

[Forums](#) / [General Discussion](#)[Help](#)

Madhouse Mess (How Washington Stopped Working). Country in perpetual Constitutional Crisis

✉ You are subscribed. [Unsubscribe](#)

🔖 [Whitehouse](#) × [Undemocratic](#) × +

Sort replies by: [Oldest first](#) [Newest first](#) [Most popular](#)

[Add Tag](#)

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Excellent documentary on the workings of the American Constitution and the system of government

<http://www.journeyman.tv/65969/documentaries/mad-house-mess.html>

Full version download costs \$2.99 but well worth it.

<http://www.youtube.com/movie/madhouse-mess>

↑ -4 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Read a book --

↑ 4 ↓ · flag

[Adrian](#) · [a month ago](#) 🔒

(Promise of Power, Gov by Judiciary, Gov by Judges, Our Judicial Oligarchy, The Plot to Seize the White House, The Case of the People against the Lawyers)

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

The video link is an excellent review of how the system is failing America. It includes interviews and statements by leading republicans in particular comments by Ronald Ragan jnr and senior members of

the Congress

↑ -5 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Another issue that raises ongoing debate is the Right to bare arms. The slaughter of the innocent and democracy at the point of a barrel of gun, The all powerful gun lobby refusing to allow gun control. The only way to stop a made man with a gun is with a good guy with a gun. the wild wild west. Children shooting innocent victims fuede by a gun culture that is out of control and beyond the reach of legislators. More money is spent on guns then on health care. Is this the bastion of democracy? Is the US system a system worthy of emulation?

Ask Michael Moore, compare Canada to the United States, and ask is your constitution serving the interests of "We the people"

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

I think the right to bare arms depends on the fashion industry, and the latest trends in Paris, Milan, London and New York.

↑ 7 ↓ · flag

[Jason Jones](#) · [a month ago](#) 🔒

You forgot to point out that "made" [sic]men do not travel alone.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

It is telling that the above post providing a link to a informative discussion on the state of the Union and the republican party by republican elders is marked down. Free speech?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Marked down for being posted anonymously for no reason.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [21 days ago](#) 🔒

No one prevented your right to free speech by giving it a mark down. Mark down is supposed to mean the post is not helpful or relevant to the topic.

In your case, it is just that your speech is worthless even tho you are free to make it.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

> Another issue that raises ongoing debate is the Right to bare arms.

Exactly, the same arms that the colonists carried, flintlock muskets and pistols. Any other type of firearm should be outlawed.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Exactly. This amendment was made over 100 years before women could vote and before people could vote regardless of race.. The two amendments about voting just seem antiquated and ridiculous today, but so does the right to bare arms (since they were talking about muskets, etc.), so why do people believe that this amendment from 1791 makes sense 200+ years later?

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

[Marcco Aurélio Teixeira Feitosa](#) · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Really nice point of view. The law should stick to social facts, and accompany them, at the risk of not doing so, not being able to fulfill its more basic function: the maintenance of order and social peace.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

What amendment gave citizens the right to bare Arms? How many guns per person in the USA? No wonder it has the highest murder rate in the world. The only way to stop a bad man with a gun is a good man with a gun. the USA Constitution at work

How does the right to bare arms override the need for gun control and better regulations on gun ownership?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

clinton mathews · a month ago

Ho Hummmmmmm! Now that the anon posters have solved that problem, we can move on!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · a month ago

How is the right to bare arms and prevent gun control a constitutional right/ For what purpose?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · a month ago

Watched this documentary, It was very interesting and highlights many of the concerns about the current situation in US politics today most importantly the role of the TEA party on the Party of Regan GOP

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · a month ago

Ronald Ragan's son claims it is broken.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Noah Barfield · a month ago

So I see this has dissolved into a debate about how the right to bear arms is Constitutional in the United States (or am I missing something?). I would like to make the point that it isn't unconstitutional to bear arms; if you retract the ability to legally bear arms, what is to stop someone who really wishes to attain a gun from doing so illegally? If you decide to simply destroy all guns, would you not see an increase in the amount of knife murder rates? Or other ways of murder? To the proponents who say that it doesn't make sense considering they were talking about muskets, flintlocks, etc: it hasn't changed because no matter the time period, citizens of a free country still wish to have the right to defend themselves. Mace can only get you so far when you have a criminal with an illegally attained weapon in front of you. Thank you.


