Volume I: Issue 12

The BEACON OF LIBERTY

A Structured Curriculum of Constitutional Study

Clauses Discussed:
- Article I, Section 3, Clauses 3-7

Concepts Discussed:
- Senate Officers
- Impeachment

Article I, Section 3, Clause 3 of the Constitution outlines the minimum qualifications necessary for a person to become a *Senator*:

> "No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

These qualifications are similar to those found in Section 2, Clause 2; the qualifications necessary to become a *Representative*. The qualifications are more stringent for Senators than for Representatives, with the person qualifying for a Senate seat needing to be five years *older* and two years *longer* a Citizen. No other issues are present in this Clause which were not covered under Section 2 (discussed in B.O.L. I:5).

Article I, Section 3, Clause 4 directs that:

> "The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided."

Most Americans are well aware of the doctrine of the separation of powers between the three branches of government. Here, the Vice President of the United States — the second in the line of command at the *Executive* Branch — is the President of the Senate (a division of the *Legislative* Branch).

The office of the Vice President was not officially proposed until near the end of the constitutional convention. As initially proposed, the President of the Senate would **not** have been of the executive branch (nor would the Senate President even have been pre-determined).

On Monday, August 6, 1787, a report from the Committee of Detail[1] was delivered to the convention delegates. The report provided an early blueprint for the Constitution based upon the 23 Resolves which had been agreed to thus far by the convention delegates. In **Article V, Section 4** of the **preliminary format**[2] of the forming constitution, the committee proposed:

> "The Senate shall chuse its own President and other officers."

The convention delegates reviewed this section on Thursday, August 9th. The section (as proposed) was agreed to by the convention delegates, as noted by James Madison in his notes of the convention, "nem. con." (short for *nemine contradicente*, Latin for "no one contradicting", i.e., unanimously). It was the unanimous opinion of the States voting on August 9th that the Senate be allowed to choose its own President.

Regardless of how the delegates initially proposed for the Senate President to be chosen, a later committee (the "Committee of Eleven")[3] revisited the issue near the end of the convention.

The August 31st Committee issued their **Resolve Number 6** on Tuesday, September 4th that **Article X** of the August 6th Committee Report be modified by adding a third section. **Section 3** stated:

---

1. This Committee of Detail was created on July 23, 1787 to consist of five members to "prepare & report a Constitution conformable thereto." The following day, John Rutledge (South Carolina), Edmund Randolph (Virginia), Nathaniel Gorham (Massachusetts), Oliver Elseworth (Connecticut), and James Wilson (Pennsylvania) were chosen to the committee.

2. The Article and Section numbers of any preliminary plan do not coincide with those of the final Constitution.

Distributed by: Foundation For Liberty.org
1500 Highway 2
Leavenworth, WA 98826

www.FoundationForLiberty.org
Copyright 2002, 2005 by Beacon of Liberty, LLC.
www.BeaconofLiberty.org

"The vice-president shall be the *ex officio* President of the Senate, except when they sit to try the impeachment of the President, in which case the Chief Justice shall preside, and excepting also when he shall exercise the powers and duties of the President, in which case & in case of his absence, the Senate shall chuse a President pro tempore — The vice President when acting as President of the Senate shall not have a vote unless the House be equally divided."

This September 4th proposal is the first express mention of the existence of a *Vice President*.[4]

That the Vice President be the *ex officio* President of the Senate means that the President of the Senate would not be directly-chosen position (*ex officio* means one holds the specified office [President of the Senate] by virtue of some other factor [here, V-P of the U.S.]).

---

3. This Committee of Eleven (of August 31, 1787) was committed for the express purpose of reviewing "such parts of the Constitution as have been postponed, and such parts of Reports as have not been acted on" , and consisted of "one delegate from each State." In August, only 11 States were yet represented in the convention.

Rhode Island did not ever send any delegates to the convention.

New York was only represented with the necessary two or more delegates through July 10th. New York made no more votes after this date through the rest of the convention (through to September 17, 1787), though New York delegate Alexander Hamilton continued to meet (he commented on issues, proposed motions, and even signed the engrossed Constitution).

