



2024 NATIONAL POLICY OF UNITED SONS OF LIBERTY

None of the founding fathers pursued politics professionally.
The "Angry Extremists" were the dissidents who refused to
subtly submit to the oppressive rule of an elitist political
establishment over their lives.

Never overlook that.

We hereby proclaim the United Sons of Liberty platform in
accordance with the following principles:

As stated in the Declaration of Independence,

The Constitution of the Land of America

and

As stated in the Bill of Rights,

As per the initial intention expressed by the Founding Fathers.

These founding documents serve as the supreme law of the
land and the cornerstone of our freedom.

As stated in the Declaration of Independence, the solitary
purpose of government is to protect the inalienable rights that
were bestowed upon us by our Creator.

The expansion of government beyond its prescribed boundaries
constitutes usurpation, which in turn undermines individual
liberty.

Our firm conviction is that a renewed commitment to the
original intent of these founding documents is the most
effective approach to resolving the significant challenges we
presently confront.

Bring Domestic Government Authority Back Home.

It is probable that civil government will be more responsible, responsive, and accountable the closer it is to the people. Enumerated in Articles I through VI of the Constitution are the powers that the federal government is authorized to exercise. Article I, Section 8, which delineates the authority of Congress, is particularly significant.

It is evident that the federal government was founded on the principle of limited authority. Specifically, the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution stipulates:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Over the course of time, the constitutional constraints on the authority of the federal government have been significantly diminished. Restoring the balance of authority between the federal government and the states, as stipulated in the Constitution and as ratified by its framers and intended by its authors, is necessary for the preservation of constitutional government.

We solemnly commit to adhering to this constitutional mandate and diligently striving to reclaim for the states and the people their lawful authority over legislative, judicial, executive, and regulatory duties that the federal government has not been constitutionally delegated.

We are vehemently opposed to any form of government regionalization, regardless of its level, which would deprive the people or those elected directly by the people of decision-making authority.

With the consensus that every state's entry into the Union is at its own discretion and that no state

should ever be "Hotel California," we cling to the compact theory. We, in our collective capacity, demand the immediate rescinding of all legislation that has transferred authority from the state to the federal government.

Conduct of character and morality

The Second President and signatory to the Declaration of Independence, John Adams, cautioned:

"Our Constitution was made only for moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other."

His counsel also included:

"The people have a right—an indisputable, unalienable, indefeasible, divine right—to that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge—I mean of the character and conduct of their rulers."

Our very Constitution is imperiled when we tolerate unethical behavior among our elected and appointed officials.

The level of public esteem and reverence for public officials has plummeted to an abhorrent state. A contributor to this national disgrace, according to the United Sons of Liberty, is the decline in the personal integrity of government officials, which is further aggravated by the absence of public condemnation regarding the unethical behavior exhibited by public servants. It is imperative that party leaders and public officials exemplify a myriad of commendable attributes, including but not limited to honesty, integrity, dependability, moral uprightness, fidelity, prudence, temperance, justice, fortitude, self-control, courage, kindness, and compassion. They cannot be trusted in public if they cannot be trusted in their private lives.

It is critical that United Sons of Liberty and its state affiliates' members and nominated candidates acknowledge the significance of exhibiting exemplary character in their personal lives.

This statement does not exclude individuals who have previously encountered difficulties but have since rectified their errors and progressed with their lives.

Congressional Reform

Constitution of the United States, Article 6, Clause 3:

"The Senators and Representatives... shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."

The United States Congress has evolved into a self-serving, overpaid, and overstaffed institution. In order to fund inflated and unconstitutionally established salaries, pensions, and benefits, it appropriates taxpayer funds. The majority of Congressmen are now held more responsible to the establishment in Washington than to their constituents. Too frequently, both chambers of Congress exhibit a lack of responsiveness and irresponsibility, displaying an arrogant attitude that elevates them beyond the authority of the laws they pass and the citizens they have a duty to serve and represent.

At this juncture, it is imperative that the American people reestablish efficacious oversight of their public servants, reinstate appropriate benchmarks, and reclaim control of the government. In order to restore congressional oversight to the public and adherence to the Constitution, it is imperative that all legislation that transfers legislative authority to regulatory bodies, bureaucracies, private organizations, the Federal Reserve Board, international organizations, the president, or the judiciary be repealed.

Legislation prohibiting the affixation of irrelevant amendments to measures is in our favor.

Amendments must remain consistent with the intent and purpose of the initial legislation.

We advocate for a rule change mandating that all members perform a complete read of each measure before it is submitted to a vote on the floor. A full read is calculated to require 5 minutes per page, based on an 8-hour workday and five days per week.

We advocate for legislative measures that would mandate the inclusion of an exact record of proceedings in the Congressional Record. It is strictly prohibited for members of Congress to revise speeches or remarks made during debates or other proceedings conducted from the floors of their respective houses. Furthermore, any supplementary materials may only be included in the record if they are referenced in the speaker's presentation and for which space has been designated.

Our objective is to eliminate post-term benefits and congressional pensions. Additionally, we support a conflict-of-interest clause that bars former congressmen from engaging in lobbying activities for a period of six years following their term in office.

To reduce congressional salaries required to maintain living domiciles by members, we support a provision mandating that all states provide lodging for Congressional delegates through the ownership of state-owned residences, apartments, or condominiums in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.

We endorse a provision mandating that salary increases for all personnel and members of Congress be exclusively correlated with COLA increases. Additionally, benefits are not subject to approval or vote by members of Congress.

Furthermore, United Sons of Liberty is opposed to the sole requirement of caucus under a two-party system. An independent elected official pledging allegiance to a political party while not adhering to its platform is both unjust and discriminatory.

We advocate for a regulation change which would prohibit any federal employee, staff member, or immediate family member from possessing authority over equities or personal assets by virtue of their employment with the government. The government is afflicted with legislation that effectively shuts the door on enrichment.

Conscription

Constitution of the United States, Fifth Amendment:

"No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

One is deprived of liberty through conscription in the absence of due process of law. Clearly, this violates the provisions of the 5th Amendment. Constriction of an individual's labor constitutes the forcible acquisition of property. Permitting conscription undermines a crucial check on the Executive Branch's unconstitutional expansion.

The concept of individual liberty is incompatible with mandatory government service. All forms of mandatory government service, including the draft, the registration law, and mandatory military training, are met with our utmost opposition.

Our institutions of higher education, including universities and colleges, provide voluntary Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) military training and a well-organized, state home militia.

Convention of the Constitution

We affirm the original text of the Bill of Rights and the United States Constitution. It is affirmed that the Constitution, the Nation's Charter, and the Declaration of Independence comprise the fundamental legislation of the federal union. Hence, we unequivocally denounce any legislative, executive, or judicial action that deviates from the literal and symbolic intent of the Constitution and the Charter.

We unequivocally reject any endeavor to convene a constitutional convention, regardless of its objective, due to the fact that it is impracticable to restrict to a singular matter and could significantly undermine the inviolable rights safeguarded by the Constitution.

The Cost of Big Government

The 45th Federalist Papers, James Madison

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined."

U.S. Article 10 of the Constitution

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Protecting the God-granted rights of its citizens—life, liberty, and property—is a valid and fundamental objective of civil government. Funding should be restricted to those efforts, operations, and initiatives that are explicitly designated for the federal government by the Constitution. We strongly urge both the President and Congress to cease all federal expenditures that have not been expressly authorized by the United States. Constitution and to restore to the states those

programs, powers, and revenue streams that have been usurped by the federal government. We urge the President to exercise his veto power in order to prevent the expenditure of funds appropriated by Congress for unconstitutional programs or in excess of tax revenue collected, as well as to halt irresponsible and unconstitutional appropriations.

Constraints on the budget are significantly influenced by the continuously increasing national debt. One of the primary expenditures of the government is interest on the debt; failure to remit the interest will result in further escalation of the debt due to the accumulation of interest. We must eliminate the debt as quickly as possible by the following means:

Ensuring that expenditures do not exceed revenues collected;

Accruing interest payments in a synchronized manner; and

Annually reducing the principal amount

An expedited resolution to the debt could be achieved through the sale of specific federal assets and territories, such as unused foreign military bases, with the proceeds being allocated solely towards debt reduction. Currently as of 2022 there is 31.63 trillion in assets held overseas.

