

It would be presumptuous for a country judge to obtude his views upon National matters where others, by experience and position are in a much better position to judge of such matter, but holding as I do that the people, if properly informed, will generally do the right thing, but realizing also that the average citizen is too busy contriving a living for himself and family to give serious consideration to those matters that today seem to threaten the freedom of action so complacently enjoyed by the individual citizen in the past, I do not consider it presumptuous for the humblest citizen to express his views upon such matters.

Republican government requires intelligent cooperation upon the part of the citizenship for under such government the people rule themselves instead of being ruled by government. By government refered to in the last sentence is meant that small group of citizens at the head of the governing forces. Where the people rule themselves the power of government is restricted. Where the government rules the people, it does so by force. When government must resort to force for its control and governing power, then such personal liberties as the people of the United States have so casually enjoyed for more than a hundred and fifty years, must be surrendered. A government of force cannot, of necessity countenance opposition in "free speech", "Free press" or the right to assemble and discuss matters of government or petition for redress of grievances. Neither can such a government by force allow such a writ as that of habaes corpus, for under such a government men of necessity must be confined in prisons for no reason other than a belief in the minds of those in power that such person is in opposition to the government. Such things took place under the French Monarchy where men were confined

in the Bastille, the great political prison of France, for a life time, with an iron mask upon his face, for no other reason or offense than that he had a chance likeness to the then reigning monarch. Under a government of force neither could a citizen be protected in his home from "unreasonable searches and seizures" as he now is because the government must have every available means at its disposal to ferret out opposition.

All these personal liberties mentioned and many others have been so complacently enjoyed by the citizenship of this country under our form of government that they have come to believe them peculiar to all forms of government. Of this supposition their minds must be disabused. It is only under such governments as ours, where a solemn compact called a constitution, has been entered into between the people and the government, that such liberties and freedom exists. These liberties were solemnly written into the compact at a time when men had the experience fresh upon their minds of the abuses of a despotic government. They were not written by chance, but out of experience. From this experience they wrote into the constitution a prohibition against those things they had suffered under the British government. They were not guessing, they knew exactly what they wished and in what manner they desired to restrict the power of government. Our form of government was originated in order to protect the individual citizen against the despotism of his own government. There is no likelihood of state governments ever becoming despotic. But it was necessary to join the states together in a union for the protection of all against foreign dangers, and also to regulate the commerce between the states so that controversies would not arise between the several states.

All the powers given to the central government was surrendered by the several states and the people and those powers not specifically conferred upon the central government were reserved to the states. Realizing that in the central government the opportunity would be mostly likely presented for despotism, the founding fathers were solicitous in protecting the citizens of the nation against despotic powers,. Fearing that, in the hands of designing men, the broad terms of the constitution itself, might be distorted and misconstrued to the disadvantage of the citizen, amendments were passed which affirmatively protected the individual liberties and freedom of men. These amendments are called the Bill of Rights. These give to our citizenship rights which should be briefly noted: Free speech, free press, the right of Religious liberty, the protection of the home against searches and seizures except in a lawful manner which is so restricted as to be amply protective; the right of a trial by jury, to have a speedy trial of all charges preferred and to be allowed to be faced with the witnesses against one and have the right to cross examine them; freedom from soldiers being quartered in private homes, except in times of war; protection from cruel and unusual punishments for crimes or imprisonment for private debts; bail must be allowed and not in excessive amounts, and then finally the Bill of Rights provided that all powers not specifically delegated to the central power should be reserved to the states.

It is from this source that the individual citizen get his liberty, written in to the fundamental law of the land by men who had experienced these abuses under the government from which they had fought a war for eight years remove themselves from its despotism.

No other government can allow these privileges to its citizenship except a republican government. Our citizenship should be brought to a complete understanding of this or their advantage may be lost.

The rights guaranteed to the citizenship under the Bill of Rights are never likely to be attacked openly. A direct attack upon such rights will not be made, but in a roundabout manner, from some concealed source, under the guise of welfare for the citizen or his ~~xxxxx~~ immediate betterment, will the rights be destroyed. It therefore behooves the average citizen to be watchful and cautious. Who or what can guarantee the citizen such rights if he casually gives them up for some speculative purpose? If the solemn compact itself, which the citizen has with his government is not sufficient then it is reasonable to ask who is going to protect him against the despotism of government. Despotic powers are never called by the people, they are imposed upon the people. Neither will an abrupt challenge to our liberties come, but it will be advanced in a secret and insidious manner; one that will lull the people into security will the act is going forward which deprives them of freedom of thought and individual action. The people must come to realize that when force, unrestrained by reason, enters into government, tyranny is taking control.

Sometimes the rights mentioned above are spoken of as "natural rights" but they are not. Natural rights are amenable only to the law of might. Government, which is an instrument of civilization is a restraint upon the "natural rights" or proclivities of man- the right to do as he sees fit, irregardless of the effect upon some other individual. Government therefore is simply rules evolved from reason whereby men who live in a state that demands equitable cooperation ~~xx~~ compromise or sacrifice their "natural rights" so as to intelligently cooperate with society. There is no natural right to food or a job, to have a family or maintain a home; to kill off others who are impeding his desires than that such person has ample

rainfall or sunshine or fine weather, unless and until he is capable of providing these things or their substitutes by his own abilities and resourcefulness. This is the law of might. When men live in close association with his fellow men he must, of necessity surrender certain of his rights that are natural and inherent. So rights as we enjoy them are man made and thought out in connection with cooperation with other men. A sacrifice of our natural rights to use force and might to the happiness and well being of society.

These rules laid down for society's best interest then must come from experience. That is the only means by which such rules can be sufficiently realized-- therefore government must depend upon experience in a great measure. Theories and experiments in government are dangerous things because in its enthusiasm it is most likely to destroy lasting security for an immediate benefit. So our government was based in its very beginning upon experience, the sad experience of our forefathers under a far away despotic government. In our government those men sought to prevent the very things they had suffered under the other form of government. It is far better that we depend upon the experience of those old masters of government than it is to chance a fling at experiment and lose our liberty, however honest the experimenters may be. Theories, however well thought out and however perfect are apt to fall down when applied to an imperfect citizenship. Government should be suited to the particular people it is designed for because one form of government may be well for one and bad for another. Our people have enjoyed their privileges under our present form of government so long and are so peculiarly fitted to the government and it to them that no other form of government will suffice. No particular form of government will reform a people or make them better or worse.

Neither is that the object of government, it is intended to be a guide to the best interest of the society of people. Therefore it should be as meager as it is possible to contrive.

The people should have such a government as they wish, of course, provided ~~mixxxxxx~~ their wish is founded upon a complete understanding and full information. A government that thinks for us, plans for us and dictates to us means slavery for us. The strong will recognize this principle, but the weak among us will be apt to shift the responsibility and through their very indolence acquiesce in a form that will mean abject slavery. Here is where the danger lies to republics. Government is a necessary evil and it naturally follows that the evil should be restricted as much as possible, and not extended?