

Chapter 1 : Our Rules of the Game: US Constitution

The U.S. Constitution represents our "rules of the game." Supreme Court justices should be seen as umpires or referees, whose job is to enforce neutral rules.

The rules of the game - the U. Constitution represents our "rules of the game. More often than not, an argument would ensue about the fairness of the cut. Those arguments ended when Mom came up with a rule: Whoever cuts the cake lets the other take the first piece. As if by magic or divine intervention, fairness emerged, and arguments ended. No matter who did the cutting, there was an even division. By creating and enforcing neutral rules, we minimize conflict. A lot was at stake. Despite a bitterly fought contest and all that was at stake, the game ended peaceably, and winners and losers were civil to one another. How is it that players with conflicting interests can play a game, agree with the outcome and walk away as good sports? The rules are known and durable. The officials could adjust the applications of the rules. Suppose the officials were more interested in the pursuit of what they saw as football justice than they were in the unbiased enforcement of neutral rules. If officials could determine game rules, team owners, instead of trying to raise team productivity, would spend resources lobbying or bribing officials. The returns from raising team productivity would be reduced. Also, I doubt that the games would end amicably. We should demand that Supreme Court justices act as referees and enforce the U. Who is appointed to the high court becomes the all-consuming issue. The question is not whether a justice would uphold and defend the Constitution but whether he would rig the game to benefit one American or another. Williams is a professor of economics at George Mason University. Digital access or digital and print delivery.

Chapter 2 : Our Rules of the Game: US Constitution - Walter Williams

The U.S. Constitution represents our "rules of the game." Supreme Court justices should be seen as umpires or referees, whose job is to enforce neutral rules. I'll give a somewhat trivial example of neutral rules from my youth; let's call it Mom's Rule.

There would have been fewer exasperated online alarms had each of the federal party leaders wondered whether Spock would appear in the next Star Wars film. Story continues below advertisement What exactly did they say to churn the stomachs of so many constitutional lawyers and political scientists? The constitutional gaffes from our political leaders appear embarrassing, perhaps even dangerous, in a country so heavily reliant on unwritten constitutional principles. Harper declared with confidence that "you have to have the most seats in Parliament to go to the Governor-General [to form government]. Mulcair was less direct, but seemed to agree with the assertion that the party with the most seats has "the automatic right to govern," although he noted that the matter was "complex. Trudeau also endorsed the fallacy that "whoever commands the most seats gets the first shot at governing. May, leader of the Green Party, announced a plan to call the Governor-General on election night to ask for time for the opposition parties to organize themselves into a potential government. While each of these positions is constitutionally suspect to varying degrees, it is important to remember that party leaders approach government formation not as scholars, but as politicians hoping to secure an electoral advantage, especially in the context of a too-close-to-call election campaign. Harper proposes that seat count bestows the right to govern in an attempt to pre-emptively discredit the possibility of political co-operation among opposition parties recall that he did so to great political effect during the prorogation episode in Trudeau, each campaigning to win and fed by mutual distrust and probably by internal polling data , have surmised that there is little to gain from advance talk of coalitions and co-operation. They are prepared to first see where the electoral chips fall. May, meanwhile, is keen to play the role of matchmaker and power broker. Story continues below advertisement Story continues below advertisement Even if these were not calculated positions of political gain, but genuine misunderstandings of our constitutional rules, party leaders are players " not referees " in the game. By constitutional convention, the authority to govern is determined not by the number of seats a party wins, but by decisions of the Governor-General. His decisions are constitutionally constrained by the principles of responsible government and historic practice, which keep our system democratic, accountable and rooted to venerable parliamentary traditions, no matter what obfuscations or convenient positions politicians take during political battle. In exercising his powers, the Governor-General takes his advice from the Prime Minister not opposition politicians with his phone number , although he always retains the discretion to refuse advice from a prime minister who has lost the confidence of the House of Commons, or, in rare and extreme cases, when that advice will significantly damage the constitutional interests of Canada. Harper can decide to meet the newly elected House no matter how many seats his party wins to see whether he can maintain its confidence; or he can advise the Governor-General that he intends to resign immediately. Harper were to resign or could not command the confidence of the House, Mr. Johnston would have two options: Ask another leader to try to form a government capable of maintaining the confidence of the House, or dissolve Parliament and trigger an election. You do not need to dip very deeply into our history to find examples of representatives of the Crown exercising their constitutional discretion. Each episode proved an exercise of responsible government at work, while affirming the reserve powers of the Crown in Canadian constitutional governance. Johnston may face similar constitutional choices over the next several months. He is well equipped to handle them. As a former law professor and dean of law, he is intimately acquainted with the interpretation of legal texts and precedent. Moreover, as have governors-general before him, he will have independent and impartial constitutional experts to consult as required. In reaching conclusions and making choices, he will be guided not by personal whim, political preferences or muddled politicking, but rather by a much lengthier and sturdier set of constitutional traditions and conventions that span the Commonwealth. For good reason, the Governor-General does not enter the political fray, and certainly he was not about to partake in any of the