War is one of the leading contributors to budget deficits. The elimination of national debt necessitates that the United States refrain from unwarrantedly engaging in perpetual conflicts. The founders did not foresee an imperialistic constitutional government. It was not anticipated that the United States would conduct global surveillance at the expense of its taxpayers.

We abstain from employing the deceptive terminology "surplus" and "balanced budget" so long as the public debt remains. We denounce deceitful accounting practices, including the

utilization of "off-budget items" to obscure expenditure practices that violate the Constitution.

We demand an end to the federal government's raids on Medicare, Social Security, and Railroad Retirement funds. It is our conviction that the Social Security system can be privatized over an extended duration without causing any adverse effects on its beneficiaries.

Nevertheless, the program has been operational since the 1930s, during which time both employees and their employers made voluntary contributions in the form of taxes. The government is obligated to fulfill its vow of providing the benefits.

We advocate for the complete elimination of the Civil Service system, as it is believed that it grants government employees a "property right" with respect to their employment.

Crime

The preeminent constitutional scholar during the American Founding Era was St. George Tucker. In 1803, he published "View of the Constitution of the United States", an exhaustive analysis of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of 1787.

Tucker considers felonies not specifically listed in the United States Constitution to be subject to state jurisdiction.

An Analysis of the United States Constitution, pages 210–211:

"...the very guarded manner in which Congress is vested with authority to legislate upon the subject of crimes and misdemeanors. They are not entrusted with a general power over these subjects, but a few offenses are selected from the great mass of crimes with which society may be infested, upon which only Congress is authorized to prescribe the punishment or define the offense. All felonies and

offenses committed upon land, in all cases not expressly enumerated, are reserved to the states, respectively."

Clause 6, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution:

"To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;"

Constitution of the United States, Article III, Clause 2:

"The Congress shall have power to declare the Punishment of Treason."

Tenth Amendment:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Crime is typically the responsibility of local and state administrations. The federal government is accountable for the increasingly destructive climate of crime to the extent that it impedes the ability of the people in their communities to apprehend, judge, and penalize accused lawbreakers through its legislation, judicial actions, regulations, and executive branch activities.

We support the notion that states and municipalities have the authority to execute individuals convicted of capital offenses and to demand restitution from the victims of such offenders. Federal intervention in criminal justice processes at the state and local levels should be restricted to the extent permitted by the Constitution.

Upon request, all individuals accused of offenses ranging from minor to capital shall be afforded a jury trial. Moreover, the jury shall be duly apprised

of its prerogative to nullify the law. Moreover, we disapprove of the prosecution and condemnation of defendants for the same alleged criminal offense by state and federal courts under distinct legislation, which violates the constitutionally protected presumption against double jeopardy.

We contend that on account of the fact that all men are created equal, they are entitled to equal legal protection. Enhanced penalties for so-called hate crimes and all "hate crime" legislation at all levels of government are met with our strong opposition. It is duly acknowledged that the classification of "hate crime" results in the expansion of federal jurisdiction to encompass offenses that would typically fall under the purview of individual states or local governments. Furthermore, we hold the view that special treatment or prosecution for particular social groups or occupations is unjust. We contend that all individuals, created in the likeness of God, are entitled to equivalent safeguards and legal retribution in regards to offenses perpetrated against innocent victims.

Defense

"The very purpose of government," as the Second Paragraph of the Declaration of Independence defines it, is to:

"Governments are established among men to safeguard these [inalienable] rights," which include "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In order to discharge this responsibility, the Preamble of the Constitution specifies that the Federal Government is entrusted with the following duty:

"Advocate for the collective defense. "

Clauses 11–16 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution confer additional authority and

direction on Congress in this regard, including the power to

"To raise and support armies" together with "to provide and maintain a navy."

Ensuring the common defense and maintaining a state of constant vigilance regarding potential threats, prospective capabilities, and perceived intentions of potential adversaries are fundamental duties of the federal government.

We express our dissent towards the unilateral disarmament and dismantling of the United States' defense infrastructure, as abruptly dismantled systems are difficult to reconstruct.

We strongly denounce the president's exercise of power to mobilize American forces into battle in violation of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, in the absence of a congressional declaration of war.

We would never authorize the deployment of U.S. forces to serve under the flag or command of a foreign power. We vehemently oppose the concept of a New World Order and disapprove of any involvement by the United States in or a transfer of command to a foreign authority.

The primary objective of U.S. security policy is to safeguard the nation's national security interests. Consequently, with the exception of proclaimed war situations, no state National Guard or reserve forces shall be mobilized to assist or carry out operations in foreign theaters for the sake of state security.

It is advisable that we be allies of liberty, while remaining solely liable for its protection and sustenance.

We advocate for the preservation of a formidable, cutting-edge armed force across all domains—land, sea, air, and space. We further urge the legislative

and executive branches to allocate funds consistently for the modernization of our armed forces, in accordance with evolving technologies and a perpetually shifting global landscape. Lastly, we demand the prompt deployment of a fully operational strategic defense system.

It is our firm conviction that all defense expenditures ought to be intrinsically linked to safeguarding our nation. Furthermore, we assert that a meticulous examination of each expenditure item is necessary to eradicate foreign aid, waste, fraud, thievery, inefficiency, and surplus profits from defense contracts and military outlays.

While we do not entirely reject policies and practices that enable women to train for or engage in combat, it is important to acknowledge that the radical feminization of the military in the last two decades can and does undermine the morale, integrity, and performance of our military organizations through forced integration and dual qualification standards. Consequently, all policies pertaining to the integration of women into combat roles should adhere to the same standard as their male counterparts.

In accordance with our legal and patriotic obligations as free citizens of the United States, we fully endorse and promote the reestablishment of unorganized militias operating at the county and community levels, as well as well-regulated state-level militias.

We strongly object to the unilateral relinquishment of our military base rights in Panama. Treaties between the United States and Panama have compromised the sovereign right of the United States to the territory of the Canal Zone, which includes the ten-mile-wide Canal Zone. Since the United States purchased both the grant ownership and sovereignty of the area, we recommend that the United States government reinstate and

safeguard its sovereign right and exempt the Canal Zone from any obligations.

Ensuring compliance with the provision of the 1978 Panama Canal Neutrality Treaty that proscribes non-Republic of Panama and non-United States of America control over the Panama Canal's entrances as a priority for the President and Congress would be the awarding of port facilities at the canal's entrances to Hutchison Whampoa, a Hong Kong company with close ties to the Chinese Communist People's Liberation Army.

It is indefensible to have unilaterally ceded all military bases in Afghanistan, particularly Bagram Air Base, due to its strategic importance in the Middle East region. The Taliban's takeover of Afghanistan was a mistake in and of itself, as were our failures to assist the duly elected Afghan government in its struggle against the Taliban and the disorderly withdrawal of our personnel and troops, which ultimately led to the downfall of the elected government.

The resurgence of terrorist organizations within Afghanistan, which now possess the means to re-infiltrate the United States mainland, and the Chinese government's access to the country for its own financial benefit. The United States' policy should have consistently adhered to a twenty-year timeframe, rather than twenty individual single year plans.

Diplomatic Policy

We base our Diplomatic policy on a few notable speeches and policies of the past.

[George Washington's farewell address.](#)

"Europe has a set of primary interests, which have to us none, or very remote relations. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our

concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise of us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities."

Why would one ignore the benefits of such an unusual circumstance? Why abandon our own in order to stand on foreign soil? Why, through the intertwining of our fate with that of any region of Europe, should our prosperity and tranquility become entangled in the strivings, rivalries, interests, cunning, or caprice of Europe?"

[The First Inaugural Address of Thomas Jefferson, Bergh 3:321. \(1801.\)](#)

"I deem [one of] the essential principles of our government, and consequently [one] which ought to shape its administration—peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

[Address by John Quincy Adams in Washington, DC on July 4, 1821](#)

"Always abstaining from interfering in the affairs of others, even when the dispute has been over principles to which the United States adheres." She does not travel the globe in pursuit of serpents to vanquish. She has a positive regard for the autonomy and liberty of every individual. She exclusively champions and vouches for her own cause.

[The Monroe Doctrine, James Monroe](#)

"We have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. Our policy in regard to Europe is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers."

