

## WHEN AN OATH BECOMES A CRIME

*"If the courts are to regard the constitution; and the constitution is superior to any ordinary act of the legislature; the constitution, and not such ordinary act, must govern the case to which they both apply. Those then who resist the principle that the constitution is to be considered, in court, as a paramount law, are reduced to the necessity of maintaining that courts must close their eyes on the constitution, and see only the law. This doctrine would subvert the very foundation of all written constitutions. It would declare that an act, which, according to the principles and theory of our government, is entirely void, is yet, in practice, completely obligatory. It would declare, that if the legislature shall do what is expressly forbidden, such act, notwithstanding the express prohibition, is in reality effectual. It would be giving to the legislature a practical and real omnipotence with the same breath which professes to restrict their powers within narrow limits. It is prescribing limits, and declaring that those limits may be passed at pleasure... Thus, the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument... It is in these words: 'I do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich; and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge all the duties incumbent on me as according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the constitution and laws of the United States.' Why does a judge swear to discharge his duties agreeably to the constitution of the United States, if that constitution forms no rule for his government? if it is closed upon him and cannot be inspected by him. If such be the real state of things, this is worse than solemn mockery. To prescribe, or to take this oath, becomes equally a crime<sup>1</sup>."*

*"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them<sup>2</sup>". ... "No judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence<sup>3</sup>." ... "Judges have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given, than to usurp that which is not given. The one or the other would be treason to the Constitution<sup>4</sup>." ... "that statutes which would deprive a citizen of the rights of person or property without a regular trial, according to the course and usage of common law, would not be the law of the land<sup>5</sup>."*

*"It will be an evil day for American Liberty if the theory of a government outside supreme law finds lodgment in our constitutional jurisprudence. No higher duty rests upon this Court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violations of the principles of the Constitution<sup>6</sup>." "It is in these words: 'I do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich; and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge all the duties incumbent on me as according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the constitution and laws of the United States.' Why does a judge swear to discharge his duties agreeably to the constitution of the United States, if that constitution forms no rule for his government? If it is closed upon him and cannot be inspected by him. If such be the real state of things, this is worse than solemn mockery. To prescribe, or to take this oath, becomes equally a crime<sup>7</sup>."*

---

<sup>1</sup> MARBURY v. MADISON, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) 5 U.S. 137 (Cranch) 1803

<sup>2</sup> Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491

<sup>3</sup> Ableman v. Booth, 21 Howard 506 (1859)

<sup>4</sup> Cohen v. Virginia, (1821), 6 Wheat. 264 and U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200

<sup>5</sup> Hoke vs. Henderson, 15, N.C. 15, 25 AM Dec 677

<sup>6</sup> 5 Downs v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)

<sup>7</sup> Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) 5 U.S. 137 (Cranch) 1803