

Table of Contents

Elishiva Levin .....	02
Ken Lucier .....	10
Ron Dickerhoof .....	13
Frederick Harvey .....	28
Jeff Williams .....	32
Kevin Tebedo .....	41
Lyle G. Daken .....	46
William Kostric .....	47
Ryan McCain .....	63
Greg Samples .....	66
Tona Monroe .....	67
Rik Humboldt .....	70
William Ramsey .....	84
David Justice .....	91
James Dowling .....	95
Ed Vallejo .....	102

## Here there be dragons! Elisheva Levin

Note: A week ago today we completed our last deliberations concerning the Articles of Freedom. The aforementioned title was only agreed upon late Saturday afternoon, November 22, 2009. Our closing ceremonies, which included a signing ceremony for the Preamble, the Civic Action Statement and the Pledge of Commitment, were held the same day. A week is not enough time to fully digest what we did and what was accomplished, so this is only a beginning. The documents referred to below are yet to be published.

(11/15/09)

Participating in the Continental Congress 2009 as a delegate was in equal measure intense, frustrating, powerful and ultimately affirming. The intensity was so great that throughout Congress, the outside world receded and everyday news took a backseat to our deliberations concerning fundamental Constitutional issues.

Even as New Mexico's first delegate Michael Lunnon and I made the return drive, I was aware that the bubble of intensity had continued, albeit to a lesser extent, until I arrived home on the Tuesday before Thanksgiving. I have spent the past five days not only preparing for and celebrating Thanksgiving, but also in an uneven and still incomplete struggle to reengage with my previous everyday life. It has only just begun to dawn on me that the maps of my previous everyday life will have to be redrawn; that the terms of the re-engagement must expand to become a new normal. On the map of my life as I understand it, I have pushed the boundaries out into an unknown labeled "Here there be Dragons".

Going into the Continental Congress, I understood my role differently, perhaps, than some of the other delegates. I went knowing that the elections we held drew very few voters, and those chiefly from the New Mexico patriot community; souls who were already awakened to the de facto demise of the Constitution of the United States over the past hundred years. I understood that I was not going to CC2009 to represent my state in a legislative sense, but rather to represent those who had voted for and/or financially supported our delegation. I felt the way to do this was to bring an understanding of how Constitutional violations directly affect New Mexico, which like any state, has unique interests and concerns vis-a-vis the federal government. With this understanding came the knowledge that my role in, and the importance of, the Congress was modest.

This sense was of great benefit to me when the fear factor of taking on the system became real to the body of the Continental Congress. I understood that unless and until we build a mass movement, we will not be considered a real threat to anyone. Therefore, as the rumor mills got going among some of the more volatile delegates and their coalitions, I held firmly to the meaning of R3volution: we do this out of our love for liberty, not out of fear or anger.

Secondly, I did not go to the Congress with any personal agenda to push. Rather, I went with the rationale and purpose for which this Continental Congress was called: to document to a candid world that petitions for redress of grievances had been made and had gone unanswered; to document the ongoing violation of the Constitution in the instances that the petitions addressed; to develop peaceful but firm civic responses to be taken upon the gathering of a mass movement in order to bring a rebellious servant government to heel. As I understood it, the first two items were the primary work of the Congress convened, whereas gathering a mass movement would be our job, and the job of the various patriot alliances, once the Articles of Freedom were written and signed.

Even before the Continental Congress convened, however, it became apparent that there existed individuals and factions who did not come to achieve the agenda laid out by the We the People Congress/Foundation, but had an agenda of their own. Some were coming with the view that the Constitution was already null and void, and thus that the Petitions for Redress were futile and that the Congress should take an entirely different approach. Others were coming with the intention of getting the Congress to agree that the United States does in fact have an established religion, a certain form of Fundamentalist Christianity, and thus were pushing a Dominionist agenda. However, as a pre-Congress survey made clear, the vast majority of the delegates agreed with the agenda of the organizing body.

It became clear when the Congress actually convened that even though the majority of the delegates agreed on the purposes of the Congress, and upon the agenda adopted without change on the first day, there were plenty of differences about the outcomes and the civic actions that ought to be undertaken. Although many of us agreed with the groundwork already completed by We the People Foundation regarding the Petitions for Redress, there was a general sense apparent in the first deliberations on Thursday November 12 that the timeline and actions laid out by We the People were too conservative given the rapidity with which our constitutional republican form of government is now being dismantled.

During the first week of the Congress, from Nov. 12 - Nov. 18, the body settled into an exacting routine in which we would hear expert testimony on one Petition first thing in the morning and another in the afternoon. After each presentation, we would retire to the New Orleans assembly room in order to deliberate upon the testimony and--at least according to the agenda--determine the answers to the following general questions:

1. Was the particular petition addressing a real violation of the Constitution?
2. If so, what particular articles and/or amendments were violated?
3. Was the petition unanswered?
4. If so, what instructions should the people send to the federal government (congressional, judicial and executive)? What instructions to the states for them to assert their sovereignty in the matter? What civic actions should be suggested to the the people for them to assert their power?

The first few days of deliberations were more difficult than I expected. It became quickly apparent that the majority of delegates had very little experience with parliamentary process. It was also clear that a sizable minority of delegates had not received a thorough education in constitutional matters and that many were hearing some of these petitions and their background for the first time. Even with these impediments, I thought the body of the Congress would "gel" in a few days and that we would see actual documents emerging as everyone gained experience and understanding. To a limited extent, this did begin to happen. The pace quickened after sub-committees were established to write reports based upon the above general questions which were made more specific to each Petition in the actual CC2009 agenda.

In spite of rule changes and an increased ability to use Robert's Rules of Order on the part of the delegations, I noticed that certain people tended to "camp out" at the microphone and that there seemed to be determined, core groups that used procedure to actually subvert the will of the body. Some seemed to be pushing specific agendas as individuals, some appeared to be loose coalitions, but by far the most worrisome were those who seemed to foment division by espousing different sides of issues at different times,

inconsistent to any personal or group agenda. This was different from what I observed of other groups and factions, which were consistent over time.

I believe this one small group of infiltrators had the intention of discrediting CC2009 and used the passions of some of the other factions to try and make it happen. Additionally, and more unforgivably, this small faction appeared to use some delegates who had unstable personalities to achieve this purpose. In my opinion, this was the cause of much of the drama that occurred during the Congress.

That drama, along with the intensity of our days, and the immensity of what we were learning about the destruction of our liberty, created an edge to our deliberations. It heightened our passion to have the perfect solutions mapped out with respect to instructions to our servant government and later, our recommendations for civic actions. The problem was that among 113 strong minded individuals, there were nearly the same number of "perfect" solutions.

In order to deal with this, most of us tended toward finding like-minded individuals for discussion and support. I found Libertarians and libertarian minded people whose understanding of the problem and whose principled solutions resonated with me, people from whom I could learn when my own analysis failed. Thus my mind was engaged by the ideas of our President, Michael Badnarik, the anarcho-capitalist John Bush, and the scholar Jon Roland. I also had invigorating conversations with some of the young people who were just discovering libertarian ideas and the philosophy of Ayn Rand.

I did speak up at the Congress, but not being one to camp out on the microphone queue, I spent far more time listening, thinking and in private discussion. I also worked on several committees, and as the secretary for the General Welfare Clause committee, I made my proudest contribution word smithing both the primary and the ancillary reports. I did get

to the microphone a few times during open discussion, and once I helped stop a change of language that would have made us look foolish by altering the name of the Department of Homeland Security. I was also among those of an impromptu coalition that got the Non-Initiation of Force Principle (NIP) into the final document.

I observed that among my fellow delegates there were moments in which personal prejudices and individual agendas led to public or private statements which were inconsistent with their own avowed principles. Some of these were religious in nature, as were certain efforts to impose the dogmas of specific religions upon the Congress and the people of the United States in what I call the "Christian nation" claim. Others involved prejudices against certain groups of American citizens such as the denial of private property rights to Native Americans on the reservation, in what I call the paternalistic "white man's burden" claim. For my part, I know I did not think deeply enough about the Mann Amendment that was passed without debate at the end of the Congress when many delegates were out of the room. I concurred with Ron Mann that the language was suitably non-sectarian, but I did not enter into a dialogue about the vote with my delegation.

Despite the drama, some inconsistencies in principle, the personal and factional agendas, that is, despite the very human nature of those of us assembled, the Congress did accomplish the intended goals; to develop a series of instructions to Congress, to the States, and recommendations to the people, with respect to Petitions for Redress of Grievances. They included those dealing with the First Amendment right to petition, the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms, the War Powers clause, the misuse of the "General Welfare" clause and the right to private property. Even those reports and recommendations that seemed "obvious" to some of us met with strongly passionate debate that served to increase the understanding of many, and also heightened our commitment to liberty.

At the last, our trust and reliance upon the honor and the integrity of those who will be charged with the style and formatting of all of the documents, made it possible for many of us to sign the Preamble and Pledge sections. Since those who signed were present as each tiny pearl of agreement was wrested from contention, we all understand both the frailty and magnitude of what we accomplished.

I stood in the line to sign after the closing ceremony, laughing from the relief of finishing the document, even though it was imperfect. I felt light and thought: "This is what freedom feels like." and as I stood with the pen in my hand before the Zia Flag, I felt the gravity of the moment. Putting my hand to that Preamble and Pledge, I suddenly knew it meant that my personal maps of reality would change. Here there be Dragons!

The magnitude of our accomplishment will depend upon our ability to persuade fellow patriots; those who already passionately uphold the principles of liberty and who espouse the idea of unalienable rights derived from the Eternal Source of Liberty (however we conceive that Source). It will depend upon our engendering a mass movement of liberty among those who are ready to hold our servant government accountable to the founding principles of the United States as declared in our Declaration of Independence and as prescribed for government in the Constitution.

In the end, the frailty of what we have accomplished can only be obviated on the uncertain road ahead. The journey will require us to expand our own personal maps across the parted seas where there be dragons. It will lead us from the security of the fleshpots of Mizrayim (the Hebrew word for Egypt that means the Narrow Places) into the vast unknown lands that can, if we let them, develop in us principles that will lead us to trust a mixed multitude of ways to live liberty.



At this moment, as I stand on the edge of my known world straining to see beyond the Dragons, I believe those who endured the labors of the Continental Congress to the end have developed a strong and enduring bond. This bond has the strength to be shared with all who love liberty and will withstand the storms and squalls of the voyage yet to come.

Ken Lucier  
2nd delegate from Minnesota

The excitement of the event and its potential to be pivotal in returning this grand country to the rule of law, was reinforced by the opening ceremony. My immediate sense was, God is at work here. I will serve honor and obey Him, as his servant, where I find myself in spite of my flaws. The first day was a disappointment. My fear (that we would not have time to fulfill our desire for a product that would serve our defined purpose, to defend the Constitution and enforce its provisions) was reinforced.

I prayed for rules of order that would aid, rather than impede our work, and help us accomplish our mission. As I came to know my fellow Congresspeople one by one, it was apparent to me the resources for a successful outcome were present. My desire to be a productive element was enabled by inclusion and furthered by active participation in the Accountability Clause Committee. Prior to the committee meeting, while having lunch with Mrs Monroe and Mrs Stevenson, we inadvertently realized our concern for the accountability clause to be properly addressed was shared. We got together informally and got the ball rolling with an initial draft and helpful hints from Mrs Taitz.

Soon after, the President appointed Howard Blitz to chair this committee. We four and several others comprised that Committee. Deborah Stevenson was elected Vice Chair. Her skills were fundamental to any success we corporately had. She held us together and on track. She was most instrumental in drafting our final document to present to the Committee of the Whole. We each had significant input, it was a team effort. We created a good piece of work in a short period of time. Two days later, we were sent back to committee to refine our draft. The next day it was adopted by the Congress

with some amendments.

I also participated in a less substantive way on the Faithfully Execute Committee. I spent a lot of time working with several other Congresspeople on Shafer Cox's Committee on Sovereignty. Kevin Patrick took the lead in formulating a draft. We considered the ideas presented by Edwin Vieira. The committee felt a simpler enunciation of many of those suggestions would be more effective. We adopted the final Affirmation in two documents.

We also had a separate submission to recommend instructions to recognize the person hood and sovereignty of the unborn. It was purposefully designed with the constitutionality question central to any instruction. It was true, well written, yet failed to be adopted by the Congress. Fortunately it will be on the agenda for any subsequent convening. I was amazed at the dedication to the task of my fellow delegates. We were rapidly coming together as a team in spite of some differing priorities and methods.

Lastly I worked on the Preamble subcommittee to the Articles of Association Committee. This was Chaired by Jeff Williams. We got together about 6 PM and spent an hour determining our focus and direction. We had little difficulty coming to consensus. Jeff then said he would go to his room during dinner and write a draft. About 8:30 that evening Jeff returned. His draft was, I thought, nicely done. We spent the next 90 minutes adding to, subtracting from and changing his draft. The result was widely acclaimed by the Congress and passed with little or no dissension.

A few later thought it may have been too abrasive or confrontational and should be toned down. That minority was overwhelmed. The effort to change what the Congress passed did not get very far. I do not doubt the sincerity of those that objected. The product was nothing less than miraculous. Four hours amazing. We had divine assistance and no one can

convince me differently. I would be surprised if the other 7 members of the committee disagree.

Time will determine the value of the fruit of our labor which this convention has merely initiated for us and the entire nation. My respect for each of the delegates is of the highest order. We were definitely alongside God's design as we toiled.

Veritas Vincit Omnia - Let us proclaim the truth loudly.

Ron Dickerhoof  
A technologist, like Benjamin Franklin

Before I left for Continental Congress, so much had already happened. In trying to recall that and give a reasonably brief account of that time, I remember a question that Mr. Kostic had asked quite a few days into the event on one of those late, late nights. He actually addressed it to Jeremy Doucet of Rhode Island by saying something to the effect of “you’re not one of those ‘everything happens for a reason’ people, are you?” Jeremy shifted his feet around in the hotel hallway outside of my room. I waited to give Mr. Doucet a few seconds to answer and it became clear that he had trouble floating a reply.

Into the silence of that moment, my mind began to pour. Too much had happened, so much had yet to happen, and signs were clear from the moment I first contacted our state coordinator about CC2009 that I could not have been anywhere else for those twelve days. My head cocked to the side and I checked Jeremy for the response that was his if he would take it. I looked back at Mr. Kostic and I said in the trance-like voice I had known from so long ago as one who found rising to such challenges a way to expose a part of myself I couldn’t help but like, “I am.”

In Ohio, we were blessed with a dedicated and utterly likable state coordinator. When I first was told about CC2009, I had seen her name on the state page and noticed that her listed address was in the city where I lived. I first offered help and then I came to realize just how busy she, like many others I am sure, had to have been back when the leaves first started to change colors and fall from the trees.

I noticed a few days after that initial exchange of hurried emails that one could, in fact, nominate themselves. I had

some reservations about that idea but the first candidate forum was a quick fifteen minute drive from my house. If nothing else, I thought, it would certainly be a learning experience.

My life had been hectic for the last few years, having gone through a lengthy and bitter divorce. My activism was scant having attended a few rallies, my contacts were few although I boasted a solid politically oriented presence on a few social networking sites, and my particular study of the Constitution was good among the general public but would be a bit less so in the crowd I wanted to be a part of.

I wrote my “stump speech” about an hour before I gave it. Being one of those “everything happens for a reason” people, I should have known it would have more to do with my experience in St. Charles than I could have possibly imagined at the time. My primary sell was two-fold; I had a good understanding of legal language and had written a few “bills” based on transitioning from large federal programs to state administration and I did so using primarily input from those I disagreed with.

Our forum just happened to coincide with the G20 protests in Pittsburgh so I told a crowd of mostly self-identified tea partiers and “912ers” that we needed to reach out to the people in Pittsburgh because we were, in essence, protesting the same thing in different ways. I believe cooperation in methods and information would be helpful to those who approach liberty from any end of the political spectrum.

The other thing I emphasized was that I had project management experience and had turned around a computing help desk with an abysmal record using empowerment of base-level employees and engaging customers. Additionally, I said, I brought the perspective of a technologist, like Benjamin Franklin, as many of our founders brought unique abilities and ideas to the first Continental Congress and those meetings that

came after. If you talked to me for any length of time in St. Charles, I probably told you that story and said something like “I should have known that God would make me live up to a promise like that.”

A few conference calls and meetings later, I was Ohio’s second delegate largely on the strength of mail-in ballots which came from people I had never met face-to-face. I thank my friends on the internet in its various incarnations for entrusting me with that purpose and I hope I was able to deliver. On the morning of Wednesday, November the 11th, I packed my bags along with two laptop computers, my desktop computer, and two extra monitors tightly into my convertible and drove the six hours to St. Charles.

“I came here to complain about taxes”

I didn’t utter those words until the Saturday before we left but it’s certainly the best way to describe why I came to the Continental Congress. The other goal I had was to take full advantage of the scant time on the original agenda for what were described as “civic actions.” I arrived and quickly found Jim Davis, the lead delegate from Ohio. We talked about Ohio’s third delegate, Trisha Connell, who was en route and running a bit behind. While I was standing in line to register, we complained that the original 2PM deadline to be ready for the opening session was coming too quickly and it was moved to 3.

