] *shall not be considered* wages or *remuneration* within the meaning of this section.

[re “irrevocably” per the CBA Article 21 Vacation Pay

-159 *An Employee* may take vacation at any time during the year with permission of the supervisor and *in accordance with departmental requirements*.

-171 An Employee will receive payment for unused vacation when *terminating* employment.]

The State of Michigan through its employees, administrative agencies, lawyers, and judiciary have gone to extraordinary lengths to abuse their power and to ignore the MCL 421.48(2) “However” sentence and the CBA paragraph -159 “departmental requirements” of which, by definition, there are none on *layoff* (which is *not* “*termination*” per CBA -171 and other exhibits).

More than just the above can be found in the [case put before the U.S. Supreme Court](#) where the ultimate plan of MSU (so they thought) came to fruition by their signaling the U.S. Supreme Court, through waiver responses (Nov 19 1922 and Dec 01 1922), that the Supreme Court should just deny certiorari. Except the Supreme Court’s Constitutional responsibility is clearly set out at Constitution Article III, § 2, 2. “[i]n all Cases ... in which a State shall be Party” and Article III, § 2, 1. “[t]he judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution.” I contend that correct arithmetic, valid logic, and law interpretation in English are all 9th Amendment rights and all have been ignored by the State of Michigan and the Supreme Court. The Courts choose to ignore those rights to “fly off from the common centre,” you, “the People,” and “Justice,” in “judicial” and “Justice” POWER plays.

As an example of Supreme Court illogic (and completely ignoring reading the law in English) also see the case of *Donald J. Trump v. Norma Anderson, et al.*, 601 U. S. ____ (2024) (i.e., *v. the State of Colorado*) https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/23pdf/23-719_19m2.pdf. The Colorado public officer oath or affirmation includes “*support the constitution of the United States*” thus meeting the requirements of Article VI paragraph 3 of the United States Constitution. Norma adhered to that oath or affirmation in applying Amendment XIV paragraph 3 as did at least one prior court before the case reached the United States Supreme Court. The United States Supreme Court however ignored, Norma’s oath or affirmation, their own Justice oaths or affirmations, and the “*But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability*” sentence of Amendment XIV section 3. [*my emphasis*]

The Supreme Court did acknowledge Congress (“*responsibility for enforcing* Section 3 against federal officeholders and candidates *rests with Congress and not the States*” [*my emphasis*]) but flipped Congress’s responsibility from being “*remove such disability*” to effectively inverting it, via “*for enforcing,*” to “*declare such*

disability” and then the Supreme Court grabbed the “remove such disability” to themselves and (ostensibly) did it. They also had the gall to charge costs to Colorado for its sworn or affirmed office holders obeying the Constitution. The Supreme Court’s “*and not the States*” illogically also undoes States’ (via their office holders) requirements to obey at least this one Amendment XIV section. All the Supreme Court’s Amendment XIV perversions are logic (and plain English language understanding) failures and are wholly un-Constitutional violations of Amendment IX and Article V. The Supreme Court cannot modify the Constitution, only interpret it when there is an ambiguity or unanticipated new application for principle (e.g., telephone vs the 4th Amendment). There is no ambiguity in the “But Congress...” sentence quoted above.

Oaths or affirmations of lawyers and State (and Federal) officeholders are to the Constitution, not to the Supreme Court. Therefore, Colorado, Maine, Illinois, and any other state wherein those sworn to uphold the Constitution and responsible for providing ballots for the 2024 U.S. Presidential election and who have duly determined Donald J. Trump “engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the [Constitution]” have a Constitutional mandate to leave Donald J. Trump off their ballots regardless of what the U.S. Supreme Court says. If Donald J. Trump is to protest such omissions to anyone it must, to be Constitutional, be to Congress.

Meanwhile the Supreme Court has to be fixed. Only Congress, through impeachment for bad Behaviour (the opposite of “good Behaviour”, Article III, Section 1), can implement the fix. Turning the 14th Amendment Section 3 on its head, then all 9 Supreme Court Justices grabbing “remove such disability” for themselves, is very clearly not “good Behavior” and thus is impeachable. And I’ve asked Congress to do that through Elissa Slotkin, Jim Jordan, Kevin McCarthy, Mike Johnson, and Gary Peters with no result other than solicitations for campaign funds and being added to mailing lists. You, you, you, and you can help. There is no statute of limitations on Supreme Court bad Behaviour therefore you can vote out all current Representatives that represent you and all the Senators that represent you in Congress and make it clear to whoever you elect that fixing the Supreme Court, starting with impeachment, is your wish. If necessary gather behind a single write-in candidate who is *NOT* a politician and not beholden to any party campaign donations/advertising dollars.

