

# Treaties Torching the Constitution

<https://frederickrsmith.substack.com/p/treaties-torching-the-constitution?s=w>

## Treaties Torching the Constitution

While the Framers clearly meant that no state constitution or state law should trump the Constitution, there is no possible interpretation to say that it empowers treaties to undo the Constitution.

*"Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification."*

- George Washington

## John Foster Dulles

*"The treaty-making power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty laws can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body and they can cut across the rights given the people by the Constitutional Bill of Rights."*

- John Foster Dulles, (1952) 1

**Treaty:** compact made between two or more independent nations with a view to the Public Welfare. A treaty is an agreement in written form between nation-states (or international agencies, such as the United Nations, that have been given treaty-making capacity by the states that created them) intended to establish a relationship governed by International Law. The treaty document may be a single instrument or two or more related items, such as exchanging diplomatic notes. Scholars use various terms for such an agreement, including treaty, convention, protocol, declaration, charter, Covenant, pact, act, statute, exchange of notes, agreement, modus vivendi ("manner of living" or practical compromise), and understanding. The particular designation does not affect the agreement's legal character.<sup>2</sup>

With the above as a backdrop, a treaty with the UN-American United Nations is akin to the Stockholm Syndrome at best or joining the mob at worst. Furthermore, the minions of the Nasty New World Order find unbridled power in the national breaking attributes of many treaties.

It is nothing short of criminal or treasonous behavior how our leaders (Reincarnated Illuminati) abused the treaty process to undermine our sovereignty. Incredibly, in the dystopian Newtopia of today, such statements of truth get tagged with Pavlovian xenophobic rants or face Hate Crime Horrors.

Like the other attacks on our Republic, the assaults on our Constitution by our internal and external adversaries thru "treaties" cry out for retribution. That's right, Virginia, a Republic; the Framers did not want the **dumbocracy** we have become.

The "insurrection" mantra broadcast ad nauseam today is the quintessential example of the kettle calling the pot black (projection).

The above "projection" accusation is not made lightly. Nevertheless, with extra-Constitutional laws and pogroms emanating from all levels and branches of government, such a determination comes from the heart of somebody who, from first grade to today as a senior citizen, gets very emotional during the singing of our National Anthem.

## **The Constitution Supremacy Clause**

Article. III., Section 2, Clause 1

*The judicial power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;--to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;--to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction;--to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;--to Controversies between two or more States;--between a State and Citizens of another State; 3 --between Citizens of different States, --between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.*

Article. VI., Clause 2

*This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every state shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.*

## **Analysis**

The above two elements of the Constitution, combined, is known as the Supremacy Clause, which requires laws of the United States codified in pursuance of the Constitution. However, some consider international agreements to be the supreme law of the land, and scholars have argued this distinction for many decades. They offer the theory that the difference is that the Treaty Clause validates treaties made before adopting the Constitution. These treaties were not crafted "in pursuance of" the Constitution (not yet adopted). Further, the Constitutional Convention records show that treaties supersede state laws.

While the Framers meant that no state constitution or state law should trump the Constitution, there is no possible interpretation that it empowers treaties to undo the Constitution. For example, Thomas Jefferson said: "In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution." The Federalist Papers indicate that treaty power was an element of foreign relations, with limited supremacy over state law. In essence, no grant of power allows treaties to trump the complete array of State laws.

As we know from Frederick R. Smith Speaks' essay *The Constitution Clarified*, the Framers deliberated in meticulous detail to develop the new Law of the Land to limit the Federal government's powers. Unfortunately, federal largess has multiplied, and the few understand the role of the Tenth Amendment.<sup>4</sup> This Amendment reserves those powers not delegated to the Federal government back to the states or the people. Those who counter-argue will rarely mention the Tenth Amendment because such actions awaken the "states rights zealot" mantra, which in turn leads to the dreaded "racist" whistle (i.e., confederacy!). Like many other things in the USSA, merely speak the truth and face the Caustic Cancel Culture Pogrom.