[The concept of national sovereignty:](#)

Since the United States is a properly free and sovereign republic that should strive to live in peace with all nations without interfering in their internal affairs or permitting them to interfere in ours, we are adamantly opposed to entangled alliances—via treaties or any other form of commitment—that commit us to intervention in foreign wars or compromise our national sovereignty. Moreover, we oppose the negotiation or ratification of any treaty, agreement, or other commitment that compromises our national sovereignty.

In pursuit of this objective, we shall:

vehemently oppose U.S. involvement in any international governmental organization, including any court overseen by the United Nations;

We strongly urge the President and Congress to revoke the United States' membership in the United Nations and its subsidiary organizations, as well as its involvement in all purported United Nations peacekeeping operations. Prohibit the United Nations and its affiliated entities from conducting additional operations, including fund-raising, on American soil; and

We strongly advocate for adherence to the Constitution, which should forbid the United States government from engaging in any treaty or agreement that requires the use of American military forces or tax dollars, compromises the sovereignty of the United States, or serves a purpose that should be governed by domestic law. We particularly condemn the agreement that would form the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) and any other trade agreements of a similar nature.

It is imperative that American personnel exclusively operate under the command of American commanders, and not those of foreign nations or the United Nations.

Domestic Federal Assistance

According to the 10th Amendment:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

All powers not delegated to the federal government are transferred to the states or the people by the Constitution.

Without constitutional authorization, domestic federal "aid" is not only unlawful, but also immoral.

We therefore urge the states to refuse all federal funds for purposes not expressly and clearly defined in the Constitution, as well as to reject all unconstitutional mandates and regulations. By doing so, we can reinstate the intended balance of power between the states and the U.S. Government, which was intended for the states.

Drug Policy:

According to the 10th Amendment:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

The Fourth Amendment specifies:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized."

United Sons of Liberty will uphold and enforce the authority of local governments and states to restrict drug access. We advocate for legislative measures that halt the importation of illicit substances from foreign countries into the United States. In the interest of self-defense, retaliatory measures such as tariffs, embargoes, and sanctions should be contemplated.

Concurrently, we shall ensure that constitutional and civil rights of American citizens are not violated; searches and seizures devoid of probable cause and due process, respectively, shall be proscribed, and the presumption of innocence shall be upheld.

Unlike the majority, United Sons of Liberty does not consider the legalization of marijuana to be a boon. The true ramifications of that policy, encompassing mental and physical health concerns, have only revealed themselves since individual states have enacted legislation legalizing it. The sale of cannabis should not generate profits for any state or federal agency, and the prevailing policy should have been to decriminalize rather than legalize it.

Education Reform

Given the absence of authority over education granted to the federal government by the Constitution, the 10th Amendment is applicable.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Section 1: In support of the parental right to ensure their children's education:

We uphold the principle that parents have the absolute authority to arrange for their children's education in any way that is most suitable for them, including homeschooling, religious and private

institutions, online schools, charter schools, and charter schools.

It is necessary to oppose any legislation at any level of government that would restrict or interfere with this liberty.

It is necessary to provide families whose children do not attend public institutions with equitable tax relief.

The abolition of mandatory attendance policies is warranted; parents are not obligated to contravene the law by enrolling their children in schools that fail to earn their approval.

Section 2: SUPPORT FOR ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS IN EDUCATION:

We support the free-market ideals that motivate the advancement of education via non-traditional means, including homeschooling, charter schools, Christian and private institutions, and online schools.

Section 3: A CALL FOR THE FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S ELIMINATION

The authority of the federal government to provide for and regulate the education of our children is not vested in any provision of the Constitution.

It is recommended that all existing federal legislation pertaining to education be repealed, and that no further federal laws be enacted that regulate education.

Section 4: FEDERAL CONTROL OVER THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN IS OBJECTED.

We hereby specify that jurisdiction over any facet of a child's upbringing cannot be delegated to any federal agency, department, board, or other entity, as authority over education has been transferred away from the Department of Education.

Consequently, the responsibility for their children's education, training, and discipline falls squarely with their parents.

Personnel, comprehensive sex education, psychological and psychiatric research testing programs, national teacher certification, educational curricula, textbook selection, or learning standards should all remain outside the purview of the federal government.

Teaching CRT, transgenderism, or LGBTQ subjects to immature children is strictly forbidden. This is equivalent to incorporating religious instruction into public school curricula; parental authority over such matters should be maintained.

Section 5: We challenge the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB Act) and advocate for its repeal through a race to the top and a congressional call:

The NCLB Act, which is unconstitutional and imposes unfunded mandates on states, not only burdens but frequently ties states' hands, prohibits states from making education-related decisions, and threatens states with the loss of federal funds for noncompliance. Graduation rates and grades have continued to decline since NCLB was re-enacted. Our education system, which was once a beacon in the hill for the world, is now in shambles.

Section 6: The legislatures of the states are urged to:

by exercising their 10th Amendment sovereignty to nullify the "No Child Left Behind" Act and all Department of Education regulations, and

in opposition to federal funding for grades K–12.

Section 7: The reintroduction of civics to seventh through twelfth graders is proposed.

Research has demonstrated that the absence of civics in the educational curriculum substantially

impacts the worldview and comprehension of children and young adults in the long run.

Section 8: The reintroduction of vocational courses to schools is called upon.

Students have been noticeably impacted by the elimination of vocational courses such as metalworking, welding, cooking, and horticulture. Specifically, they have lost a sense of accomplishment and the ability to create and support themselves. Furthermore, they now graduate without any practical skills necessary to support themselves in the modern world.

Election Reform Procedures:

Federal Constitution, Clause 1 of Article 1, Section 4:

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives shall be prescribed in each state by the Legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations."

The United Sons of Liberty advocates for the reinstatement of a state and local-controlled electoral system that is impervious to manipulation by federal judges and bureaucrats. In regards to district boundaries, electoral procedures, and campaign activities, the federal government has prematurely and unconstitutionally assumed control.

It is necessary to examine the Voting Rights Act and its amendments in light of state and demographic legislation enacted to rectify any inequities.

Every individual should possess the entitlement to run for public office in compliance with the requirements stipulated in the constitutions of both the federal and state levels.

The imposition of further regulations and responsibilities pertaining to the eligibility of candidates and the conduct of campaigns unconstitutionally undermines the integrity and responsibility of our political system.

In order to promote the integrity of electoral processes, it is imperative that all candidates are accorded equal treatment. To this end, we advocate for the abolition of designated "major party" status, which confers an unjust advantage on certain candidates through ballot access and taxpayer funding, while necessitating others for the same office to collect petition signatures or satisfy additional rigorous standards.

We advocate for the complete repeal of all federal campaign finance laws, including McCain-Feingold, on the grounds that they contravene the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

To mitigate the risk of electoral fraud, we require that both paper and electronic voting processes generate a transparent, auditable, and verifiable trace. Additionally, elections ought to be audited arbitrarily at the precinct level subsequent to the conclusion of polling.

"After the fact" signature verification significantly raises the expense of an election. Since genuine freedom occasionally necessitates inconvenience and additional exertion,

We support the practice of states purging voter registers every 30 days. Additionally, we advocate for the removal of voters from the rolls following three or more consecutive election cycles.

We support the design and implementation of election systems in Washington and Colorado, which have demonstrated greater reliability than voting machines and require signatures and voter registrations, thereby facilitating voting access for the homebound and disabled.

We firmly oppose any form of ballot harvesting conducted by a group and advocate for its prohibition across all states.

It is imperative that all outer security envelopes utilized for ballots be barcoded. This will enable them to be inserted into the system for tracking purposes solely upon dropping. Additionally, drop receptacles ought to be fortified with an internal container and restricted access solely to the election tally chambers.

In order to maintain accurate records of the time and ballots deposited, it is imperative that every drop box be equipped with a video camera that records the individual delivering each ballot. In the event that any of these systems malfunction, the locks on the drop boxes are securely closed until the necessary repairs are made.

Electoral College

Part of Article II, Section I of the United States Constitution is as follows:

"Each state shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of senators and representatives to which the state may be entitled in the Congress; but no senator, representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector."

The aforementioned provision instituted the Electoral College. In contrast to the popular vote, the election process for the President and Vice President of the United States is governed by the selection of "Electors" in accordance with regulations endorsed by legislators of each state. These electors were furnished with a roster of certified candidates and were tasked with casting their ballots in favor of the individual they deemed most deserving of occupying the aforementioned

highest-ranking positions entrusted with the federal government.

