

Constitutions, and Other Magic Tricks

So, according to constitutionalists, the “founders” got together, did their rituals and meetings and made their documents and stuff, and then *presto chango*, the United States “government” suddenly had the right to boss people around here – albeit in a supposedly “limited” way. And now, if you want something changed, you have to go through the amendment process, or vote different “representatives” into office, use the established “checks and balances,” and so on. Because hey, it’s the “law of the land,” and all that.

My question is, does the same magic trick apply on other big pieces of dirt? Like, are the people in North Korea all obligated to pay tribute to and abide by the wishes of the ruling class they have there? After all, it was created by a *constitution*. Even if you’re an American constitutionalist, and think “our” constitution is way better, don’t you still basically have to insist that the people under *any* democratically-elected constitutional republic (yes, North Korea is one of those) have to play by the “rules” set forth in their constitution?

Otherwise, the American constitutionalist would basically be saying, “Everyone is obligated to abide by the Constitution that I like, but no one is bound by constitutions I don’t like.” So, Mr. and Mrs. Constitutionalist, which is it? If, by living between the Atlantic and the Pacific, I have some obligation to live under the dominion of the ruling class that *your* favorite Constitution created, does the same hold true of all the people born in all those countries with their own constitutions? Are they all obligated to submit and obey their political masters?