

“Man's mind, once stretched by a new idea, never regains its original dimensions.”

— Oliver Wendell Holmes

Keep this in mind as you read the following section:

If millions of Mexicans entered the United States and had enough firepower to take over our government and us by imposing their laws and way of life on us, most Americans would be enraged. We would feel eminently justified in fighting back any way we could, even if it took 200 or more years to expel the invaders and to erase every trace of the controls they placed on us, including laws, regulations, debt, taxes, and other manifestations of their government—a government that we would almost universally declare to be **not** legitimate. With this in mind, I have a question for you:

Is the United States of America government legitimate?

No government or nation is legitimate if coercion played a role in its formation. If you trace the roots of every government or nation back far enough, you will see that power comes largely from the barrel of a gun. Even the United States of America, which traditionally basks in self-righteousness so extreme that it precludes introspection, has roots that are no better than a muscle man raping a woman simply because he can get away with it. The American Indians were indisputably here first. It was *their* land, and they did not willingly deed it to people who invaded North America from Great Britain and Europe. “Here are the keys to our home. Now put us on reservations and tell us what to do.”

Yeah, right, it would never happen. No proud man or woman wants to be controlled, and the American Indians were no exception. Thus, they did not willingly deed their land to us; they **capitulated** after the colonists and their descendants killed enough Indians to make them submit—like what a woman might do when she is ordered to spread her legs by a thug holding a gun to her head.

American Indians benefited in many ways from modernization brought by the White Man. As one of those White Men who grew up reading books that presented an incredibly lopsided view of history, I used to think that Indians should be grateful for that modernization. While they probably do owe us their gratitude, they never owed us their land. If you believe that introducing someone to technology were sufficient justification for usurping their property, let me introduce you to some amazing gizmos I've made. As your jaw drops in amazement and you wonder if you've been **teleported** into the next century, I will take your property and, while

I'm at it, tell you what to do, now and forever. I'll also tell your children and grandchildren what to do. Fair?

Obviously not. If you receive stolen goods, you are never the legitimate owner of them. They always properly belong to their original owner. Courts recognize that contracts signed under [duress](#)—such as when the threat of force induces someone to sign a contract—are not valid. Therefore, the surrender of American Indians, effected by Winchester, Remington, and Smith & Wesson, was clearly a coercion fueled by gunpowder and blood, not ethics or justifiable legal principles, so the United States government is not legitimate, period.

If you are familiar with the events surrounding the 1836 [Treaty of New Echota](#), you know that it culminated in a forced relocation known as the [Trail of Tears](#) in which thousands of Cherokee Indians died and many more suffered in a viciously violent, unethical, and illegal action that is worse in some ways than the notoriously barbaric [Bataan Death March](#) during World War II. The US government was justified in doing what it did to the Cherokee (and other¹) Indians as much as a musclebound man is justified in raping a young girl because he is physically capable of making her submit to his evil desires.

If American Indians asserted they had the right to govern the [contiguous 48 states](#)², who would referee such a dispute? A *United States* court? The Congress of the *United States*? The United States government, with its characteristic arrogance, would almost certainly [aver](#) that it had the right to decide whether their [usurpation](#) of the land we now call the United States was legal, or whether it was confiscated by the use of force and the threat of more of it. You don't need a crystal ball to predict the outcome of such a dispute: an arrogant *United States* court or *United States* Congress would certainly declare that the US government was legitimate, **no matter how many brains they had to bash in to take over a land that certainly was never theirs to take**. Expecting a *United States* court or the *United States* Congress to be fair to the American Indians in such a dispute would be like expecting a Mafia [consigliere](#) to advise the Mafia [don](#) that his criminal enterprise was illegal and thus should be [disbanded](#): it would *never* happen.

This is what gives rise to war. The original impetus for litigating disputes in court arose from a desire to give people a way to equitably settle disagreements without resorting to violence. Research has shown that even some animals possess an inborn sense of fair play, and react negatively when they are treated unfairly—that is, when they are subjected to some injustice. With a sufficient provocation, the desire for

1 Historians have documented innumerable injustices committed by White Men as they sought to control Indians and the land they once ruled.

2 Native people in Alaska and Hawaii could assert the same right to govern their land.

revenge kicks in. Seeking revenge is yet another innate human response that courts can mitigate by equitably settling disputes, or [exacerbate](#) by *not* fairly settling them.

Given the overwhelming gap between the power of the United States government and the power of the American Indians, is all of this a [moot](#) point? Is their lack of firepower so insufficient that the US government could brush away their valid legal claims to this land without any worry that the Indians could use force to retake what is rightfully theirs? Yes, for now. But what if one or more Indians invented some of the weapon-methods I thought of (and decided not to use)? They could use such methods to force the US government to vacate their offices.