While the Constitution does not impose any particular requirement on states regarding the election process or voting practices of these representatives, its language implies that distinguished individuals would be appointed or elected to serve as electors representing their respective congressional districts and the state as a whole. In accordance with this system, each voter would have the opportunity to select three individuals: one to represent their district and two "at large" representatives to serve as representatives of the state.

Until the 1830s, this was the prevailing protocol; subsequent to that, all states adopted a "general ticket" system, with the exception of South Carolina. Presently, the "general ticket" system remains in operation; it perpetuates corruption by means of an unjust transfer of authority from congressional districts to the states and major cities, while rural communities bear the burden.

The National Popular Vote, which permits as few as eighteen to twenty-one states to circumvent the constitutional requirement that all thirty-eight states amend the Constitution, poses a grave threat to our Constitutional Republic, according to the United Sons of Liberty. They urge states to abandon the "general ticket" system and revert to the procedure originally envisioned by the Framers.

The National Popular Vote process, which forces electors to vote against the ballots of their constituents, effectively eliminates the last vestiges of the Electoral College as originally established in the United States Constitution. As such, it generates a fictitious majority.

A presidential candidate could be elected with as little as 15% of the popular vote, per the National Popular Vote scheme, because there is no threshold

for what constitutes a "majority" under that system. The elimination of the Electoral College would render overnight the votes of Americans in approximately 25 states irrelevant, as candidates would only be interested in campaigning in large-population states, rendering small states meaningless zeros.

The National Popular Vote is opposed by the United Sons of Liberty, which will strive to defeat it in state legislatures.

Energy

The 45th Federalist Papers, James Madison

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined."

Constitution of the United States, 10th Amendment

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Concerning energy, the United Sons of Liberty urge the United States to maintain a sufficient energy supply for national security and to adopt an immediate policy of free market solutions in order to achieve and maintain energy independence permanently. These solutions include the use of renewable energy sources that are both economically viable and environmentally friendly, as well as synthetic fuels and biofuels, in addition to the traditional approach of putting down a stealth Hoover.

It is imperative to uphold private property rights and refrain from federal interference in the exploration and implementation of viable energy sources such as nuclear energy, natural gas,

hydroelectric power, solar energy, and wind generators.

Environment

The 45th Federalist Papers, James Madison

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined."

U.S. Article 10 of the Constitution

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

United Sons of Liberty is of the opinion that stewardship of the natural resources entrusted to us should be prudent, productive, and efficient. We abstain from accepting or pursuing magical solutions to environmental problems solely on the basis that they are fashionable or trendy at the moment.

Funding and influence have been invested in environmental science to promote the pseudoscience of global warming. We do believe that warming zones are caused by humans, but not climate change. Furthermore, that the cyclical nature of the earth's warming and cooling should be comprehended prior to imposing radical alterations on the populace.

The United Sons of Liberty argue against the fallacious scientific consensus regarding climate change, contending that environmentalists and globalists are exploiting the threat of global warming to advance their own interests through sustainable development on a global scale. As per the organization's position, eminent domain is considered illegal due to the fact that "the federal government may never seize private property

through regulations and rules that prohibit or significantly restrict the productive use of the property, even in exchange for fair compensation."

However, this necessitates an ongoing and appropriate dynamic equilibrium between utilization and preservation, as well as between development and conservation.

Consistent with this stipulation, we ardently endorse practical endeavors to safeguard the environment and mitigate pollution across land, air, and water. However, we refute the argument regarding the perceived danger posed by global warming caused by humans, as it has been disproven by an extensive body of scientific research. The globalists are utilizing the prospect of global warming to increase their influence through sustainable development on a global scale.

The federal power of eminent domain is restricted by the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution to the purchase of private property with just compensation for public use, excluding urban renewal, environmental protection, and historic preservation, which are considered public ownership. Examples of such properties include military reservations and government office buildings.

The federal government may not seize private property through the implementation of rules and regulations that prohibit or significantly restrict the productive use of the property, even in cases where just compensation is provided.

Our position is for the return of all territories seized by the federal government in violation of the Constitution to the states and the people.

Additionally, we demand that the federal wetland legislation and the Endangered Species Act be revised.

Furthermore, we are in opposition to any endeavor that seeks to designate public or private properties as Biosphere Reserves or United Nations World Heritage Sites. We urge the cessation of U.S. involvement in United Nations initiatives, including but not limited to UNESCO, Man and the Biosphere, and the UN Council on Sustainable Development.

Our stance is in opposition to environmental treaties and conventions that infringe upon our sovereignty and right to private property, including the Biodiversity Treaty, the Convention on Climate Control, and Agenda 21.

Executive Orders

Clearly, Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution limits the authority to enact legislation:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

Our stance is in opposition to the utilization of presidential executive orders that legislate or otherwise usurp the legislative and judicial branches' constitutional authority and responsibilities. Congress must end this pernicious practice against the Constitution. Whatever executive directives are unconstitutional are nullified.

Family

As the 10th Amendment affirms, no civil government may lawfully authorize or define marriage or family relations; this authority is delegated to the people, in accordance with how our Founding Fathers regarded the family as essential to the common good.

The exclusion of any definition of marriage from the Constitution is deliberate; it is not a fundamental tenet of the document, and any attempt to impose

it through judicial legislation is an abuse of the people's authority.

The establishment of the family is predicated on the marriage covenant, which in turn is critical to preserving a prosperous, stable, and healthy social order. No governing body may lawfully define or sanction matrimony or family ties. We hold a firm stance against any judicial decision or amendment to the United States Constitution. A constitutional provision, including state constitutions, that redefines marriage in any way. Marriage is an institution established between two consenting adults of legal age and, if desired, of their respective religions; the government should not intervene in defining it.

We advocate for the elimination of all economic formulas and taxation that deter matrimony, followed by the promotion of cohabitation and reproduction outside of marriage, as well as the prohibition or financing of government initiatives and programs that erode the authority of the family or parental rights.

Protesting the idea that homosexuals and transgender individuals merit preferential treatment or legal safeguards, we uphold the authority of municipalities and states to outlaw sexual conduct that is deemed objectionable. We reserve our dissent against any endeavors to establish a novel sexual legal framework via legislative bodies or judicial bodies.

We are in opposition to legislation deemed "hate crime" and "sexual orientation" statutes, which seek to criminalize hate speech or suppress public opposition to the expression of inappropriate sexual behavior.

We are opposed to the financing of "partner" benefits by the government for unattached individuals.

It is widely acknowledged that parents possess an inherent entitlement and obligation to provide care, instruction, and guidance for their offspring. We vehemently oppose any governmental agency assuming any of these responsibilities in the absence of explicit parental consent or legal due process. The value of a two-parent household is affirmed.

The provisions governing abortion are not defined in the Constitution. States and local administrations are therefore tasked with establishing regulations and laws that reflect the preferences of their constituents.

Nevertheless, United Sons of Liberty approaches this matter pragmatically, noting that the founding fathers would not have considered it essential to tackle this particular concern. From the 18th century until approximately 1880, abortions were legally permissible and prevalent according to common law. Leslie Reagan's book *"When Abortion Was a Crime"* stated that they became unlawful only after expectant women experienced "quickening," a highly subjective term used to characterize the moment they could feel the embryo moving. This would occur between the twelfth and fifteenth week of the pregnancy.

We provide support for this conventional 18th-century perspective for a duration of 15 weeks. In addition, we endorse it on the grounds of rape and incest, with the approval of a physician-in-practice. We also endorse it when it comes to the mother's life and health, as evidenced by a review by a board-certified physician in the field.

Foreign Aid Policy

Since the conclusion of World War II, the United States has participated in an unprecedented global philanthropy initiative, devoting billions of dollars annually to assist foreign countries. This expenditure has no foundation in the Constitution

and has failed to garner support from any nation. Moreover, these investments have failed to earn us any allies and represent a significant financial burden on our taxpayers. Consequently, we demand the following:

No additional funds shall be appropriated for any program of foreign aid;

It is proposed that the United States withdraw its involvement from international lending institutions, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Abolish the Export-Import Bank;

Immediately cease all government subsidies, tax preferences, and investment guarantees that incentivize American companies to invest in foreign territories; and

It is necessary to collect all debts owed to the United States by foreign nations or foreign entities.