I was in my suit and ready although I never managed to fully unpack and that stayed true for all twelve days. In truth, had Trisha arrived when we expected her to, I wouldn’t have pushed so hard for the first motion that passed at the Congress - to amend the prewritten rules to allow laptops during the proceedings. My plan was that when Trisha figured out where she was, I could look up directions and drive out to meet her.

I lobbied the idea a bit at dinner and was first in line with the motion when the session resumed. It passed. It also changed CC2009, for better or worse. I had said in online discussions with delegates before the Congress that the people of Ohio couldn't care less if I attached my name to something that came out of the event. I now jokingly refer to that motion as the "Dickerhoof Amendment to the Rules." Trisha finally showed up the next morning but didn't last the day.

I'm not going to spend much time talking about what a fiasco the first couple of days were. That subject will probably be told in such detail as to make the reader engage in wonder at how anything was accomplished. Instead, I'll just say that my first motion which was somewhat hotly contested at the time, ended up changing the Congress over those twelve days.

When speaking about it with Charles Zoeller, who ended up being the steady balance to my manic work in the Secretary's chair, he had mixed feelings. I stated more or less, and I would hope we came to some agreement on the idea, that laptops should have either remained banned or been something of a requirement.

People can find their own distraction in any environment but the disconnect of one generation from the next was at least initially amplified by the use of electronics. I recalled that Benjamin Franklin invented the bifocals to allow those with eye conditions to take part in reading and shaping the founding documents of this country. Would Franklin have remained quiet had bifocals been banned at that first Continental Congress? In remarking that there could not be one set of rules for the front table, decorated on that first day with a row of laptops, and the delegates who had already begun testing their ability to hide their devices, I was fulfilling the promise I had made to bring that technologist's perspective. Besides, I had thought, there was no reason to use paper to print out the volumes of information I had on my machines. Love it or hate it, technology increased the



efficiency and improved the weight of product that CC2009 passes on to America. It landed me on the stage a few days later and cost me the opportunity to complain too much about taxes.

### The Super-Secret Admin Committee

After lunch on the second day, Richard Fry of Kansas informed me after a quick discussion on the impasses that were facing the delegates that he had been appointed the Chairman of the Administrative Processing Committee. He asked if I was interested and I said that I was and that the job before us reminded me quite a bit of the one I was paid for back home.

I described it as “herding cats.” The idea was that a room full of liberty-minded people was a great thing for learning but the desire to be heard wasn’t necessarily a recipe for doing. We ducked out of the afternoon session and found a spot by the pool to begin talking about what could be done to make sure the Continental Congress would not remain in the same vicious stall that had marked the first three sessions and was intensifying as we met.

I tried to emphasize that part of the problem was that pre-packaged instructions were being handed to delegates after lecture-style presentations with the hopes that they would stamp them and pass them on. I didn’t see that as a possibility. The other members of the committee and I tried to hash out a few ideas for speeding things up. My input was that the panic cost time, that the workload should be divided, and using a committee approach to separate instructions would allow us to use time between sessions by breaking the connection between presentation, discussion, and votes. “Storm to norm” is a pretty self-explanatory idea but Information Technology managers have it beaten thoroughly into our heads. As for the others, I will let them tell their own story.

After our meeting had gone on for quite a while, one of the delegates came to the meeting and sat down with us for a few minutes. I do not remember his name but he brought a very important message with him: things were deteriorating in the session and we were, in his estimation, the last best hope for fixing it. With that pronouncement, the members of the committee dedicated ourselves to producing the right recommendations, deadlines be damned, and we would stay up all night if we had to. All of us did.

We had reached our own impasse in the committee when I realized that it was time to employ another lesson I had already learned in my life; that thinking visually did more to break down disagreements than hours of debate. I told the group I would return with a whiteboard and I left for the office. I asked Todd McGreevy for one of the two that was available in the office and for every dry-erase marker he had. I returned to the committee, illustrated my idea and then things just clicked.

Jeff Lewis illustrated one of the most important lessons I have ever learned about this country simply by putting it on that board. His idea was that each committee report would contain separate instructions for the federal government, the states, and the people. He drew “WTP” on top, states under it, and congress under that. It immediately occurred to me that it was the first time I had seen the chain of command under the Constitution correctly described.

We had to do a bit of fighting to get our findings in front of President Badnarik and Vice-President Gonzales. It was worth it in the long run. I didn't stick around for our presentation but I had faith in Richard and the Jeffs (Lewis and Williams) to deliver it well and they did. Schaeffer Cox and I went on to a meeting of the People's Action Caucus.

I awoke to the first session the next day to find our committee's plan in action. We scrapped the entire idea of the

agenda schedule outside of scheduled speakers, meals, and special events. I believe that if not for the work of that committee and the abundant use of technology at the Continental Congress, we may have returned a few instructions for Congress or the states and only because the dreaded “rubber stamp” would have fallen.

A few days after that initial meeting, a woman I had befriended referred to the Committee on Administrative Processing as “they” and it was widely believed that we were secretly altering the course in St. Charles. I replied that “I am they” and that we had committed our plans so that civic actions, the goal we shared, wasn’t pushed to the side in a mad dash at the end of the Congress because we would have fallen so desperately behind the original agenda.

I am grateful for the members of that committee and the work we did. Yes, we cost you all a great deal of sleep but fatigue in the defense of this nation is a badge of honor I wore from that day on. Where did I go from the committee meeting? I went to the second meeting of the People’s Action Caucus, of course.

### Synergy

Many of us who gathered in St. Charles had the same fear; that we were intended as a rubber stamp on Bob Schulz’s agenda. Let me make it quite clear that I don’t blame Bob for that even if it was his explicit purpose from day one. The original event was supposed to be much longer than twelve days and the “pre-packaged” feel of the agenda we were given prior to arrival had more to do with expediency than ulterior motives. For reasons discussed in connection with the Admin Committee, it just wasn’t going to work. Besides, as I often reminded myself, it was a Continental “Congress” and not a “Conference.”

At the end of a session on the first day, a speech by Dan

Gonzales seemed to resonate with a number of us. We gathered around him when the session ended and a group of people who were individually terrible at remembering names tried to address each other. By foresight, perhaps, Schaeffer Cox of Alaska was born to parents who gave him a name that was easily distinguished from average American male tags and not so odd as to be hard to recall in a pinch. I engaged him in conversation.

Those of us who were primarily interested in things that citizens could do to combat the monster that government could become would form an unofficial sort of committee. Schaeffer took it from there. We didn't have the name until much later that night after our first meeting, a trip to an empty ballroom, and a return to the hotel bar. We had a name, a mission statement, rules, and most importantly a purpose.

At the first meeting of the People's Action Caucus, we got together and started feeling each other out. Most every one of the twenty-plus people that attended that first meeting were much better friends before we left St. Charles and our unity from the beginning fueled the belief that we could accomplish something amazing.

We split off into two groups to discuss the agenda items for the next day and come up with resolutions for each. Schaeffer ran the meeting with order and the "salty cracker" approach he had described earlier on the floor. Both groups came up with something. Both groups had the mutual support of the other when they would bring their motions to the floor. We had strategy, justifications, and each other.

The next day, we brought a statement of purpose and a resolution concerning "hard/honest money" to the floor. Both passed quickly and with little discussion of the language we had worked diligently to refine for that reason. As Jeff Williams said, we needed to start with a small victory. When I

followed him to call the question and vote the statement through, I said only the Congress needed one. There was applause, there were congratulations, and at last we had a sense of what our contribution would be. Let it be stated for the record that we were identified as the young, the “mavericks.” What we had really done was to take the knowledge and practice of our wiser members and translated it into the energy of the hopeful. We were proud, and understandably so, but should have recognized that pride rarely comes without a price.

### A Visit from Bob Schulz

The People’s Action Caucus got back together that night. The first order of business was to pat ourselves on the back. We had done what everyone else at the Congress seemed incapable of doing; we carefully crafted and brought our own resolutions, we guaranteed each other support, we brought the motions to the floor, and then we got them passed. We had members that were sitting in on some of the committees that were formed that day and so thirteen of us met to discuss strategy, the next step, and what our “end game” was.

I will admit that I used the word “hijack” quite a bit and it was a poor choice. Nonetheless, we had acknowledged our power so discussing what to do with it made sense. We talked and “brainstormed.” We discussed the agenda items for the next day. We carried on for about an hour when my state coordinator called to let me know our alternate, Steve McMasters, was on his way to replace Trisha who had checked out of the hotel that morning. I informed the group that Steve would make a great addition to the caucus.

Things were going so well that it didn’t seem to register that Bob Schulz, the man whose dream the Continental Congress had been for so long came into the room to listen to our discussion. In my mind, pride was poison and it was telling me that Bob’s agenda simply didn’t matter anymore. I thought

that CC2009 was our show to run for the remaining ten days. Bob was a great man and I knew this from having read extensively about him before taking two weeks' vacation and spending all of my food money on gas to get to St. Charles. Selfishly, I had thought that it was now Bob's turn to get on board with our agenda.

Judith Whitmore joined him not long after. I know this is something of a tease but it's not my place to reveal what was said during that meeting. I heard some of the bravest statements in that room that I will likely ever hear. My heart goes out to each and every person who sat through the entire affair not the least of which were Bob and Judith. It was in that meeting that I recognized that I shared the desperation of being a young father and faced with the prospect of my son living under the tyranny of our supposedly "servant government," I was too quick to forget what others had already sacrificed.

For my own part, I will share what I remember most vividly saying to Bob and Judith who approached us first as if visitors in their own home. I recall as if I said it today that the words did not spend any more time in my head than it took to reach my tongue. I told Bob I had studied him exhaustively, that I found him to be a patriot of unquestionable character and deed, and that my purpose at CC2009 was to take his incredible knowledge and distribute it so that some of the hardships that he endured could be avoided by millions of Americans coming together to retake our country.

Bob did something I could not have possibly expected when faced with such unbridled arrogance out of the mouth of a man who has still not contributed 1/1000 of what he has to the cause of liberty: he listened. I didn't meet formally with the PAC after that night but we spread out and took our resolve in new directions. Many of us started to really listen and that is another turning point that the Continental Congress can count among its historic course.

## The Secretary Knows Everything

My mother had often reminded me that secretaries often know more about how any company or organization works than anyone else in it and I would generally reply to her that such a statement was expected from those who did much but were repaid little. I am coming to realize at a much deeper level than I could have even a few years ago that my mother is always right.

Just like the understandable concerns about the secrecy of the Admin Committee, I feel I need to explain how I came to become the Secretary so that the record will defend me when I cannot afford the time.

On third day of CC2009, Jeremy Doucet approached me after I took a prolonged morning nap and managed to miss the first session. He informed me that he was now the “clerk” and was assisting the secretary who was elected as a non-delegate during the first session. He wanted to know if I would help him with computer issues as sort of a deputy clerk. I believe that God puts me where he needs me to be and the move just made sense.

Despite the earlier adoption of amended rules that allowed laptops, the technology in the room was not being utilized to do much besides recording minutes and collecting finished documents after some editing on the floor. When I first sat on the stage, I turned to an online collaboration tool that had been made available to delegates but to that point had been largely used so that certain people could antagonize others on the internet in addition to in the hallways.

I began to shape it so that it could display data on committees and so that it was intuitive for distributing documents or getting them to the secretary and clerks to be printed, distributed, and edited. That was most of what I did

on the first day.

A little later, the secretary informed Jeremy and I that she was overwhelmed. She didn't know what to expect but what was being asked of her was clearly more than she had signed on for. She "asked" by telling us that she would like to leave and probably wouldn't return if we would be willing to take over her duties. We agreed. That night, Jeremy and I discussed which of us might be Secretary and who would then be the Vice-Secretary. After we both figured out that neither of us wanted to be prime position, we decided that Co-Secretaries sounded better and fit with the principles of consensus and self-governance.

The next morning, we started taking over every aspect of that job we were capable of. It seemed a poke in the eye that we had been "nominated" later and unanimously elected to the position that the parliamentarian had asked Charles Zoeller, a delegate from Kentucky, to take minutes as the acting secretary. As we came together, though, Charles was invaluable. His taking minutes freed us up to collect reports, get them printed, and distribute them so that the body had a reasonable, if not optimal, amount of time to read them.

When Jeremy began following a different path toward the end of the Congress, Charles and I began to work in sync quite naturally. I had suggested that I could run two monitors more efficiently than most people could run one and that duty became mine. In terms of paper organization, I was a mess and Charles had himself together quite nicely. We later certified the reports, motions, amendments, and findings of the Continental Congress with surprising ease because my digital copies matched his paper records with few exceptions. Again, God had a way of making me live up to that Franklin comparison. I thank him for that opportunity.

I could write an entire book about what I learned from this experience, the power of the Secretary in a meeting such as



CC2009, and the secrets that people may or may not wish to be aired. Certainly, I am again a tease. Most of what I learned I put on display in some form or another. If you saw me working, keep in mind you saw about one-fifth of what I was doing. Manipulating the screen was one thing but I was working behind the scenes to get feedback on what to fix next.

I fix things for a living and I've found that simply asking people what they want or consider important is more valuable than spending my time guessing. I also learned that people can come together much more easily off-camera and face-to-face, so when I knew different groups or people were working on similar projects, I let them know to get together. I learned that the best way to be heard and really listened to was to let everyone else have their say first. My speeches to the body became mostly procedural after I took the Secretary's chair; urging people to focus first on their common ground, reminding CC2009 that the clock was ticking, or taking time to read a message called "fortune cookie" that was as true when I read it as it was weeks earlier when I had written it.

When I finally spoke to advocate a position, the adoption of the preamble sub-committee's work as read by Jeff Williams, the body came together. As for secrets, well, a secretary doesn't reveal those as trust remains my most valuable currency.

## The Evolution of a Revolution

I am eternally grateful to all those who stuck out those historic twelve days. To a great degree, what the Continental Congress achieves has much more to do with what happens next. Another point I had made in my candidate's speech was that I wanted to find ways to reach out to different groups who might think we're opposed to their efforts. I wrote a blog about how the real enemies of liberty use false divisions to keep Americans focused on guarding against each other while the thieves sneak in the back door to rob us of our treasure.

Similarly, those divisions exist within Continental Congress and the false “left-right” paradigm we’ve all been fed for years. That lie is told with the help of distractions and inefficiencies that run through our communication and I believe at my core that things happen for a reason and I was meant to occupy the Secretary’s chair so that much work could be done in twelve days.

Without that bit of history, perhaps we would not have enough material to win over some on the traditional “right” who would take offense to our condemnation of the Patriot Act and abuses of the War Powers clause. Perhaps we would have pushed to the side those two efforts and others that help us reach out to the traditional left who are willing to listen now that the blunt force of overreaching central government is revealed.

I shudder to think that sixty or eighty percent of what we accomplished would have been a generous estimate of our abilities without freeing up the channels of information by utilizing our tools and by my being held to the promises I made to Ohioans.

My primary goal was to bring the collaborative approach to education and knowledge-sharing that I had developed in working for the state to a community of patriots. It became my slogan, of sorts, but I will reiterate it here for the record: I would measure the success of CC2009 by the idea that I wanted to leave St. Charles with ten times more work than I came with. That as the objective, I can gladly report that this is initially, at least, a smashing success. We have a public to win over and we have a good number of tools to do it with.

I had told others on the first few days of the Congress that it was my intention to write a book about the proceedings and that I would entitle it *The Evolution of a Revolution*. I thank Mr. Kostric for taking that task upon himself. I thank Bob Schulz for gathering us, Michael Badnarik for giving up the

chance to speak eloquently more often for the mantle of the Presidency. I thank Dan Gonzales for using the position of the Vice-President to push willingly toward the goal of a finished product. I thank the PAC for making me feel welcome. I thank every delegate who stuck it out for being a part of this. I thank the Technology Sub-Committee for standing behind me. I thank the people of Ohio for sending me. To the God-fearing people who read this, let us thank God for such work as this. For those who do not know God, I thank God you're on our side. Yes, I'm one of those "everything happens for a reason people" and I wouldn't have changed a thing about those twelve days.

Frederick Harvey  
Newington, NH 3rd Delegate

Dear William,

I applaud your dedication, and the idea you had to compile some recollections and entries while they are fresh. In my case I will submit them here and now.

My first effort was to assist Orly Taitz - CA to acquire support for her law case on eligibility that involved US Military Officers. Brian Franks and I collected about 46 signatures of delegates on a motion to include a statement of support. However, though there was considerable support for this among the delegates, the body ultimately decided that the CC2009 should not involve itself in individual legal cases per se. The work was helpful, however, to others who eventually included the work in the language that came out in the article that was adopted regarding the Obama Presidency and eligibility.

I milled around a bit at first in CC2009 trying to get the measure of the experience I was having as the deliberations got started. Then I found John Roland - TX with a rather interesting publication. It was entitled 'Declaration of Non-Authority' and listed a number of cases that have been heard and completed since about 1819, all of which have been wrongly decided, with gross violations of the constitution embedded within. In spite of that fact, these particular cases have been used for years as precedents; thus assuring our courts can continue to violate the constitution.