Further I would suggest that the Supreme Court, whose size has not kept up with the growth of the country (from 3 million at ratification to 330 million today), be upped to perhaps 45 Justices with panels of 3 to decide each case always declaring precisely the why of their decisions in reasonably clear and succinct form. If the 3 are not unanimous then move the case to a panel of 9. Certainly more thought and discussion should go into restructuring of the Supreme Court but kicking out the egregious constitutional violators on the current Supreme Court should be a no-brainer. They’ve done enough damage to you, you, you, and me over many years.

Contract

When is the last time you sat down one on one to negotiate a contract? How many take-it-or-leave-it contracts do you have to agree to or take-a-hike these days? How many “contracts” do you have to commit to where the “contract” can be changed to whatever the party shoving you the “contract” wants somewhere down the road? How many “contracts” do you see that can only be taken to arbitration, not to court? Do you know that arbitrators know where their money comes from?

I propose that a Federal “Contract Board” be established and that any organization of more than 10 employees must have the contracts they shove at those wishing to avail themselves of the products or services of the organization be approved by said Board. The Board to make sure that the contract is properly balanced between the organization and their customers. Contract changes likewise to be reviewed and approved by the Board.

AI

Can you tell an Artificial Intelligence image or article or whatever from one produced by actual humans? I propose that Congress create laws that it be mandatory that all AI produced stuff be clearly labeled as such and that the provider cannot enforce any kind of disclaimer at all. Further I propose that all fake and spoof and the like (“news” or whatever) be clearly labeled as such and again that the creator be liable for any resulting harm. Also that anyone that tampers with any of the above and particularly those that remove any proper labeling of such (whether passing it on or not) also be liable for properly decided penalties ranging from meaningful fines to incarceration.

Further I propose that all news media must include a date with all news articles and their headings when posted elsewhere include the date also. Additionally all news videos that are recorded (by anyone) include the date of recording and that any “LIVE” (or equivalent) be replaced in recordings with the date. “LIVE” means nothing useful; “Recorded Live” with the date would be honest as would just the date.

Ukraine War

Remember the French? If it was not for them there very likely would be no United States of America. Remember over 50 years of at least European peace? Notice that a single individual, Vladimir Putin has thrown that peace out the window for what he apparently sees as his own self-aggrandizement. Where do you draw the line for such? I think it is very clear that the NATO allies and others are going to have to sooner or later kick the Russians out of Ukraine (and possibly other places they don’t belong). Appeasement of dictators (even when “elected” in a “managed Democracy”) has never ever worked to the advantage of the people of the world; things always get worse until right is reasserted by might of the exasperated many. There is always a huge cost which the dictators just laugh at, it’s not them

getting hurt. One of the biggest costs is always to the people of the Dictator's own country.

Germany and Japan, as examples, did not stop until they got their butts thoroughly kicked in the mid-1940s and at some point, if diplomatic overtures don't get that educating done to Putin, some level of butt kicking will be essential. Unfortunately, it won't actually be Putin's butt that gets kicked, it will be many of his countrymen who pay the price. Germany and Japan (and their leaders) have learned from their mistakes but not all wannabe emperors have (or necessarily will). See Hamilton's "love of power" paragraph again.

It should also be clear, from the "God," "Religion," "Bible..." etc., sections above that any war based on "religion" distinctions among people is wholly invalid, it's just a people vs people power grab (or at least of those claiming "leadership"). You may have noticed that Putin went from being an atheist 20 some years ago to a Russian Orthodox Christian as one more (probably) lie to add to his "liberate" and "Nazi" and "Ukraine is Russia" lies to justify to his countrymen why they should willingly die to aggrandize Putin. The invalid support for the (human created) religious views held by (some) Jews and (some) Hamas/Palestinians, etc., is just as surely not legitimate reason for wars in the so-called Middle East or Africa. In fact, the only justified war is one to defeat an aggressor nation that starts a power grab by might.

United Nations (UN)

It should be obvious that the United Nations is, in general, when it comes to big countries grabbing territory (and people and resources) through military might, an abject failure. Either the UN needs reworked such that *an aggressor nation* cannot veto UN actions against itself or a whole new organization needs created. Yes, it's hard because there is perhaps no vote system that will totally overcome the myriad little countries vs the few larger and more economically and militarily strong countries. But clearly the single vote of some specific (aggressor) country in all cases is not viable when the Putins of the world exist.

The U.S. Senate

Somewhat analogous to the veto power of specific single UN members is the issue of 2 state Senators for even the low population states. Some other mechanism is needed that guarantees that more populous states cannot gang up on the low population states and yet the low population states cannot gang up on the high population states. The answer will not be easy but good faith must guide it and whatever it is good faith must honor it. The Founders understood the issue but left it unsolved with the following embedded in Article IV "and that no State, *without its Consent*, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate."