recent debates about who misunderstood which convention when. But still, I like to imagine his response:

Chapter 3 : Our Rules of the Game: US Constitution – GOPUSA

13 CHAPTER TWO The Constitution: Rules of the Game CHAPTER OVERVIEW This chapter discusses the "official rules" of the political game in the United States Constitution.

It was interesting to note that it was the political elites, or as the film would call them the propertied elites, who drafted the constitution. The common people did not participate in the process. However, through the years and the centuries that the constitution has endured, we have seen how it has evolved and adjusted itself to the needs of the people for whom it was created. Two significant aspects of the video *The Bill of Rights: A Living Document* are worth noting. First was the discussion on the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Tinker vs. It*. It was significant because the Supreme Court held that the Bill of Rights applies to students, even though they are in a controlled academic environment. Another significant part of the video was when the host called the Bill of Rights a living document. I agree with his pronouncement, and see the Bill of Rights as a document which, similar to the constitution, tries its best to adjust to the times, and is an expression of the hopes, dreams, and aspirations of the American people. Part II The case study of the response to the Katrina Disaster, extensively discussed in Chapter 2 of Wasserman, shows how the current set-up of the political structures may not be efficient to address contemporary problems. However, this may be an isolated case, because there are numerous instances before when the political structure has efficiently and effectively worked for the benefit of the people. The goals of efficiency and democracy in the Constitution do not work against each other. The constitution has found a way to balance the need for efficiency, while at the same time allowing democracy to flourish. The major constitutional principles of separation of powers and checks and balances, federalism, limited government and judicial review, all work hand in hand to ensure protect democracy and ensure efficient function of the government. This led to the creation of a number of small communities, which unfortunately did not last even for a generation. As aptly put by the commentator of the film, Nevada was built by the common people. Another significant aspect was the early grant of suffrage to women in Nevada. Through the efforts of people like Ann Martin, the state in granted the right to vote for women, a good 6 years before the national movement to do the same. Lastly, another significant event was the legalization of gambling by the state legislature in This perhaps was the move which has shaped what is Nevada today. Gambling has provided the state with the needed and necessary revenues in order to grow and develop. Though it also gave the state a number of problems, through the years, with increasing government controls, it has made Nevada a prosperous and developed state.

Chapter 4 : The Constitution rules of the Game

Our Rules of the Game: U.S. Constitution Walter E. Williams Â· Jul. 18, Justice Anthony Kennedy's retirement, leading to President Donald Trump's nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court, has thrown progressives, the Democratic Party, and the news media into an out-and-out tizzy.