I felt that needed some amplification, and so became the Chairman of the Committee which brought it to the floor, but alas, it was not adopted. However, I did put the list of cases up at the New Hampshire WTP Site for lawyers and others to learn about. I do believe the issue is key to straightening out our courts, but it will have to wait for now. It was early in the

deliberations and I do not think the delegates were able to grasp the importance, possibly owing to our short time available to explain it.

As the congress proceeded I found myself drawn to the Committee on Civic Action. Terry Dodd-CO chaired this committee and gave me permission to analyze the existing civic actions that were contained in several sources, including adopted and not-yet-adopted articles from all the other committees. The idea I had was to sort and sift the specific actions into categories to try to isolate the generic civic action types.

The work was started about 9pm on the evening before the committee report was due, and finished up at 3 am that morning and given to Terry. It led along the way to amazing discussions with several delegates at 3 am in the morning!, including some who were being “obstructors” in the congress. This resulted in Terry acknowledging me and my effort before the group the next day from the podium. I was very pleased with his compliment, and it made me feel I had contributed. Basically I had used techniques taught to me by Booz, Allen and Hamilton when I was just out of the MBA program and working in the Chicago office many years ago, 1973-1975.

The Article for Civic Actions did not make it through to final adoption, primarily because it was becoming “contentious”. A growing level of concern and trepidation was surfacing among delegates, some of whom left the Congress around this time. As a Congress, we did not have the time to resolve all that. The matter was put forward to the next Congress session.

A reasonable and moderate Civic Action was proposed for the final Articles of Freedom that we could sign onto before we left St. Charles. The actions proposed in the final articles are consistent with all the other proposals, but not nearly so detailed.

I hasten to point out that the civic actions being organized in many cases were both brilliant, and easy to implement. Suffice it to say, no government on Earth could stand that the people will not support. With the full measure of civic actions available to the American public, it would just be a matter of time before a general government set upon ignoring or defying the will of the people, would be replaced.

The work I did resulted in the development of a paper called: “10 Yards in Civic Action and then Across the Goal Line...Run for Office”.

Without getting into the details of the civic actions under consideration, which remain with the Congress as work in progress, the ten generic types of civic actions which were identified were these;

Refusals  
Demands  
Personal Choices and Self-reliance  
Encourage Local Officials  
Join Groups,  
Organize Petitions and Coalitions  
Collect Information and Study Liberty  
Participate in Actions with Groups  
Share Information and Teach Others  
Lobby  
...and finally,  
RUN FOR OFFICE.

As you know, we are subject to recall by President Badnarik, so let's just leave it there for now. The trip back was an interesting one. We went by secondary roads, a trip of over 1,000 miles, talking with people in stores and in restaurants about CC2009. I know it may sound strange, but I had the impression often during these conversations with my American brothers and sisters that they were actually out ahead of our

Congress, and me!

Good luck with your documentation, and congratulations on undertaking this important work for the CC2009 delegates and the American People. I might add, William, that throughout the proceedings I felt the guidance of unseen forces, and the presence of great spiritual influence. I am so grateful, no matter the outcome, to have been a part of this important event.

Frederick Harvey  
2009-11-25-18:47

Jeff Williams  
Pullman, Washington

On the heels of an unsuccessful campaign for local political office, I came very close to not attending Continental Congress 2009. Much to my consternation, event fund raising had fallen remarkably short of published goals, there were rumors circulating that delegates would be required to pay their room and board (which I could not afford to do) or that the event itself was completely bust. The level of acrimony on the base camp message boards was extremely high making me question exactly what I was getting myself into.

Combine these issues with the fact that a benefactor who had agreed in advance to provide my air transportation had suddenly gone AWOL, and I pretty much figured my Continental Congress experience was over before it began. With less than a week to go, I had many loose ends to tie up, not the least of which was the glaring lack of a plane ticket.

Honestly, I was shocked I had even been elected to Continental Congress 2009. I had not actively campaigned as I was so incredibly busy with my run for Pullman (WA) City Council. I had worked damn hard running against a nine-year incumbent and lost that election roughly 60/40. I was unhappy about that loss and feeling a bit disillusioned. At the same time, however, over the past 18 months I honestly believe I have been led or pushed or otherwise influenced to become part of this movement of patriots. My life has been like a leaf on the surface of the water, and I have been following the current wherever it will take me. That journey has been amazing, and has led me in directions I never dreamed.

In the final days leading up to the event, Judith Whitmore emailed me several times with words of encouragement and inspiration, and an individual who has been very generous with our local 9-12 group found out about my air transportation



situation and assisted me with heavily discounted tickets.

So, with everything falling into place, I was resigned to it being my destiny to attend this event. I wrapped up my business obligations, finalized child care, packed my stuff, and literally, the night before I was to leave, made sure I had fifty bucks in my pocket so that I could catch an early flight back if things didn't quite work out.

At the very least, I noticed that Michael Badnarik had been elected as one of the delegates from Texas. I have been a huge fan of his for as long as I have been politically aware and I figured in the very worst case scenario, I might at least get a chance to talk to him and/or listen to him speak; to gain some additional insight that I didn't already have from his Constitution class videos that I literally keep with me at all times - on my iPhone!

I arrived in Chicago's O'Hare airport mid-afternoon where I was met by Dan Corey, one of the local volunteers who had graciously offered to shuttle delegates from the airport to the resort. By the time I hit my room at Pheasant Run - I was exhausted, in need of a shower, and literally had about an hour to get my stuff together and head down for registration and opening ceremonies. I dropped my bags, lay down on the bed and closed my eyes to rest for a microsecond... and I dozed. When I opened them again, I had only ten minutes left. I skipped the shower, dressed quickly, and headed for the ballroom. From the moment the opening ceremonies began, the next 11 days were a complete whirlwind for me.

I came to Continental Congress 2009 with strong beliefs but no specific motives - the only agenda I had was to listen, learn, and only open my mouth if I had something substantive to offer. On the first full day of Continental Congress, I became a member of the administrative committee, largely by accident. I heard during the Thursday afternoon lecture that they were forming, and I had done some preliminary work on a

specific issue and although I can't even remember what that issue was, the work I had done was significant enough that I chose to interject myself and ask Richard Fry if I could join his new committee. Little did I realize just how much organizational difficulty was occurring, the result of which was causing dissent and frustration throughout the Congress, and threatened to significantly harm the event.

Again, I was apparently in the right place at the right time. Along with Jeff Lewis, Schaeffer Cox (who would become one of my closest friends), Ron Dickerhoof and Richard Fry, we attacked the problem and in a few short hours, formulated a working solution. While much of this committee's work went unnoticed or unheralded, I believe the impact we made and the role we played was significant. Others have stated that we "saved" the Congress... I'm not comfortable going that far. However, had all deliberations remained in the committee of the whole rather than breaking down into committees and subcommittees as we proposed, I believe that things could have broken down completely, and rather than producing the significant work we did, we might not have accomplished anything.

Outside of the Admin committee there were the evening caucuses organized by Schaeffer Cox and regularly attended by William Kostric, who I became friends with. I was attracted to the caucuses because this is where the younger crowd was hanging out, and they were motivated to shake things up and get stuff done. I appreciated that. However, not everything happening in the caucuses was positive, as this is where I first met delegates who seemed to take a contrary position than what I would expect from an individual attending a Continental Congress. These individuals had an extremely narrow agenda and seemed to oppose every proposal and idea with paranoia and fear, or with an irrational, skewed logic that simply made no sense to me. I would struggle communicating with and understanding these individuals for the rest of the Congress.

On the morning of Friday the 13th, I woke up with a plan. People were frustrated and demoralized. I huddled with my fellow Washington State delegate Darin Stevens and several other individuals I had met while caucusing, and I shared my ideas to pass a simple, relatively insignificant resolution. I called the concept “Small Victories. My theory was: give a good speech, get people fired up, vote on something (anything!) and pass it, and see if we couldn’t pour some gasoline on the coals to re-ignite our fire. Several other individuals had proposals ready to go as well, and it was clear that there was significant support towards jump-starting momentum of the Congress.

I lobbied both President Badnarik and Vice President Gonzales that morning, but I must have done a lousy job arguing my point... the impression I got from both of them was that my idea was pretty much a pointless waste of time. However, once the Committee of the Whole reconvened, an opportunity to present arose with about an hour to go, and I offered the resolution. The speech got most of the delegates out of their seats and seemed to energize everyone; it passed unanimously and several other motions were subsequently carried before adjourning for lunch. My plan worked, and we were moving in the right direction. At lunch, I overheard a number of people talking positively about the Small Victory just achieved.

Throughout the week, aside from acting as an occasional, unofficial cheerleader, I was particularly satisfied with my contributions to Second Amendment resolution language, Eligibility Clause committee input, a speech I made regarding political correctness, and of course, helping to capture the intent and sentiment of our Congress in chairing the preamble and introduction committee for the Articles of Freedom.

Even through disagreements I tried to keep an open

mind and give due consideration to the fact that all of us had strong opinions, and were often working with only a few hours of sleep. Considering my own temper and inherent ability to hold a grudge, I was particularly grateful to Darin Stevens for keeping me grounded at moments of high tension.

In particular, I wrangled with the delegate from Wyoming, Catherine Vandemoer, in Second Amendment committee and subcommittee deliberations. To put it bluntly, we disagreed vehemently - and at the end of that evening, she really didn't like me and the feeling was quite mutual. However, over the next several days, she and I were able to overcome our differences. I was on her Eligibility committee, where I felt we worked exceptionally well together, and eventually we became friends. I'd like to say it was my charming personality that won her over, but it was more likely the chocolates I constantly bribed her with.

Unfortunately, redemption was not to be found in every conflict. In particular, during my successful efforts to include language specific to open and concealed carry in the Second Amendment language, I was confronted outside the ballroom by two delegates who were VERY upset with me. It was quite intimidating, but I tried to be as polite as possible given the circumstances, and just made it clear that I would not be dissuaded by their arguments and we would have to agree to disagree. Eventually my efforts would prove successful over their objections.

Aside from this particular incident, in the final days of the Congress I was really disgusted by some of the behavior I witnessed. In one instance, several delegates actually stood and turned their backs on an individual who was speaking, one of them even put her fingers in her ears. I was not impressed. Beyond this, the constant legal wrangling and fear mongering by a miniscule group of attorneys and paralegals really turned my stomach.

While I am well aware that there were voices of moderation and negativism in the original Continental Congresses, I believe that these individuals were solely successful in killing one of the most powerful and important pieces of our Articles of Freedom; the Civic Actions. Granted, Bob Shulz offered a last minute compromise which passed, but the “teeth” of the original proposals were gone. Even a last minute compromise attempt by Terry Dodd which looked promising, failed. Politics being the art of compromise is something I learned first hand during my eleven days in St. Charles and at the end I found myself arguing vociferously for the Schulz proposal, because I was resigned to the fact that without it, there would be no civic actions at all, which seemed to be the ultimate goal of these individuals.

At one point, the attorneys and paralegals took the podium to recuse themselves from the proposed language. However, if their ultimate and overriding concern was covering their own posteriors, they simply should have recused themselves and resigned. Even some of the benign language I wrote in the preamble and introduction was potentially “seditious” to them, and I was shocked by their unwillingness to confront the issues head on with direct language. After all, this is why we had gathered! Furthermore, I was amazed at how they used fear as a divisive wedge to turn delegates against one another, or even cause people to pack their bags and leave. The amount of outright fear and paranoia by some during the last days was disappointing. After all, we had been instructed on day one that when it came time to sign the final document, we would be scared - just as the founding fathers undoubtedly had once been. Those individuals pledged “their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor”. Many of us were willing to do the same.

Personally, even with family and business concerns, I was fully prepared, without fear, to face arrest and imprisonment. I still believe there could be nothing better for the cause of liberty than for the Federal Government to take that next step

and openly attack peaceful free speech and assembly in this manner. I also believe strongly that any delegate not willing to sacrifice themselves in this manner should probably never have run for their post, nor should they attend another Continental Congress in the future.

It's amazing how much work our group completed in eleven days, and more so when you consider that we were even able to put coherent thoughts and words together after multiple nights with only three hours sleep, and consciousness sustained only by Red Bull, Monster drinks and energy shots. It's remarkable that in the heated 2 A.M. Sessions, fistfights didn't break out (unlike the original Continental Congresses); somehow cooler heads managed to prevail, and for that I recognize the yeoman service of our President, Michael Badnarik. I am so proud that we were able to produce a comprehensive and credible document, the nature of which is truly a testament to the intelligence and passion of the individuals who made up this Congress. I now hope and pray that the Articles of Freedom are widely accepted and provide a unique opportunity to change our nation for the better.

Personally, when I was presenting the Preamble and Introduction to the Articles of Freedom that were ultimately accepted, I had a unique moment of complete focus and clarity; where random experiences and skills I have acquired and cultivated over the past 15 years of my life all came together; I knew that standing at that podium I was exactly where I was meant to be, and I am thankful to have made the most of a wonderful and unique opportunity. It was humbling.

When I looked out from that podium and saw the faces of all of my colleagues, regardless of whether they were individuals I liked, disliked or was ambivalent about, the one amazing mental impression I was left with is that I was looking at my future; at men and women I will spend years collaborating with and debating against. I firmly believe Continental Congress 2009 is only the beginning of something

potentially amazing, and all of us will be sharing our lives for some time to come.

When I think of Continental Congress 2009, the oft-recited Thomas Paine quote we are all so familiar with comes to mind... “These are the times that try men's souls: the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: it is dearness only that gives every thing its value”. The members of this Continental Congress who persevered, produced and signed the completed Articles of Freedom may be many things, but there are no Summer Soldiers among this group.

In closing, I was so thankful for one on one time spent with Michael Badnarik, who graciously allowed me to pick his brain repeatedly during his down times, when he just as easily could have been enjoying a cocktail in the hot tub. The amount of wisdom and knowledge this man passed along to me in 11 days will take me months to process, and I am forever grateful for his time and insight.

I particularly appreciated very much the principled and strong support of Dan Gonzalez and Judith Whitmore at the Nth hour when we were requested to reconsider of some of the “strong” language of the preamble and introduction of the Articles of Freedom. I was so proud to associate with individuals with the same “no compromise” attitude I have when it comes to the concepts of Freedom and Liberty.

I respectfully acknowledge the contributions of John Bush and Catherine Bleish. While I did not always agree with everything they said, nor even in the manner in which they presented their opinions, I have rarely come across two articulate and impassioned individuals of their caliber. They

inspired me.

I am also thankful for all of my interactions with all of my fellow delegates, but I was particularly thankful for the friendships I formed with Darin Stevens, Schaeffer Cox, William Kostric, Kevin Tebedo, Jeff Lewis, Ryan McCain, Ron Dickerhoof, Catherine Vandemoer and Kath McCubbins-Carlson. Last, I salute Dr. Bob Shulz, Judy Schultz, Todd McGreevy, and Mike Bodine, as well as the state and county coordinators and their teams who made this event possible.



Kevin Tebedo

A personal reflection on the Continental Congress 2009

The following are some of my thoughts on my experience at the Continental Congress 2009. I did attempt to journal day's events, but my recollection will undoubtedly be different from others and clouded by sleep deprivation. An official record will be produced, which was one of the primary reasons for enlisting a professional parliamentarian. Without a substantive and tenable record, the credibility of what we accomplished is in doubt.

Those who did not sign the final and original document titled Articles of Freedom (AOF) may come to regret their decision should the document attach itself to history in some major way. Should those who did sign the document experience injury and disquiet as a result of their association being indicated in wet ink, they may come to regret their decision, and those not signing will have a feeling of vindication. Only time will tell this story.

Our leader and patriarch of the Continental Congress in the year 2009, Robert Schulz, has achieved a milestone both personally and publicly. When I was first approached by a good friend to consider allowing him to nominate me as a delegate, my initial reaction was, "No, I don't wish to go to some organizational meeting for the We the People Foundation, a 501(c) (3) corporation, billed as a representation of the people when it is really no such thing."

After meeting Mr. Schulz personally and learning more about his intentions to specifically not allow the CC2009 to be painted in such a way, I got on board as they say. However in my own mind, I reserved personal final judgment on the issue and resigned myself to a course of action at the Continental Congress that would be one of small impact should the event

turn out to be a rubber stamp on the aspirations of Mr. Schulz.

Not that I was against Mr. Schulz's vision in principle, I just was not interested in being part of a smoke screen. By the end of the first full day in the committee of the whole, it was clear to me that Mr. Schulz was going to have to earn the success of his point of view - there would be no rubber stamp. But the experiences of the day presented me with another dilemma.

It became clear to me after the first full day of proceedings, in the Committee of the Whole and in the Congress, that the majority of the delegates had little to no experience in orderly procedure. The ignorance of proper procedure combined with the self-aggrandizing attitude of a good number of delegates, in my estimation, was going to make it nearly impossible to reach the goals set down by Mr. Schulz (and agreed upon by the delegates through the agenda). To be sure, it was going to be a long ten days for the parliamentarian.

In addition, it was Mr. Schulz's plan that all the work of the congress was to be accomplished in the committee of the whole. The pre-congress administrative preparations offered no practical resource for sub-committees. I deduced the improbability of any type of reasonable product coming from the ten days' effort without breaking into smaller groups. Therefore, there must be added to the already mounting confusion of the body the frustration of seeing no useful yield.