Electoral College

Popular vote or some other mechanism needs to be devised that better balances the wishes of the people in the election of the President and Vice-President of the United States. A good part of the solution, when honored by the people in the branches of the government, is already found in the Constitution's checks and balances. But in a large part the Founders issues must be recognized and dealt with in tune with the USA of today:

The Founders, even those and maybe especially those with slaves, understood that slavery was an issue, that education was an issue, that social prejudices were an issue, that free riders were an issue, that blessings at birth were an issue, that remoteness from power or current events were issues, etc. But times have changed, slavery is gone, education is better, many social prejudices have substantially softened, etc., so election rules perhaps need adjusted (by Constitutional amendment, not Congress or the Supreme Court) to today's realities.

The USA *Is* Great

So many people want to get into the USA precisely because it is the greatest and most equitable country in the world at the moment. Yes, we (meaning Congress) need to implement a better immigration system and perhaps find some way (other than going in with guns blazing) of getting other countries on board. For a while trade was doing the job to a fairly large extent then people like Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping decided that they wanted military might and power accumulated to themselves rather than trade and sound economics to be what defined importance in the world.

Why there is so much lingering prejudice from prior to the Civil War I cannot easily imagine unless it be the simple desire for power over others that many people seem to hold with no intelligent desire to suppress it. "Make America Great Again" means what to Trump and (many of) his supporters? "Great" by demonstrating that we as a nation are willing to subject some (or many) residents of our country to less than full human status? I don't see how that makes sense. What if the time comes when "they" can do that to "us" (whatever those groups might be)? Would that make the USA "greater" or what? My thinking is that it will make us far less both then and now!

MAGA is almost certainly a "Dog Whistle" but if you believe it, can you be sure that what it might mean to you is exactly what it means to all others that believe they hear it? I'd wager "No." It's rather the Putin autocrat call to "do it my way or go to jail or die." Your belief in what hearing the ultrasonic notes means to you doesn't actually make it so. Anarchy or autocracy are far more likely and you won't like either one. When your rights are fully gone, not just to the extent the judiciary has stolen them now, there won't be any rights left for you. Everyone must have the same rights as you or anyone can take them away.

First they came for the socialists, and I did not speak out—because I was not a socialist.

Then they came for the trade unionists, and I did not speak out—because I was not a trade unionist.

Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out—because I was not a Jew.

Then they came for me—and there was no one left to speak for me.

—Martin Niemöller

Unfortunately Martin Niemöller didn't have this epiphany until *after* Hitler (and his “go along” Germans) lost World War II. In his lectures after the war, Niemöller publicly confessed his own inaction and indifference to the fate of many of the Nazis' victims (of which he became one). Who would be the MAGA victims? Perhaps you, even if, as the Nazis did, you joined MAGA because you thought it would benefit you to have unequal power and law on “your” side? Exactly what the USA founders feared from their knowledge of history but had to allow concessions for in the Constitution given the then “southern” states' predilection for their economic benefits from slavery.

Economics

You, you, you, and you are much more responsible for the US economy than any President can be. Get over it. It's 330 million vs 1, you win. If you are not spending money (within reason) other people are not profiting from your tight fists. If you're worth more at work and aren't agitating for a pay raise (or seeking more gainful employment elsewhere) then how you fare vs others is heavily tied to you, you, you, and you, not the President.

Granted, the balance of power at work is not always such that you can either complain and get a raise or leave a current job. I know. My last employer grants some (reasonable but not overwhelming) benefits to employees that retire after working for them for 15 years and 25 years. It is always a choice as to whether, at say 12 years or 20 years, to abandon the time invested in those extra retirement benefits and get employment elsewhere. My choice was to complete at least the 15 years and I knew what salary I needed to induce me to abandon ship. I never got an offer at that level but that doesn't mean I wasn't making the effort to send out resume's and ask around.

Also granted that a President can have, mostly through (sometimes false) reassurances because that's what you, you, you, and you want to hear, some economic success. But the lengths of such effects are still dependent on you, And there is the Federal Reserve Board (Fed) made up of fallible humans that are intentionally as isolated as practical from daily “politics” but no matter what they do it is still you, you, you, and you that govern the lag time between their changes and the economy. Correction swings that don't asymptotically hit 0 are a natural phenomenon just as are the swooping murmurations of starlings (and equivalents of other creatures). Without the Fed though the swings would be much wilder and more frequent as they were before the Fed. Why, because banks and business would

drive interest rates from wildly aggressive to once-burned overly cautious as new bank and business leadership changed.