Opinion Our Rules of the Game: More often than not, an argument would ensue about the fairness of the cut. Those arguments ended when Mom came up with a rule: Whoever cuts the cake lets the other take the first piece. As if by magic or divine intervention, fairness emerged, and arguments ended. No matter who did the cutting, there was an even division. By creating and enforcing neutral rules, we minimize conflict. A lot was at stake. Despite a bitterly fought contest and all that was at stake, the game ended peaceably, and winners and losers were civil to one another. How is it that players with conflicting interests can play a game, agree with the outcome and walk away as good sports? The rules are known and durable. The officials could adjust the applications of the rules. Suppose the officials were more interested in the pursuit of what they saw as football justice than they were in the unbiased enforcement of neutral rules. If officials could determine game rules, team owners, instead of trying to raise team productivity, would spend resources lobbying or bribing officials. The returns from raising team productivity would be reduced. Also, I doubt that the games would end amicably. We should demand that Supreme Court justices act as referees and enforce the U. Who is appointed to the high court becomes the all-consuming issue. The question is not whether a justice would uphold and defend the Constitution but whether he would rig the game to benefit one American or another. Williams About Walter E. Williams is a professor of economics at George Mason University. Williams is also the author of several books. July 20, at Greedy, egotistical and envious people looked at the way the Constitution sets up our government and figured out how to make profit, big profit. To insure success, they need the political parties. Parties, every to this day, guarantee results, election after election, the elected are in the power position, election after election. Lobbyists provide the profit. Judges provide the stamp of approval, or not, thus the parties have to control that, too. We the People are kept in the dark, kept out of the system by costs, disarmed, and have no way to fire our governmental employees even if we did find out what is going on. With modern electronic voting machines they do not even need our vote anymore. We the People must regain control of government, institute new and harsher controls on our employees or just accept the fact that our children will be serfs to the elitists that control government, who controls us through bureaucracies.

Chapter 5 : Our Rules of the Game - LewRockwell

Even if these were not calculated positions of political gain, but genuine misunderstandings of our constitutional rules, party leaders are players - not referees - in the game.

More often than not, an argument would ensue about the fairness of the cut. Those arguments ended when Mom came up with a rule: Whoever cuts the cake lets the other take the first piece. As if by magic or divine intervention, fairness emerged, and arguments ended. No matter who did the cutting, there was an even division. By creating and enforcing neutral rules, we minimize conflict. A lot was at stake. Despite a bitterly fought contest and all that was at stake, the game ended peaceably, and winners and losers were civil to one another. How is it that players with conflicting interests can play a game, agree with the outcome and walk away as good sports? The rules are known and durable. The officials could adjust the applications of the rules. Suppose the officials were more interested in the pursuit of what they saw as football justice than they were in the unbiased enforcement of neutral rules. If officials could determine game rules, team owners, instead of trying to raise team productivity, would spend resources lobbying or bribing officials. The returns from raising team productivity would be reduced. Also, I doubt that the games would end amicably. We should demand that Supreme Court justices act as referees and enforce the U. Who is appointed to the high court becomes the all-consuming issue. The question is not whether a justice would uphold and defend the Constitution but whether he would rig the game to benefit one American or another. The Best of Walter E. Williams is the John M. Olin distinguished professor of economics at George Mason University, and a nationally syndicated columnist. To find out more about Walter E. Williams and read features by other Creators Syndicate columnists and cartoonists, visit the Creators Syndicate web page.

Chapter 6 : Roman-words: U S Constitution, Rules of the Game

activity the constitution:rules for the economy lesson 9 the u.s. c onstitution:rules of the game focus: understanding economics in united states history Â©national council on economic education, new york, ny.

Constitution represents our "rules of the game. More often than not, an argument would ensue about the fairness of the cut. Those arguments ended when Mom came up with a rule: Whoever cuts the cake lets the other take the first piece. As if by magic or divine intervention, fairness emerged and arguments ended. No matter who did the cutting, there was an even division. By creating and enforcing neutral rules, we minimize conflict. A lot was at stake. Despite a bitterly fought contest and all that was at stake, the game ended peaceably, and winners and losers were civil to one another. How is it that players with conflicting interests can play a game, agree with the outcome and walk away as good sports? The rules are known and durable. The officials could adjust the applications of the rules. Suppose the officials were more interested in the pursuit of what they saw as football justice than they were in the unbiased enforcement of neutral rules. If officials could determine game rules, team owners, instead of trying to raise team productivity, would spend resources lobbying or bribing officials. The returns from raising team productivity would be reduced. Also, I doubt that the games would end amicably. We should demand that Supreme Court justices act as referees and enforce the U. Who is appointed to the high court becomes the all-consuming issue. The question is not whether a justice would uphold and defend the Constitution but whether he would rig the game to benefit one American or another. Williams is a professor of economics at George Mason University.

Chapter 7 : Our Rules Of The Game: US Constitution

The Constitution rules of the Game One of the most significant aspects of the video Making of the Constitution that I saw was how different men from all walks of life worked together and played their part to achieve independence and to eventually draft the constitution; and it wasn't until 13 years later that the Constitution as we know it.