Gambling

The 45th Federalist Papers, James Madison

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined."

Constitution of the United States, 10th Amendment

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

We oppose government sponsorship, involvement, or promotion of gambling, including lotteries, casinos, and the subsidization of Native American casinos, as it contributes to an increase in criminal activity, divisiveness within families, the expansion

of government bureaucracies, and the exploitation of addicts.

We demand the revocation of federal legislation that supersedes the jurisdiction of states and local governments with respect to the approval and oversight of tribal casinos within their borders.

Government / Private Partnership

First Inaugural Address by Thomas Jefferson, Wednesday, March 1, 1801:

"What else is required to ensure our happiness and prosperity as a people?" A prudent and economical government would enforce rules to prevent individuals from harming one another, allow them to govern their own industrial and progressing endeavors, and refrain from robbing labor of the sustenance it has earned. "The sum of good government is as follows."

United States of America was established upon the economic tenets of the "free enterprise" system, which granted individuals the freedom to operate their businesses in accordance with the law, without interference or regulation from the government. This economic paradigm is presently being supplanted by public-private partnerships, which are referred to as fascism. United Sons of Liberty opposes this transition and advocates for a return to the "free enterprise" system that once fueled our nation's prosperity and greatness.

Gun Control

By stating: The Second Amendment strictly prohibits any interference with firearms ownership.

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

The right to bear arms is an intrinsic component of the rights to defend oneself, one's family, and oneself against tyranny. It was bestowed upon individuals and communities by our Creator with the dual purpose of protecting life, property, and liberty, and to aid in the preservation of national independence.

The constitutional protection of the right to keep and bear arms is enshrined in the Second Amendment, which prohibits its legitimate infringement or denial.

The United Sons of Liberty advocates for the preservation of the right to keep and bear arms among its members. We vehemently oppose any legislation that would mandate the registration of firearms or ammunition or restrict the ownership of firearms by law-abiding citizens.

It is emphasized that the prohibition of firearms would exclusively benefit criminals; under such conditions, the protection of law-abiding citizens against intruders would be gravely compromised.

We advocate for the reevaluation of the Federal Firearms Act of 1968, which erred in its classification of non-violent citizens as being prohibited from possessing firearms.

We demand that all executive orders be revoked, that future executive orders be prohibited, and that the ratification of any treaty that would restrict the right to keep and bear arms of United States citizens be prohibited.

In order to enhance the protection of American citizens and their families, we suggest that all government-designated "Gun Free Zones," including military bases, be abolished. These areas have been shown to be more attractive to criminals who seek to exploit the absence of firearms among the local populace.

Additionally, we were opposed to the broadening of restrictions and limitations imposed on nonviolent "white-collar" offenders.

Evidently, each mass shooting in the last two decades is the product of an individual experiencing a mental crisis. Gun control legislation has been ineffective in halting this epidemic of mental health issues; furthermore, there is a dearth of services to address these concerns. Numerous perpetrators have communicated their impending actions to law enforcement or provided advance notice of their impending heinous deeds; however, no preventive measures have been implemented or are feasible. In the most egregious cases, such incidents have transpired.

Healthcare and Administration

The 45th Federalist Papers, James Madison

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined."

Constitution of the United States, 10th Amendment

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Opposing the bureaucratization and governmentalization of American medicine, the United Sons of Liberty believes that government subsidy and regulation jeopardize the accessibility and quality of patient-centered health care and treatment.

Patients should hold hospitals, physicians, and other health care providers accountable, not HMO administrators, insurance bureaucrats, or legislators.

In the event that the federal government exercises control over the supply of medical care, its officers will have the authority to dictate which demands are met. This could lead to service rationing, increased costs, substandard outcomes, and the transfer of the critical decision-making authority from compassionate physicians to unaccountable political overseers.

We strongly oppose any civil government agency that uses age or any other personal characteristic to: restrict individuals and insurance companies from contracting for medical coverage voluntarily; compel such individuals to participate in socialized medicine programs (e.g., Medicare); or forbid individuals from using insurance funds and/or their own funds to acquire medical services that supplement or improve the quality of those provided by the program.

We support propositions for "family coverage" health insurance plans that are managed by employees and are founded on the principles of cash value life insurance.

There is no constitutional provision that authorizes the federal government to regulate or restrict the public's access to medical supplies, treatments, or care. Consequently, we support the reorganization of the Food and Drug Administration, the principal federal agency that has been prosecuting beneficial products, technologies, and treatments that are readily available in the majority of developed nations.

We support the principle that all citizens have the right to exercise freedom of treatment and practitioner selection in their healthcare.

We advocate for the adherence of patients to the legal system in order to pursue remedies for their complaints against HMOs and insurers.

We strongly denounce the Federal Administration's fabrications, which were instrumental in securing the Medicare prescription drug bill's passage. Furthermore, we condemn the exploitation of this legislation to secure government subsidies for special interest groups, such as HMOs, and to safeguard the artificially exorbitant prices of prescription drugs for consumers.

Furthermore, as a consequence of their location or the incapability of medical staff and doctors to repay their student loans, numerous communities have come to lack of care and medical facilities. This is a problem that affects both inner-city and rural areas, as it is frequently impracticable to travel for extended periods of time to see a doctor. For this reason, we advocate for the expansion of telemedicine and nurse practitioners, whose debt could be subsidized by local governments or municipalities.

Medical malpractice lawsuits have significantly increased the overall cost of healthcare by compelling physicians to perform unnecessary tests and treatments in the name of defensive medicine. This has a disproportionate impact on rural America, as obstetricians, surgeons, and other providers are compelled to relocate to urban areas or retire in response to the escalating insurance premiums. To that end, we advocate for both state and federal legislation that caps non-economic damages in medical malpractice lawsuits.

Immigration

Constitution of the United States, Article 4, Section 4:

"The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union a Republican form of government and shall protect each of them against invasion."

The words of James Madison:

"When contemplating the potential benefits that may arise from a streamlined process of naturalization, it is imperative to also bear in mind the requisite precautions to prevent any potential excesses... Aliens could potentially obtain citizenship, repatriate to their country of origin, and circumvent legislation designed to promote the economic and commercial activities of legitimate American citizens and residents, all the while benefiting from the privileges accorded to citizens.

We affirm the constitutional authority and responsibility of the federal government to safeguard and secure the integrity of the United States' international borders, including the regulation of the quantity and quality of immigrants entering the country.

An estimated one million lawful immigrants and almost two and a half million unauthorized aliens entered the United States in 2023. All of these immigrants, including the unlawful aliens, have been granted eligibility for a range of public assistance programs, such as those for housing, education, Social Security, and legal services.

The substantial influx of individuals with low socioeconomic status into the United States threatens the wage structure and labor equilibrium of American citizens and raises the cost of government at the federal, state, and local levels, in addition to increasing the tax burden and straining the social fabric. This unconstitutional drain on the federal Treasury is exerting a severe and detrimental influence on our economy.

This has the greatest impact on low-income adolescents and minorities residing in the United States at this time, diminishing their employment opportunities.

Our position is that the misuse of the H-1B and L-1 visa provisions outlined in the Immigration Act is causing the displacement of American workers in

favor of foreign nationals. We advocate for a temporary ban on immigration to the United States, with the exception of cases involving political asylum, extreme hardship, or other exceptional circumstances. This moratorium would remain in effect until all federal subsidies and assistance are withdrawn, and appropriate security protocols have been implemented to safeguard against terrorist infiltration.

Furthermore, we require that any private organization or group that requests the admission of an immigrant to the United States, regardless of the reason, be legally obligated to provide housing and sustenance for the immigrant, assume complete responsibility for the immigrants' economic independence, and post adequate bonds to certify such commitments.

The United Sons of Liberty advocate for the reinstatement of immigration policies by the federal government, which operated under the stipulation that prospective Americans would be denied entry if they would place an unwarranted burden on the United States, any state, or any American citizen due to factors such as criminal record, moral character, financial reliance, or health.

We hold a firm stance against the allocation of taxpayer-funded benefits and welfare subsidies to unauthorized immigrants. Additionally, we denounce the practice of granting U.S. citizenship to children born to illegal alien parents during their sojourn in the country.