As I examined the reality before me, my heart sank. I just could not envision it all being pulled together in ten days. After all, the framers took four months, and most of us, including me, did not rise to their level of intellect and prowess. The dilemma before me amounted to a decision. I felt I had two options; I could sit back and watch what I was convinced was going to be a train wreck of gigantic proportions (given the amount of time, money and sacrifice

employed in this project) which would create nothing to which I would affix my signature (This I felt would be safest personal choice). Or, I could inject myself into the melee (trying not to make enemies of my fellow patriots) in a manner that would aid in guiding this Congress to some type of end product which the delegates could sign in clear conscience.

I chose the latter and on the morning of the third day, moved the Money Clause debate to committee. I am not sure the hotel was prepared for this, and I know the body was not. The sub-committee deliberated and created a report to the committee of the whole. The committee of the whole debated the report and eventually adopted the report with amendments, and the report was adopted by the Congress. The first hurdle in the agenda's issue requirements was complete, and the pattern was set for all future agenda items to be sent to committee, which was the only way any real work was going to be accomplished.

The lack of attention to the adoption of the Money Clause report by most of the delegates (a deficiency that proved to be a marked pattern for the rest of the days) led to a general feeling of consternation among the delegates that somehow, they had been snookered. This sentiment was expressed to me by quite a number of delegates. Of course, we were not snookered, we were just too busy talking to one another and/or typing on our computers or preparing our next speech or giving a mini-lecture to anybody who would listen. The impression of being snookered became a daily opinion which remains to this day. I certainly hope that our next meeting will see an improved experience of listening rather than talking. It may also be motivation to reconsider the idea of allowing computers in the Congressional hall.

Now that we had an example of how the committees could work effectively, I was feeling more confident in the possibility of some success. The next monster of constipation then reared its head. The majority of delegates were unable to

grasp the concept that parliamentary procedure, if used properly, gives full opportunity for discussion and debate while at the same time moving the topic to conclusion. That to which parliamentary procedure is not friendly, is extraneous material that is not on point and does not move the body to resolution.

After being given a presentation in the auditorium, the plan was to return to the committee of the whole and, using the presented information and all of our combined knowledge, spend the next four hours developing instructions and civic actions using parliamentary procedure to arrive at an adopted resolution on the given subject -- a difficult to near impossible goal given the short amount of time allotted.

The new stopper formed when instead of using the committee of the whole to drive to an end result, we started listening to speeches for the next two or three hours. The speeches, although somewhat informative and at times entertaining, produced nothing. Had the Continental Congress been given a month to accomplish its tasks, the pedantic pile may have been justified. But the extreme time constraint under which we were operating really allowed no time for extraneous and superfluous trappings. Plus, we were using up valuable committee time listening to each other's opinions being preached to the choir.

As a result of this waste of time, and I do believe it was a waste, we were relegated to staying up late into the mornings doing a lot of the meat and potato work that we could have been doing during the demagoguery sessions. It seemed no matter what the agenda called for, we found ourselves in a quagmire of never-ending palaver. Even during the executive session, which should have only lasted fifteen to thirty minutes, at the most, had we stayed on point, we endured four and one half hours of (you fill in the blank). By the last days of the congress, tempers were flaring and tensions were high because all of us were tired, stressed and rightly

frustrated.

In spite of all of this, the committees did produce (and the congress adopted) instructions to the national and state governments as well as civic actions for each agenda item and for the eligibility issue. Combined with the Articles of Freedom, I believe the Continental Congress of 2009 produced a work worthy of its sacrifice.

I know from reading base camp that the feeling is not mutual, and most definitely, the harvests of our labor are far from perfect. But I did proudly affix my signature with prayers that regardless of the imperfections, it will be used for the benefit of freedom and liberty in our nation.

There is one thing about which there is no doubt, we all shared an exciting and valuable experience together. I will never forget each and every one of you. You will all hold my respect and admiration into eternity.

And finally, to those fellow patriots who doubt the rigidity of my spine and the size of my courage batteries, a doubt acquired from misinterpretation of a display of emotion, know that courage is exhibited in many ways. Jesus the Christ was the most courageous man to have ever lived, in my estimation. It is my greatest desire and aspiration to own the type of courage that enables a man to lay down his life for another. For those in whose eyes I saw steel, in speech I heard wisdom, in manner I observed kindness, and in heart I discerned compassion for the weak, I shall give my life.

May the Lord bless you and keep you. May His light shine upon you. Until we meet again. In Liberty,  
Kevin Tebedo

Lyle G. Daken

I'm from a small town in northern Minnesota, (Kelliher, Pop = 285), and I'm the County Coordinator for same, so this was quite an experience for me. I arrived by shuttle from Midway airport and met up with the other 2 delegates from Minnesota at the Pheasant Run Hotel in St. Charles, Ill. I was impressed by all the other delegates, speakers and programs held each day, as well as the deliberations after them.

I was born July 3, 1934 so the 1940's and 1950's were the best years in America as far as I'm concerned. The 1960's were the years everything started to go down hill.

I enjoyed the caucuses and all the delegates on the committees, a great bunch of Americans. I was surprised at the number of knowledgeable young delegates that were there, they gave me hope that America can and will be turned around for the better.

The food provided was great and I gained 6 lbs. while there for 11 days. I want to thank We The People for providing everything and for the Continental Congress which I believe will go down in history as one of the turning points for The United States of America and I want to thank all the Delegates for serving.

MY cc'09 - William Kostric

Pre-story;

It was several months till the big week. Rick Harvey was the NH state coordinator for WTP. Bob had come to Concord and distributed some inspiration. It looked like NH was leading the pack for getting delegates selected, vetted and elected. At the time I had no intention of going, being one who greatly values privacy (anonymity in fact). I was prepared to pitch in from behind the scenes and leave it at that.

The best laid plans came crashing down with the combination of the open carry incident in Portsmouth, along with Harvey's resignation. Any semblance of privacy was lost for me, and as a group, we drifted for quite sometime. Rick had asked me to pick up the mantle which I declined being in the midst of personal melodrama. With only a few weeks left, I spoke to Bob who asked that I fill the State coordinator position which I did and at the behest of a few friends became a delegate. With great help from Bill Domenico and Don Fairchild, we established a single polling location (Thank you Keith Murphy) and put the word out. Mail in ballots were also allowed.

During this time, I was asked quite often what this whole WTP Congress thing was all about. My standard answer was: Bob Schulz and WTP have been working on these lawsuits and petitions for over a decade. I don't know if he ever thought they would be successful at changing things, or was simply building a historical record the entire time. Either way, it is now clear that the value has been documenting the chain of abuses and that something more is required to set things right. That being said, I think the petitions and lawsuits are finished (except for the NCEL) so the question being asked is, "What should a free people do?". Since I only got twenty three votes, it's hardly a mandate from the people of NH. It is however an

opportunity to represent WTP members in NH and help decide how the resources of the Congress and the Foundation should now be channeled. In other words, the members get to decide the future tack of the organization and hopefully, the action plan would attract and inspire new members / partnerships with other liberty organizations.

That's what I had in mind with a particular bent towards getting the membership to take action on a local level. I had no interest in instructions to any federal branch and little faith in action at the state level minus a few standouts. Clearly, others had a different vision which became highly manifest towards the end (although I believe it hampered things throughout) when serious roadblocks were thrown up to what I thought was the entire reason we had come together.

An added bonus of going was that I knew some of the delegates from other states whom I hadn't seen in awhile and there were some others I was looking forward to meeting for the first time. In the end, I felt blessed to have cemented many more valuable friendships than expected. I'm tempted to say that these contacts were the best part of the event but that would be premature as the final value of the CC is yet to be determined. I can say that I expect interactions with certain activists to become a larger part of my life, and for that I'm grateful.

Story;

Base-camp drama and opening ceremony.

It started in cyberspace, and ended with me excusing myself from the opening ceremonies. I believe in freedom of religion. Everyone has a right to believe in, well, whatever. I don't believe anyone has the right to not be offended. I also happen to be very fond of the separation of church and state and while this wasn't a state sanctioned activity, it was meant to be political and, hopefully, have as broad an appeal as



possible. I could say I don't know what motivates people to push their brand of religion on a group which clearly subscribes to a variety of spiritual paths or none at all. I could say that, but I'm pretty sure I do know, although I don't plan to discuss it here as it would be unnecessarily contentious.

What I would like to discuss is the prevailing misinformation spread by some that “all the founding fathers were Christian”. This is clearly an untruth. Those who are deficient in history should read the writings of Thomas Paine (my favorite founder without whom there would likely have been no secession [revolution by definition is an overthrow of the existing power, as the crown was not overthrown, there was no revolution, the thirteen colonies simply seceded from England]). Also see the personal writings of Washington, Jefferson, Allen and others. The original proceedings were opened with prayer and because these men failed to vociferously disapprove, two hundred years later we're still dealing with these misconceptions.

To avoid a repeat of history, I felt it was necessary to vocally object (on basecamp) not because I take personal offense to a meeting being opened with prayer, but so that history will be clear that there was objection to it. To that same end, I include it here and to remove all doubt, I removed myself from the room during those times. I don't even want someone to watch the video two months from now and assume that because I was in the room and didn't condemn, that I endorsed. For the record, I also stand against the pledge of allegiance (Written by a socialist who sold flags for a living. Indivisible? Where were the 14th amendment folks on this one?). On a personal note, I have limited tolerance for pomp, tradition and ceremony.

First Acts.

Picking the officers was prologue to the next two days of inefficiency. The selection of the president quickly turned into

a popularity contest. I don't know how many delegates were clear on exactly what the duties of the president would be or why a certain nominee would be preferable to another based on their ability to preform said unknown duties. I myself was nominated (thanks to the delegate from MA for the vote of confidence) but quickly removed my name from the list knowing that I would kick myself if unable to participate in the writing of civic actions and also based on my limited knowledge of parliamentary procedure.

Many voted for Badnarik because they knew of or liked him. I knew of him, and liked what I knew. Never the less, I voted against him. It was not a vote of no confidence, but exactly the opposite. I strongly felt that he would contribute mightily to the debates and didn't relish losing the opportunity to learn from a luminary. Some suggested a non-delegate be president so that all delegates could preform their proper functions as representatives of their constituents. I concurred as the duties of the president in this case were mostly administrative and I saw no reason to restrict a delegate from contributing directly to the document. There was dissent on this point and I do understand the necessity of having someone of clear conscience to moderate and not steer the congress. Michael did an excellent job of exactly that and while I'm not sure anyone on site would have done a better job as president, I stand by my assertion that the document we produced would have been better with his direct input even if it meant a slightly less competent moderator.

Next order of business, amend the rules regarding laptops. The minute I saw the rule, I began garnering support for change. Turns out the motion was made by someone I had yet to speak to but it helped that a few us who ended up testifying (that's not the right word is it?) had been talking about it. The debate was robust, I felt the decision was sound especially the part where the questions of enforcement and punishment were answered with "honor". Law and order rears its ugly head and gets it bitten off by personal responsibility.

This really turns out to be the opening volley between old school and new school thought patterns (and no, it's not just an age thing). I believe the laptop issue is directly connected to the question of cutting the audio during the committee of the whole, having an executive session at all, and the civic actions. I found that the vocal minority on both sides of the above issues were mostly the same people with few exceptions. Those who were all about complete transparency and civic actions were the free marketers.

Then you have the authoritarian, top down model of existence (which has shown itself to be a failure). It claims that there are some things we're better off not knowing. It's none of our business what happens at Groom Lake, the military knows what's best for us and it's necessary for them to keep some secrets in order to protect us. It's okay for the Pentagon or the Cabinet to meet in secret; they're special people and will save us from ourselves. We don't need to know about CIA black ops and where they spend billions, just let them do their job. The entire idea that somebody knows what's best for someone else or that people just can't handle the truth or at the very least, we need to present a facade of respectability and competence instead of having people see that we are every bit as human as they are. Why, if they see that, they won't respect us as leaders! Yes, that's the point. For the general public to realize that no one is going to save them, that's their own job.

I planned to put this in at the end but I'm putting it right here instead. I had folks from home write me (and I know other delegates did too) opposing all attempts at less than full transparency. There are always reasons to hide things, and they all fall flat. Part of my motivation for producing the Journals is as an apology to those who supported me with their time and money. I hope they feel there is enough honesty from the contributors to atone for having been excluded from any part of the proceedings. Lastly on this point, the parts that were cut were exactly the parts which would have vastly

multiplied viewership and might have even gone viral. The most human aspects which the public would have related to were relegated to the cutting room floor (so to speak). A golden opportunity missed.

Politics.

The money clause. At this point, I hadn't figured out (and apparently I wasn't alone) that the civic actions were to be done the final three days and that we were only supposed to be working on instructions to the fed gov and states. Since civic action was what I went there to do, I began working on that and passed up the opportunity to be on the money clause subcommittee. They came back with Vieira's document unchanged but for spelling corrections which then passed the committee of the whole overwhelmingly to my dismay. I had made up my mind to object for the record when the report was passed to the cc for approval but the opportunity never materialized. In retrospect, my version of instructions to congress regarding money would have been; 1) Repeal legal tender laws 2) Repeal the federal reserve act. The end.

The fun begins. It was my original intent to get an open carry day put into the civic action section of the Second Amendment (2A) subcommittee (sc) but when I saw two pages of lawyer speak being proposed as instructions to congress (I2C) (specifically an offering by Edwin Vieira known as The Power of the Sword, PTS), I changed tack. It was at this point that politics began for me by way of inviting like minded individuals to join the sc (stacking the deck?). The sc was broken up into three sub-subcommittees (ssc) and I made the decision to go with the I2C ssc instead of the Civic Action (CA) ssc. Mistake number one? No doubt. Why did I care what the I2C were? That's not why I came! Why didn't I focus on what I was passionate about? I'd come to regret the decision.

In my absence, Jeff Williams and some others on the C A ssc made a valiant press for language that included open carry.

It failed to pass by a narrow margin. I like to think the outcome would have been altered had I been there to defend it (one more vote for it if nothing else). So, regret number one.

Having abandoned my stated mission of working on civic action, things in the I 2 C ssc were heating up. After heavy debate, we broke with a plan to come back with three versions, the PTS unchanged, an original work by the delegates on the committee and a melding of the two. When the ssc reformed the next day, five versions were presented (instead of three). The PTS, three versions of our original work and a melding. We then voted with the intent to narrow it down to two. Had I been thinking clearly, I would have objected at that point but it never occurred to me until after the voting was almost complete. The three versions of the original work were so close that they only served to split the vote between them. I would have been happy with any of the three.

We had ranked the offerings 1-5 and there was a question of how to tabulate the totals. One method would count those that had the most votes for first or second place. The other method would be to total all counts. The difference would be if a doc got five votes for second place and five votes for fourth place compared to a document which got ten votes for third place, which should win? This remained unresolved due to my contention that having three versions of our original doc unfairly biased the voting towards the PTS regardless of the methodology. That is, if we only had one original it would have been an overwhelming favorite instead of splitting support for it three ways. As this debate dragged on, people began to leave being needed now on other subcommittees. We were down to six delegates and decided to start the selection process over. The ssc chair devised a method whereby we compared each doc to each other doc individually. We settled on one of the originals and the merged document to present to the 2 A sc.

Terry Dodd was the 2 A sc chair as well as the Instructions to the State ssc chair. He had his hands full. I couldn't tell you exactly how long they spent just deciding what the definition of militia should be, but it was quite awhile. We were running short on time and the sc wouldn't be able to debate the two versions as most people were still on their respective ssc's so he sent us back to eliminate one.

At this point, let me state very clearly my objections to the PTS submission;

1) It was written by a lawyer. Granted a brilliant and talented man who has a passion for the constitution but hey, aren't these guys a source of most of the problems we're here discussing? Isn't Harvard and the BAR proof that we never won the war for independence?

2) It was written by someone who chose not to be there. He's popular enough that had he ran for the position, he no doubt would have been elected. For whatever reason, he made the decision to not be there.

3) Do the people want to read, and will they rally around, another legal document? (Whereas section F subsection 2 blah blah)

4) Should we be stamping someone else's work with zero original input from any elected delegate?

5) The first paragraph says "Congress shall... pass a statute...". That's all I needed to read. Aren't too many federal statutes a big part of the problem already? How are you going to cure the problem of too many federal statutes with... another statute. This is equivalent to current efforts to spend our way out of debt (What's the definition of insanity?).

6) Not that we needed to go on but if we did, the paper then calls for the creation of a federal bureaucracy. Here's

some redundancy with a twist. Aren't too many federal bureaucracies a big part of the problem already? How are you going to cure the problem of too many federal bureaucracies with another bureaucracy? This is equivalent to... you get the point.

Summation of objections; Written by a lawyer who chose not to be there with no original input from any delegate calling for congress to pass a statute and create a bureaucracy. Some of the best and brightest activists from all over the country, small government advocates, constitutionalists, all about decentralized power etc and this was the best we could come up with? That's what we spent hundred's of thousands of dollars and traveled tens of thousands of miles to put our stamp on and go home with? Not me. My constituents might have tarred and feathered me. I may have had to jump in the tar myself.

The original work was straight forward, to the point, easy to read, easy to understand and said everything that needed to be said. The only objections to it were

1) Too simple. Yes, two people at least said these words. I'll save a paragraph by not responding to it.