Nicholas Gilman (New Hampshire), Rufus King (Massachusetts), Roger Sherman (Connecticut), David Brearly (New Jersey), Gouverneur Morris (Pennsylvania), John Dickinson (Delaware), Daniel Carroll (Maryland), James Madison (Virginia), Hugh Williamson (North Carolina), Pierce Butler (South Carolina), & Abraham Baldwin (Georgia) were chosen to this August 31st committee.

Earlier "Committees of Eleven" of "one delegate from each State" consisted of different delegates and even *different States*. While New York attended the convention from its effective start date of May 25, 1787, only to be absent after July 10th, New Hampshire did not first attend until July 23rd.

Thus, for example, the July 2nd Committee of Eleven (committed for the purpose of proposing a rule for the right of suffrage in the "second branch" [i.e., the Senate]) consisted of the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia.

4. Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, in modifying North Carolina delegate Hugh Williamson's suggestion of the same date, suggested on July 25th , 1787 that "two persons one of whom at least should not be of his own State" should be voted for when electing the President of the United States.

This does not necessarily infer that a *second* person would be elected to a secondary position (i.e., a Vice Presidency). There was a strong sentiment that if only one vote were cast, it would often be cast for a candidate from one's own State. Thus, casting a vote for *two* persons (with one necessarily from a different State) could prove beneficial, even if only the person with the most total votes wins the single office.

In this case, the Senate would have as their President whoever happens to be chosen Vice President of the United States. The Constitution, as ultimately ratified, vests with the Vice President of the United States the *style* (nominally; *title*) and *office* of *President of the Senate.*

On Friday, September 7, 1787 (ten days before the end of the convention), the delegates discussed the 6th Resolve of the Committee of Eleven. This discussion of the Vice President of the United States as the *ex officio* President of the Senate was objected to by some of the constitutional convention delegates.

Colonel George Mason, of Virginia, viewed the principle of the Vice President being the President of the Senate as an "encroachment on the rights of the Senate; and that it mixed too much the Legislative and Executive".

Hugh Williamson, of North Carolina, stated the Vice President was only "introduced for the sake of a valuable mode of election (of the President) which required two to be chosen at the same time".

Williamson further suggested that the Vice-President "was not wanted".

Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, was not only opposed to denominating the Vice President the President of the Senate, he also opposed the office of the Vice President.

Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, argued in opposition to the previously-mentioned delegates and in favor of a Vice President. Sherman "saw no danger in the case. If the vice-President were not to be President of the Senate, he would be without employment, and some member by being made President must be deprived of his vote, unless when an equal division of votes might happen in the Senate, which would be but seldom".

An added benefit of having the Vice President of the United States as the President of the Senate was that the Vice-President wouldn't theoretically bring to any specific State undue influence since the V-P was elected without direct regard to any particular State (other than he could not be from the same State as the President).

The only official duty specifically listed in the Constitution for the President of the Senate is found in Article II, Section 1, Clause 3 (and in 12th Amendment). The President of the Senate is to accept and open all the electoral certificates (in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives) for choosing the President and Vice President of the United States every four years. The President of the Senate announces the President-elect after opening the certificates if the person having the most votes has a majority of all the electoral votes.

Announcing the President can be an unpleasant experience for the President of the Senate (the Vice President of the United States). When the Vice President of the United States is running for the office of President, which is common, he may well end up announcing his opponent. This was the case when Democratic Presidential candidate Vice President Al Gore had to finally announce his opponent, Republican candidate George W. Bush, President-elect of the United States in 2000.

The only official duty expressly noted for the Vice President of the United States in the Constitution is that of presiding in the Senate. He is reserved the power and duty of the President should the President, in some manner, be unable to function. The Vice President does not ever vote in the Senate (by express constitutional prohibition), except to break a tie.

The Constitution discusses a total of three different *presiding officers* of the Senate, depending upon the circumstance involved. The *primary* presiding officer of the Senate is the Vice President of the United States, as delineated in Article I, Section 3, Clause 4.

In Clause 5 of the same Section and Article, the Constitution creates an *acting* President of the Senate when the Vice President of the United States is absent from the Senate, or "when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States". The *secondary* presiding officer of the Senate is the President *pro tempore* (Latin for “temporary”).

