

Holding onto Humanity when Employed by a Government of Men

By Sovereign Dave

I received today and EXCELLENT piece written by Stan Goff entitled “Hold On to Your Humanity.” In this piece Goff very well destroys the ploys of those Nationalists among us who peddle their war-wares as Patriotism. You can of course skip what I say, but please don’t ignore what veteran Goff has to say below [in green]. For the rest, I thought it important to put this in context. I was reading today’s newspaper and some startling statistics popped-out of an article. Before I get to that, I’ll set the mood by posing this quote, explanation and **revelation**:

“The executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers or either of them to the end that it may be a government of laws and not of men.”

John Adams

Aside from the separation of powers aspects, the government that was to be established was a government of laws.....for government only.

Do the words “for government only” that I added to clarify surprise you? They weren’t needed in Adam’s day. However the same propagandists that Goff describes--who shove nationalism disguised as patriotism--rarely want you to focus on that latter aspect. Let me explain: Examine the whole quote again and let’s parse it in steps beginning backwards:

- The government that was to be established was “...A GOVERNMENT...NOT OF MEN”! So if it is not a government of men, what can it govern? Well...who is left? Itself! Is it a shock that men are not included in this description? Well the long train of abuses that led to the Declaration of Independence were NOT caused by other common men—rather they were caused by government.
- So what party did Adams want to bind tightly so as not to tread on the unalienable rights of people? Government...only. And now you see the separation of powers aspect of the quote whereby he hoped that 3 branches would prevent the Executive branch “end” game of something very bad—the government of men!
- A brief pause in the logic to clarify. Due to the propaganda handed-down on a near continual basis, perhaps you are wondering how MEN fit into the equation of lawful society? I can hear some of you proclaiming me nuts at this point: “Why Dave is portraying a lawless wild-west society where only government needs governing. This cannot be!” Ahhh...you fell for the second myth of the propagandists as you assume there is only ONE law when in reality, as of the Declaration, there are two laws independent. Men (i.e. the People) were commonly known and expected to govern their own actions by law common with men. This was the revelation of the founding fathers. This has been the lot of men from day one and will always be the lot of men. Think about this: No free societies have enough policemen to define otherwise IF indeed people did not

conduct themselves under law for People. On a percentage basis, people “consent” to conduct and “govern” their affairs quite admirably, don’t they? Hold that thought until after the next bullet for a revelation.

- I apologize for the freedom intermission, now back to the quote: The government that was to be established was a “government of laws”. If the government is NOT of men, then to whom do the laws passed by government apply? To answer this question just think of the party that led to the long train of abuses of men. In a nutshell the laws of government can only apply to government as only government needs governing! Men (i.e the People) were completely left out of this equation as they declared themselves independent prior to the establishment of the government that came later. The precedent is important and is the reason why the Constitution became supreme law for government....only. Think of it this way in terms of a modern day descriptor: Outsourcing. The people kept pursuit of happiness and outsourced the headache of such things as coining money, trade deals, representation of people, etc. and control of their respective branch government employees.....to government...by binding them under employment contract and/or legal duty (oath of office) to the laws of and for government.
- **Revelation:** Did you often find the quote “consent of the governed” a little troubling? Oh...it’s tossed-about by lawyers and politicians when nothing-else works: “Don’t blame us for your recent XYZ conviction. That law has been on the books for twenty years. The People through representative government desired it and the Legislature passed-it. After all it is ‘consent of the governed’.” Hmmm...do you buy that Penn and Teller bullshit? So how can one small set of people—and a representative to boot—and say one generation before make laws for the next generation? At first glance it seems perfectly logical. However one can see LEGAL EXPANSIVENESS to the detriment of UNALIENABLE RIGHTS inherent in this equation. Wasn’t that fought-for and that tyrant eliminated over 200 years ago? After all, what about all those laws snuck-in when the people aren’t noticing? Or what about those laws written with the “it depends on your definition of is” logic of a lawyer-legislators? Coupled-with law for government cleverly misapplied to people, I smell **usurpation**, don’t you? So how can this quote fit within the concept of people declared independent of government? Supposing the “tossing parties” of that quote forgot to point-out something related to the second myth. Would you suppose the laws the People “consented to be governed by” were laws of government....or laws common with People? Ahhh...does the “consent of the governed” now make a lot more sense? You see, the government-expansive propaganda evolutionists would have you believe that the founding fathers threw off the British yoke simply to replace it with a milder version they “consented: to be governed by: “Oh sure...we saw all the abuses in governments set-up in the past...we’re stupid...we pledged our lives and fortunes and sacrificed our lives so we could only live under something of our own creation that would gobble and ‘govern’ us till we and our posterity essentially have no pursuit of happiness.” Huh???
- Why do you think [government] “laws in derogation of the common law must be strictly construed”? Words to these effects appear in nearly any state government law. In most states this is the sole reference to laws common with people. Would