2) What happened to the PTS docs? I'm tempted to write a paragraph here on appeals to authority, self government etc but, I won't.

We're back in the ssc and have to eliminate either the original work or the melded work of the PTS submission with some original stuff worked in. While the melded version may at first blush appear to be a reasonable compromise, it only addressed one of my six objections. I was getting a vibe from some that they would rather put forth the unedited PTS but were 'letting' us add in a few sentences for the sake of appeasement. Oops, I almost left out a critical detail. Right before we reconvened the ssc, Terry had asked that on the

melded version, we highlight the additions.

I can see it's gonna be close and now the salesman comes out. What we're up against here are emotional objections, yes the second has a veneer of logic, but in the end it's emotional (he's an expert, he's a scholar, he's written a book etc [For any who might think those are logical objections, they are not! A logical objection would directly address why one document was better than the other without regard to the author. At no point was there a statement by anyone that the PTS was better on it's face or would be more likely to accomplish what we set out to do. Only appeals to authority.]). What then is called for are emotional pleadings. It does no good to make a logical appeal to an emotional objection nor vice versa.

We go around the circle and everyone has their say. I'm watching closely to see who has their mind made up and who's on the fence. I see at least two critical fence sitters that like the original, but the idea of disregarding the words of the great Vieira just wasn't sitting well with them. My turn comes, I reiterate my disapproval of the melded version based on the positions mentioned. No headway. Time is running out. Gotta think fast...

We've spent all our spare time (ha, spare time) on this for the last two days. No one likes to feel their time has been wasted. No one likes to see their input disregarded. The statement goes; "Do you know why it was asked that we highlight the original sections of the melded document? So that it would be easy to make a motion to strike them." Silence, gears, smoke. Unsaid but understood, if we wanted the unedited PTS document, we could have come back with that in ten minutes. What have we been doing these last two days? The meld was discarded. The original work was presented to the sc which adopted it as part of the report. Victory? Hardly. There's a reason I quit working in sales and it wasn't a shortage of money. It gets worse.



There's a general feeling of relief, accomplishment, job well done. Self congratulations seem to be the order of the hour except for the ssc chair, who is visibly upset, and myself who is feeling a little dirty. He asks to speak with me and I catch up to him in the hall a few minutes later. We take a seat in front of the ice cream shop. He asks if I understand that I had impugned upon the character of Terry Dodd. That I insinuated he had bad intentions for asking that certain areas be highlighted. That this amounted to an insult and what's more, he wasn't there to defend himself.

It's clear to me that the ssc chair is an extremely honorable fellow as demonstrated not only by his concern for the reputation of an almost complete stranger (knight in shining armor rides in to defend the defenseless) but also his concern for me, that I may not have realized I had maligned Terry. I agree with him that it crossed a line. I agree that I don't know what Terry's motivation was as I didn't ask, but it was unfair to presume that his intentions were less than pure.

I agreed with all those things and more but none of it changes the fact that I knew all of this before I said it and I said it anyways because that's what it took to get the job done. Now it's compounding. Doesn't this always happen? Is it going to help to be that honest with him right now? I don't see how. He's already upset. Why make it worse? It's not going to change what's done. It will make any future collaborations less effective. Can this process stand to be less effective? Would Terry even care about this off hand slight? No one but he and I even noticed it. Why didn't I stick with Civic Actions?

We part. He's feeling better, as he should. I'm feeling worse. I head up to the room and shed some tears. Can't say for sure who they're for. No time to think about it now, gotta get to the Orleans room. Gotta post something about our big victory. Ugh! How can I destroy that "William Kostric for Congress" Facebook page? Is it true that you can't compromise principles, you can only abandon them? What was lost? What

was gained? If the ends never justify the means, why would such a comparison matter? I'm not apologizing. It would be disingenuous. I don't want absolution. If there's a price to be paid, I'll pay it.

After this occurrence, I made up my mind that nothing could come out of the event that would be worth repeating this type of action on a personal basis. My new (strategy) was to bounce around to various committees and try to have a positive input without becoming attached to the outcome. I succeeded in a few places and failed in others.

### Odds and Ends

The faithfully execute clause turned out to be a good example of reformed strategy. I felt strongly that if we were going to, in good conscience, claim that this was a constitutional issue of the executive branch failing to uphold the laws of the land, it should be about more than a few statutes dealing exclusively with immigration. I came up with a list of other examples of the executive branch (failing) to faithfully execute the laws mostly dealing with the supreme law of the land as opposed to statutes. They were all taken out in committee. In my previous frame of mind, I would have gone to the caucus and gathered a bunch of folks (and there were plenty) who thought this shouldn't be solely about immigration and put in amendments on the floor once it came back from committee. Instead, I abstained and the congress adopted the report as it was with not so much as a minor change if I recall correctly. Good? Bad? Who knows. All I cared about was being back on track. Refocusing on Civic Actions. I didn't come to write a letter to the president. I didn't come to write a letter to the congress. I didn't come to write a letter to the judiciary. Not petitions nor instructions nor demands. I came to write a plan of action for the people.

Can we get off this immigration thing? Not quite but at least we're off politics. I have to say that I am a proponent of

open borders. I'm a proponent of civil disobedience so it's irrelevant to me if some one crossing the border has, in the words of a colleague, failed to get a hall pass from a corrupt federal government. I refuse to declare a human being "illegal". I believe laws restricting free travel or trade are immoral. I believe that to whatever extent immigration is an actual problem, the meddling of the federal government is directly responsible via the welfare state. I realize that all of these are unsupported blanket assertions but they'll have to stay that way since I'm writing a chapter, not a book.

That movie. Sucked! Fear mongering. It amounted to an updated version of Reefer Madness. Replace black people and marijuana with brown people and cocaine. And, conflating the war on some drugs with immigration is downright disingenuous. If there were zero "illegal immigrants", it wouldn't put a dent in the drug trade (supply and demand, basic economics). Of course if the public wants a product, someone is going to provide it. Of course if you make it impossible to get honest work, people will turn to the gray or black market. Recurring theme, I don't have time to give this subject proper treatment so I'll just say this; It's immoral to lock a human being in a cage for growing a plant in his back yard. I wanted to run down the aisle, grab the mic and say "How many people in this room have used illegal drugs since you've been at this event?" and watch the horror of some as twenty percent of the room raise their hand. The war on some drugs is a war on your neighbors, friends and family. I wanted to ask how they can claim to be a proponent of liberty while denying people the most basic of rights, to decide what they put in their own bodies. I say it's a war on "some drugs" for those who feel "Oh, my drugs are ok, I've got a silly piece of paper from my doctor that says so". Gee whiz.

Pleasant surprise. The largest gathering of older white Christian republican ex-military folks in the country with nary a positive word to say about the war in Iraq. Or Afghanistan for that matter. I had been concerned about neo-con infiltration.

The religious stuff I can deal with but if I had to listen to any pro-war rhetoric, I may have blown a gasket. Granted, much of the opposition was based solely on the lack of a proper declaration of war but I'll take it. It was a great platform from which to reach out to the entire country and garner popular support. Some folks went up to the mic and really impressed me. Based on the speeches, I misjudged some folks and was glad to be proven wrong.

The media. We have to be careful or they'll paint us as x y z. Seriously? It was a given that the mainstream was going to ignore the event entirely and any sound bites that leaked out were going to be negative. I was blown away at the apparent level of concern about how we would be portrayed. If I was concerned about how I might be seen, I wouldn't have gone to begin with. The only chance we had at publicity was something outrageous happening and to that I say, there's no such thing as bad publicity. Oh yeah, the Restore The Republic crew rocked the house!

I heard it said by a delegate that the founders were contrite. Perhaps they were, but the founders had a king. One kneels before a king. One grovels before a king. We have no king and bow down to no man or group of men. We have agreements which have been violated. If anyone needs to show up at the table with a little contrition, it's the federal government. They should bring along an apology for what they've done to our country.

Ends

Civil Disobedience. It was suggested be renamed Civic Actions. One reason, which I happen to agree with, is that the first term implies an obligation to obey. We had an awesome plan. Tiered mass actions guaranteed to be the enforcement measures they were designed to be. It was gutted. I was heart broken. The only reason I came, blown out of the water by a few... (insert nothing here as I don't have anything nice to

say). I would break them down like this, a small group of lawyers and a small group of fear mongers. They totaled less than sixteen people but managed to derail what might have been. Between them, there wasn't a single Civic Action of value they would have agreed to.

The executive session happened. Then a contentious next day. We were close to retaining something after heavy compromises but in the end. Nada. I stood in disbelief that people were whining about open carry and hanging banners because it might be illegal while at the same time, a fair percentage of the room habitually break federal and state drug laws. Complete disconnect. Out of touch. Sad. I wanted to scream, how many of you voted for or liked any Kennedy? Any idea how they made their money? Pay attention. Throwing tea into the harbor was illegal! [Insert pages of quotes from the founders here]

There were claims that these actions violated the patriot act. Guess what? Showing up probably violated the patriot act. That's the whole point. That's why we came together. To stop the abuses, not to cower in fear of them. I understand that there were some folks who are new to the game and still think writing a letter to the editor means something. Or, demonstrating, remonstrating, prostrating, campaigning, voting, etc. I wish them all the luck.

I went with my Thoreau and I left with my Thoreau. I went looking for an answer to the question Bob asked "What would a free people do?". Without passing judgment, I feel the degree to which this question was answered is the degree to which the entire congress was a success or failure. What say you?

Divine providence. Also known as the Mann amendment. Questions. Unanswered as of yet. What can I say... I was unhappy with the way it was passed as well as the content and it closed the lid on any chance of me signing the document.

Truth be told, it was probably too late before the final nail. It seems I first began to go astray (from principle) when I became concerned about being sure the final document was pure enough for me to sign. Had I not been delusional, ok, head in the clouds, I would have known that wasn't possible. I should have resigned myself to that outcome from the beginning and simply focused on contributing as much as I could. To add whatever I had of value to offer. To let the final document be what it was instead of having an idea of what it should be, and attempting to conform it to my vision.

A saving grace would have been line item acceptance. It is not uncommon for people to scratch parts of a contract they disagree with or initial parts they do. I apparently failed miserably in my attempts to convey the importance of this feature. It would have been the ultimate arbiter, don't like it, don't sign it. A free market solution instead of top down agree with us, or don't. The pros outweigh the cons by so much, it's an embarrassment that I fell short on this point.

I returned home and was asked the questions. Ya'll know what they were. My answer to those who sent me is, the country isn't ready for real activism yet. What would a free people do? Exactly what we're doing. As more super activists continue to relocate to NH, I'm afraid (and happy) that the rest of the country may never catch up, in fact, we'll continue to pull further away. Some states are so lost the best advice I could give any liberty lovers in them would be, move. Vote with your feet. There's a long and honored tradition of doing so from the pilgrims fleeing the the tyranny of England, the Quakers relocating to the land of Penn and the Mormons and others continuing west. Galt's Gulch baby! Let the looters cannibalize each other. Stop shielding them from the natural consequences of their corruption. [www.freestateproject.org](http://www.freestateproject.org)

Amy, thanks for everything.

CC2009, In my own words.....  
by Ryan McCain (Louisiana Delegate)  
11/24/09

These are random thoughts and may seem to be all over the map.

I arrived at CC2009 not knowing much about Roberts Rules of Order and even less about what we were really trying to accomplish. Now that I'm home I know more than I ever wanted to know about Roberts Rules of Order but still am not totally clear on what it is we were trying to accomplish.

Bob has been doing amazing work in documenting the violations of our overlords for 10+ years. It was my understanding that we were done “petitioning” the government to fix our problems and we were there to come up with instructions for the citizens can take to restore the power to the people and remove it from Washington.

The first day was an absolute train wreck. No one understood parliamentary procedure and it was apparent. However, as people became more and more familiar with the rules I noticed the wheels of liberty began to turn quicker and quicker.

We wasted 2 days trying to debate ever single issue on the floor of the entire Congress. Once we FINALLY broke into committees to hammer out our resolutions rather than having one huge committee in the form of the entire Congress, things started to go much smoother. It just makes more sense for a small group of 10 or so people to come up with the core resolution then bring it back to the Congress as a whole to shoot holes in it rather than the other way around.

I chaired the Privacy Committee. We had people with a general knowledge of personal privacy and others who were

very knowledgeable in very specific issues (ie; traffic cameras, fusion centers, etc.). We worked late into the night twice and presented a resolution to the Congress that was unanimously passed without debate or even a single amendment.

After the first couple of days, I saw a body of chaos turn into a body of reason. There are exceptions such as Ron Teed from Illinois who left because his amendment to change the word "Creator" to "Almighty God" was voted against. He has since then admitted that he doesn't feel non-Christians have the ability to fight for the cause of liberty and freedom.

Anyways, all was going fairly smoothly until the final day. As we were discussing the civic action resolution. Bob became more involved than he had been in the preceding days of CC2009. The Bush/Bleish resolution had been called to question and the cards went up in the air to vote. It was going to pass by a large margin when Bob took the stand. I'm not sure how he was able to get on the mic but the President allowed him too. As he began to speak you could hear yells of "OUT OF ORDER, OUT OF ORDER." Because it was Bob, I think the President was too willing to let him freely speak. He somehow convinced everyone if they voted against the Bush/Bleish resolution they could vote on his resolution and if they rejected his, we could go back and vote again on the Bush/Bleish resolution. I'm not even getting into the Dodd resolution that was a little less "teethy" than the Bush/Bleish resolution.

I should add here that Sheriff Naysay (PA) did his best to disrupt the process causing Badnarik to get frustrated and steer us off course. IMO, this was straight out of 'Rules for Radicals' and he accomplished his goal.

There is a lot more to this but somehow Bob's resolution ended up being voted on and passing. I can't say if this was intentionally done because Bob didn't like the Bush/Bleish resolution or if Bob truly was concerned we were running out



of time and wanted to get something passed. Either way, it was the wrong thing to do, IMO.

Around this time I made a motion that made sure all documents coming out of CC2009 use the phrase “constitutionally protected rights” and not “constitutional rights” for obvious reasons. It passed overwhelming.

While I was frustrated with Bob's resolution I was still on board to sign my name to the 'Articles of Freedom'. This was until Mr. Mann stepped to the podium while we were REHEARSING THE CLOSING CEREMONY. His amendment called for 5 additions, the most egregious being that we instruct people to call their congressman and the President to issue a resolution for a day of prayer and fasting. Not only was this out of order, but when I objected saying how this would be repugnant with the Constitution I was shouted down by those who can't seem to grasp the bigger picture. The amendment ended up passing but there was no debate and a quorum call wasn't permitted. Because of this I didn't attend the closing ceremony and now refuse to sign the 'Articles of Freedom.' Not only is this repugnant to the Constitution, I can't support a body that would ram through amendments like that at the last minute. How are we any better than our overlords in Washington DC?

In conclusion, CC2009 was one of the best experiences of my life and I hope great things come out of it but I am afraid it further divides the mass of people we are trying to obtain. I look forward to working with John, William, Tona, Catherine, Schaeffer and some of the other young contingent who actually want to make some real changes rather than begging our overlords in Washington to make the changes for us.

Greg Samples

As the Continental Congress 2009 winds down this weekend, I pause to reflect on the 4 days I filled in as an alternate delegate. I left inspired by the knowledge and dedication of my fellow delegates, yet also aware of the daunting task before us.

The Congress, as a representative body of the people of the 50 states, (duly elected by those who did not have too much apathy to pay attention), will result in a series of documents that details and evidences the abuses of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. If Congress is not bound by the Constitution, then the American people are not free, more like well fed animals in cages. If congress can do anything it wants to do, regardless of restrictions laid out clearly in the founding document and the amendments to it over two centuries, then we are no longer a government of the people.

Most Americans have sensed this for a long time, exercising their voting power in elections time after time, yet seeing nothing ever really changing, except the approval ratings of congress creeping lower and lower. But the Congress made it so obvious that the people have other powers as well, elections are just the first bite of the apple.

As you will see, if you pay attention, over the next few months you will learn of the extensive power you do have, and how the genius of the founders anticipated the future tyranny of government officials. Stay tuned.

Thanks William,

Greg Samples - Committee on Foreign Policy and  
the General Welfare

Reflections of Continental Congress 2009  
by Tona Monroe, delegate from Tennessee

On November 11, 2009, I arrived in St. Charles Illinois, uncertain of what we would accomplish, other than documenting our grievances with federal and state governments. I was certain though, that we delegates would form lasting bonds in the cause of freedom.

One of the biggest mistakes that I believe this body made was the adoption of the rule that discussion of constitutional amendments would be ruled out of order. It's not that I believe that the Constitution needs to be radically altered, but that it has already been radically altered by our Supreme Court through interpretation and egregiously ignored by our Congress and President. Therefore, amendments could bring our government back into compliance with its original meaning. A better rule would have been that talk of a Constitutional Convention would be ruled out of order.

I for one wanted to discuss Representative Michele Bachman's HJR 41. It would prohibit the president of the United States from entering into a treaty adopting as legal tender any currency issued by a foreign entity. I had to accept the fact that this rule had been adopted and move forward with the many other issues that needed to be addressed.