Under Clause 6 (of said Article I, Section 3), the supreme Court Chief Justice presides over the Senate when the Senate constitutes itself as a (High) Court of Impeachment and is trying the President of the United States. The *tertiary* presiding officer is the Chief Justice of the United States, though only during an impeachment trial of the President of the United States.

Rule 1 of the Standing Rules of the Senate provides for the appointment of *quaternary* presiding officer. This rule provides for a Senator (or the Secretary of the Senate [or the Assistant Secretary]) to be chosen as the *acting* President *pro tempore*.

The Constitution does not directly envision this "acting temporary" fourth delegate (though in absence of the Vice President, someone must necessarily preside for a very short duration during the election of a President *pro tempore* and during his swearing-in ceremony).

The Constitution presupposes that the Vice President of the United States would preside in the normal situation; that in his absence a day here or a week there, that a President *pro tempore* would be chosen in a temporary manner as the title would suggest. The Vice President would then come back and serve until his next absence, which would then cause another President *pro tempore* to be chosen (which could be the same individual chosen before, but not necessarily).

There would be little need to have a "back up" to the President *pro tempore*, because being only a temporary replacement for the Vice President, the Senate would simply choose another *temporary* when the previous "temp" was not there (a *temp* being replaceable at will and not holding that position when he himself was absent).

Which presiding officer happens to normally preside over the Senate has become more of an question of what era one is discussing. For example, *Democratic-Republican* Thomas Jefferson was elected Vice President in 1796 when *Federalist* John Adams was elected President. Philosophically-opposed on many issues to one another (even though they wrote volumes of letters to one another after their retirement until their simultaneous deaths on July 4, 1826 — the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence), Jefferson spent the bulk of his time not as the President's right-hand man, but presiding over the Senate. One of Jefferson's many important accomplishments include the writing of his *Manual of Parliamentary Practice* for the Senate (which was used by many later presiding officers).

Other Vice Presidents both before and after Jefferson likewise spent the bulk of their time presiding over the Senate. As a rough indicator of where and when a major shift to executive duties occurred, beginning in 1952 with Richard Nixon, Vice Presidents have kept their primary office in the Executive Office Building.

Senators now chosen to the position of Presidents *pro tempore* find themselves in a position which is no longer considered temporary (other than in name only).

Article I, Section 3, Clause 5 states:

> "The Senate shall chuse their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States."

The Senators themselves are empowered to choose their officers other than the President of the Senate. As covered above, the President *pro tempore* is to act as the (temporary) President of the Senate when the Vice President is absent (or when he is exercising the Office of President of the United States).

The primary Senate officers include the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Chaplain.

The **Secretary of the Senate** acts as the default presiding officer of the Senate as in the case of the absence of the Vice President and pending the election of a President *pro tempore*. The Secretary is the

custodian of the Seal of the Senate; he requisitions moneys from the Secretary of the Treasury for payment of Senators and the contingent expenses of the Senate. The Secretary certifies consent on treaties; confirmation or rejection of Presidential nominees for officers; extracts from the Senate Journal, and he attests bills and resolutions. During impeachment trials, he issues writs, mandates, and orders authorized by the Senate under the authority of the Presiding Officer.

The **Sergeant at Arms** of the Senate serves as the Executive, Protocol and Enforcement Officer of the Senate. The Sergeant at Arms is delegated the primary responsibility for security in the Capitol and Senate.

The Sergeant at Arms is the principal administrative manager; he directs the departments and facilities; enforces Senate rules to maintain order; locates absent Senators for quorum purposes; organizes ceremonies including Presidential Inaugurations; funerals for Senators who die in office; he escorts dignitaries visiting Senators; and he maintains custody of the Senate gavel.

In addition to opening the Senate each day in prayer, the duties of the **Senate Chaplain** include spiritual counseling for Senators, their families, and their staff. The Chaplain conducts various prayer meetings, including a weekly Senator's Prayer Breakfast.

Impeachment

Article I, Section 3, Clause 6 reads:

> "The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present."

The House of Representatives, under Article I, Section 2, Clause 5, has the sole power of Impeachment. *Impeachment* is the power and process to accuse and charge executive or judicial officers of misconduct to remove them from office (once convicted by the Senate).

The House, in presenting their *Impeachment*, serves an equivalent function to a Grand Jury issuing its *indictment* or *presentment*. The House *Managers* serve as Prosecutors for the trial held by the Senate as judge. The Senate serves as the quasi-judicial political body for the criminal trial of Impeachment.

