

[CLICK HERE FOR ADVERTISEMENT RATES](#)

Edwin Vieira: The Bastardy of Martial Law

0 0 0 0

by [Elias Alias](#) , [November 26, 2014](#)



This article was first published at News With Views:

Dr. Edwin Vieira, Jr., has unleashed another round of cover-fire for the Constitution and the Militia which that Constitution requires. In his masterly pathways through history and current events, through the competing smoke-and-mirror shows of a driving force which uses the People's government to control them, Dr. Vieira deftly carries the reader into the meanings of the phraseology of the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights and more. Dr. Vieira generously shares a remarkable ability to convey perceptions which strike home while illuminating the interfacing logic of all segments of the founding documents. This article was first published at NewsWithViews, linked below. Feel free to give 'em some hits. It is republished here in full with permission. Dr. Vieira would like for our readers to know about his new book and the following article.

<http://www.newswithviews.com/Vieira/edwin264.htm>

Salute!

Elias Alias, editor

THE BASTARDY OF “MARTIAL LAW”

By Dr. Edwin Vieira, Jr., Ph.D., J.D.

August 9, 2014 * NewsWithViews.com

My latest book—[*By Tyranny Out of Necessity: The Bastardy of “Martial Law”*](#)—is now available through Amazon. Its title encapsulates its theme: namely, that “martial law” (as most Americans conceive of it) is a wholly illegitimate concept which appeals to some supposed, but false, “necessity” in order to establish a very real tyranny.

Some might say that, in light of the present parlous condition of the Republic, and especially the pathetic indifference of average Americans to this sorry state of affairs, writing such a book will prove to be a fool’s errand on my part—or perhaps a hopeless task quixotically undertaken for the benefit of fools. Obviously, I disagree. I consider the subject-matter of this book to be vital to this country’s survival.

To be sure, *By Tyranny Out of Necessity* is not the most important book which I have written on the general subject of the place of the Militia in America’s constitutional edifice. The others—*Constitutional “Homeland Security”, Volume One, The Nation in Arms*; *Constitutional “Homeland Security”, Volume Two, The Sword and Sovereignty*; *Thirteen Words*; and *Three Rights*—were more significant in principle, because if patriots in sufficient numbers had paid attention to the message those works conveyed, and had taken action upon it, the danger of “martial law” would already be well on the way to being obviated. As of now, however, *By Tyranny Out of Necessity* is the most important of my books in practice, precisely because most Americans have not been paying attention—not so much to my works, but to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution upon which those works are based. Now, people are becoming increasingly worried about the imposition of “martial law” in the course of some jury-rigged “national emergency”. They are being told by “the Powers That Be” that “martial law” is legitimate, and that sufficient steps are being taken to prepare for it—especially in the para-militarization of State and Local “law-

enforcement” and “emergency-management” agencies. Through the media, they have witnessed an example of the implementation of “martial law”, on a small yet highly organized scale, in Watertown, Massachusetts, hard upon the bombing of the 2013 Boston Marathon. Many of them have had personal experiences with the bestiality of “martial law” in the myriad episodes of unpunished “police brutality” which take place almost every day throughout this country. Yet, overall, most Americans have no idea whether “martial law” is even lawful or not—but apparently are resigned to the belief that nothing can be done to stop it from being imposed upon them.

One would presume that, in light of the seriousness of the matter, Americans would ask: “What is ‘martial law’?” and “How is ‘martial law’ *legal*?” Certainly, proof of the illegality of “martial law”—in any of its particulars, let alone as a whole—would provide a firm foundation for opposing it, and for deposing from public office those individuals who propose it. So I anticipate (or at least hope) that *By Tyranny Out of Necessity*, which demonstrates in exhaustive detail why the common misconception of “martial law” is industrial-strength bunkum, will be a smashing success in terms of its usefulness among patriots who intend to keep their heads out of the sand, their feet on the ground, and their eyes on the ultimate goal of living in what the Second Amendment calls “a free State”.

Yes, one would presume, perhaps even expect, that such would be the case. Yet hoping does not make it so. There remains the possibility that this country has already plunged so far off the deep end of Spengler’s *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* that nothing can be done to salvage the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, or any semblance of “a free State”. What might constitute evidence for that lugubrious conclusion?