Is profanity losing its punch? Constitution represents our "rules of the game. More often than not, an argument would ensue about the fairness of the cut. Those arguments ended when Mom came up with a rule: Whoever cuts the cake lets the other take the first piece. As if by magic or divine intervention, fairness emerged, and arguments ended. No matter who did the cutting, there was an even division. By creating and enforcing neutral rules, we minimize conflict. A lot was at stake. Despite a bitterly fought contest and all that was at stake, the game ended peaceably, and winners and losers were civil to one another. How is it that players with conflicting interests can play a game, agree with the outcome and walk away as good sports? The rules are known and durable. The officials could adjust the applications of the rules. Suppose the officials were more interested in the pursuit of what they saw as football justice than they were in the unbiased enforcement of neutral rules. If officials could determine game rules, team owners, instead of trying to raise team productivity, would spend resources lobbying or bribing officials. The returns from raising team productivity would be reduced. Also, I doubt that the games would end amicably. We should demand that Supreme Court justices act as referees and enforce the U. Who is appointed to the high court becomes the all-consuming issue. The question is not whether a justice would uphold and defend the Constitution but whether he would rig the game to benefit one American or another. Comment by clicking [here](#). Walter Williams is an American economist, commentator, and academic. He is the John M. Olin Distinguished Professor of Economics at George Mason University, as well as a syndicated columnist and author known for his libertarian views.

Chapter 8 : Our Rules of the Game: U.S. Constitution | Frontpage Mag

The U.S. Constitution represents our "rules of the game." Supreme Court justices should be seen as umpires or referees, whose job is to enforce neutral rules. If officials could determine game.

Constitution represents our "rules of the game. More often than not, an argument would ensue about the fairness of the cut. Those arguments ended when mom came up with a rule: Whoever cuts the cake lets the other take the first piece. As if by magic or divine intervention, fairness emerged and arguments ended. No matter who did the cutting, there was an even division. By creating and enforcing neutral rules, we minimize conflict. A lot was at stake. Despite a bitterly fought contest and all that was at stake, the game ended peaceably, and winners and losers were civil to one another. How is it that players with conflicting interests can play a game, agree with the outcome and walk away as good sports? The rules are known and durable. The officials could adjust the applications of the rules. Suppose the officials were more interested in the pursuit of what they saw as football justice than they were in the unbiased enforcement of neutral rules. If officials could determine game rules, team owners, instead of trying to raise team productivity, would spend resources lobbying or bribing officials. The returns from raising team productivity would be reduced. Also, I doubt that the games would end amicably. We should demand that Supreme Court justices act as referees and enforce the U. Who is appointed to the high court becomes the all-consuming issue. The question is not whether a justice would uphold and defend the Constitution but whether he would rig the game to benefit one American or another. Williams is a professor of economics at George Mason University.

Chapter 9 : Minority governments: The constitutional rules of the game - The Globe and Mail

Justice Anthony Kennedy's retirement, leading to President Donald Trump's nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court, has thrown progressives, the Democratic Party and the news media into.

Our Rules of the Game: Constitution What Americans should demand from our Supreme Court justices. Constitution represents our "rules of the game. More often than not, an argument would ensue about the fairness of the cut. Those arguments ended when Mom came up with a rule: Whoever cuts the cake lets the other take the first piece. As if by magic or divine intervention, fairness emerged, and arguments ended. No matter who did the cutting, there was an even division. By creating and enforcing neutral rules, we minimize conflict. A lot was at stake. Despite a bitterly fought contest and all that was at stake, the game ended peaceably, and winners and losers were civil to one another. How is it that players with conflicting interests can play a game, agree with the outcome and walk away as good sports? The rules are known and durable. The officials could adjust the applications of the rules. Suppose the officials were more interested in the pursuit of what they saw as football justice than they were in the unbiased enforcement of neutral rules. If officials could determine game rules, team owners, instead of trying to raise team productivity, would spend resources lobbying or bribing officials. The returns from raising team productivity would be reduced. Also, I doubt that the games would end amicably. We should demand that Supreme Court justices act as referees and enforce the U. Who is appointed to the high court becomes the all-consuming issue. The question is not whether a justice would uphold and defend the Constitution but whether he would rig the game to benefit one American or another.