PRE-EXHIBITED

INFORMATION

1. On June the 8th, 1789, before the House of Representatives, Congressman James Madison, having been one of the most prominent Founders or Framers of the Constitution itself, gave his presentment of the first proposal for the Bill of Rights, to be considered for Amendments to the existing Constitution for the United States.

2. In his Presentment, at **Paragraph 43**, we find that Mr. Founder Madison is concerned about the fact that there are States that have "**no** bill of rights," that "there are others provided with **very defective ones**, and there are others whose bills of rights are **not only defective**, but **absolutely improper**; instead of securing some in the full extent which republican principles would require, they limit them too much to agree with the common ideas of liberty."

3. With this statement, we become aware that – his intention of establishing a Bill of Rights at all – *is* that it be more for providing some form of unified protection against State encroachments of Rights than against *federal encroachments of rights (*the 1833 erroneous federal

claim made in Barron v. Baltimore, denying the Bill of Rights to the States altogether from 1833 to 1937 – which later time brought forth the U.S. Supreme Court's "Selective Incorporation Doctrine"). Because of this, his, Mr. Founder James Madison's, true concern, as unveiled to us without dispute, having said what he has said, we are compelled to apply this purpose for the Bill of Rights throughout his Presentment for that day, each and every paragraph of it, unless there be any thing in any particular paragraph that should appear to actually be for the "federal" powers and not the States powers instead.

4. As we read in the **28th Paragraph**, we find that the wording therein appears to coincide with some of the language contained in the present day Sixth Amendment, as well as the Fifth Amendment.

5. We are certain that Mr. Founder Madison means this part of his Presentment to go to the States and not to the United States, for his words to this end are precise and not misleading:

> ". . . crimes committed within **any county** which may be in possession of an enemy, or in which a general **insurrection** may prevail, the trial may by law be authorized in some other **county** of the same State."

6. With language this clear, there can be no mistake that the "**county**" or [counties], as with "**any** county," being discussed here pertains to those existent and future existing **counties** – **in States**, **not** within the parameters of the United States central government's location itself.

7. The same thing continues with **Paragraph 29** following, wherein it states:

> "In cases of crimes committed not within **any county,** the trial may by law be in **such county** as the laws shall have prescribed."

8. Once again we see this reference to more than one county being possible, and know that such was never possible or intended as such within the very small Territory of Washington wherein the District of

Columbia was established to exist; nor even if it were "added to" by way of military forts, dockyards, etc, such other Places as these could in no wise be referred to as though a "county," — for military governments do **not** relate to county governments, ***as though*** there exist any "**elective**" **powers** among the "residents" (troops/sailors) thereof.

9. This last realization confirms that none of the language of Mr. Founder Madison, either at **Paragraph 28** or **Paragraph 29**, in his Official Presentment of the Bill of Rights, on June 8, 1789, **involved the United States** being able to have a "**county**" therein, as a matter of the proposed Constitution ITSELF providing for such a "**county**" as a matter of "**just that**."

10. **Without Uncertainty**, since the Constitution Itself ***provided*** for **no** recognition for a "federal" "county" for the proposed United States central government, ***nor*** provides for **any** "federal" county" to this date, such an existence can only be brought about by the use of the Congress' own Powers, either **Before** or **After Clause 18**, to make one for itself (see The Clause 18 TEST).

11. Searching, thoroughly, the few existing Powers within the Constitution that belong to the Congress itself (see The Clause 18 TEST exhibited supporting visual Glasses TEST **and** The War Powers Resolution of 1973 – "Congress' own powers"), we do **not** find such a "county-making" Power as it would take for the Congress to have one, even though its Legislative exercising Power within the District of Columbia is "exclusive" (**MEANING simply** that it is **not** "***inclusive***" of the several States' governments UnConstitutional aegis or auspices).

12. **Not** *finding* a Power to "make or have ***counties***" outside of Clause 17 itself, and certainly **not** a The Clause 18 TEST **Power** of Congress **to** "**take-over counties** out in the several States," **we are compelled**, again, ***without wavering***, to **know** that ***any*** claim for a "**county**," or any authority involving a "**county**," by whatever name it might be called, was just an attempt, by the Congress inside of the Territory of Washington, District of Columbia, to cause the use of the word "**county**" for **itself** in

order to align itself with that same usage of the word "**county**" as was presented to the Congress by Mr. Founder Madison, on **June 8, 1789**, in order to **COVER UP** and confuse the people outside of the Territory of Washington, District of Columbia, as to just what lawful and proper usage the name "Washington" ought to be applied to as the greater legal existence within which the said "District of Columbia" was to be located at some time after the Constitution was ratified, and the land proposed to be **ceded,** or **given**, for it – from the particular States of Maryland and Virginia – was to be satisfied for ***that*** purpose;