A. The evidence. That I have had to write [*By Tyranny Out of Necessity*](#) (or, for that matter, any of my books touching on the Militia) is prime evidence of the decay into which this country has fallen. For, as [By](#)

[Tyranny Out of Necessity](#) explains, the Militia are, as they always have been, the definitive preventive of and answer to “martial law”, or any other manifestation of usurpation or tyranny. No threat of “martial law” would exist if Americans were properly organized in “the Militia of the several States”, because any constitutionally valid form of “law” that needed enforcement by “martial” institutions against civilians would be the civil laws of the Union and of the several States executed *by the Militia*—that is, by WE THE PEOPLE themselves.

Even the half-witted rogues in the Disgrace of Columbia would think long and hard about the inadvisability of attempting to invoke “martial law” if WE THE PEOPLE awakened to their own constitutional authority in the Militia; refused to recognize the legitimacy of any form of “law” that needed “martial” enforcement against civilians, but was not executed by or under the control of the Militia; organized themselves for the purpose of revitalizing the Militia by means of State legislation under the States’ reserved constitutional authority in that respect; and through that effort prepared themselves to oppose “martial law” even if that legislation could not be enacted in time in every State. Emphasis on the last point is vital: Even if patriots could not succeed in having proper Militia statutes enacted throughout this country before a major economic, political, and social breakdown occurred, they could at least motivate, educate, organize, equip, and train tens of thousands of Americans who would be capable of acting collectively in their and their country’s interests. This critical mass does not exist at present; and it will never come into being unless and until adequate steps are taken to revitalize the Militia. Perhaps only a small part of it can be amalgamated before a calamity strikes. But something for some is better than nothing for all—a self-evident truth to which every passenger who found a seat in one of the few lifeboats on the *Titanic* would have attested.

B. Some of the responsible parties. The plain fact is, however, that neither “the Militia of the several States” nor any significant movements in favor of revitalizing the Militia exist in any State. Who is to blame for this? Of course, “the Powers That Be” and their partisans, clients, stooges, and hangers-on are the primary culprits—because the very last thing they want is for WE THE PEOPLE to organize themselves in the institutions which the Constitution describes as “necessary to the security of a free State”. “The Powers That Be”, after all, recoil from “a free State” as vampires recoil from garlic. Yet they are not the only responsible parties. Many other Americans are at fault, too. For example—

- **The catastrophards.** These doomsayers contend that it is useless to promote the revitalization of the Militia (or any other constitutional reform, for that matter), because all is already irretrievably lost. A national catastrophe, in one horrendous manifestation or another, is inevitable, imminent, unavoidable, and unmitigable. Perhaps surprisingly, in the front ranks of these people march certain lay preachers who declaim in the style of prophets out of the Old Testament how this country is “under judgment” and will soon be destroyed by the hand of God. Well, if that is so, then good riddance to it. But is that prophecy true? Apparently their voices have not reminded them that God still helps those who help themselves. Neither have their voices recommended to them the alternative explanation of contemporary events, that Americans have not yet failed Heaven’s test, but are *being* tested right now—that all of the cultural bolshevism, pessimism, decadence, perversion, depravity, criminality, corruption, usurpation, and even tyranny from which America suffers is being allowed to afflict her so that WE THE PEOPLE can finally screw their courage to the sticking place and reassert the principles of “a free State” under “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”—and that “judgment” will befall them only if they fail, neglect, or refuse to pass this test.

- **The appeasers.** Amazing (at least to me) is how many self-styled “patriots” are actually rather abject appeasers of and collaborators with “the Powers That Be”. This manifests itself most strikingly and sickeningly in the childish fear of “the M word” endemic in these people. How many times have I heard it said, and all too accurately so, that “even most of those Americans who support the Second Amendment do not want to be associated with anything concerning ‘militia’”? How, though, is this possible? Precisely how can someone claim to support the Second Amendment while at the same time repudiating the constitutional institutions which the Amendment itself declares to be “necessary to the security of a free State”? What good is “the right of the people to keep and bear Arms” if it does not conduce to “the security of a free State”? And how can it do so if “the people” do not employ it in the Militia which the Amendment itself declares to be “necessary to” that purpose?