It quickly became clear that Robert's Rules of Order was a challenge for many of us. Filled with zeal and valuable ideas, we stumbled around having gratifying discussions but accomplished little for the first few days. Seeing the frustration of this, I took it upon myself to draw up a resolution that would create subcommittees to draft resolutions on each of the agenda items.

After receiving the blessing of some of the delegates sitting near me, I took my resolution to Jeff Lewis, a delegate

from North Carolina. To my surprise, I found that he was writing a resolution that was almost identical to my proposal, but with greater detail. We had no disagreement in developing the structure for resolutions of the agenda issues. My only concern was that his proposal was greater in length, and therefore more apt to be rejected by the body. However, his details were good and I decided to support his plan.

When Jeff and I got to the floor, a motion had already been made by Paul Venable, a delegate from Idaho. At that point, I could see Jeff's frustration because he could only speak to the motion on the floor. I was at the microphone on the other side of the room, so that I would be next to speak, and I tried repeatedly to tell him to make a substitute motion. Obviously, Jeff couldn't read my lips and he sat down after making a few comments.

At that point, the only thing I had in my hand was the resolution I had written; a more concise version of what Jeff had intended to propose. Thus, I proceeded to substitute Paul's motion with mine. After reading a few sentences, Jeff rose from his seat and asked me to wait a minute. He then brought me his resolution and I immediately withdrew mine and offered his to the body. The resolution passed, and the rest is as is often said, history.

From that point on, the body was much more organized; Robert's Rules of Order no longer being a complicated challenge. The body organized into subcommittees where our best work was done. Many fine documents were produced, enumerating the litany of egregious and flagrant violations of our Constitution. These documents and resolutions are the result of our collective knowledge and sacred labor, and they are how I believe posterity will remember the Continental Congress of 2009.

Emotions ran high and low with feelings ranging from fulfilling joy, to heavy hearts. Many statements and

resolutions brought me to my feet to render fervent applause.

My heart sank when Continental Congress failed to adopt John Bush's amendment to encourage people to resist a draft to fight in unconstitutional wars. War should never be an offensive strategy and I pray that all Americans realize that it is not unpatriotic to question the role of our military any more than it is to question the role of our President, Congress or the Courts. A true patriot thoroughly examines everything our government does.

When the Preamble was read, freedom radiated from the body in the same spirit that our founders had when they produced the Declaration of Independence. It was an inspiring moment that reaffirmed my belief that freedom and liberty shall live on forever in the hearts of men and women.

The 16th amendment resolution unified the body resulting in thunderous applause because every delegate in the room knew that a free people always own the fruits of their labor. The preambles of the Declarations and Resolves and the 16th amendment resolution are perhaps the shining moments of Continental Congress 2009, but I encourage all Americans to thoroughly examine the documentation produced by the Congress because there is much to learn and enjoy.

The action plan of Continental Congress 2009 and the Articles of Freedom are currently somewhat vague, but I call upon my fellow Americans to remember the following statement: I AM my brother's keeper. It is our solemn duty to carry forward the torch of freedom now and forevermore.

To all fellow Americans, present and future, please reflect and act upon the work of Continental Congress 2009 along with the work of past and future generations, with the goal of universal freedom for all mankind.

Personal Reflections on Continental Congress 2009  
Rik Humboldt

There is much to reflect upon. We, the People of the United States, are VERY busy and are now inundated with an avalanche of information. Given that we have not become adept at sorting out the priorities of the overwhelming amount of raw input, I shall do my best to limit my observations to what I deem most pertinent.

Allow me to include only this in the way of background information about me personally. I attempted to create a national unity event called LIBERTYSTAND which was meant to occur on September 11th 2002 all across the United States. My vision was to have a continuous line of people from coast to coast (I had no illusions that all the people in that line would actually be holding hands all the way across). My vision was that there would be Mile Leaders (I did mark each mile with a GPS device across the route I selected). The Mile Leaders would have simply called their neighbors and friends and invited them to stand along the route (part of the continuous line) on Sept 11, 2002.

I envisioned a simulcast where the continuous line of people would hear on their radios three pieces of music: Copeland's Fanfare for the Common Man, Lean on Me by Bill Withers, and the Star Spangled banner. Then an announcer would say something like this: "We now know that all across this country, there is a continuous line of people who represent every major religion, and most every nation, ethnicity and cultural heritage that exists in the whole world. We stand here, united in support of the principles that empowered the Founding generation of this great nation... we stand united in support of the Constitution of the United States and of the Constitutions of our respective States. We will not allow any enemy to come between us". This was my

vision.

I skated on rollerblades across the nation in the hopes of generating Mile Leaders. I discovered early on that the major media outlets simply would not cover my invitation. Hence, it was not successful. This was the beginning of my journey of self-discovery and the discovery of how far my country had strayed from it's roots. It was then that I began to take personal responsibility for what was occurring in my country and the world. What could I do to make a difference that would expand personal Liberty and Freedom?

Having failed in my attempt to 'rally' the nation into some kind of unity, I fell into a funk but continued to read and inform myself as to what others were doing to 'secure the blessings of liberty' for themselves and their neighbors. Along the way, I stumbled across the work of the We The People foundation and the work of Robert Schulz, et al. (the et al being those who joined Schulz in his personal quest). I could not help but notice that what he was doing was impeccable legal work... dotting every 'i' and crossing every 't' in a most thorough way. It was unlike anything I had ever seen. It troubled me greatly when I learned about the 'income tax' issue. I certainly did not want to do anything to 'break the law'. At one point, I thought that this was simply the work of a bunch of people who just didn't want to pay their 'fair share' of taxes. I watched in awe and horror when people who were convinced by Schulz's arguments, were arrested, convicted and imprisoned.

I wanted no part in anything that was illegal or immoral. I still feel that way, but I have learned much since I began my own studies. It became obvious to me as I continued my investigations and observations that this was much more than a bunch of disgruntled wholly self-absorbed people. These were people of the highest levels of personal integrity. These were intelligent, reasoned arguments that began to make sense as I looked deeper. Why was the government ignoring

these people? Why was there no official acknowledgement of their petitions?

When I first learned of the Continental Congress 2009 I had some doubts about it even occurring. Then I had some doubts as to its potential effectiveness. I went with friends who introduced me to it (although I had known about Robert Schulz and We The People for some time). I went to a pre-event in Lexington Massachusetts and met some people from Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts as well as my own New Hampshire. I participated to the degree that I could. I threw my hat in the ring by nominating myself for delegate. Having been elected as one of the delegates to represent NH in cc2009 did not dampen my doubts and reservations. I persisted in spite of all those doubts. Days prior to actually departing for St. Charles, Illinois a close friend (and fellow delegate) asked me, "Are you ready for this?" I could only respond with "I think so. I guess I am as qualified as anyone else that I know". It was in this frame of mind that I departed, accompanied by my fellow delegate, William Kostric. We were in touch with our other fellow delegate, Rick Harvey and knew we would all attend.

It came to me in a flash of insight that came some time during the fourth or fifth day of the Congress. I believe that what occurred in St. Charles, Illinois Nov 11 -22, 2009 was truly historic. I believe that Continental Congress 2009 revisits a place where Constitutional Rule of Law first began to go awry. It takes us back to the ruling of Marbury vs. Madison of 1803. This is where the Supreme Court began to claim that it alone had the authority to 'interpret' the Constitution. I believe that that decision was wrong. I believe that the People in those days should have raised their voices LOUDLY against this ruling. They did not. It has taken the People (us), over two hundred years to notice the horrible injury to our Liberty that comes as a result of that ruling. THIS is the historic nature of Continental Congress 2009. There was only one other delegate with whom I discussed my insight that immediately and



resoundingly saw the same thing. That delegate was Danny Bedwell from Mississippi. I will make the point very simply.

In the Preamble to The Constitution of the United States is written: 'We the People of the United States, In Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.'

Notice carefully... "We the People... DO ORDAIN AND ESTABLISH..." What did We the People ordain and establish? '...this Constitution for the United States of America'.

Question: Does the Constitution establish ALL the branches of government? Answer: Yes.

Question: Is the JUDICIARY one of those branches that the PEOPLE did ordain and establish? Answer: Yes.

Therefore, it is obvious that since the Judicial branch is PART of the government that the PEOPLE established... that it is the PEOPLE who have the Right and authority to interpret the whole of the document that they did ordain and establish. It has taken over two hundred years for the People to reclaim their Right and authority to interpret the Constitution. THIS is what makes Continental Congress 2009 groundbreaking and historic.

What might otherwise have been a mere 'rubber stamping' of Robert Shulz's' and We The People foundation's prepackaged agenda items was, I attest to you, transformed into an AUTHENTIC interaction with some of the most dedicated and honorable human beings that it has ever been my pleasure to meet in my sixty-one years on planet Earth. The Continental Congress 2009 began with all of us trembling and wrestling with our shortcomings individually, as well as a

body/group. We might have become actors in a play put on by We the People... and we did become that in PARTS of the event such as the Opening and Closing ceremonies. It is as it should have been. Who else created it? The group who arranged for us to meet ought rightfully to have created the format and set the air and mood. When we got down into the heart of the matter, authentic self-government began to assert itself very early on. It was when we all realized that because 110 plus delegates representing 48 States were in attendance, we would not be simply rubber stamping anything. It was an authentic Continental Congress.

If you go and look at the video archives, you will undoubtedly see how unprepared we were, as a group, to meet the task before us. What became obvious to me right away is that the overwhelming majority of us (myself included) knew little to nothing about parliamentary procedure. Imagine how frustrating it must have been for the vast minority who DID know 'the rules of the game'. Nevertheless, we were patiently dealt with by our hosts. Our first meeting produced a vote for President, Vice President and Secretary. I had never met (and only heard of) Michael Badnarik. There were nominations from the body, 'the body' became the generic term for all of the delegates gathered together, whether as the committee of the whole or as the continental congress. The nominations were genuine self-government. I found myself raising our voting card as my fellow NH delegates directed, as I personally was unacquainted with the qualifications of any of the officers. We left our first meeting with our officers and a parliamentarian elected. Our next order of business was how the 'rules' were to be structured. It was rough going.

The very first and glaring assertion of self-government occurred at the very opening of the first full day. The 'no laptops in the assembly hall' rule placed by our hosts was overwhelmingly overturned. It was argued, debated and voted that we WOULD have laptops in the assembly hall.

It was confusing to me what the purpose of 'the committee of the whole' and 'the continental congress' distinction was all about. It was explained that when we were meeting as the C.O.W (yeah, how's that for an acronym?) that the audio feed of the live webcast was to be silenced. It was when we were deliberating an issue... debating, that we would be the C.O.W. and when it came for the actual voting we would be magically transformed (voluntarily and by vote, of course) into the Continental Congress. I believe it might have been the intention of our hosts to eliminate any acrimonious or vulgarity ridden discourse from the webcast. How was anyone to know just how honorable and civilized we could be, prior to us actually getting into it for a few days? I believe they 'lifted' the audio ban about the fifth day or so.

The only other time that there was a censorship occurrence was when we went into executive session near the end of the Congress. This was the only part of the event that I regret participating in. I believe it was most unnecessary and that there was nothing said in that session that could not have been said openly. The only reason that I allowed myself to participate in it was that it was sold to me as having something to do with our immediate physical/personal danger. It was only during the session that I discovered that it was NOT about an immediate physical danger. I can only say that it is now my opinion that it was not in the slightest bit necessary to have it occur in secret. Nothing, in my opinion, was expressed in that executive session that had not been openly expressed in one way or another during the course of the open Congress.

Early on, I think about into the second or third day, I noticed that there were pieces of paper plopped onto our table prior to being called to order. These came in various forms. Some indicated that they were 'resolutions'. Some indicated that they were 'resolves'. Some were obvious instructional/educational material. I rose and spoke from my table (this was before they began holding to the rule that anyone addressing the body MUST come to a microphone). I

said in a most loud voice that 'there are pieces of paper landing on my table that are unlabeled... that is; they do not even indicate who is responsible for placing them there'. I let everyone know that I was disturbed by not knowing the origin of the material. I could not distinguish (at that time) if they were part of our agenda items or whether they were being generated by fellow delegates on their own initiative. It occurred to me that we did not do an excellent job of managing or tracking the origin of many of these documents. As we went on, the only thing that could be brought before the Congress (or the CTW) HAD to be accompanied by an official written MOTION form, complete with signature. This practice was not held with consistency until some time during the final week of our deliberations. It was VERY confusing, and I now believe, disruptive.

As previously mentioned, one of the biggest stumbling blocks to our overall effectiveness as a body was our ignorance of Robert's Rules of Order. Our President did an amazing balancing act creating a way for as many people as possible to express their contributions... in spite of the 'rules'. It was frustrating and maddening for all of us. Some people allowed themselves to digress into being suspicious that the President and the parliamentarian were bending the rules in favor of 'the power behind the throne'. I was disappointed at every attempt to 'dissemble' our efforts. It is my earnest belief that the MAJORITY of my fellow delegates from all the States, as well as the President, as well as the 'agenda makers'... all operated in the highest degree of personal integrity and honor.

Another area where disruption occurred came from ordinary human pride. This showed up in the congress by way of many being single issue focused. These delegates were determined to let their fellows know that THEY came equipped to share with us THEIR immense knowledge of a particular topic. They set about to convince us that if we would ONLY listen to them, that ALL of the other issues would simply go away. So convincing were they in their delivery that many

delegates took the bait. It caused division and spawned real fear. I was suspicious of any effort that was obviously intended to disrupt and to generate division and or fear. Some of the arguments of the single issue folks actually made some sense and they may deserve our attention at some future date. Yet, it was clear that these people wanted to steal the show.

The body held together in it's collective wisdom, calmer heads did prevail. Some delegates left due to the fears and suspicions raised. It is unfortunate. It did happen. There were two such main disrupting forces. One, was the 'fourteenth amendment' faction. and the other was the 'lawyer' faction. These were the two main such generators of fear and suspicion within the unfolding of the Continental Congress 2009. There was a third minor faction that was what can only be said to be of a 'single issue' focus. This was the Taitz issue of Presidential eligibility. Although it is important, it was my opinion, and the opinion of many of my fellow delegates that this was a topic better left out of the 'limelight'. First off, we simply do not know whether Mr. Obama is a natural born citizen or NOT Since he has not produced a birth certificate. What is egregiously and obviously 'out of order' is the arrogance displayed. If a person has a birth certificate... why not simply SHOW it? The truth is that we do not know if Mr. Obama is qualified to be the President under the rules set out in the Constitution. He may BE. He also might NOT be. We simply do not know. That is unacceptable behavior for a President, for sure, but it should NOT dominate the stage at a Continental Congress tasked with citing MANY other abuses that MANY CONGRESSES and MANY PRESIDENTS and MANY JUDICIARY'S over MANY DECADES, perhaps over two hundred years... have been party to.

There was yet another issue that gave rise to some sense of disharmony in the body and that was the issue of religion. There were many delegates who expressed openly a belief in God. That is their right. They did so, however in ways that were disturbing for some who did not share their EXACT beliefs. There were some resolutions that contained language

and words that to many, were unnecessary.

It was claimed, by some that ALL of the Founding generation were Christians, and therefore WE should follow and echo them. I do not recall anyone pointing out that Jefferson made his own 'version' of the Bible. He scratched out many verses that he found troubling. He created what became known as the Jefferson Bible. I do not recall many pointing out that if it had not been for the writings of Thomas Paine, the American Revolution would almost certainly have failed. Thomas Paine was tossed aside by the very Americans that he had helped succeed in their hour of desperate need. It is recorded that Thomas Paine not only wrote Common Sense, which was distributed and read almost universally throughout all the colonies. It was Common Sense that pulled a people together in a common cause. It was Thomas Paine who wrote the opening lines of The American Crisis on a drumhead just days prior to the most crucial battle of the entire American Revolutionary War, the Battle of Trenton.

Washington had his officers read Paine's words to his remaining (ten percent of his original troop strength) troops just prior to going into combat across the Delaware river, on snowy December 25th evening. It was those words that buoyed the morale of a shattered and demoralized army and fortified them with a resolve known only to desperate and completely committed warriors. The words began... "These are the times that try men's souls." The rest is history. It is clear to me and anyone who knows the whole story that if there were no Thomas Paine, it is highly improbable that there would have been a United States of America. Thomas Paine later wrote The Age of Reason. It was a scathing criticism of religion and the Bible. No one can really say whether or not Thomas Paine believed in a Higher Force. We can say for sure that he asked a lot of uncomfortable questions... and he encouraged others to do the same.

I find it both interesting and a little odd that we are still

dissecting the same stumbling block today. It is evident to me, that the First Amendment was meant to settle the issue. What goes on between a person's ears is his own business. If one is an ardent believer of anything, one is free to express it verbally and in print. What could be clearer? No one is required to give up the practice of their religion, nor is anyone required to believe a certain way. It is simply a matter of FREE CHOICE. I believe that the Founders saw religion as an essential part of society. They saw it as a bulwark for moral behavior. They were also very suspicious of it's power as it related to the kinds of questions one could ask.

One only need look at the story of Copernicus and of Galileo to see the immense power of religion in Europe. One need only look at King Henry VIII and what he did to see the power of religion in society. I believe the Founders meant to divide and separate power whenever and wherever they saw that it was possible to do so. Religion being such an immensely powerful force in society, I believe they wanted it to exist in it's own realm.