P.S. No anonymous function.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Carol A. Kichen · a month ago 

Hard to understand why people don't understand that if someone wants a gun or other weapon they will get it. Gun control in Great Britain didn't keep terrorists from stabbing that soldier to death in the middle of the day.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag


Jason Jones · a month ago 

That is just daft. I don't understand how you grabbed a single incident in a nation of roughly 64 million people and tried to make it the basis of your argument.

Were you riffing off of Noah Barfield's dumb argument about knife murder rates? For all he or you know we could see an increase in cheese grater related murders. Once we outlaw cheese graters people will go around killing people with their old toaster ovens.

There are so many cognitive biases in operation that it hurts my brain. When your opponent (in this case the silly people talking about muskets)presents something silly, you point out the silliness. You do not just rush headlong into more silliness.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago 

It's not about the right to own a gun. It is about the right of citizens to be safe from lunatics who should not own guns in the first place. All though unlike most on here I try to keep my political views to myself. I am a liberal who is from a big hunting family. I have always believed that the 2nd amendment is an individual right associated with the right of self preservation. That being said it is in the government's duty to protect law obiding citizens right to be safe. Case law from Heller to Chicago and before that when the court ruled that a sawed off shot gun is not protected under the 2nd amendment. I voted for Obama twice. Tea Baggs can get tea bagged all day. Oops I mean the tea party and all the GOP. Hillary Clinton 2016.


↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Carol A. Kichen · a month ago 

You obviously have never met anyone from a tea party group. They are not the people that hateful liberals make them out to be. The problem seems to be that the liberals have become so wedded to the religion of their ideology that they can't carry on a discussion with anyone who disagrees with them without the whole thing dissolving into insults.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag


[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 

The only way to stop a mad man with a gun is a good man with gun.


Canada, Australia, new Zealand all have tight gun control and no where near the level of gun related violence as in the USA. Take another look at the documentary "Bowling for Columbine" and watch the documentary which is the subject of this post and you will see that the US is a broken state, one that is not safe, democratic or representative. How many heads of state have been assassinated over the years? When your government is headed by one individual you can change thr course of its people with a single shot from a grassy knoll. The Westminster system of government is by far more democratic and stable then the fragile undemocratic US presidential system.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Carol A. Kichen · [a month ago](#) 

If you are basing your opinions on trash from Michael Moore then you are already going down the road of nut jobs. By the way, I grew up in Flint, Michigan. Unlike Michael Moore, I actually lived there. Michael Moore is an angry hateful person. All of his ridicules films are based on his ugly agenda - not truth.


↑ -3 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 

Michael Moore is the man. He is not angry. He makes movies that question your closed tea bag closed belief system that makes you angry.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 

I am basing my assessment on a number of sources., The documentary referred to in the first post speaks for itself. Did you watch it?

<http://www.youtube.com/movie/madhouse-mess>

Those interviewed are leaders within the US Republican Party (GOP). Its hardly a partisan point of view. If anything it highlights the flaws in the overworked separation of power structure built into the US Constitution. The executive often ignores the legisltaive branch. Power in the hands of one individual is not democracy its autocracy. there is no one successful democratic Presidential state in the world. Look at all the hot spost in the world today. Syria, Russia. Ukraine, France. All governed by a presidential system, All creating divsion not unity. All inhertently undemocraic and unrepresentative.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Noah Barfield · a month ago

Okay; thank you for pointing out the flaws in modern democracy. Now, what does democracy have to offer? Is it right to blame the system for the mistake of an individual? Would it be better to, instead of having a president, have a council or board, with the same systems in place (Congress, House of Representatives, Senate, all the branches, etc.)?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago

in the US the President goes it alone. A single individual that controls and dictates government, More often than not they represent a simple majority not the majority of voters. There is minimal accountability. Where under the parliamentary system such as exists in the UK, Canada and Australia, the executive is a subset of the legislative chamber and as such they are held accountable on daily basis. Decisions are reached by the collective without the degree of adversarial politics that more often then not stifles democracy and good governance.