the scarcity of such words surprise you if this was law for government only? It exists as testament to the power of the common law and because the common-law rights of the *government* employees to whom those laws apply must still be preserved. Right about now there are many people in power from politicians, to corporations, to socialists, to ignorant judges that would prefer this revelation NOT be made public. It means the entirety of the myth of laws common to People being encompassed within statutory law is destroyed (except for government employees and those who consent) for what is statutory law? If it's passed by the Legislature, that is government. The government "is not of men" [it might be composed of men but men, meaning the People, are not *governed* by same]. That government is bound by creation and supreme law for government called the Constitution. Hence statutory law is simply more law for government...only. Whoops...all those lawyers trained in statutory law are instantly unemployed except for the government.

- Now before you go into a courtroom to ask-about or explain this to some statutorily-trained judge, remember the words of Jesus to his judge...which I paraphrase: "If I asked you, you wouldn't tell me. If I told you, you wouldn't believe me."

I wouldn't need to go through this whole exercise if we had no deception in the society we call free. However that is not the case. We have a government that portrays itself as the epitome of freedom but due to the ignorance of the population--and indeed the government's own member ignorance--conducts its actions contrary to "governments of small enumerated powers". The next statistic--revealed in the form of a question--will bear this out:

QUESTION: How many people are detained by the US FEDERAL government "beyond the reach of established law"? (Meaning of course how many people are being held by the US Government without a "fair" trial [as if a tribunal is fair] and without due-process of law someplace in the world?)

ANSWER: If you were like me and thought only Guantanamo—which is where the government wants to keep you focused now that the Guantanamo 'cat was let out of the bag'—perhaps you would think 500 to 1000...right? Well...would you believe 14,000? (Source: U.S. Prison Network Grows, AP, Patrick Quinn)

Whoa! If that isn't startling perhaps the next couple of quotes pulled from the statistic source are:

- "It is hard to believe I'd get out," Bagdad shopkeeper Amjad said after his release—without charge—last month. "I lived with the Americans for one year and eight months as if I was living in hell."
- Aside from the 14,000 the article states, "...tens of thousands now have *passed through* US detention."
- "Many say they were often interrogated around the clock, then released months or years later without apology, compensation or any word on why they were taken."
- "I will hate Americans for the rest of my life." (released prisoner Waled Karim)

When you read Goff's article, the Vietnam parallels will become clear. For each of the 14,000 people held captive without charge or due-process, each has countless relatives or friends. It took David Koresh and the bumbling ATF to inspire non-relative Timothy McVeigh in domestic soil terrorism. McVeigh was an American, the same race as ATF majority and probably the same majority religious base. With these 14,000 numbers, how easy is it to inspire countless new recruits to the War on Terror when the perpetrators are not of the same religion, not of the same politics, not of the same economics and not of the same race? If you see this as some kind of perpetual motion machine, you are correct. The fuel for the machine though is your money, stress, freedom and the lives of your children. The victims as always are the innocent...and truth.

Now that you are armed with knowledge, I thought it important to summarize points and some crimes.

- Government ONLY is bound by its law. That law is for government only to prevent abuses by it. People have law common with the People—it cannot be Legislated away when people are declared independent.
- The Declaration of Independence is NOT jurisdiction or country dependent when it states ALL MEN possess INALIENABLE RIGHTS. **You see, the rights of men transcend borders.** There is no “exclusive country club” of rights called America and then those poor-slobs that live outside the club. The members of the club inside the border who take an oath are not free to abuse those outside the border IF they swear they are free. Simply put: If you are about freedom, you cannot abuse the rights of another simply because they are outside jurisdiction...war or not. You can do so only if you do not declare yourself of freedom.
- The Declaration of Independence sits at the beginning of all statutory law [i.e law for government], hence it cannot be ignored. Hence that government cannot abuse ANY MAN...country-of-origin America or elsewhere.
- A government that detains under its laws for government is in violation of its mandate that its laws only apply to government. It is a government of men.
- A government that detains irregardless...is a government of men...period.
- A government that tortures when its mandate is to protect inalienable rights is a government of men.
- A government that numbers its own people under National ID and demands presentation of such ID...is a government of men.
- A government that demands 40% of your paycheck to conduct such abuses...is a government of men.