That representatives (Congressmen, Presidents, Judges) of the People would be devout in their beliefs, it was expected. That they should mingle their personal individual doctrines with the affairs of State was something that I believe they did NOT want. Surely, If one is devout and a disciple of a creed of belief, that person will bring that with him/her. It is part of who they are as individuals. This is fine and good. It is not also so, that a person could be devout in a DIFFERENT religion and be a GOOD representative of the People? After all, is it not so that even if all Parties were to simply vanish, Good Government could ensue if the representatives simply adhered to the Rulebook of Government... the Constitution? Is it not so that a Good Representative will simply abide by the rules IN the Constitution... regardless of his/her personal religious beliefs?

There is not, nor should there ever be, a Religious Test,

that would determine whether or not a person is fit to be a Representative of the People. A good knowledge of the Constitution ought rather to be the deciding factor. Religion is powerful. Government is powerful. Let the two areas remain aloof from one another. Having said that, I do not find it objectionable for people to pray prior to deliberating government issues... provided that they do not JUDGE others if they do not see things in EXACTLY the same religious doctrinal view. We need one another. Period. I am for Liberty and Freedom for every individual. I am for holding hands one with another in trust and in mutual respect when we are claiming to be standing for Liberty and Justice For All. We need not alienate one another. We must UNITE and get past this stumbling block.

It is a difficult thing for humans to see their own foibles and shortcomings. A Continental Congress is a good place to examine ones self. Two days prior to the subject being brought up, I felt the necessity to put some thoughts to paper regarding a 'preamble' to our body of work. This I did. I did not pass it out to every delegate as I was now seeing how that practice simply took time away from the process. I was learning. When the topic of creating the format for the Articles of Association (now called the Articles of Freedom) came up, I made sure I was on that committee. When that committee began creating language for the Preamble (I had already created my own version) I stated in the committee that since we were tasked with creating the FORMAT that all we need do was to state that there would BE a Preamble. I was not heard.

The committee continued to create language for the 'Preamble'. I stood my ground and wanted at least two points to be made. One, was that of not blaming any President, Congress, or Judiciary for our current state of affairs. I wanted it stated in plain language that We, the People, recognize that WE are responsible for allowing our Representative to not strictly follow and adhere to the Constitution. Two, I wanted it



stated that if things continued as they have, we could not blame anyone but ourselves.

Later, there was a committee formed and specifically tasked with creating the LANGUAGE of a Preamble. I made sure I was on that one as well. I have never had such an experience before. What I experienced was something on the order of a mind meld. The language that came out of the Preamble committee was an authentic give and take and represents the group mind of between ten and fifteen delegates. The committee chairman took it upon himself to create the finished document for submission to the body for deliberation.

What was created was so authentic as to be stunning. It was evident. It was adopted without amendment and passed by a near unanimous vote to applause and amazement by all present. All I can say is this. I experienced myself yielding my will to my fellow committee members as they yielded to one another. You can see the result in the opening lines of the Articles of Freedom. I assure you, this did not come as a piece of prepackaged agenda from We The People foundation nor from the mind of Robert Schulz. Those words were generated in a most generous and authentic manner. It was an extraordinary experience. One I shall not soon forget. These are words coming from hearts and minds joined together with one single focus... LIBERTY triumphing over tyranny.

My final contribution was that I made absolutely sure that some specific language appeared just above the signature line of whatever people will be asked to sign. I did not invent the sentiment. It is an old one that echos through time and is sometimes forgotten. It is a meaning that has been recently adopted by modern thinkers. I still have the motions in written form that I tried at least three different ways to deliver at the podium for consideration. I ran my suggested language to the committee that was deliberating on the alternative 'civic action' resolutions. The language expresses this: ' We, the

undersigned, renounce and condemn the INITIATION of Force. I knew if that were not stated in plain sight above the signature line that I (as well as many others) might well NOT sign. I knew that if it WERE in there, I probably would allow other language to slip by. It is an emphatic statement. I am honored that it survived the deliberations.

I must admit that I believe in the final half of the last day of the Continental Congress 2009 there were gross irregularities made with the rules that we had just begun to learn. I believe that it was stated at one time that we would have a chance to choose between one or the other of the 'Civic Action' instructions. This did not occur. I believe that we WERE manipulated and controlled and that the parliamentary procedures were simply 'suspended'. I myself felt manipulated and lied to at some time during the last half of the last day of the Congress. In retrospect, I have come to see what happened as absolutely NECESSARY for it to have occurred the way that it did. I believe that it was simply a matter of ENDING ON TIME. The Congress DID have an agenda. It DID have a timeline, It DID have a scheduled 'closing ceremony' which simply had to occur 'on time'. It is unfortunate that it had to go down that way.

As a mature adult, I am willing to give the benefit of the doubt to those who most masterfully brought us all together and to our President, Vice-President, Secretary and Parliamentarian. I vote them ALL a resounding vote of CONFIDENCE in their personal HONOR and INTEGRITY when it comes to their adamant and indefatigable stance and devout resolve to Restore our country to the Rule of Law under the Constitution of the United States. That they had to bend some parliamentary procedural rules to get us out of the hotel on time is of much less importance. The fact of the matter is this. We had an AUTHENTIC Continental Congress that has not occurred in over two hundred years.

The fact of the matter is that our work is not finished. The

fact of the matter is this... We have ONLY JUST BEGUN. I remind all who have read these words that we cannot accomplish our vision by ourselves, nor can we attain our desired ends alone. We need AS MANY AMERICANS as possible to look at and review our work. We need to invite them to claim THEIR RIGHT and authority to interpret the Constitution of the United States... as we have. We HAVE begun. We MUST remain UNITED and we must invite further UNITY to our cause.

Journal of Continental Congress 2009  
Delegate Wm. H. Ramsey (NE) - December 1, 2009

Over the past year and a half I watched the once-great economy of the United States begin to crumble before my eyes. I had finally reached a point in my life where I was ready to pursue the American dream in earnest. I had recently gotten married and wanted to buy the house I had been renting for over four years. The timing was all wrong though and it became apparent that the calamity was no small speed bump for the economy. Like so many other Americans I began to search for answers and my research led me to the conclusion that the ills affecting our economy were systemic and gargantuan. I hearkened back to vows and values instilled in me as a U.S. Marine and made the choice to take on the leviathan so that my children and future generations might be spared the suffering that comes from economic collapse. Continental Congress 2009 would prove to be the first concerted effort in our American velvet revolution.

Since childhood I have had an interest in history and government. Over the years I meandered left and right in search of a political formula that truly provides justice for all but the continual disappointment dealt by politicians left me with a sense of apathy. Dr. Ron Paul, however, in his historic campaign for President in 2008, cured me of my apathy. He spoke of the Constitution as the foundation for government power, that it was there to limit the government's power, not to allow it unlimited reach. I already knew this but like so many others was disheartened. We were conditioned to the continuous growth and emerging corruption in the upper reaches of the government. Ron Paul was consistent in his message. The success of his campaign inspired me to become a political activist.

In the first few months of 2009 I was up to my eyeballs in

research. I had a bachelor's degree with a concentration in Political Science, but I had much to learn and much to catch up on. Most of my research was done on the Internet. At some point I discovered We the People Foundation and signed on to receive their newsletter. Continental Congress 2009 was created from this foundation, and naturally I was interested. I volunteered to attend as a delegate, pending election. The organization in my state was very poor and I never heard from anyone within Nebraska concerning Continental Congress. I actually lost track of the group altogether amidst my numerous other projects.

Finally, a message came back saying I was approved as a nominee. At that point I withdrew my nomination because I had not yet campaigned, raised funds, or made arrangements to attend the 12-day event. Soon after, Judith Whitmore, Chief of Staff, called me to ask to reconsider. I did, realizing that it was well worth the time. I would find a way to make it. The election consisted of notarized mail-in ballots, so it was highly inconvenient for supporters to vote. The short time line and a shortage of funds prevented the process from being well publicized. Nonetheless, I was elected as the "1st Delegate" from Nebraska. I pledged to do my best to represent the people of Nebraska whether they were supportive of the liberty movement or not.

Acclimating myself to Continental Congress 2009 was a culture shock similar to Marine Corps boot camp which I experienced years earlier. I didn't know the other 110+ delegates nor any of the staff. I soon found out that we were all bound by our common goal. We became fast friends. Many of us had a sense that the nature of the event made it possible that we would never come home, I might never see my wife and kids again. It seemed a great risk, and we, the delegates, will forever live with the memory of that collective dread, yet also with the positive feeling that God was present and protective.

My experience over the past year showed that the liberty movement was generally initiated by libertarians, but soon adopted by overwhelming numbers of conservatives. A case in point is the “tea parties”. Libertarians would consider overseas wars of choice an integral part of the unjustifiable big government welfare-warfare state - and would protest the war along with the taxes that pay for wars. Conservatives seem to be less likely to speak out against the wars, perhaps out of respect for military service. Similarly, I had observed some trends within the liberty-conservative movement that I found to be distasteful, particularly, what I felt was overemphasis on the issue of Barack Obamas' birth certificate and anti-immigrant sentiments. I also felt that it was important to oppose any calls for violence (none were made). If I had an agenda going into Continental Congress, it was to keep the outcome of Continental Congress palatable to as many Americans as possible and to adhere to peaceful libertarian principles.

The first two days were chaotic due to the size of the body. Most discussion was brought forth in the “Committee of the Whole,” an informal gathering of the Congress. Many hours were wasted trying to hammer out better procedures than the general agenda provided. Robert's Rules were used. While being effective in sorting out where we were in the proceedings, they were also time-consuming. I believe processes like Robert's Rules are a natural part of government - a necessary inefficiency, just like government itself.

On the first night, Schaeffer Cox of Alaska called for the formation of a caucus within the larger group. The “People's Action Caucus” would focus on the civic actions that the Congress would recommend to the people. Its mission statement was “Arming the People with recommendations for local action that are not contingent upon government cooperation so they can exercise their inherent right to be free.” The group tackled the issues of the following day: 2nd Amendment and the Money Clause.

Cox split the group into two units and I quickly volunteered to work on the money sub-committee. I was chosen as the chair for the night. With the help of Jeanne Golrick (MA), J.D. Shultis (SD), Rick Humboldt (NH), and a few others, we were able to come out with a short, clear statement to offer the people a nudge in the right direction to escape from unwarranted monetary control over their lives. We wrote the statement short and without too much specificity, because it would have to be up to activists in the localities to do the real work. The next morning, our money civic action was quickly passed on the floor. I believe it set the tone for much of the work of the rest of the days because it became clear that small groups could focus on issues and turn out effective resolutions that might have otherwise used up several hours on the floor. Sub-committees were soon created to tackle each of the issues.

Schaeffer Cox, John Bush (TX), and Catherine Bleish (MO) were youngsters in their twenties who were all extremely gifted and highly charismatic. They and I, along with Kevin Patrick (WV), Ryan McCain (LA), and a few others, soon formed our own little social group, the “Liberty Kids”. It was very interesting to see that factions formed, even in a body with so short a life-span and so focused in purpose. The Founding Fathers warned about factions, or parties, but we had quickly developed them. Most of our differences were not based on ideology, though. It was more a case of target audience saleability. The older, more traditional conservative delegates simply had different constituencies.

I had focused most of my research in the months leading up to Continental Congress on the money issue and foreign policy. I found lectures on other topics very informative. Experts spoke to us about the Constitutionality of current government policies and related the cases to Mr. Schulz' petitions for redress. It would have been nice to hear opposing points-of-view on each of the subjects so that the delegates could make more educated decisions. The time crunch made

that impossible, however.

Despite my reservations, some of the less palatable issues were taken up. Article II Eligibility was lectured on, discussed, and debated. Two separate resolutions were brought forth, one that focused on candidates' eligibility and one that focused on President Obama's eligibility. The first resolution was pretty straightforward and I supported it, but the second one would only marginalize our work, in my opinion. The Faithfully Execute Clause was also brought forth. It involved the lack of enforcement of laws by the executive branch of the government. In particular, the petition for redress called into question the lack of enforcement on our Southern border. It is a very complicated situation, though, being intertwined with prohibition laws, free-trade agreements, and human rights. The unfortunate side effect of the whole issue is the casting of immigrants, particularly Mexicans, in a negative light. It is my opinion that we should move beyond the so-called "immigration problem" per se, and instead attack the root issues of prohibition and not-so-free trade fiascoes.

The Fourteenth Amendment was also brought forth as a resolution. It was not on the original agenda because it had not been petitioned by Mr. Schulz, but a handful of delegates asked to have it considered. It was sent to a sub-committee and later brought before the floor for discussion, but was eventually tabled until a later Congress. The issue is very complicated and I had never even heard of it in terms of Constitutionality before. The small group that took it to committee were dedicated on pushing it through. Fortunately, it was denied; unfortunately, we lost a couple good delegates because it was denied.

The second-to-last day brought us to the most important work - the civic actions. I was on the Civic Action Committee which I felt went hand-in-hand with the People's Action Caucus. It was my understanding that the whole purpose of Continental Congress was to give suggestions to the people to



be able to escape from the encroaching tyranny. The committee broke into three groups. The first group, headed by William Reil (PA), wanted nothing other than to push for the Sheriff Program. The second group was focused on compiling the various civic actions already devised in other committees into one list. The third group was led by Stan Jones (MT) though the bulk of the plan was created by John Bush. I was in the third group. Bush's "Tiered Approach" would set increasingly aggressive, coordinated actions to be conducted by signatories of the Articles of Freedom, all based on numerical milestones of signatures to date. Sadly, when the civic actions reached the floor, the Congress was overcome with FEAR. The language of the Tiered Approach was toned down several times. Reil tried over-and-over to block anything but his Sheriff Program. Discussion got more and more heated to the point that we had to go into "executive session" to block out the media.

We resumed the debate on the final day, and the fear again overtook the discussion. All the civic actions were finally scrapped for a very vague and short statement that was substitute-amended by Mr. Schulz. Que sera, sera. I was disappointed that we dropped the strong, concrete actions introduced by Mr. Bush. Yet in the context of the overall document, Mr. Schulz' civic action would be easier for people to commit to.

Continental Congress 2009 was about to come to a close, and I was mostly satisfied with the outcome of our work. The documents we wrote were very solid and had the potential to become timeless. We ran through the closing ceremony once and then had a few minutes to spare before the final ceremony. A few minor resolutions were introduced for rubber-stamping - ok, no problem. Then Ronald Mann (ID) introduced the Divine Providence Resolution and pushed it through with no debate, no opportunity to bring amendments, and despite the fact that it was defeated earlier after being attached to another resolution it sailed through. I was immediately and

absolutely shocked! The intent was good, but the language and lack of debate were totally contrary to the rest of the work we had done, and it was a clear violation of my understanding of the separation of Church and State. I simply couldn't agree with the part that directed the government to call for a day of fasting and prayer. I had never fasted up to that point in my life, how dare I expect to have the government call for such a thing?

Continental Congress ended but the debate rages on. The final version of the Articles of Freedom is not released yet. It is my hope that the Divine Providence Resolution be trimmed down and set aside as an appendix rather than as part of the signatory pledge and civic action. It is my hope that somehow the birth certificate resolution be lost in the shuffle and left out. It is my hope that our work will impact the country in a positive way rather than divide us and marginalize the Patriots. I believe the work will inspire millions either way. Regardless, I will always be a patriot in defense of liberty and in defiance of tyranny, so help me, God.

William H. Ramsey  
Omaha, Nebraska  
December 1, 2009

David Justice

My experience at the Continental Congress felt like being reunited with long lost relatives at a family reunion. Although I had never met most of these people, the sensation that I did know these people was present always. The overall encounter seemed all too familiar. It had a *deja vu* quality, a back-to-back parade of memories. Did I dream this? I spent the entire time challenging my memory, wondering when and where in my life I'd had a similar experience.

The only comparable experience occurred in Estes Park, Colorado, in or about the fall of 1992. Sammy Weaver, 14, had been fatally shot in the back at his home near Ruby Ridge, Idaho, while running away from a couple of trespassers. His mother, Sara, was murdered standing at her front door. She was holding her baby in her arms, holding the door to let her husband Randy into the house to escape flying bullets. Randy and his daughters were later awarded monetary damages by a jury who found the BATF liable for their abuse.

Long before the trial, just shortly after the Idaho dust had settled, a conference was called in Colorado. One hundred and fifty-three men attended. The concern we addressed: What are a free people to do? Like the recent Continental Congress, we, too, broke up into committees, with debate, conversation and reports. At the end of the conference we adopted a written resolution and took an oath, pledging our lives, fortune, and sacred honor to support and defend it.

What did the resolution say? I wish I had a copy I could quote. I suppose one day it will surface. I hope so for posterity's sake. Essentially it said, "We, being filled with righteous indignation, condemn the attack of an American family at Ruby Ridge Idaho, and that should the government again attack an American family, we will insert ourselves,

unarmed, between the assailant and the American family, risking our own lives to call America's attention to the matter and cause a peaceful outcome to the circumstance."

Shortly after the Estes Park Conference came the assault on the Branch Davidian Church near Waco. Knowing there would be hundreds, if not thousands of men ready to perform the "insertion resolution," I grabbed a friend and traveled south. How disappointed I was to find that the insertion was postponed for lack of either courage, or interest.