One can understand why various subversive organizations and individuals, in public office as well as private station, stridently demonize the word “militia”. They are intent, after all, not simply on tarring a word, but on psychologically terrorizing all Americans so that they can prevent the reinstatement of the very establishments which the Constitution itself declares to be “necessary to the security of a free State”—and thereby insure the destruction of “a free State” everywhere within this country. Beyond understanding, though, is what those self-styled “patriots” who appease these subversives by distancing themselves from, if not demonizing, the word “militia” expect to gain from such craven and stupid behavior. Collaboration of that ilk can only hasten the day when no “free State” exists anywhere in America.

If these appeasers are ashamed of and unwilling to support their own Constitution with respect to what it declares in no uncertain terms to be “necessary”, they should emigrate to North Korea, where even lip-service is not paid to the principles and practices of “a free State”. They would do truly patriotic Americans a favor, because the departure of each defeatist collaborator from this country would give those patriots who remained that much of a better chance to prevail—at least to the extent of not having constantly to worry about being stabbed in the back.

• **The intellectual élite.** A not insignificant part of the self-styled “patriotic” leadership in this country contends that next to nothing can be done to dam the political, economic, social, and cultural sewage pouring out of the Disgrace of Columbia because, although the intellectually acute leaders themselves fully understand what needs doing, average Americans are little more than bovine morons whom the leaders simply cannot educate or motivate to do the right thing. So it is supposedly hopeless to expect “the sheeple” ever to understand the need to revitalize the Militia. This, however, is pathetic special pleading on two counts.

First, those in glass houses should not cast stones. If the sheeple are stupid, are the shepherds any smarter? How many among the self-obsessed intellectual élite of the “patriotic” leadership really understand the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and especially the relationship between the two? How many realize what the Second Amendment calls “a free State” actually is? How many are willing to do what is required to guarantee the survival of “a free State”? And, most to the point, how many pay any attention to the only institutions the Constitution itself declares to be “necessary to the security of a free State”? Apparently not very many. For how many among the leadership support, or even mention, revitalization of the Militia?

Second, only a poor workman blames his tools. By hypothesis, average people need “leaders” because they are incapable of “leading” themselves. True “leaders” qualify as such because they are extraordinary individuals who demonstrate the capacity to show average people the right way to go. Therefore, the primary responsibility of “leaders” among the intellectual élite is always to devise a means to educate the people, not to complain about how uneducable they are. Just as a cabinetmaker must hone his chisels to fine edges in order to perform satisfactory work, if the people’s wits are dull the first task of the leadership must be to sharpen them. So, if America’s “patriotic” leadership does comprehend what is “necessary to the security of a free State”, its failure to pass on to average citizens the gist of this knowledge is more likely its own fault, rather than the fault of its pupils. The leadership cannot justly blame the people for its own sloth and incompetence.

• **The “patriotic” *gurus* of the ether.** The *gurus* who haunt the “patriotic” alternative media of websites, blogs, videos, talk radio, and so on make their livings by expatiating endlessly on the terrifying dangers that are impinging upon this country. In style, they are strikingly akin to the gnats of summer. They flit wildly from one topic to another (or provide a plethora of links that encourages their audiences to do so). They buzz with the artificial excitement of the moment. Sometimes they bite with trenchant comments. But, when all is said and done, their effect remains ephemeral. No one remembers tomorrow what they said yesterday. This is because, although they are often good at identifying obvious problems in the short term, they always seem unable to propose really workable long-term solutions. They sometimes can tell Americans what is going wrong, but almost never delve into how to set it right. Perhaps this is because they are unable to grasp that, although the day-to-day problems may change, the underlying causes of—and the ultimate solutions to—they never do. Or perhaps it is because they do grasp that the ever-intensifying difficulties assaulting Americans are (as the Chinese say) their very own rice bowls, without

which they would have to find other sources of employment and income. Whatever the reason, they tend to be more public nuisances than public benefactors, because their viewers, readers, and listeners imagine that they have done something useful by tuning in, or that they need not do anything else, or that nothing more can be done.

