



Written by [Staff](#) on January 9, 2017

Published in the January 9, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 01

Letters to the Editor

Correct Quotes

Over several decades, I have found numerous quotes attributed to our Founding Fathers to be false. A shame because while the rest of an article might have some merit, the finding of one false aspect of the written piece destroys the whole of the argument. I believe all quotes should have the primary source noted.

An October 10, 2016 TNA letter to the editor states that Thomas Jefferson said, “A government big enough to give you everything you want is big enough to take everything you have.” Jefferson didn’t say that.

I encourage The New American to screen letters to the editor and verify the accuracy of direct quotes. If found to be untrue — highly likely — then add the following: [quote can’t be proven].

Michael Greenstreet

Chesapeake, Virginia

Editors — *The original letter said the quote was “credited” to Thomas Jefferson.*

Clintons’ Crimes

In response to the letter to the editor entitled “Hillary’s Honorifics” from Ralph DeScoville, published in TNA October 24, 2016, I offer the following commentary: The Clintons are an unholy alliance.

Bill Clinton admitted to eluding his security detail to indulge in his peccadilloes. He made himself temporarily AWOL from the chain of command and exposed his person to unacceptable risk.

A lot of “smart” people, as usual, claimed that Bill’s behavior was innocent extramarital adventurism, and nothing else. Yet an important concern for the nation should have been the treason, or dereliction of duty, he displayed by his behavior. His impeachment bill should have included this charge.

Hillary mishandled her e-mails despite signing paperwork telling her how she should handle potentially secret e-mails, and any willful or negligent act that threatens our country’s security is also treason.

Further, she demonstrated, perhaps inadvertently, her disdain for our freedom of speech and the Constitution. She told the families of Benghazi victims that the maker of an anti-Muhammad video that she blamed for the Benghazi attack should be arrested and prosecuted. For breaking what law? Absurd and troubling, coming from an aspirant to the presidency.

Hillary and Bill have demonstrated, unapologetically and without remorse, that they place their own gratification and convenience ahead of national security,

Richard Dimery

Sent via e-mail

Law of the Land

I believe it was John Foster Dulles who first asserted in the 1950s that treaties trumped the Constitution, and since then constitutional lawyers have twisted and lied about the U.S. Constitution.



Written by [Staff](#) on January 9, 2017

Published in the January 9, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 01

The Constitution grants, from the people, the enumerated powers of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the U.S. government.

Article VI, paragraph two clearly states: “This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made *in pursuance thereof*; and all treaties made or which shall be made, *under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land*; and judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.” (Emphasis added.)

By any dictionary definition, the word “supreme” means “the greatest in power, authority or rank; paramount or dominant.”

This means that there cannot be more than one “supreme law of the land.” The Constitution must take precedence over all treaties and laws, especially those contradictory to the Constitution.

The power and authority for the legislature to *make* laws, and for the government to even make treaties, comes *from* the Constitution itself, so treaties contrary to the Constitution cannot legitimately — or legally — trump the Constitution as the “supreme law of the land.”

We can immediately challenge in courts to nullify all treaties and membership in the UN and its sub-organizations, since those are not “*in pursuance thereof*.”

All this seems very clear to me, and the logic should hold in any court of law. If not, then the Constitution is a worthless piece of paper.

Robert Matter

Sent via e-mail



Written by [Staff](#) on January 9, 2017

Published in the January 9, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 01

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.