Article I, Section 3, Clause 7 discusses judgment in cases of impeachment. It states:

> "Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law."

Senate convictions in cases of impeachment are limited to removal from office and exclusion from holding future offices (though such persons are liable to future punishment upon conviction in a judicial trial).

Strictly speaking, impeachment and conviction of *officers* are not a bar for them becoming future legislative *members*, since *members* do not hold *offices*. This principle may sound odd at first, but is actually quite consistent with limited, *representative* government.

Since Citizens elect members to represent them, it is not within the purview of members to tell Citizens whom they can or cannot choose.

Legislative members have oversight (via enactments of law and also impeachment) over executive and judicial officers, but do not have oversight over Citizens who choose the members themselves.[5]

A few simple member qualifications are listed within Sections 2 and 3, reserving to the electors the actual judgment of whom they want to represent them. The concept of inherent sovereignty ultimately residing in the people is but a farce if the choice of the people is greatly limited by outside means.

The concept of inherent sovereignty ultimately residing in the people is but a farce if the choice of the people is greatly limited by outside means.

When proven unworthy, those chosen to *administer* and *adjudicate* may be permanently barred from *doing so*. These barred persons are yet otherwise eligible for a legislative *seat*; allowing nearly unfettered choice to those who elect members to represent them.

Articles of Impeachment

Examination of a recent impeachment trial provides better understanding of such authority while providing additional insight which will later prove beneficial.

Four Articles of Impeachment were initially leveled in the House of Representatives on December 15, 1998 against William Jefferson Clinton, 42nd President of the United States. After lengthy discussions, a separate vote

5. Note that Article I, Section 5, Clause 2 allows each House to "Punish its members for disorderly behavior, and with two-thirds, *expel a member*." Neither House has the ability to permanently bar a member from being re-elected. The legislative branch operates under different rules from the ordinary executive and judicial officers (who do not constitute the government, but merely are chosen to help run it).

occurred on each article. Ultimately, the House preferred two Articles against President Clinton, with Articles II and IV failing to gather sufficient votes.

Article I was agreed to by a vote of 228 yeas, 206 nays (1 abstention) (see text below).

Article II charged that Clinton "willfully provided perjurious, false and misleading testimony" with his sworn answers to written questions of December 23, 1997 in Paula Jones' civil action against him; and also during in his January 17, 1998 deposition. This Article failed in a vote of 205 yeas, 229 nays (1 abstention).

Article III was agreed to by a vote of 221 yeas, 212 nays (2 abstentions) (becoming the Second Article of Impeachment as approved — see text below)

Article IV charged Clinton with impairing the administration of justice through misuse and abuse of the powers and influence of the President, (specifically by providing perjurious, false and misleading sworn statements during the impeachment inquiry authorized by the House of Representatives) contravening the authority of the legislative branch. This Article failed by a vote of 148 yeas, 285 nays (2 abstentions).

William Jefferson Clinton, in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has willfully corrupted and manipulated the judicial process of the United States for his personal gain and exoneration.

With such votes, President Clinton was impeached with two Articles of Impeachment by House Resolution 611 of the Second Session of the 105th Congress on December 19, 1998, according to the powers vested in the House of Representatives by Article I, Section 2, Clause 5 of the Constitution. Said final resolution read:

House Resolution 611

in the House of Representatives, December 19, 1998

Resolved, That William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America, against William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

Article I

In his conduct while President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has willfully corrupted and manipulated the judicial process of the United States for his personal gain and exoneration, impeding the administration of justice, in that:

On August 17, 1998, William Jefferson Clinton swore to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth before a Federal grand jury of the United States. Contrary to that oath, William Jefferson Clinton willfully provided perjurious, false and misleading testimony to the grand jury concerning one or more of the following: (1) the nature and details of his relationship with a subordinate Government employee; (2) prior perjurious, false and misleading testimony he gave in a Federal civil rights action brought against him; (3) prior false and misleading statements he allowed his attorney to make to a Federal judge in that civil rights action; and (4) his corrupt efforts to influence the testimony of witnesses and to impede the discovery of evidence in that civil rights action.