You might object to their use of force to retake what is rightfully theirs, but our forefathers used violence to force *them*. *We* can use force, but *they* cannot? That is a double standard, and an indefensible one. Violence and the use of force (or the threat of it) is never desirable, but it is ethically warranted when there is no other means to restore property to its rightful owner. When a deputy sheriff evicts people from their homes, he shows up with a gun because the US government knows that violent force, or the threat of it, is the way to make people do things they don't want to do, such as paying exorbitant taxes so that politicians can use your money to screw you in myriad ways. If the US government were as legitimate and noble as it claims to be, it would not need to use so much force at home and abroad to control resistance to it.

You might contend that you had no part in the violence used by the US government to take control of a land that was occupied by American Indians and their forefathers for 15,000 years before White Men arrived and said, "This sure looks like home. *Our* home." True, so perhaps the American Indians could not fairly [assert](#) ownership of your land—or perhaps they could (and should), because if you purchase a stolen piece of property or inherit it, it is never rightfully yours.

While reasonable minds might disagree on how to best settle that dispute, no ethical person could possibly contend that **control** of the land that is now the United States should not be returned to the American Indians. The [swath](#) of North America that we call the United States is controlled by the US government not because God gave us title to this land, or because the Indians begged us to impose our controls on them after *we invited ourselves to the land they inhabited*, but because we were more successful in killing them than they were in killing us. It's that simple: Might makes right. Do whatever you can get away with. The Indians were here first? It was *their* land? Screw 'em, said the US government, we appointed ourselves rulers of this land.

What's that, the Indians didn't bow down and kiss our feet? No problem.

Let's turn to page 1 of the Might Makes Right Manual. There it is, plain as day. Friggin' savages won't lay down and let us walk all over them. Might Makes Right Solution? Start killing them, and continue killing them until they beg for mercy. They *will* agree, after enough of them are turned into hamburger.

The US government conveniently made it a heinous crime for anyone to even attempt to overthrow them. Had they shown the same level of respect for the Indians as the US government now demands *OR ELSE*, when White Men invited themselves into North America, they would have *assimilated* into the Indian culture instead of bossing them around on *their* land. But might makes right, correct? Want others to follow your orders? Just load your gun.

Dissolving the US government would obviously be good for the American Indians (and the right thing to do), but it would also be potentially good for other US citizens since it would instantly erase the massive US debt and teach the many creditors of that debt a valuable lesson in how it is inadvisable to do business with an illegal enterprise.

Rebooting our government would benefit us in many ways, similar to the improvements a computer user would obtain by installing a new and better operating system (OS) on his computer. The OS of the federal government is horrendously bloated, disgustingly corrupt, amazingly inefficient, and sustained by roots stained in Indian blood, not justifiable principles of ethics.

The US government is hardly the only one founded on the “might makes right” principle. I think that ethical people should *rethink* their participation in continuing to acquiesce to governments or nations that arose via coercion. **Perpetuating an injustice does not erase it.** If it could, a rapist could *expunge* his guilt merely by the passage of time. His first stroke was a felony, and his thousandth stroke is fine, right?

Obviously not.

Hey kids, gather round! Good ol' Uncle Sam has a lesson for you:

Does your neighbor have a nicer home than you? More land, too? If he won't give it to you, just pick up your trusty Winchester and *pay him a visit*. Tell him this is now your home, and he will abide by your rules—or else, as in *or else* you will start shooting until he gives in and stops complaining about being put in the closet.

Uncle Sam wants you to know that might makes right—unless, of course, might is used against the US government. Anyone doing that is a very bad person—a terrorist, in fact. Public Enemy #1. Only the US

government can invite itself into someone's home, kill the occupants, and still be as pure as the wind-driven snow.

The US government should be thankful that I was not alive in 1881 – 1885, when one of my relatives, Chester A. Arthur, was President of the United States. Had I been alive then, I would have invited myself into the White House³ to see if the fairness genes I possess came from President Arthur or from someone else. If Arthur were fair, he would understand that the good intentions of our forefathers were ironically, and tragically, based on the arrogant assumption that we had a right to create a government that spread its control over every square inch of this land because, in their minds, the Indians were subhuman. They were here first? Screw 'em, we have more Winchesters!⁴

Like most of their [contemporaries](#) around the world, the Founding Fathers of the United States possessed a rather one-sided conception of fairness. When they wrote that “all men are created equal” and that “they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights,” they meant that all *white* men are created equal. It was perfectly acceptable to put a chain around the ankle of a black man and whip him if he didn't work fast enough, and it was A-OK to tell Indians that the land they had called home for thousands of years was suddenly going to be controlled by White Men. Indians at that time might well have asked, “[Who died and put you in charge?](#)”

What response could the White Men possibly [muster](#)? Would they [sheepishly](#) admit, “Uh, we did”? Or, [suffused](#) with the notion that God gave men with white skin the right to rule others, would they boldly proclaim that they were justified in doing what they did?