In contrast, the Constitution sets out certain fixed principles of permanent value for WE THE PEOPLE'S control of the institutions called "government" at every level of the federal system. The most important of these is that "[a] well regulated Militia" is "necessary to the security of a free State", because the overarching purpose of the Constitution is to secure "a free State" for all Americans. One would hope that THE PEOPLE would not need any "patriotic" gurus (or anyone else) to remind them of that. Yet, inasmuch as THE PEOPLE seem to have temporarily forgotten this principle—as evidenced by the absence of "well regulated Militia" in all of the fifty States—to be worth their salt the gurus should be emphasizing it at every opportunity. That they are not is revealing.

- **The members of "private militias".** It is worse than simplistic to dismiss the members of various "private militias" scattered across this country as mere rustic buffoons who stupidly imagine themselves capable of employing Eighteenth-Century tactics to save America from Twenty-first-Century tyranny. For they at least understand that it is more intelligent to put some extra lifeboats on the Titanic before she sails, than to attempt to cobble a few together from deck chairs as she is sinking. They at least comprehend that it is more prudent to organize their families, friends, and neighbors into what they mistakenly call "militia" *before* a nationwide crisis breaks out and "the Powers That Be" invoke "martial law", rather than afterwards. For obviously it is better to bring together as many people as possible in cooperative endeavors on the basis of common plans *before* any such crisis supervenes—rather than when society is in utter disarray; when in the midst of chaos patriots are compelled to act as individuals or in small groups who or which do not even know of each other's existences; and when, realizing their own isolation and lack of support from anyone else, patriots cannot depend upon or even minimally trust their own neighbors.

PART TWO

Nonetheless, the members of these "private militias" have grasped only the less important half of the right idea. In the final analysis, the organization of such groups is useless for restoring constitutional government, for the undeniable reason that, even if they are perfectly legal in all other respects, "*private militia*" by definition possess no governmental character. True *constitutional* "Militia" are *governmental* establishments of the several States, "well regulated" by statutes according to certain definite constitutional principles. In contrast, being the products of purely private action, no "private militias" can claim any governmental, let alone specifically constitutional, authority. And without such authority no "private militias" can assert the constitutional right, power, and duty to execute the laws of the Union and of the several States in a "martial" fashion against usurpers and tyrants who attempt to inflict "martial law" upon Americans anywhere within this country.

Indeed, if the misplaced enthusiasm for "private militias" did not derive originally from the machinations of *agents provocateurs* and agents of influence despatched by the CIA, the FBI, or the BATF, it ought to have. For nothing could be more useful to "the Powers That Be" than: (i) to goad patriots into expending their energies on purely private and uncoordinated activities, rather than on efforts to revitalize the constitutional establishments which embody and empower popular sovereignty; (ii) to deceive patriots into becoming suspicious of and antagonistic to "government" in general, so that they will disdain seeking the specifically governmental authority which the Constitution offers them (indeed, requires them to exercise) through the Militia; and (iii) to mislead patriots into disarming themselves of such a status, so that, in a crisis, when they are asked "What is your constitutional authority?" the honest answer must be "We have none."

- **Proponents of the so-called "*individual right to keep and bear arms*".** Those in the rather large crowd touting "the *individual* right to keep and bear arms" are worse off than the members of any "private

militia”, because they comprehend far less than half of the problem. They fixate on the private possession of firearms alone, disregarding entirely that the organization of “well regulated Militia” imbued with governmental authority—not simply the adventitious possession of firearms by average Americans as their private right—is “necessary to the security of a free State”.