In doing this, William Jefferson Clinton has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, has betrayed his trust as President, and has acted in a manner subversive of the rule of law and justice, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore, William Jefferson Clinton, by such conduct, warrants impeachment and trial, and removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

Article II

In his conduct while President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has prevented, obstructed, and impeded the administration of justice, and has to that end engaged personally, and through his subordinates and agents, in a course of conduct or scheme designed to delay, impede, cover up, and conceal the existence of evidence and testimony related to a Federal civil rights action brought against him in a duly instituted judicial proceeding.

The means used to implement this course of conduct or scheme included one or more of the following acts:

(1) On or about December 17, 1997, William Jefferson Clinton corruptly encouraged a witness in a Federal civil rights action brought against him to execute a sworn affidavit in that proceeding that he knew to be perjurious, false and misleading.

(2) On or about December 17, 1997, William Jefferson Clinton corruptly encouraged a witness in a Federal civil rights action brought against him to give perjurious, false and misleading testimony if and when called to testify personally in that proceeding.

(3) On or about December 28, 1997, William Jefferson Clinton corruptly engaged in, encouraged, or supported a scheme to conceal evidence that had been subpoenaed in a Federal civil rights action brought against him.

4) Beginning on or about December 7, 1997, and continuing through and including January 14, 1998, William Jefferson Clinton intensified and succeeded in an effort to secure job assistance to a witness in a Federal civil rights action brought against him in order to corruptly prevent the truthful testimony of that witness in that proceeding at a time when the truthful testimony of that witness would have been harmful to him.

(5) On January 17, 1998, at his deposition in a Federal civil rights action brought against him, William Jefferson Clinton corruptly allowed his attorney to make false and misleading statements to a Federal judge characterizing an affidavit, in order to prevent questioning deemed relevant by the judge. Such false and misleading statements were subsequently acknowledged by his attorney in a communication to that judge.

(6) On or about January 18 and January 20-21, 1998, William Jefferson Clinton related a false and misleading account of events relevant to a Federal civil rights action brought against him to a potential witness in that proceeding, in order to corruptly influence the testimony of that witness.

(7) On or about January 21, 23, and 26, 1998, William Jefferson Clinton made false and misleading statements to potential witnesses in a Federal grand jury proceeding in order to corruptly influence the testimony of those witnesses. The false and misleading statements made by William Jefferson Clinton were repeated by the witnesses to the grand jury, causing the grand jury to receive false and misleading information.

In all of this, William Jefferson Clinton has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, has betrayed his trust as President, and has acted in a manner subversive to the rule of law and justice, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore, William Jefferson Clinton, by such conduct, warrants impeachment and trial, and removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

Passed the House of Representatives December 19, 1998. Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives. Attest: Robin H. Carle, Clerk.

William Jefferson Clinton has undermined the integrity of his office, has brought disrepute on the Presidency, has betrayed his trust as President, and has acted in a manner subversive of the rule of law and justice, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Even though President Clinton was Impeached by the House, it was necessary to convict him in the Senate before he could be removed from Office.

House Resolution 614 of the Second Session of the 105th Congress (see also H. Res. 10 of the 1st Session, 106th Congress) appointed 13 House Members as Managers to conduct the impeachment trial in the Senate against William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States.

On January 7, 1999, the House Managers were received into the Senate (the First Session of the 106th Congress) to exhibit the Articles of Impeachment preferred by the said House against President Clinton.

Chief Justice of the United States, William H. Rehnquist, presided in the Senate according to the mandate in Article I, Section 3, Clause 6, since the President of the United States was being tried.

The Chief Justice, with his left hand on the Bible and raised right hand, answered in the affirmative to the following oath:

"Do you solemnly swear that in all things appertaining to the trial of the impeachment of William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States, now pending, you will do impartial justice according to the Constitution and laws, so help you God?"

The Senators then took the same oath (also according to Clause 6 of Article I, Section 3 of the Constitution). All who took an oath signed the *Official Oath Book*. The Court of Impeachment then recessed and the Senate tended to some extraneous Legislative business.

On Friday, the 8th of January, the Senate temporarily resumed sitting as a Court of Impeachment. Various parameters were given regarding the number of hours allowed for each side to make their case; for questioning; and for the calling of witnesses.