We are in opposition to the expansion of amnesty to include undocumented immigrants and advocate for the deployment of United States military forces to safeguard the states from potential invasion.

Citizenship was previously granted on the condition that individuals wishing to participate in the electoral process and governance of this nation could read and comprehend basic English. This

criterion should be reinstated as the benchmark. Citizenship is the ability to comprehend basic English communications.

We support the designation of English as the official language of the United States government for all affairs.

Furthermore, we advocate and support the finalization of the southern border wall and the implementation of advanced surveillance systems, both aerial and subterranean, to deter any air or tunnel incursions.

Furthermore, we require that all trucks and containers entering the ports of entry via land, sea, or air be scanned, with at least 30% of them undergoing random visual inspections. The necessary equipment is readily available in the market and would not significantly disrupt the flow of traffic beyond what is currently achieved through inspections. Moreover, it offers a significantly more secure border against unauthorized immigration and trafficking.

International Engagement

United Sons of Liberty has maintained a steadfast stance against American intervention in conflicts spanning the Middle East, Africa, Asia, Europe, Central and South America. These regions do not possess any intrinsic value that would warrant the loss of American lives on foreign battlefields, and our nation should not be portrayed as a life-squanderer in global arms races. In light of this, we suggest the following for the United States:

denounce any explicit or implicit commitment to deploy United States military forces into foreign conflicts, whether independently, in collaboration with NATO, or as a component of "peacekeeping" operations conducted by the United Nations; and

Put an end to arming and financing combatants in the troubled regions of the globe.

The Monroe Doctrine, which articulates the United States' stance against European adventurism in the Western Hemisphere, is a principle that we uphold.

We strongly urge the Congress to promptly cease American military presence in all foreign nations where such a presence invites the United States to engage in or continue to participate in foreign conflicts.

We hold a stance that opposes the negotiation or ratification of any partnership, treaty, or agreement that could infringe upon the constitutional rights of United States citizens. Furthermore, we oppose any political or economic union that would involve the United States, Canada, and Mexico (NAU).

Judiciary

We draw your attention to the subsequent provisions outlined in Section 1 of Article 3 of the Constitution:

"The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior."

It should be noted that the tenure of federal judges is not indefinite, but rather "during good behavior."

Article 2, Section 4 as well:

"All civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

"All civil officers"

Clearly, justices are included in this.

In addition, the Constitution states with respect to jurisdiction:

"Appellate jurisdiction shall be vested in the Supreme Court," as stated in Clause 2 of Article 3, Section 2. "Subject to the regulations and exceptions that the Congress shall establish."

Congress is authorized by the Constitution to grant exceptions to the Supreme Court's jurisdiction.

Concerning the responsibility of justices, Clause 3 of Article 6, Section 1:

"All executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."

Which Constitution are they obligated to pledge their support to?

Constitutionally, federal justices are not appointed for life; rather, they are appointed for a limited term.

We advocate for the implementation of Congressional oversight over the constitutional principle of good behavior and the limitation of judicial activism through the appropriate removal of erroneous judges via the impeachment procedure outlined in Articles I, § 2, and 3. Additionally, Congress should exercise its authority to prevent all federal courts from hearing cases that it determines to be beyond the jurisdiction of the federal government, as specified in Article III, § 2 of the Constitution.

We reject as invalid judicial decisions that overturn U.S. precedent on the basis of foreign court decisions.

Mental Health

Our stance is in favor of the establishment of a resilient mental health system. The increasing prevalence of mental illness being identified as a significant concern among both adolescents and adults. The fact that federal agencies' recurring justification for inaction following a mass shooting is that they knew the perpetrator demonstrates the profound inadequacy of the mental health system in the United States. Potential determinants contributing to the deterioration of mental health encompass social media usage, isolation, and loneliness. However, additional variables such as personal history and prior encounters with health conditions may also exert an influence. Acquiring psychiatric care can be challenging, in addition to the fact that the prevalence of mental health conditions has increased the demand for such services. A majority of those afflicted with mental health disorders do not seek treatment. Mentally ill adults and adolescents comprise an estimated 11% of the uninsured. This is the case despite the fact that the Affordable Care Act has increased access to affordable healthcare. Over twenty-five million Americans reside in rural regions where there is a dearth of mental health professionals. Even if they possess the resources necessary to consult a specialist, one may not be accessible. Alternatively stated, individuals may be covered by insurance for mental health services; however, the insurance benefits are forfeited in the event that said services are not accessible.

Money and Banking

Clause 5, Section 8 of Article 1 exclusively confers the authority to:

"To issue currency and oversee its value," without any provision for the delegation of this authority to another group.

Congress promptly initiated the process of meeting this duty by enacting the Mint Act of 1792, which established the United States Mint and mandated the production of coins based on silver and gold, specified the value and composition of each coin, and imposed capital punishment on individuals found guilty of debasing such currency.

Part 10 of Article 1:

"States shall not... "Coin currency; issue bills of credit; accept as tender for debts anything other than gold and silver coins."

Notably, the States were prohibited by the Constitution from employing or accepting any form of currency other than that backed by gold and silver. Money serves as a dual purpose—as a medium of exchange and as an emblematic representation of a country's ethical standards.

In order to ensure the integrity of the citizens' earnings and prevent "improper and wicked" manipulation of the nation's medium of exchange, the Founding Fathers devised a system of "coin" currency.

The federal government has granted the private Federal Reserve System unconstitutional control over the nation's banking and monetary systems in violation of the Mint Act of 1792 and the U.S. Constitution's definition of "coin" money.

The United Sons of Liberty advocate for a comprehensive restructuring of the federal taxation system. For this reform to yield the desired results, the following conditions must be met:

Revert to the monetary system that is specified in the Constitution;

It is proposed to repeal the Federal Reserve Act and convert the existing Federal Reserve institutions exclusively into settlement houses.

Fractional reserve banking should be prohibited.

Our objective is to ensure that the American people are not subjected to a "debt money" system. We advocate for the implementation of an interest-free and debt-free money system.

Pacts and Accords

Since World War II, the United States has progressively assumed the unfavorable position of an international policeman. Our nation is transforming from a republic to a global empire through our involvement abroad; in doing so, our freedoms have been sacrificed. The United States is now obligated to defend foreign nations in every region of the globe by treaty, and by agreements other than treaties, it is committed to defend even more.

For example, the United States should withdraw from NATO because it serves no defensive function. Unconstitutional, Undeclared Wars:

Numerous thousands of young Americans have lost their lives in tragic, undeclared, and unconstitutional conflicts in the United States since World War II. These conflicts were a direct and predictable consequence of the bipartisan interventionist policies of both the Democratic and Republican administrations.

United Sons of Liberty is opposed to the continuance of the interventionist policy that has the potential to enlist the nation in additional conflicts. We require the following in return:

In accordance with the provisions of the United States Constitution, employing United States forces

on any foreign battlefield without a declaration of war by Congress shall never again occur.

In opposition to undeclared, unconstitutional wars initiated by the president or in accordance with international obligations that delegate American sovereignty to multilateral organizations, Congress refuses to fund such conflicts.

Personal and Private Property Security

The Fourth Amendment specifies:

"No violation shall be made of the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures; and no

"Warrants shall be issued only in the presence of probable cause, substantiated by oath or affirmation, and providing a detailed description of the location to be searched as well as the individuals or items to be seized."

In addition, the Fifth Amendment safeguards property by stating:

"No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

We reaffirm that civil governments' authority to encroach upon the private lives and affairs of individual citizens, including arbitrary or de facto registration, general and unwarranted electronic surveillance, national computer databases, and national identification cards, must be strictly limited. We uphold the Fourth Amendment right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures.

Additionally, we reaffirm the common-law principle that safeguards individuals against any search or seizure that infringes upon their Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination. We vehemently condemn and oppose executive actions and legislation that deny the public their Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights on the pretext that it is essential to "combat terrorism" or "protect national security."

Our stance is in opposition to legislative and administrative measures that employ asset forfeiture laws to seize private property from individuals unrelated to the crime. Asset forfeiture can only be enforced subsequent to the property owner's conviction as a penalty for the offense. In accordance with the standards of criminal prosecution, such forfeitures must adhere to the full due process of law.