If the misplaced enthusiasm for “the individual right to keep and bear arms” did not derive originally from “black” political-psychological operations set in motion by the CIA, the FBI, or the BATF, it too ought to have. For Americans who myopically focus on an “individual right” to the exclusion of the Militia imagine that they are promoting the ultimate purpose of Second Amendment simply by “clinging to their guns”—which, as one of their favorite expressions has it, will have to be pried “from their cold, dead hands”. But this bravado, even if backed up by action, can defend only a part of the Second Amendment—a part which, although necessary, is not sufficient. While each American who might have helped to revitalize the Militia dotes exclusively on his “individual right”, the Militia remain unorganized, and “the security of a free State” remains undefended by the institutions which the Second Amendment declares to be “necessary” for that purpose. None of these folks seems to recognize that: (i) Americans’ collective right (and duty) to possess firearms suitable for service in the Militia also secures each American’s “individual right”—for the self-evident reason that every member of the Militia, armed for that purpose, is also an individual who must maintain personal possession of one or more firearms at all times, thereby exercising an “individual right” to those firearms within the Militia far more secure than any “individual right” to any firearm which he might enjoy outside of the Militia (until the Judiciary declares that some so-called “compelling state interest” allows for that “individual right” to be abridged). And (ii) the purely “individual right to keep and bear arms” does nothing to secure each American’s collective as well as individual right (and duty) to participate in “[a] well regulated Militia”, and therefore next to nothing to promote “the security of a free State” for which such a Militia is “necessary”.

Consider the danger from tyranny. Can any individual, exercising solely his “individual right to keep and bear arms” in the confines of his own cellar, be expected to deter, let alone to stand up against, a tyranny which disposes of a large, well organized, and fully equipped police-state apparatus? Can even thousands and tens of thousands of individuals, *individually* exercising their “individual rights” in their individual cellars in mutual isolation, be expected to stop such a tyranny in its tracks? No—the “individual right to keep and bear arms”, individually exercised, simply assures the defeat of all individuals in detail. Only by organizing the great mass of her patriotic citizens for collective action can America defend herself from any tyranny worthy of that name. (And from an host of other highly undesirable situations less serious, but probably more likely, than full-blown tyranny.)

Consider also the contemporary problem of the constant political agitation in favor of “gun control”. Even having been approved by bare majorities of the Justices of the Supreme Court in the *Heller* and *McDonald* decisions, “the individual right to keep and bear arms” remains woefully insufficient to stifle this subversive ferment. Notwithstanding *Heller* and *McDonald*, which way is the line moving on the graph of tyranny versus liberty? On the one hand, “gun control” is still advancing by giant strides in such “people’s democratic republics” as New York, Connecticut, California, Maryland, and New Jersey. On the other hand, in the course of lobbying and litigation over “gun control” sometimes patriots do win, and sometimes they lose—but the struggle goes on interminably, because they have not finally secured the practical application of the constitutionally most significant principle that every eligible American has a right (and a duty) to serve in “[a] well regulated Militia”, and therefore to be appropriately armed at all times for that purpose (unless, as to the actual possession and use of firearms, he happens to be a conscientious objector). Is not this never-ending fight over “gun control”, arising out of incessant political aggression against the American people by rogue public officials and the subversive private special-interest groups allied with them, wholly incompatible with the Second Amendment’s command that “the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed”? What other constitutional right is the subject of such relentless attacks that its character as a true “right” is constantly open to challenge and even denial in America’s legislatures and courts?

Thus, “the *individual* right to keep and bear arms” proves to be a snare and a delusion—even arguably the greatest disservice to the defense of the Republic in modern times:

First, it cannot defeat, and probably cannot even deter, the kind of tyranny against which average

Americans would need to exercise large-scale armed resistance.

Second, it diverts Americans from the real issue—which is the supreme constitutional authority of WE THE PEOPLE organized in “the Militia of the several States”.

Third, it administers a political soporific—that the big “gun-rights” organizations have everything well in hand, as long as common Americans continue to send them and their attorneys more and more money to pour down the rat-holes of endless lobbying and litigation.

Fourth, even when lobbying and litigation fail to secure “the individual right” to anything like its full extent, it nonetheless provides a political narcotic which attenuates the psychic pain of defeat with the consolation that at least some Americans can retain possession of some of their firearms under some circumstances for some limited purposes for some little while longer. Of course, who can foresee how long that will last? And as the narcotic effect wears off with the steady advance of “gun control”, who can predict how painful the withdrawal symptoms induced by a final exposure to hard reality will be? Finally, and of the most dire consequence,

Fifth, while the struggle over “gun control” continues on the “gun controllers’” own terms, Americans are doing nothing to revitalize the Militia on the Constitution’s terms.