I apologize for the long-winded explanation. As I said, it would not be necessary if we had an informed populace and no deception. First-hand testimony is the best witness of truth: I now present Goff's EXCELLENT piece.

“Hold On to Your Humanity”

An Open Letter to GIs in Iraq from a Vietnam Vet

“We stayed the course in Vietnam until 58,000 Americans were dead and lots more maimed for life.”

By STAN GOFF
(US Army Retired)

Dear American serviceperson in Iraq,

I am a retired veteran of the army, and my own son is among you, a paratrooper like I was. The changes that are happening to every one of you--some more extreme than others--are changes I know very well. So I'm going to say some things to you straight up in the language to which you are accustomed.

In 1970, I was assigned to the 173rd Airborne Brigade, then based in northern Binh Dinh Province in what was then the Republic of Vietnam. When I went there, I had my head full of shit: shit from the news media, shit from movies, shit about what it supposedly mean to be a man, and shit from a lot of my know-nothing neighbors who would tell you plenty about Vietnam even though they'd never been there, or to war at all.

The essence of all this shit was that we had to "stay the course in Vietnam," and that we were on some mission to save good Vietnamese from bad Vietnamese, and to keep the bad Vietnamese from hitting beachheads outside of Oakland. We stayed the course until 58,000 Americans were dead and lots more maimed for life, and 3,000,000 Southeast Asians were dead. Ex-military people and even many on active duty played a big part in finally bringing that crime to a halt.

When I started hearing about weapons of mass destruction that threatened the United States from Iraq, a shattered country that had endured almost a decade of trench war followed by an invasion and twelve years of sanctions, my first question was how in the hell can anyone believe that this suffering country presents a threat to the United States? But then I remembered how many people had believed Vietnam threatened the United States. Including me.

When that bullshit story about weapons came apart like a two-dollar shirt, the politicians who cooked up this war told everyone, including you, that you would be greeted like great liberators. They told us that we were in Vietnam to make sure everyone there could vote.

What they didn't tell me was that before I got there in 1970, the American armed forces had been burning villages, killing livestock, poisoning farmlands and forests, killing civilians for sport, bombing whole villages, and committing rapes and massacres, and the people who were grieving and raging over that weren't in a position to figure out the difference between me--just in country--and the people who had done those things to them.

What they didn't tell you is that over a million and a half Iraqis died between 1991 and 2003 from malnutrition, medical neglect, and bad sanitation. Over half a million of those who died were the weakest: the children, especially very young children.

My son who is over there now has a baby. We visit with our grandson every chance we get. He is eleven months old now. Lots of you have children, so you know how easy it is to really love them, and love them so hard you just know your entire world would collapse if anything happened to them. Iraqis feel that way

about their babies, too. And they are not going to forget that the United States government was largely responsible for the deaths of half a million kids.

So the lie that you would be welcomed as liberators was just that. A lie. A lie for people in the United States to get them to open their purse for this obscenity, and a lie for you to pump you up for a fight.

And when you put this into perspective, you know that if you were an Iraqi, you probably wouldn't be crazy about American soldiers taking over your towns and cities either. This is the tough reality I faced in Vietnam. I knew while I was there that if I were Vietnamese, I would have been one of the Vietcong.

But there we were, ordered into someone else's country, playing the role of occupier when we didn't know the people, their language, or their culture, with our head full of bullshit our so-called leaders had told us during training and in preparation for deployment, and even when we got there. There we were, facing people we were ordered to dominate, but any one of whom might be pumping mortars at us or firing AK-47s at us later that night. The question we stated to ask is who put us in this position?

In our process of fighting to stay alive, and in their process of trying to expel an invader that violated their dignity, destroyed their property, and killed their innocents, we were faced off against each other by people who made these decisions in \$5,000 suits, who laughed and slapped each other on the back in Washington DC with their fat fucking asses stuffed full of cordon blue and caviar.

They chumped us. Anyone can be chumped.

That's you now. Just fewer trees and less water.

We haven't figured out how to stop the pasty-faced, oil-hungry backslappers in DC yet, and it looks like you all might be stuck there for a little longer. So I want to tell you the rest of the story.

I changed over there in Vietnam and they were not nice changes either. I started getting pulled into something--something that craved other people's pain. Just to make sure I wasn't regarded as a "fucking missionary" or a possible rat, I learned how to fit myself into that group that was untouchable, people too crazy to fuck with, people who desired the rush of omnipotence that comes with setting someone's house on fire just for the pure hell of it, or who could kill anyone, man, woman, or child, with hardly a second thought. People who had the power of life and death--because they could.