The Senate committed itself into a Court of Impeachment again on January 14, 1999. The House Managers presented their case against President Clinton; Clinton's attorneys defended him. On February 12, 1999, on the First Article of Impeachment, the Senate voted 45 *for* impeachment, 55 votes *against*. The vote for Article II was 50 Senators *for* impeachment, 50 votes *against*; failing the necessary 2/3rds majority, Clinton was not found guilty on either count.

While President Clinton's impeachment trial could be discussed from any number of viewpoints; two items regarding it are of primary interest currently.

The first concern is to briefly cover the mechanics of impeachment and the implications of such conviction since that is the current topic of study; which has been done sufficiently for our present purposes.

The second point is to be briefly exposed to the use of *deception* as the principle means to circumvent the Constitution to increase government power and

authority. A continued careful study of the Constitution and how it seems to have little direct influence in government today will ultimately prove to be a study of masterful deception.

President Clinton, through his team of 11 attorneys, answered the Articles of Impeachment in the Senate, in part, with the following **admissions** (while denying that Clinton overtly *perjured* himself or *obstructed justice*) (as recorded in *The Congressional Record* — Senate [106th Congress, 1st Session], January 14, 1999, pg. S61):

> "The President has acknowledged conduct with Ms. Lewinsky that was improper..."
>
> "The President was truthful when he testified before the grand jury that he did not engage in sexual relations with Ms. Lewinsky *as he understood that term to be defined by the Jones lawyers during their questioning of him in that deposition...*"
>
> "The President stated to the grand jury that he did not attempt to be helpful to or assist the lawyers in the *Jones* deposition in their quest for information about his relationship with Ms. Lewinsky..."

Clinton himself, admitted (also on pg. S61):

> "When I was alone with Ms. Lewinsky on certain occasions in early 1996 and once in early 1997, I engaged in conduct that was wrong. These encounters …did involve inappropriate intimate contact..."

Clinton's attorneys also admitted (pp S62-S63) that:

> "The President denies that he obstructed justice when he mislead his aides about the nature of his relationship with Ms. Lewinsky…The President acknowledges that in the days following the January 21, 1998 Washington Post article, he misled his family, his friends and staff, and the Nation to conceal the nature of his relationship with Ms. Lewinsky..."

The House Managers gave their impression of the President's activities (pg. S69):

> "The President proceeded to equivocate and engage in legalistic fencing…The entire testimony was calculated to mislead and deceive the grand jury and to obstruct its process, and eventually to deceive the American people..."

Clinton, himself, again admitted (pg. S70):

> "My goal in this deposition was to be truthful, but not particularly helpful…I was determined to walk through the mind field of this deposition without violating the law, and I believe I did..."

The House Managers commented further (at pg. S71):

> (When) "The President…did answer, he engaged in legalistic hair-splitting in an obvious attempt to skirt the whole truth and to deceive and obstruct the due proceedings of the Committee."

President Clinton (on the same page) stated what can be not only a summation of *his* activities, but of *government-by-deception* in general:

> "So I said things that were true. They may have been misleading…"

One must realize that, even with these overt admissions by the President of the United States and/or his team of expert *attorneys* (*attourne*; Latin root word meaning "to *twist, turn*"), the President was **not** convicted. That President Clinton was later disbarred from practicing law before the supreme Court and had his Arkansas law license suspended for five years, but not removed from his office of President does not bode well for the integrity-requirements of that office (thereby acknowledging that the President of the United States is held to a *LOWER* standard of ethics than an attorney!).

By Clinton's admissions and the Senate's inaction, one **must** conclude that it is possible to *mislead* and *deceive* **in a legal fashion**.

One must conclude that it is possible to *mislead* and *deceive* **in a legal fashion**.

It should not be too much of a stretch to believe that a clever, misleading politician rose through the ranks of politics so *quickly* and so *far* BECAUSE he understood so well the game of politics which is being played in America!

President Clinton, for purposes of base self-gratification, exposed for all the world to see, the *modus operandi* of the entire United States Government operating in excess of the United States Constitution.

The method used to circumvent the Constitution works best when people are generally ignorant of the actual mechanisms used to bypass it. Clinton's failure was to not realize that people well understand "sexual relations" and are not easily mislead in topics they understand.