• **Purveyors of fairy-tale panaceas for America’s problems.** If the proponents of “private militias” and of “the individual right of the people to keep and bear Arms” at least grasp small—albeit woefully insufficient—parts of what needs to be done, what can be said about the Pied Pipers of Humbug who promote such airy schemes as “Impeachment” of Barack Obama?

Leave aside the obvious objection that, if Mr. Obama is constitutionally ineligible for “the Office of President” because he is not “a natural born Citizen” under Article II, Section 1, Clause 4 of the Constitution, then he cannot be “removed from Office on Impeachment” under Article II, Section 4, because as a matter of constitutional law he never entered into that “Office” in the first place. Indicted he might be—for impersonation of a public official (as well as for numerous other offenses stemming from and facilitated by that imposture)—if he is actually constitutionally ineligible for “the Office of President”; but “removed from Office on Impeachment” he cannot be. To be eligible for “Impeachment” from some office, one must first be eligible to the office to which “Impeachment” relates. The illogicality of the drive for “Impeachment” is not the worst of its demerits, though. The most glaring are the impracticality of “Impeachment” in the short term and its utter irrelevance in the long run.

First, in light of the present composition of Congress, can anyone not regularly ingesting LSD or some other hallucinogenic drug possibly imagine that “Impeachment” of Mr. Obama might possibly follow a strictly constitutional path to a strictly constitutional end? For example, with respect to the notorious issue of Mr. Obama’s alleged ineligibility to “the Office of President”, and all of the consequences thereof, is not every Member of Congress knowingly, willfully, and intentionally complicitous in whatever wrongdoing has taken and continues to take place, or at least proceeding with willful blindness towards or in reckless disregard of the facts? No present Member of Congress who was in office in 2008 or 2012 challenged a single electoral vote supposedly cast for Mr. Obama in the presidential elections of those years—although every Member of Congress had a statutory right and even duty to do so. And apparently not a single Member of Congress at the present time openly refuses to acknowledge, accept, or acquiesce in Mr. Obama’s posturing as “the President”. Why this is the case doubtlessly requires different explanations for different Members of Congress—none of these excuses, one presumes, exculpatory. But that such is the case no one can deny. How, then, can anyone expect such hopelessly compromised individuals to carry through the process of “Impeachment” in the “no stone left unturned” manner in which it ought to be prosecuted? That, in such an environment of thoroughgoing institutional cowardice and corruption, “Impeachment” would provide nothing but farcical political entertainment can be predicted with moral certainty simply by studying the history of the last two episodes of real “Impeachment” or near-“Impeachment” of the real Presidents Clinton and Nixon, as documented in such “kiss and tell” books as David P. Schippers, *Sell Out: The Inside Story of President Clinton’s Impeachment* and Jerry Zeifman, *Without Honor: The Impeachment of President Nixon and the Crimes of Camelot*.

Second, what of real substance could be expected to change for the better if, for recondite political reasons, the necessary majorities of Members of Congress would agree in the cloak rooms that Mr. Obama should be “removed from Office on Impeachment”? Mr. Obama, after all, is merely a symptom, not the underlying cause, of America’s malaise. Removing a single, even very prominent, puppet from the stage will not change the identities of the puppet masters, let alone their ability to bring forth as many new puppets as may be necessary to serve their interests. As long as “Manchuria” exists, it will continue to supply a plenitude of suitable “candidates”. Certainly the departure of Mr. Obama from the scene will not, by itself, return control of their own political destiny to WE THE PEOPLE. The “two” major political parties, and (of more consequence) the factions and other special-interest groups that pull their strings, will remain in commanding positions in the electoral process, in the big “mainstream media”, in the world of banking and high finance, and so on.