The anger helps. It's easy to hate everyone you can't trust because of your circumstances, and to rage about what you've seen, what has happened to you, and what you have done and can't take back.

It was all an act for me, a cover-up for deeper fears I couldn't name, and the reason I know that is that we had to dehumanize our victims before we did the things we did. We knew deep down that what we were doing was wrong. So they became dinks or gooks, just like Iraqis are now being transformed into ragheads or hajjis. People had to be reduced to "niggers" here before they could be lynched. No difference. We convinced ourselves we had to kill them to survive, even when that wasn't true, but something inside us told us that so long as they were human beings, with the same intrinsic value we had as human beings, we were not allowed to burn their homes and barns, kill their animals, and sometimes even kill them. So we used these words, these new names, to reduce them, to strip them of their essential humanity, and then we could do things like adjust artillery fire onto the cries of a baby.

Until that baby was silenced, though, and here's the important thing to understand, that baby never surrendered her humanity. I did. We did. That's the thing you might not get until it's too late. When you take away the humanity of another, you kill your own humanity. You attack your own soul because it is

standing in the way.

So we finish our tour, and go back to our families, who can see that even though we function, we are empty and incapable of truly connecting to people any more, and maybe we can go for months or even years before we fill that void where we surrendered our humanity, with chemical anesthetics--drugs, alcohol, until we realize that the void can never be filled and we shoot ourselves, or head off into the street where we can disappear with the flotsam of society, or we hurt others, especially those who try to love us, and end up as another incarceration statistic or a mental patient.

You can ever escape that you became a racist because you made the excuse that you needed that to survive, that you took things away from people that you can never give back, or that you killed a piece of yourself that you may never get back.

Some of us do. We get lucky and someone gives a damn enough to emotionally resuscitate us and bring us back to life. Many do not.

I live with the rage every day of my life, even when no one else sees it. You might hear it in my words. I hate being chumped.

So here is my message to you. You will do what you have to do to survive, however you define survival, while we do what we have to do to stop this thing. But don't surrender your humanity. Not to fit in. Not to prove yourself. Not for an adrenaline rush. Not to lash out when you are angry and frustrated. Not for some ticket-punching fucking military careerist to make his bones on. Especially not for the Bush-Cheney Gas & Oil Consortium.

The big bosses are trying to gain control of the world's energy supplies to twist the arms of future economic competitors. That's what's going on, and you need to understand it, then do what you need to do to hold on to your humanity. The system does that; tells you are some kind of hero action figures, but uses you as gunmen. They chump you.

Your so-called civilian leadership sees you as an expendable commodity. They don't care about your nightmares, about the DU that you are breathing, about the loneliness, the doubts, the pain, or about how your humanity is stripped away a piece at a time. They will cut your benefits, deny your illnesses, and hide your wounded and dead from the public. They already are.

They don't care. So you have to. And to preserve your own humanity, you must recognize the humanity of the people whose nation you now occupy and know that both you and they are victims of the filthy rich bastards who are calling the shots.

They are your enemies--The Suits--and they are the enemies of peace, and the enemies of your families, especially if they are Black families, or immigrant families, or poor families. They are thieves and bullies who take and never give, and they say they will "never run" in Iraq, but you and I know that they will never have to run, because they fucking aren't there. You are

They'll skin and grin while they are getting what they want from you, and throw you away like a used condom when they are done. Ask the vets who are having their benefits slashed out from under them now. Bushfeld and their cronies are parasites, and they are the sole beneficiaries of the chaos you are learning to live in. They get the money. You get the prosthetic devices, the nightmares, and the mysterious illnesses.

So if your rage needs a target, there they are, responsible for your being there, and responsible for keeping

you there. I can't tell you to disobey. That would probably run me afoul of the law. That will be a decision you will have to take when and if the circumstances and your own conscience dictate. But it perfectly legal for you to refuse illegal orders, and orders to abuse or attack civilians are illegal. Ordering you to keep silent about these crimes is also illegal.

I can tell you, without fear of legal consequence, that you are never under any obligation to hate Iraqis, you are never under any obligation to give yourself over to racism and nihilism and the thirst to kill for the sake of killing, and you are never under any obligation to let them drive out the last vestiges of your capacity to see and tell the truth to yourself and to the world. You do not owe them your souls.

Come home safe, and come home sane. The people who love you and who have loved you all your lives are waiting here, and we want you to come back and be able to look us in the face. Don't leave your souls in the dust there like another corpse.

Hold on to your humanity.

Stan Goff - US Army (Ret.)