If a group of immigrants were to move to a new land in 2010 and take it over as the White Men did in North America, the self-appointed Policeman of the World, the current United States government, would use its military might to bomb the hell out of those immigrants. Our President would give a self-righteous speech in which he would tacitly suggest that we were [eminently](#) justified in doing that because it is a violation of human rights for those immigrants to invite themselves into the home of someone else and then assert the right to control that home.

Such a [sanctimonious](#) speech would illustrate that the US government was founded on a hypocritically indefensible assumption: that it was fine for us to use force to take control of the land we now call the United States, but no one else enjoys that privilege, even if they only want to control a few square miles, ten acres, or just the four square feet of

3 At that time, what we now call the White House was then called the Executive Mansion.

4 I am (hopefully obviously!) using *Winchester* in this context as a generic term for firearms because the Winchester company was not formed until the mid-1800s.

space they occupy.

Native Americans **did not gain the right to vote until the 20th century**, thus giving the United States government plenty of time to become **entrenched**, using progressively more power to threaten anyone who objected to its illegitimate foundation.

No judge could rightfully deny that Native Americans controlled this land thousands of years before White Men even knew it existed.

No judge could rightfully claim that we had the right to invite ourselves into their home and establish a government that made us superior to them.

No judge could rightfully claim that we had the right to exclude Native Americans from voting until long after we **wrested** control of this land *from* them, *to* us.

No judge could rightfully claim that the only elections that matter are ones that **tacitly** assume that the only legitimate controllers of the land now occupied by the United States are United States politicians who are eager to perpetuate the injustice upon which the United States was founded: the usurpation of the control of this land.

Nevertheless, virtually all judges are brainwashed into thinking that US governments, including federal and all 50 states, are legitimate despite overwhelming evidence that White Men seized control of this land by using hot lead as a means of persuasion. Consequently, if I or someone else were to deny that the US government was legitimate, virtually all judges would not be sufficiently intelligent to refute my logic, which is based on common-sense principles of ethics. All men *are* created equal and they *are* endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights—except, of course, if some arrogant White Men presume they have the power to revoke rights endowed by their Creator, a.k.a., God.

Placing themselves above God placed our Founding Fathers in a very **untenable** position. Though it **reeked** of indefensible inconsistencies and contradictions, virtually all judges would use every bit of twisted logic they could muster to counter my arguments. Once they failed to change my mind with their best attempts at logic, they would resort to the same **tried-and-true** method of persuasion that the US government is so fond of: Winchester, Remington, Smith & Wesson, or anything else that can sling hot lead fast enough to obliterate the brains of people who know that perpetuating an injustice does not legitimize it. White Men took control of this land by killing the people who had long occupied it. That makes those White Men criminals and terrorists, and anyone who

perpetuates the usurpation of this land is party to⁵ a crime.

President Washington, President Obama, and even my relative, President Arthur, were all convinced that they and the United States were perfectly legitimate. Yes, and Saddam Hussein was convinced that he was the legitimate ruler of Iraq. The current Royal Family of Saudi Arabia is convinced that it is legitimate, too, but what gave them the right to rule was not a right given by God but a willingness to use lethal force to make other men and women get on their knees—*or else*.

Remember the quote at the beginning of this section? “Man's mind, once stretched by a new idea, never regains its original dimensions.”

Until recently, I was very proud of my country and never questioned its legitimacy. However, if you read enough, sooner or later you are bound to encounter facts that don't mesh with your view of the world. Most people rigidly cling to their preconceived notions and are threatened by conflicting ideas, but I am willing to consider the possibility that I may be wrong. When I looked at the facts, only one conclusion resulted: The United States of America established its rule over this land by killing people who had lived here for centuries. Sure, we didn't kill *all* of the Native Americans—just enough so the remaining ones could [read the writing on the wall](#): Do what the US government wants, or you, too, will be slaughtered. In short, we used violent force to take this land from the people who lived here for thousands of years. So is the United States legitimate? Obviously not, unless you think that killing people is a legitimate technique of persuasion.

Unless you want to bury your head in the sand, ignore the evidence, and make self-delusion more of a priority than doing what is right, you will agree with me. Do you? [Contact me](#) and let me know what you think. I will publish the best responses and comment on them.

5 *Party to* = a person who participates in some action or plan; a participant; one who participates in or is otherwise [privy](#) to a crime.