Gerrymandering

Political gerrymandering to create voting districts that favor one political party over another or that effectively diminishes a one-person-one-vote power for some groups needs to be curtailed to the largest extent possible. Michigan is perhaps at the forefront of this process with their Michigan Constitution's Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission however there is not enough experience with it yet, or with its involvement in court cases, to adequately judge whether it is meeting the reason it was created in the first place. Review and consideration of alternatives is needed. Again, likely no perfect answers.

Globalization

Globalization will not and cannot go away. Why not? For the simple reason that mineable and other exploitable resources are not geographically even across all countries. Just like you don't have a goldmine in your back yard (if you have a back yard). Additionally, within reason and within reasonable bounds that do not leave any country dependent on another country, moving manufacturing to low-cost labor countries helps bring all countries toward equality in "quality of life" even though that means different things to different people. Corporations are very poor at striking a good balance between domestic manufacturing and "foreign" low-cost labor. Generally the only way to achieve a better long-term balance is for government intervention through law and import taxes generally known as tariffs. Tariffs are not free, they cost the local consumer while encouraging more local manufacturing and discouraging more foreign manufacturing. Getting a perfect balance is a goal but highly improbable, there will always be some compromise.

Vote

Studying the issues and the candidates and their perceptions of the issues and possible solutions and compromises is the only way you can maximize the power of your vote. It is no longer the case, if it ever really was, that just picking a political party and voting a straight party ticket will work things out the way you want or that best balances the greater good. You can also help by letting the people that you do vote for *and* the people that get voted into office what you want to see accomplished. Yes, your letter, email, survey response, whatever, will seem to go into a black hole and be forever lost but it does make a difference and many other similar encouragements will have a long-term effect. The oil tanker of government does not turn on a dime as should clearly be understood by looking at the continuing effects of slavery and racial prejudice in the USA for over 200 years.

Additionally, you, you, you, and you must take responsibility for strongly encouraging your elected representatives to get the whole of the USA Justice system back on track. Donald Trump is wrong when he (through his disregard of sound ethics and morals) claims the Justice system is somehow unfairly being used

against him. It is not. While it is true he has been singled out for prosecutions that other prosecutors might have let slide it is also way more true that he is the one that assumed he could get away with whatever he wanted, legal, ethical, or immoral as it might be.

Remember Martha Stewart being prosecuted to the hilt and going to jail for merely accepting a recommendation of a financial advisor? Whatever happened to that financial advisor and the undoubted line of other people that culminated in her prosecution? Prosecutors, because you've not given them the funds to prosecute every wrongdoer, often selectively, pick higher profile people because it gives the prosecutor more visibility as well as giving the wrong behavior itself and the penalties for it more visibility thus having a long-term effect to the benefit of all. Donald Trump is clearly a violator with high visibility and prosecutors coming after him is no surprise but it is not a political party nor a President decision.

You, you, you, and you need to unelect Republicans that voted against the Trump impeachment for Jan 6, 2021. Why? Because they weren't paying attention to you and the good of your country. They were paying attention to the big campaign finance dollars they hoped to garner from their vote. See the "Campaign Finance" section for more.

Safety

Everybody wants to be safe. But too many people want "the government" somehow to provide that safety. It can't. You can't. Nobody can. There is always danger from natural disasters big and small, bad actors from drunk drivers to scammers, killers, and other lesser or more amoral people, and simple accident. While some effort to prepare for and prevent some damage from natural disaster can be done it most often is the case that somehow the cleanup and recovery must be done. Sure, "the government" can (and often should) help but you too must do your part. Make life choices that reduce your chance of being involved in a natural disaster, make cost-effective (to you) preparations in the hope they are a "waste of money," and carry proper insurance to spread the costs out among many.

Be aware that a large part of the issue is the natural sympathy of juries and the greed of lawyers in casting blame. As a juror you, you, you, and you need to be very certain that there really is foreseeable blame that is within the reasonable man cost-effective test realm. If you yourself, or when putting yourself in the supposed "blame recipient" shoes, would have also "been to blame" then as a juror the only fair answer is not to assign blame. Let the victim take their lumps and ask them why they perhaps have not properly insured themselves.

Responsibility

Yes, it is all very complex. No, I cannot tell you what is the best answer for you or for all. You must engage your brain, gather the facts (the actual facts sorting the wheat from the well-presented, deliberate chaff), reason from them to what appears workable to you, actively engage in discussion (even when embarrassing or you fear

being ostracized), and cast your votes. Democracy, in a Constitutional Democratic Republic with two tiers of branch balanced government “of the people, by the people, for the people⁷,” is a responsibility that lies entirely on your, your, your, and your shoulders.

⁷ Abraham Lincoln, Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1863