Europe is a collective of democratic states. They have a tradition of negotiation as opposed to autocratic rule. All too often we see the US trying to dictate global policy as opposed to entering into meaningful discussion and collaboration. Decisions are made not on merit but on what appeases the mass audience. Issues such as religion or pressure groups have an undue influence on the Presidential deliberations. Ragan and Bush regularly ignored the Congress.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · a month ago

A parliamentary system is by far more democratic. A prime Minister is held accountable on a daily basis a President is only held accountable once every term and the rare possibility of impeachment. Safety is found in numbers. The Westminster system of government is preferable to the US presidential system. The interplay between the various branches and the so called separation of powers has produced a deadlock. The mad house is not working as it was intended See the video referred to above. At the time of inception a presidential system may have been the only option. Replacing the monarch for a president, Most modern Parliamentary democracies the head of state has little to no power. the head of government is the representative of the parliamentary majority.

look at the events unfolding in Ukraine, A presidential system. Ukrainians have struggled to remove presidential power and adopt a parliamentary system of government.

Most, if not all, of the problems and arena of civil unrest in the world is concentrated under presidential regimes, US included

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago

Another post based in ignorance. Where's the objective evidence? You cite a couple of examples (US and Ukraine) that apparently support your case. How are things working out in Thailand, Pakistan or India?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Adrian · a month ago

ROD CLASS

Title 28, Ch. 5, Sec. 88

- Definition of the only two Article III Courts vs. (All the rest)

"Territorial" Administrative Courts !

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Adrian · a month ago

you are being robbed by the Lawyers corrupt RICO system (Promise of Power, Gov by Judiciary, Gov by Judges, Our Judicial Oligarchy, The Plot to Seize the White House, The Case of the People against the Lawyers)

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Adrian · a month ago

A few side notes...

1. Have been under a Communist Dictatorship since 1933 (doesn't matter we hold elections, it's about who gets in office and how they act) *HJR1491 and HJR1492*
2. Have been under Military Jurisdiction since 1933
3. Have been under Admiralty and Maritime Juris since 1213 since this land was stolen by England first! (Yale Avalon Project Ordinance of William I, handed over all lands and "future" lands to the corrupt Vatican)

4. Have been under Administration since 1946....Administrative Procedures Act of 1946
5. You have to BUY back you Rights thru Legal Process, the PUBLIC has its Rights reserved over yours!
6. Look into how and when things "laws, regs ,codes" have been passed(!) Not ONE "thing" has been DONE by the LAW!
7. USCA the United States Codes Annotated are owned and are private laws codified by Little, Brown and Company in 1926 but the own the patent on how they were arranged and what was not to be told to the public (you).

All always read the "notes" and the end of each section of any "code or regulation" to find out what that "code or reg." actually pertains to, the CORPORATION and the AGENTS that work for the Public.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · 21 days ago 🔒

The documentary refereed to in the lead post is a god example as to the inherent structural flaws in the US presidential system, Ot also highlights problems when there is only a two party state. China's one party state would be seen to be more effective then the US presidency

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

New post

To ensure a positive and productive discussion, please read our [forum posting policies](#) before posting.

B	<i>I</i>			Link	<code><code></code>	Pic	Math		Edit: Rich ▼	Preview
<div></div>										

☐ Make this post anonymous to other students

☒ Subscribe to this thread at the same time

Add post