Our stance is against the surveillance and regulation of individuals' financial transactions via proposed legislation like "Know Your Customer." Banks ought to serve as treasury vaults and fiduciaries for the public, not as enforcers of the state. Any data pertaining to customer transactions that the government obtains from banks should be safeguarded by the conventional Fourth Amendment provisions.

Our position is in favor of privacy legislation that forbids private entities from engaging in discriminatory practices against individuals who decline to disclose or obtain a Social Security number. Furthermore, we advocate for legislation that restricts the use of the number to Social Security transactions by governmental entities. Lastly, we demand the repeal of all laws, regulations, and statutes that mandate the application of the Social Security number for purposes other than those specified in the aforementioned legislation.

Presidential Immunity

As is the case with everything else, reality does play a role in the process of policymaking. The idea of "Presidential immunity" is one of the topics that has to be considered. In the case of *Nixon v. Fitzgerald* (1982), the Supreme Court of the United States came to the conclusion that the president is completely immune from civil damages lawsuits that pertain to behavior that occurs inside the "outer perimeter" limits of their responsibilities. However, in the case of *Clinton v. Jones* (1997), the Supreme Court decided against providing sitting presidents with temporary protection from lawsuits that stem from behavior that occurred prior to their term. In addition, we are of the opinion that a sitting president does not have immunity from criminal actions, as well as from direct criminal breaches of the United States Constitution or violations of election and campaign statutes in the United States.

To free ourselves from the rule of the English crown, we fought in the war of independence. Due to the fact that the kings and queens of England were not elected, the people of England and the people of America had very little influence over the decisions that were made by these leaders. The Founding Fathers of the United States came to the conclusion that a monarchy form of government did not provide individuals with sufficient opportunities to participate in the decision-making process at the national level. And it would establish a position of authority that was unrestricted in its scope. These are the reasons why the Founding Fathers would never have imagined that a President would have complete immunity from prosecution.

Religious Freedom

The first clause of the Bill of Rights states:

"Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

It is important to note that the federal government is not endowed with the authority to authorize or prohibit the religious expressions of the people in any location, as prohibited by both the First and Tenth Amendments of our Constitution.

We urge every branch of government, irrespective of the forum in which these liberties are exercised, to cease their assaults on the religious liberties of the people and the states.

It is our conviction that levying taxes on churches and other religious organizations constitutes an explicit and perilous progression towards governmental dominance over the church. Such encroachment is proscribed by the Constitution and demands an immediate cessation.

We contend that membership, volunteer, and employment decisions for private organizations, including the Boy Scouts of America, should be determined by their own oaths and creeds.

Social Security

As stated in the Declaration of Independence:

"The Creator endows every man with specific inalienable rights." "In order to safeguard these rights, human societies establish governments."

The US Constitution's Preamble outlines the means by which the following liberties are to be safeguarded:

"Provide for the common defense; promote the general welfare."

Here, two distinct distinctions must be made:

Promoting implies a more inert stance, whereas providing implies an active and financial contribution. For instance, I may advocate for organizing a lavish feast, but I expect you to furnish the necessary resources.

General welfare is intended to benefit all members of society; in contrast, individual welfare focuses on providing assistance to a specific segment of the population, such as the impoverished.

Social Security is an unconstitutionally authorized form of individual welfare.

The authority to administer a social security system is not vested in the federal government by the Constitution. The United Sons of Liberty supports a phasing out of the entire Social Security program while continuing to fulfill obligations already incurred under the system. In the interim until the responsible phase-out of the current Social Security system can be achieved, we propose the following:

It is imperative that the Social Security tax not serve as a "rainy day" fund from which legislators can pilfer or obtain loans to finance their missteps and indulgences.

Individuals who have made contributions to Social Security will be granted the ability to withdraw those funds and reinvest them in an IRA or other investments that fall under their discretion.

The prohibition of any form of merger between the Social Security System of the United States and that of any foreign nation will ensure that benefits are not disbursed to individuals who have not met the requirements for payments as legal residents under American law.

Eliminate earning restrictions for individuals aged 62 and older, allowing them to earn an unlimited amount of supplementary income without jeopardizing their benefits.

It is necessary to repeal those Social Security provisions that impose penalties on individuals born between 1917 and 1926, commonly referred to as the "notch years." Instead, such individuals should be enrolled in the same benefit schedules as all other eligible recipients.

We advocate for the autonomy of individuals in selecting private retirement and pension programs, whether through their employer-sponsored plans or on an independent basis.

Statehood

Constitution of the United States, Article I, Section 8, Clause 17:

"The authority shall be with Congress... "to exercise exclusive legislative authority in all matters pertaining to a district (not exceeding ten miles square) that may become the seat of the United States government through the acceptance of Congress and the cession of specific states. Additionally, to exercise similar jurisdiction over any locations procured by the legislature of the state in question with the intention of constructing forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, or other essential structures."

Article IV, Fourth Section:

"The United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a Republican form of government."

Clause 3 of Article IV, Section 4:

"New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union."

All newly admitted states, in accordance with the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 (re-enacted under constitutional authority in 1789), are to enter the nation on an equal footing with the original thirteen states.

We are in opposition to any endeavor to grant the District of Columbia statehood or representation in Congress that would be on par with that of an independent state within the federal union.

Our stance is in opposition to any endeavors to grant statehood to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or to increase the number of states from the current fifty. We recognize that each state's membership in the Union is voluntary. Furthermore, we uphold the equal footing doctrine, which holds that all states entering and having entered the Union as states are on an equal footing with the original thirteen.

With the consensus that every state's entry into the Union is at its own discretion and that no state should ever be "Hotel California," we cling to the compact theory.

Furthermore, we collectively advocate for the revocation of any legislation that has resulted in the transfer of state authority to the federal government.

State Sovereignty

According to the 10th Amendment:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

It should be noted that the Constitution granted the Federal Government only a limited number of enumerated powers, leaving all other powers reserved for the States and the people.

Consequently, the federal government's powers were exceptional in nature.

A gradual transformation of our federal republic, which was established through the collaboration of several states, into a socialist apparatus designed to exert federal authority over the states' internal affairs, has occurred.

The authority to impose policies on states pertaining to housing, health care, natural resources, and transportation, among other areas, is not vested in the federal government. It is our belief that states should reclaim their rightful place in federal affairs and legislation, as stated in Amendment 10 of the United States Constitution. By doing so, the federal government would be compelled to cease conducting operations that are not authorized by the Constitution and refrain from intervening in such matters.

Tariffs and commerce

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, the authority to:

"To regulate commerce with foreign nations."

We therefore oppose the unconstitutional transfer of authority over U.S. trade policy from Congress to agencies, domestic or foreign, that improperly exercise policy-setting functions with regard to U.S. trade policy, since Congress may not relinquish or transfer these constitutional powers to others.

Tariffs serve as a constitutional revenue stream and contribute to the safeguarding of the national economy when implemented judiciously. However, the United States government has pursued a free trade policy since the passage of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which has resulted in the destruction or jeopardization of significant sectors of domestic industry and agriculture, wage reductions for American workers, and the

outsourcing or complete elimination of hundreds of thousands of jobs overseas.

We are in complete opposition to any international trade agreements that result in the loss of jobs and the reduction of America's economic self-reliance and capacity to provide for national defense. Such agreements have the detrimental impact of impoverishing American families and communities, as well as undermining American communities.

We consider our nation and its citizens to be more than mere bargaining pieces in the malevolent and ill-conceived New World Order scheme of multinational corporations and international banks.

We abstain from endorsing the trade principle of normal trade relations, also known as most favored nation status, which is employed to curry favor with regimes whose domestic and international policies are abhorrent to all moral people and are fundamentally at odds with the United States' vital interests.

Our stance is vehemently opposed to the "Trade Promotion Authority," an unconstitutional body that transfers the responsibility for formulating trade policy from Congress to the Executive Branch.

The U.S. government has granted tax breaks to multinational corporations in the name of free trade that are not accessible to American businesses. The funds obtained from U.S. taxpayers have been utilized to subsidize exports and incentivize overseas expansion of businesses. These improper practices must be eradicated.

It is imperative for the United States government to institute a steadfast policy mandating that U.S. or multinational corporations investing overseas do so at their own peril. Our government is not obligated to safeguard these corporations with the lives of our service members or the tax dollars of our citizens.