The above notwithstanding, the Constitution under the Supremacy Clause states that treaties are the "supreme law of the land." Did the Founders specifically desire this Clause to invoke international law that trumps our Constitution or our rights under the first Ten Amendments? The historical records indicate otherwise. Enter the following key quotes:

**Thomas Jefferson** | *If the treaty power is unlimited, then we don't have a Constitution. Surely the President and the Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole government is interdicted from doing in any way.*

**Alexander Hamilton** | *... treaty cannot be made which alters the Constitution of the country or which infringes any express exceptions to the power of the Constitution of the United States. 5*

**James Madison** | *I do not conceive that power is given to the President and the Senate to dismember the empire, or alienate any great, essential right. I do not think the whole legislative authority have this power. The exercise of the power must be consistent with the object of the delegation.*

**The 1619 Project and the Peoples History by communist Howard Zinn ensure our dumbed-down sheep think of the above wisdom as trash. After, all the Founders were "racist" because they enslaved people (see The Sin of Slavery). Additional aphrodisiac for the masses includes Critical Race conspiracy Theory, environmentalism (communism), laziness (aka/dba socialism), inclusion (self gender/sex identification), equity (communism), social justice (communism), and sex ed (pornography for all ages). See Madness Made to Order. No wonder there is no interest in preserving our once proud sovereign Nation, now the USSA, thanks to crummy "treaties" such as this "partnership:"**

Several modern Supreme Court decisions used treaties to undermine Constitutional safeguards. For example, over 90 years ago, Missouri challenged a federal law restricting its power to control migratory birds. Federal courts agreed with Missouri by indicating no such authority in the US Constitution. The "fix"—our commie leaders promptly entered into a migratory bird treaty with Canada and got it ratified by the Senate. Accordingly, the Supreme Court ruled that the treaty did take precedence over the Constitution and its 1920 decision "Missouri v. Holland" proclaimed that ratified treaty does supersede the Constitution.

Is it too much trouble to go through the entire Senate's advice and Consent process concerning a treaty? You bet, dear reader. The solution, enter into a "partnership" (see above video) or "agreement" and abide by it. Another well-known example is the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Keyword — agreement! And of course, there are the Faustian pacts such as the Iran Nuclear "Deal." Stay tuned.

## **Bricker Bill**

In response to this alarming trend, in 1952, Senator John Bricker (R-OH) introduced a bill to limit treaty law. The Bricker language stated, *"a provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect."* **It would have imposed the same restrictions against the power of international organizations that the Tenth Amendment now imposes against our federal government.** It never made it through Congress.

The people who tout the "isolationist" or "xenophobic" mantra will never allow anything like the Bricker Amendment to see the light of day. Why? There are many reasons, such as globalization, power, and money. Also, as hollow as the argument goes, our "leaders" (wink wink) fear being branded as isolationist worse than death! Welcome to the Nasty New World Order (dba Great Reset).

## **Historical Timeline**

The following is a short historical timeline of the Supremacy Clause for your reading pleasure.

John Jay, Federalist Paper No. 64 (1788) | Others, though content that treaties should be made in the mode proposed, are adverse to their being the supreme laws of the land. They insist, and profess to believe, that treaties, like acts of assembly, should be repealable at pleasure. This idea seems to be new and peculiar to this country, but new errors, as well as new truths, often appear. These gentlemen would do well to reflect that a treaty is only another name for a bargain, and that it would be impossible to find a nation who would make any bargain with us, which should be binding on them absolutely, but on us only so long and so far as we may think proper to be bound by it. They who make laws may, without doubt, amend or repeal them; and it will not be disputed that they who make treaties may alter or cancel them; but still let us not forget that treaties are made, not by only one of the contracting parties, but by both, and consequently, that as the consent of both was essential to their formation at first, so must it ever afterwards be to alter or cancel them.

- New Orleans v. US Supreme Court decision (1836) | The government of the United States ... is one of limited powers. It can exercise authority over no subjects except those that have been delegated to it. Congress cannot, by legislation, enlarge the federal jurisdiction, nor can it be enlarged under the treaty-making power.
- US v. Pink Supreme Court decision (1942) | A treaty is the 'law of the land.'... State law must yield when it is inconsistent with, or impairs the policy or provisions of a treaty, or of an international compact or agreement.
- State Department No. 3972 (1950) | ... there is no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs.
- Senator William Jenner (1954) | The United Nations is preparing a series of treaties which operate as domestic legislation, affecting our citizens in matters on which our Constitution does not permit even the Federal Government to legislate. They would abolish our Bill of Rights and replace it with a body of state granted privileges and duties modeled exactly upon the Soviet Constitution.
- Representative Thomas Bliley (1989) | Have we determined the impact that this convention [on the Rights of the Child] will have on our system of federalism? No. Have we resolved in our minds its inherent conflicts with the US Constitution? I think not. Do we realize the great new powers Congress is taking away from the sovereign States, as well as giving up itself, to the Judiciary?