Moreover, by itself “Impeachment” of Mr. Obama will not solve any of the problems that now confront this country with the threat of “martial law”—in particular, the impending dethronement of the Federal Reserve Note as the “world reserve currency”, with the consequent collapse of America’s domestic economy in hyperinflation, depression or (most likely) the one followed by the other. *Whoever* “the Powers That Be” contrive to foist upon this country as President in Mr. Obama’s stead—whether that be “Joe Biden” or some other equally appalling figurehead—must follow the path heretofore laid out for Mr. Obama, because Obama’s successor can do nothing else without impairing the position of “the Powers That Be”. So, even if “Impeachment” were successful to the extent of removing Mr. Obama himself from the office which perhaps he never held in the first place, Americans would *still* need to revitalize the Militia—which, of course, can (and should) be done without wasting any time and effort on “Impeachment”.

C. At the end of the rope. What can these and other Americans who have neglected revitalization of the Militia, or worse yet actively opposed it by joining the dissident chorus of those who demonize the very word “militia”, belatedly offer in their own defense? That now, as the threat of “martial law” looms large over this country, they are sorry for having misled themselves and countless others too? What good will such a tardy admission be? As of this writing, patriots of all sorts have squandered more than forty-five years since the Gun Control Act of 1968 plastered the agenda of the “gun-control” fanatics across the pages of the United States Statutes at Large for everyone to see, and almost twelve years since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security began the erection and deployment in earnest of a national paramilitary police-state apparatus. America, moreover, does not have the luxury of another forty-five years, or another twelve years—more than likely not even another four or five years—during which her citizens in sufficient numbers can finally catch on to what is going on, and to what lies at the end of the road down which they are being led.

If Americans want to live in “a free State”, they must bend their every effort—immediately, if not sooner—to restore, protect, and preserve the Constitution. No alternative to an unremitting defense of the Constitution exists, because the Constitution, rightly understood and enforced according to that understanding, provides the only basis for acceptable “government” now available. Nothing else is ready, or even in contemplation, to replace it. Moreover, the great advantage of the Constitution is that true patriots know perfectly well what it really means and how to put that meaning into practice.

According to the Constitution, the Militia are the sole institutions “necessary” for achievement of the Constitution’s ultimate aim, “the security of a free State”. Therefore it is childishy ridiculous to imagine that anyone can defend the Constitution—even as it might be amended by those supposedly well-meaning but naive individuals recklessly calling for a “constitutional convention” of some sort—without demanding revitalization of the Militia. Certainly no proposed amendment which I have ever seen substitutes, or even suggests, something other than “[a] well regulated Militia” as a new institution “necessary to the security of a free State”. The reason is obvious: Who but WE THE PEOPLE themselves, exercising sovereignty through the ultimate Power of the Sword in their own hands, could possibly perform the task of guaranteeing such “security”?

Yes, time is rapidly running out. But perhaps that is not so bad, after all. Although America’s neck is in a noose, perhaps the threat of “martial law” will finally stimulate enough of her remaining “good People” (as the Declaration of Independence styled true patriots) to think about—and then to take action aimed at

—revitalization of the Militia before the trap door on History’s scaffold springs open and the threat of “martial law” becomes a fatal actuality. After all, as Samuel Johnson once reputedly quipped, nothing focuses a man’s mind more than his impending hanging.

**

Edwin Vieira, Jr., holds four degrees from Harvard: A.B. (Harvard College), A.M. and Ph.D. (Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences), and J.D. (Harvard Law School).

*For more than thirty years he has practiced law, with emphasis on constitutional issues. In the Supreme Court of the United States he successfully argued or briefed the cases leading to the landmark decisions *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, *Chicago Teachers Union v. Hudson*, and *Communications Workers of America v. Beck*, which established constitutional and statutory limitations on the uses to which labor unions, in both the private and the public sectors, may apply fees extracted from nonunion workers as a condition of their employment.*

His recent books include: “[How To Dethrone the Imperial Judiciary](#)” ... and [Constitutional “Homeland Security,” Volume One, The Nation in Arms...](#)

*He can be reached at:
52 Stonegate Court
Front Royal, VA 22630.*

*

> [back](#) <

Categories: [2nd_amendment](#), [Academy](#), [Academy-Edwin-Viera](#)

About Author



[Elias Alias](#)

Editor in Chief for Oath Keepers; Unemployed poet; Lover of Nature and Nature's beauty. Slave to all cats. Reading interests include study of hidden history, classical literature. Concerned Constitutional American. Honorably discharged USMC Viet Nam Veteran.