Five of us showed up at the designated staging area, a Taco Bell parking lot a few miles from the scene. I later learned that others not involved with the Estes Park event also had arrived, prepared to take a stand. Due to a lack of communication, we did not meet the others until a few days later, and this only because we began an ongoing conversation with a local talk show radio personality. Gary Hunt from Florida assumed the leadership of the effort. History records that we were unsuccessful in our efforts. We abandoned the idea of an insertion after a couple of days when less than ten men honored their Estes Park pledge. But this missive is not about Waco. It is about St Charles ... to which I now return.

From the experience related above, I suppose my sense of deja vu had a possible origin. But it seemed that there were way too many familiar faces and personalities at the Congress at St. Charles, people I had never met. Who were these people? I had conversations with several who I was sure I knew, while simultaneously being sure I didn't know. I entertained the story that maybe I had known them in a previous life, or that maybe I had dreamed about this event before getting here. I know this sounds weird, but that was my experience.

Days for me began at 6 am and ended at 2 am, a few times as late as 3 to 4 am. Every morning upon awakening, I couldn't wait to rejoin the conversation. My only regret was that there were not four or five of me to be involved in all the

conversations each subcommittee was having. Every night when I went to bed, I did so only because I would be worthless without sleep.

When I stood in front of the elevator awaiting a ride to the lobby - my room was on the 14th floor - I would have the eerie sensation that the building was swaying. It was a lightheaded, but not dizzy, feeling, akin to walking on air. I felt this sensation from time to time when I was standing in different parts of the conference center as well. In fact, this sensation was present quite often, which is why I mention it at all. I am sure tiredness may have contributed, but the sensation was present from Day One. I do wonder if anyone else experienced this.

I was privileged to sit on quite a number of committees. I was thrilled to contribute by writing, giving input on the use of words, and structuring ideas and sentences that appeared in the final committee reports, which ended up in the work product of the Continental Congress: the Articles of Freedom. The name "Articles of Freedom" was chosen in lieu of the title "Articles of Association" because a few, uncomfortable about the implied corporate overtones of the phrase, adamantly opposed the latter term. I think these few likely did not realize that at the first Continental Congress, the findings and conclusions were compiled into a document entitled: Articles of Association.

Among my several highlights, delivering George Washington's farewell address to the Delegates was most humbling. Judith Whitmore, one of the primary organizers of the Continental Congress, asked me on Saturday if I would be up to that challenge for Monday morning. To my knowledge Judith had never heard me speak, let alone deliver a speech, so her confidence in my abilities surprised me. I gladly accepted the challenge. We kept the secret so well, no one knew it was coming. The Delegates were only told there would be a surprise guest speaking on foreign policy. I read through

the speech silently once, rehearsed it twice out loud, once by myself, and once with Jan Graber, my assigned coach and an amazing personality.

Introduced as George Washington, I took the stage. Before giving the speech I bowed to the delegates offering my deep respect. (like John Adams to King George in the John Adams TV mini-series). I got through the speech all right though I was embarrassed when I mispronounced the word "pernicious," but later was told that because of Washington's bad teeth and inability to speak well, I was right in character. When I finished, Judith thanked me and then asked if I would be willing to answer questions. Yea right! I told the audience to "take it easy on this old man." After answering five or six relatively simple questions in what I believe to be George Washington's fashion, I felt relieved to get off the stage.

All in all, I will cherish my experience at the Continental Congress all the days of the rest of my life. I did not want the experience to end. I consider the Continental Congress attendees, whether delegates, support staff, or mere spectators, as America's true leaders. I felt at home in this group of activists, lawyers, carpenters, paralegals, electricians, retired military, both officers and enlisted, writers, talk show personalities, mechanics, ex-senators and ex-government agents and employees. Men and women were present who had been in constitutional activism for 30, even 40 years. A few were literally just getting their first exposure to the issues. We were there to talk about specific constitutional violations by the Federal Government. We were there to talk about hot potatoes that very few have the courage to talk about openly for fear of being labeled.

We were there to discuss a means by which America can be thrown a life preserver. The Continental Congress 2009 was a great first attempt, an excellent dress rehearsal. I do, with great anticipation, look forward to the main performance.

James Dowling.  
TUEBOR! - A Delegate's View of Continental Congress 2009  
November 10, 2009

Tomorrow, elected Delegates from every State, will assemble in St. Charles Illinois to convene as "Continental Congress 2009", for a specific purpose: To DEFEND (not amend) the U.S. Constitution.

Continental Congress 2009 will gather in response to continuing abuses against We The People of the United States by our servant government, including (but not limited to) the following:

- 1) Ever increasing abuse, disregard, and violation of the solemn Oath of Office;
- 2) Abuses against and overreaching of the defined constitutional limitations on government;
- 3) Abuses and infringements against the unalienable rights of We the People;
- 4) Willful negligence in failing to fully protect the security of our people, our national and territorial border sovereignty and our property;
- 5) Endless entanglement in undeclared wars and hostilities;
- 6) Fiscal malfeasance placing us and our posterity in permanent economic peril;
- 7) Failure to constrain and define jurisprudential judgments strictly in accordance with the proscriptions of the Constitution.

Continental Congress 2009 Delegates will convene daily from November 11 - 21, to consider these matters, to determine appropriate instructions to the government to return to compliance within the framework of the Constitution, and to recommend (if warranted) appropriate non-violent civil actions to this nation's sovereign, We the People, for motivating the government to adhere to the U.S. Constitution.

November 11, 2009

Today we had elections for Continental Congress 2009 President (Michael Badnarik - TX), and Vice President (Daniel Gonzales - FL). Then we had dinner, followed by a very patriotic opening ceremony, which included parading of all the state flags, prayers (including the first invocation at the First Continental Congress, 1774...very inspiring), and singing our National Anthem (3 verses), a patriotic hymn, and our National Hymn.

Later, I did check and see they were live streaming the opening ceremony on the home page of Continental Congress 2009 ( [www.givemeliberty.org](http://www.givemeliberty.org) ). You might be able to view it, or see us in daily action... I'm guessing you'll be able to see something there each day.

I can see a mindset coming together among us delegates, that we want to produce action, not mere words, and also that whatever we do will be meaningless and hollow unless this cause is taken to heart and implemented by The People . You. The moment of dedication to the causes of liberty & freedom is NOW. This is long term resolve, come whatever trials and hardships must be faced. Freedom is not free, and our beloved Constitution cannot defend itself.

The Delegates on their own are talking in earnest with each other in informal round tables... in lobbies, lounges, and



even the "business center" (computer/copier room for resort guests). Good, focused talk about various topics...all focused on how to come forth with resolutions that have teeth. Not asking the government (federal or states), not suggesting, but rather, INSTRUCTING them to comply with certain actions by certain times. These are the impetus of the various informal discussions and debates, so when we are assembled in the Committee of the Whole or otherwise, well constructed motions can be put forward that will lead to precise resolutions and calls to specific civic actions.

There are so many errant modes of operation in our government, it seems almost overwhelming. One key theme in several of the informal discussions I've observed seems to be our support for the states to prioritize their push to reclaim their rightful state sovereignty in accordance with the 10th Amendment. Several key issues hinge on the states assuming their role in providing counter and balance to the actions of federal encroachments. The states need to reestablish unequivocally where the powers of the federal government end. The state's sovereignty bills are a start.

November 13, 2009

The Continental Congress 2009 has been very active in the last two days, spending long hours discussing and deliberating on a wide variety of issues related to defending the Constitution.

While progress had been slow, even laborious, the first 2 days, some changes were adopted in our session format that have improved our ability to progress more steadily.

First, we have established several subcommittees to work independently in gathering input, and developing resolutions to be brought before the Congress for consideration. The committees are focused on several elements, including the various "monetary clauses" of the Constitution, the Right of

Redress of Grievances, Second Amendment issues, and others.

With the committees primary meeting times taking place in the late afternoon, evening, and early morning hours, more time has become available for general floor discussion and debate. The committees form their reports and/or resolutions through the night, and are able to present them as sound, well-thought resolutions to the Congress session in a day or two. In addition to having more time for voicing floor arguments and opinions while assembled as the Committee of the Whole (entire body in less-formal mode), the Congress has been able to have presentations by acknowledged experts in various subjects related to the interpretations and/or abuses of Constitutional concepts.

Yesterday, Mark Lind, recognized expert on the application of the First Amendment in the U.S. courts, and author of, "Rush to Judgment", presented information to this Congress about how the First Amendment Rights have largely been dismissed in federal courts for "lack of standing" (even though the Rights have been understood historically to be an individually held right from before the writing of the Magna Carta).

Today, presentations were heard on various aspects of the Second Amendment. Documents submitted through the Virginia Delegation by Dr. Edwin Vieira were presented for our consideration. The Congress has taken formal steps toward action and will soon consider adopting these and other documents, developing them into formal resolutions and perhaps Instructions to the U.S. Congress, the leadership of each legislature body in the several states, each state governor, and possibly to others including every County Sheriff.

A second presentation regarding the Second Amendment included two short films on the background history and present-day application of the Amendment, and a rousing speech by Ralph Connor, former Mayor of Maywood (IL), and

Chicago regional leader of the organization, "Congress of Racial Equality" (C.O.R.E.). Mr. Connor spoke of how pre-meditated "gun control" in our nation's urban centers is effectively removing the law-abiding citizen's ability to defend their family and themselves from the "narco-culture" rampant in those places.

So far, most Continental Congress 2009 Delegates are experiencing very long work days, with formal Congress sessions beginning at 8:00 a.m., and continuing until 9:00 p.m., to be followed by committee work-sessions and informal group discussions, often until 2:00 a.m. or later. The process was slow and cumbersome until today, but we are pleased with the changes we've made, and can already see an improvement in our progress.

November 19, 2009

Over the last several days, Continental Congress 2009 has formed itself into approximately 18 committees assigned to determine in what ways the Federal and State governments have ignored or are abusing the limitations, and requirements, of various parts of the U.S. Constitution.

Committees have been organized in the areas of Constitutional Governance, First Amendment, Public Debt, War Powers Clauses, General Welfare, Sovereignty, Property, Money, Second Amendment, Education, and others. Each Committee has focused on three areas for input into it's final report. Each report to the Continental Congress includes: Instructions to the Federal Government (all three branches), Instructions to the State Governments, and Civic Action Recommendations to The People.

The Instructions to the Federal Government, and to the state governments are a listing of the specific areas where the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the federal government and the state(s) are not in compliance with the

requirements of the U.S. Constitution. Any deviation beyond or outside of what is specified in the Constitution is an abuse against the liberties of the people. The Constitution was written as the Supreme Law of the Land by our nation's founders to keep government within specific limitations so that the liberty of the people could flourish and be secure. Whenever government grows, liberty shrinks. When government ignores the limits given in the Constitution, the freedom of the people is in danger.

But governments NEVER stop eroding the liberties and freedoms of the people, if the people don't oversee their government's actions. Around the world, and in international associations like the U.N. and NATO, it is a king or government or council that rules everything...but in America it is different...in America the ruler is We the People, the citizens of our nation. We say how we want to be served by our government - not ruled by it. We are the ruler, and we acknowledge that only God Almighty is above us. Our government in America was created by us, to serve us. It was designed to be small, efficient and affordable, easy to access and oversee, and to be allowed only the duties and powers we specifically give to it in our Constitution.

The only way Government is kept to its correct size and functions is if We the People don't ignore what it is doing. For a long time we have mostly ignored it, and now it has become a danger to the people. It takes more and more of our resources and properties...to waste in ways not allowed by our Constitution.

Continental Congress 2009 is listing the ways our government branches are disobeying the U.S. Constitution - the ways they are stealing your individual rights, freedoms and liberties. Continental Congress is making a list of Instructions to the Federal Government branches and the states of what they must do to return to the kind of government required by our Constitution...the only kind of government allowed in

America.

We will give them a time table for compliance, so they understand that their violation of your rights, freedoms and liberties will no longer be tolerated, and that they are expected to make the changes by a certain time.

And, if they do not make the changes demanded by the U.S. Constitution, then We the People of this nation will take recommended non-violent Civic Actions to achieve those changes.

Will the government return to honoring the laws of our Constitution? We don't know for sure, but it is doubtful they will - unless each person decides that it is time to save the freedoms and liberties protected for us in our Constitution. If we dedicate ourselves to this goal, our freedoms and liberties will stay, and America will flourish and prosper again.

If we do not, the torch of freedom will end in America and the world. Our Constitution will be lost, forever. Our nation will die. This may be our last chance to keep what was given to us as our freedom and liberty in this nation. Only God's blessings and our dedication to this cause can help us. Freedom has never been free.

Please pray for America, and prepare yourselves and others to fulfill the recommendations soon to come from the Continental Congress, to return American government to The People, as stated in the words of the Constitution.

God blesses America.

James Dowling, Delegate (MI)

Ed Vallejo

Second day of December, Two-Thousand and Nine

It is only upon reflection that I am able to pen these lines, and pen them I will, even though I have more convenient mediums of recording my thoughts. There's something about composing with one's own hand that aids in the transfer of mind to paper, but I have yet to figure it out. At the time, I was not aware of my approaching participation in what I see in hindsight as the next Grand Vignette in the Opera that is my life. Up until then, I had only experienced these portions of the play as chapters in the book of Ed - never seeing any real connection to the 'grand scheme of things'. Not even throughout the Ron Paul campaign did I feel a mark or even a dent in 'history', and I was one who went all-out in a game that couldn't be won; to change the System from within the System. But now, holding the first and only signed copy of The Articles of Freedom in my own hands, knowing what it took to be here, right now... all the sacrifice... the pain, and sorrow... Bob in a hunger strike... I can't stop the tears.

It's so easy to fool oneself. I know - I did it for years. When I see others do things that I went through personal HELL to unlearn, it becomes Badnarikly obvious (inside joke there for you people in the year 2525) that they are on the wrong track. I've made plenty of mistakes in my life, and I'm one of those who really doesn't like learning the same lesson twice. I have a good memory and a low tolerance for pain.

I make no secret of not having a drink of alcohol since March Twenty-Second of Nineteen Eighty-Three. I think it important that my fellows know I have a Program for Living that requires rigorous honesty, and eventually gave me the ability, among other things, to intuitively know how to handle situations that once baffled me. Not every man can say that.

Few have I seen that display the rare talent of actually contemplating what they are about to say in response to a question (instead of just spewing out some preconceived dogma or the latest soundbite). Dr Mary Ruwart immediately comes to mind. We sure could have used people of her caliber to attend the Continental Congress!

I am grateful that seventy-five percent of the Delegates had sufficient knowledge to make The Articles of Freedom what they are: a historical document that will go down in the books as the prime motivating factor in the Second American Revolution - the one that Restored the Constitutional Republic by the demand of the People, and appointed Guardians for its maintenance. It's that other 25 percent we could have done without.

I'm sure there are some who will rail on about perceived injustices, and won't sign on for this reason or that. Their journal entries will fill volumes with nit-picking intricacies that will only cloud the real issues for the common person, who this document happens to be for!

I addressed the meat of the problem at the Congress, and I would be remiss were I not to reiterate: Never Sacrifice Principle For Power. I pointed it out every time I witnessed it, no matter what anyone thought. It's a shame that I had to do it so many times in eleven days, but to do any less would be a travesty to them as well as myself, my God, and those that sent me with their votes.

I've lived a life of lies and deceit, and have striven for decades since to make myself closer to what I believe my Maker intends me to be - a Just Man, free to bow to whom or what I choose - if at all; or to follow the whim of my conscience, so long as I do not negate the rights of others. The long road of the school of hard knocks and serious work due to necessity had prepared me for everything I had done leading up to attending the Congress.

My faith sustained me in my participations and contributions to the process and the final work product. The hardest part I believe is yet to come - the Firestorm that will ignite once the Articles hit the hands of every American that knows something is wrong, but lack a basic understanding of the simple difference between a right and a privilege.

For eleven days, people from all walks of life came together in a tucked-away place called St. Charles, Illinois (about thirty miles West of Chicago), to put their heads together and right some of the wrongs that have come to bear on America. I am honored to have been a part of that experience. Friendships were created and alliances were formed that will continue to be the source of a Worldwide Network of individuals that believe in the Power of the Sovereign and how change begins from within.

The more I change me, the more I change the world. The more I share knowledge, the more I help my fellows to understand what they need to see to want to effect the changes that need to be made for the People of the Future - Our Posterity - to be secure in their rights to make their OWN decisions in life, and not to be dragged down by a tyrannical, oppressive, servant government determined to micromanage every action within the scope of its assumed authority - outside the boundaries set forth in the United States Constitution.

The Articles of Freedom can empower every man, woman, and child. They can provide a basis for understanding the underlying principles that are required to express Liberty, with an eye towards that elusive Freedom which all who draw breath yearn for in their heart of hearts. But in most cases, it will require assistance; the support of one's peers, and a knowledgeable person that can calmly and rationally guide individuals of the General Public through the material and answer questions without disturbing the Domestic Tranquility.



Be that person. Your time is at hand. Answer the call. The Redcoats are HERE!

Ed Vallejo Arizona Delegate/State Coordinator Vice-Chair -  
Technology/Website Committee Continental Congress 2009