## Washington's Farewell Address

In his Farewell Address of September 1796, George Washington warned against the peril of foreign entanglements. Below is an excerpt from his address that illustrates how our leaders (wink wink) have strayed from the truly good of our Constitution as related to treaties (boldface added).

*Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. ... In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur.*

*So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.*

*Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.*

*The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop. ...*

*Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand, neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the Government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.*

## **Afterword**

Now, back to the future. In July 2015, Iran and six countries reached an "agreement" called the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. It is generically known as the Iran Nuclear Deal. The six major powers involved in the negotiations with Iran were known as the P5+1 [United Nations security council permanent members (the US, France, the UK, China, and Russia) Germany]. After two years of intense discussions, the "Deal" restricted Iran's ability to develop nuclear weapons to lift economic sanctions against Tehran. And of course, there is this tidbit reported by CNN (no fake news there, haha) on August 4, 2016:

**The Obama administration secretly arranged a plane delivery of \$400 million in cash on the same day Iran released four American prisoners** and formally implemented the nuclear deal, US officials confirmed Wednesday.

**President Barack Obama approved the \$400 million transfer, which he had announced in January as part of the Iran nuclear deal. The money was flown into Iran on wooden pallets stacked with Swiss francs, euros, and other currencies as the first installment of a \$1.7 billion settlement** resolving claims at an international tribunal at The Hague over a failed arms deal under the time of the Shah.

Iran and the US have been enemies since a CIA-orchestrated coup in the 1950s. Later a pro-American monarch (Mohammad Reza Pahlavi or the Shah of Iran) faced overthrow in 1979 from the Islamic revolution. And there was the infamous hostage crisis at the US embassy in Tehran.

Trump's decision to withdraw the US from the Deal in May 2018 and promptly condemned by US allies and the raging Orange Man haters. In January 2020, Trump ordered a drone strike that killed Iran's top general, Qassem Soleimani; Tehran abandoned the crummy "Deal" altogether. President Joe Biden has made restoring the 2015 Iran nuclear deal a top foreign policy priority.

**President Washington must be spinning in his grave.**

**General George Patton knew the perils of entangling alliances, particularly with communists.** He complimented the Russian soldiers on their courage and skill as troops and their dedication/sacrifice for victory against the Nazis. However, **Patton despised the communist leaders and politicians for a forcibly imposed economic system, tyrannical government, abolition of the right of free speech, government ownership of all property, and control of religion.**

**For the love of God and country, it is high time to trash all the unconstitutional mandates, laws, treaties, regulations, and the crummy Creature From Jekyll Island.**

=====

1- John Foster Dulles was born on February 25, 1888, and was a World War I veteran. He was appointed in the United States Senate from New York, serving out the term of Robert F. Wagner, who had retired due to ill health. He was defeated for re-election then served as Secretary of State in the Eisenhower administration. Dulles was instrumental in forming the Southeast Treaty Organization (SEATO). Due to cancer, he resigned from his office on April 15, 1959. He was awarded the Medal of Freedom (America's civilian award) shortly before his death on May 24, 1959. John Foster Dulles was a Reincarnated Illuminati because, in 1939, he openly promoted the transition to a new order of less independent countries. The article, CIA's Holy War, is an interesting treatise about John and his brother Allen (CIA chief) that illustrates how entanglements (right, muddy middle, or left) are a bad thing.

2 Treaty legal definition (thefreedictionary.com)

3 This Clause has been affected by amendment XI — "The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State." South Carolina subsequently ratified the Amendment on December 4, 1797. New Jersey and Pennsylvania did not take action on the Amendment. Ratification occurred on February 7, 1795.

4 With states awash in federal money, such an arrangement is akin to loans from the mob.

5 Hamilton was an interesting character. Unfortunatley, he was a man of money interests and favored a big government. No wonder the WOKE folk love Hamilton (the play). It makes sense why the WOKE trash the Founding Fathers who owned slaves but never mention that new research suggests Alexander Hamilton was a slave owner.