Scum Rises to the Top

In nature, when water ceases to flow downhill, it tends to stagnate. Insufficient flow decreases dissolved oxygen, snuffing out aquatic life. Putrefication of organic matter occurs. Algae forms on the top of the water. In short, *scum rises to the top*.

That "scum rises to the top" may be an apt description of 20th century political cesspool in America may say a great deal about how a number of people of questionable character gained political power and influence.

It also has much to say about the ignorance, deception, and misunderstanding in America.

When government operates almost exclusively in deception, do not become surprised when a *Master of Deceit* takes over the reins (and reigns).

When government operates almost exclusively in deception, do not become surprised when a *Master of Deceit* takes over the reins.

When men spend millions of dollars to run for two, four, or six-year positions which pay only several tens of thousands of dollars per year, one must question if the activities of government have gone too far. When scores of people give these men those millions of dollars to run for that position, one must ask; "What do these people expect in return"? When government becomes all things to all people, one must question what happens to the losers in the great game of politics?

Many things are irrelevant to our present discussion about impeachment: whether Bill Clinton was a good President; statesman; politician; man; or even whether he should have been convicted on one or both Articles of Impeachment.

The main point to focus on is the *mechanism* President Clinton used, with all his ability, to *deceive* people *in a legal manner* (or least not in an *illegal* manner) when he was caught with his pants down.

It actually would have been quite hypocritical of the Senate to convict Clinton of perjury and obstruction of justice. Comparing the amount of deception practiced by Bill Clinton attempting to cover his sexual escapades during his eight years in office amounts to a mere drop in the ocean as with the degree and scope of deception practiced by the U.S. government since the Civil War.

For the federal government to grow from its modest beginnings to such gargantuan proportions; to consume so much of the gross national product; to employ such vast numbers of people; to do so much to hinder the productive output of American businesses; to virtually enslave hundreds of millions of Americans is, as compared with Clinton's follies, a mountain is to a grain of sand.

Few people in government are overly hypocritical or deceitful: most are actually fine Citizens and good people who work long and often ungrateful hours attempting to make America a better place. Unfortunately, they lend their integrity to an unjust and corrupt system which has perverted justice and is destroying the America of our fore-fathers.

The fault of these good people is *ignorance* — their *inability* and possibly even an *unwillingness* to honestly look past the *symptoms* and the *devastation* to their actual *causes*. These people are likely *too busy* dealing with all the *busyness* of all-encompassing government to get to the root problem. They are too busy attempting to re-invent the wheel of government to ask the right questions or look in the right places.

There is no need to fight another war of Independence — the United States of America won their freedoms centuries ago! There is no need to enact a charter only authorizing limited government — the Constitution which does so was ratified hundreds of years ago! There is no need to ratify Articles protecting our individual liberty — the Bill of Rights have been the supreme Law of the Land for decade upon decade upon decade! There is no need to fight for limited government — we already have it!

We Americans simply have to discover how these freedoms and liberties were deceptively taken from us! The good thing about this is that we do not have to *fight* — we must simply *learn*!

The fantastic thing about this is that a little knowledge goes a long way to completely restoring a limited federal government (along the lines of 1850 America, but for ***all*** people) indefinitely. Once ignorance of the mechanism used to circumvent limited government is conquered, unlimited government is a thing of the past!

Deception, when exposed to the light of day, becomes completely powerless. When the Wizard of Oz was exposed for the fraud he was, the game was over. Reality will prove no different than fiction in this instance. People will be amazed at the simplicity of the ploy; that it could work for year after year after year. It will be as though "the scales fell from our eyes" and that we could see for the first time; we will not be deceived in a similar manner again!

Clinton's tactics of misleading people can be viewed as a primer of the condition of American politics in the 20th century. As such, they can provide a reality check for those desiring to get to the bottom of the actual *corruption of justice* during the entire 20th century.

A more-thorough understanding of the tactics used by the Prince of Deception can be then transferred to all government activity which also shows strong evidence of corruption.

Distributed by: Foundation For Liberty.org
1500 Highway 2
Leavenworth, WA 98826

www.FoundationForLiberty.org
Copyright 2002, 2005 by Beacon of Liberty, LLC.
www.BeaconofLiberty.org