Foreign interests have been facilitated in their attempt to obtain America's high-tech secrets through the pretense of conducting business. We advocate for the criminalization of technology transfers that jeopardize national security and demand that all perpetrators be prosecuted. Furthermore, we require that all weapon systems, military uniforms, and equipment procured for the American military be entirely domestically manufactured, including all of their component parts.

We strongly denounce the conduct of any United States government officer or spouse who, after leaving the government, works to represent a foreign government or private foreign entity, with the intention of influencing public opinion or policy regarding issues that impact U.S. trade with said foreign government or entity.

Taxes

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress the authority to:

"To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excise to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

Section 9 of Article I of the original document specified:

"No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the Census of Enumeration herein before directed to be taken."

Furthermore, it is determined that:

"No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any state."

An unconstitutional assumption of direct taxing authority by the federal government has resulted in the imposition of federal income, payroll, and

estate taxes on each of us since 1913, thereby compromising and diminishing our constitutional rights to life, liberty, and property.

The enforcement component of the current inequitable tax system implemented by the federal government is the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Despite repeated requests from individuals and groups of citizens for clarification regarding the agency's tax policies and procedures, the IRS bureaucracy has yet to provide such information. While an accountable government should be answerable to the people and have a responsibility to those it is entrusted to serve, no answers have been forthcoming.

Legislative measures are proposed to eliminate the Internal Revenue Service, and we will strongly advocate for a veto on any authorization, appropriation, or continuing resolution that allocates any form of funding to this unlawful and unconstitutional organization.

We Advocate for the Substitution of the Existing Income Tax with a Graduated Flat Tax Structure Commencing Above the Poverty Line, with Local and State Adjustments.

In cases where tariffs on foreign products and excise fail to adequately compensate the federal government for legitimate constitutional expenses, an apportioned "state-rate tax" will be implemented. This tax would allocate the cost of unfulfilled obligations among the states according to their respective proportions of the total population of the United States (excluding the District of Columbia). For instance, if a state is home to 10 percent of the nation's population, the responsibility for covering such obligations would be divided among those states.

We hold the view that, to the degree allowed by the Constitution, taxing corporations is a suitable means of generating government revenue. The

term "income" has been defined by the Supreme Court as "gain or increase arising from corporate activity or privilege." It is important to note that corporations do not possess the characteristics of human beings, and therefore, are not required to be treated as "people" for taxation purposes.

Our position is in favor of ratifying the Liberty Amendment, which would serve to nullify the Sixteenth Amendment and establish the provision that "Congress shall not impose taxes on individual incomes, bequests, or estates."

We advocate for the implementation of automotive fuel excise taxes, not surpassing the rates presently levied, for the sole purpose of financing the construction, upkeep, and management of federal highways. Such levies should never be allocated towards "demonstration projects," public transportation, or other non-highway endeavors.

We advocate for the implementation of excise taxes as a means to rein in the expenditure of tax dollars on media advertising and to fund "economic development grants," "tax abatements," and "tax incentives." These terms serve as pretexts to plunder the public treasury and exploit the labor force for the benefit of affluent interests favored by politicians.

Terrorism and Personal Liberty

The Bill of Rights constitutes the initial of ten amendments to the Constitution. As the fourth and fifth amendments will be alluded to, it is prudent to thoroughly peruse them.

IV. Amendment:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation,

and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized."

V. Amendment:

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Note: In the event of war or public peril, these liberties are not subject to any exceptions.

Clause 2 of Section 9 of Article 1:

"The privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless, in cases of rebellion or invasion, public safety may require it."

It has not been asserted that the threat of terrorism constitutes an invasion or rebellion. Rather, the United States is embroiled in an undeclared war against an unidentified foe (terrorism), which has the potential to last forever and is being exploited to significantly enlarge executive branch authority at the expense of individual liberties.

The government is using the "war on terrorism" as a pretext to exceed its revenue, enlarge the federal bureaucracy, and socialize the country through subsidies to the largest insurance companies, taxpayer rescues of the airlines, and other federal programs.

Legislation and executive actions that infringe upon the rights guaranteed to the public under the Fourth and Fifth Amendments in the name of

"national security" or "combating terrorism" are abhorrent and vehemently opposed. Prominent instances of such legislation include the USA Patriot Act, the National Security Act, the proposed Domestic Securities Enhancement Act (commonly referred to as "Patriot II"), the Military Commissions Act, the National Defense Authorization Act, and particularly the proposed Domestic Securities Enhancement Act.

The federal government uses the National Security Act as a shield to prevent the American people and our elected officials from learning how much and where our tax dollars are spent on covert operations around the world. The National Security Act also prohibits the release of presidential decision directives and executive orders, such as PDD 25, to the American people and our elected representatives. Many of these are not only used to thwart justice in the name of national security, but they also prohibit the release of PDD 25.

This action could potentially jeopardize our national sovereignty.

Since we shall no longer have a free nation while the federal government (or the governments thereof) continues to authorize arrests without warrants, secret detention without counsel, wiretaps without court supervision, and searches and seizures without notifying the individual whose property is invaded, the USA Patriot Act authorizes a plethora of other violations of the legal safeguards our nation has historically developed in accordance with principles descending from the Fourth and Fifth Amendments.

The National Defense Authorization Act grants the President of the United States the power to detain individuals, including U.S. citizens, indefinitely and without a trial, without the need for a warrant.

When addressing terrorism, it is crucial for the United States to refrain from retaliatory actions that

result in the loss of innocent lives and incite animosity toward the country and its citizens. This is consistent with the principles espoused by our Founding Fathers, which advocate for disengaging the nation from international entanglements that incite foreign animosity toward the United States and serve as a pretext for terrorist assaults against the United States and its citizens. The term "war on terrorism" does not accurately describe the nature of the problem.

Veterans

According to President George W. Bush:

"The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportionate to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their country."

The United Sons of Liberty values the valiant efforts of our veterans and service members in safeguarding the principles of American liberty. By continuing to provide generous health, education, and other benefits to veterans and equitable pay and benefits to our military personnel, we shall continue to acknowledge their contributions to the national welfare.

We vehemently oppose any endeavor by a governmental agency to nullify or diminish benefits that veterans and their survivors have accumulated, including pensions, health care, compensation, and education.

Wage and Price Control

The purpose of government, as stated in the Declaration of Independence, is "to secure these rights," including liberty.

Notably, the Constitution, the writings of the Founding Fathers, or logical reasoning do not

contemplate the existence of a divinely bestowed entitlement to a particular wage or price.

Our position is that the civil government lacks the jurisdiction to establish prices and wages, which would be contrary to the values of individual liberty and the free market.

Welfare

As stated in the Declaration of Independence:

"All men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. To secure these rights, governments are instituted among men."

As outlined in the Preamble to the United States Constitution, the following liberties are safeguarded:

"Provide for the common defense; promote the general welfare."

Here, two distinct distinctions must be made:

To "provide" is to offer active and financial support; to "promote" is to adopt a more passive stance. I may publicize the fact that we are hosting a magnificent feast, but you are responsible for providing the food.

Individual welfare is distinct from general welfare. The general welfare would benefit all members of society as a whole, whereas individual welfare would benefit a specific subset of the population, such as the impoverished.

The provision of personal welfare is not deemed constitutionally authorized.

Throughout the majority of this nation's history, those who provided care for the ill, elderly, indigent, and impoverished, as well as those who were otherwise incapable of attending to their own needs, have been individuals.

The American assistance crisis is an instigated crisis by the government. Similar to how economic and regulatory policies have hindered the ability of our citizens to find employment, social and cultural policies implemented by the government have eroded the value of hard labor.

The provision of welfare to those in need and charitable contributions are not constitutional obligations of the federal government. It is imperative that the taxpayers of the United States never be coerced into sharing the financial burden of providing welfare for their fellow citizens through mandatory taxation. Likewise, it is unjust to obligate taxpayers to fund welfare programs for individuals who unlawfully access the United States.

Welfare provisions funded by the federal government are frequently misdirected and morally pernicious. Redistributing wealth is not the intended function of civil government; rather, its purpose is to protect life, property, and liberty. This redistribution undermines the fundamental principles that established this nation and ousts us from the British system of taxation without representation, which the federal government has essentially equated to larceny.

Individuals, families, churches, civic organizations, and other private organizations are encouraged to assist those in need in accordance with their personal responsibility.