13. All done to **cover up** the real purpose for the proper name of the specific place and lawful functions therein, of the place referred to by the term "the **Territory**" as found in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, a **COVER UP** to hide the **sham[e]** of **Official Corruption**, or **Malversation**, that was taking place, **secretly**, as all frauds do, right under the noses of the American populace that were existing within the Several States themselves at the time;

14. Unknown to most people in America, the Constitution's claim for the ability for real property to exist on behalf of its proposed central government to "not exceed ten miles square" does not currently exist as any official reality, for what was originally believed to be the Territory of Washington, District of Columbia 10 miles square layout of the city therein was reduced by **3 ½ miles** by Mr. Founder George Washington himself.

15. AND that that **COVER UP** was the Act by the Congress, certain factions thereof, to, in law, align itself with particular words spoken by Mr. Founder Madison in his official Presentment of the Bill of Rights on June 8, 1789 wherein he, Mr. Founder Madison, referred to the political organized areas within a State known as **counties**, recognizing the existence of more than one of them as such, and their, potential for counties, integral existence within what was the beginning existence of both the Fifth and Sixth Amendments, by which **superfluous establishment** of **two** "**counties**" within the Territory of Washington, District of Columbia, within the 10 miles square thereof, or 6 ½ square

miles for one County, Washington, and 3 ½ square miles for the other County, Alexandria, caused a **FALSE APPEARANCE** or **FALSE STANDING** for the Territory of Washington, District of Columbia, ***as though*** such "**counties**" - as were spoken of by said Mr. Founder Madison, aforementioned - were those same counties which were to be same (**two**) Washington, D.C. counties, so that the term "State **district**" used in the Sixth Amendment could be made to "**appear**" **as though** it were the **replacement** term for **those** alleged **two** **counties** within the Territory of Washington, wherein the District of Columbia ("Washington, D.C.,") is located, and therefore **reducing** the Sixth Amendment's term ***as though*** it were a "federal district" instead of a "**State district**" (as it actually states), as the Sixth Amendment term was actually meant to mean, — as a full reading of Mr. Founder Madison's June 8, 1789 Presentment of the proposed Bill of Rights undoubtedly proves it to be.

16. ***Thus***, as **any** **Fraud** — must include – in order to be successfully carried out — **the appearance of legitimacy** — ***irrespective*** of the facts and truth relative thereto — **is an essential element of the** **fraud** so **perpetrated**, which **fraud** may be carried on indefinitely ***UNTIL*** the motive for the fraud is figured out, or discovered, and the **method** by which the **fraud** was enacted and carried out are discovered, in order to **Declare the** **Fraud** itself null and void, as a matter of Law and Law-Binding Fact, **in the interest of justice**, in the satisfaction of the Law and the restoration of the rights of the injured people who have suffered or been injured by such said **Fraud**.

17. It was therefore ***one*** of the conspiracies in the **Cover Up** of the real use for the name, "Washington," originally proposed because it was believed that Mr. George Washington himself was going to give (or "cede," as in "cession") 3 ½ square miles of his own Virginia plantation to become the seat of government, but withdrew his offer afterwards when he, Mr. Founder George Washington, came to realize that the greater majority of political minds therein were not to be trusted, because of the Frauds that had been perpetrated upon him April 30, 1789 (see the Exhibited - **The Nation That Never Was** **Expose**), and that, in the 1803 Marbury v. Madison, even Chief Justice John Marshall's having referred

to the Territory of Washington as the "**county** of Washington" was a likewise Fraud by Appearance to **Cover Up** for Mr. Founder Madison's June 8, 1789 proposed Bill-of-Rights revealing words instead.

18. This of course Flies in the Face of that which was spoken concerning "**any county**" or counties, as the same might relate to any **State's** district seen in the Sixth Amendment, by those same words, when reviewed in their fullness, in the Presentment of the Bill of Rights by Mr. Founder Madison on said June 8, 1789.

19. And the claim for any none Clause 17 TEST United States "county" as existing as by any name at all (there are only **two** {2} "D.C." ***counties***), further Flies in the Face of the following evidence and information:

20. To establish a "**county**" ***is*** a political endeavor; a political endeavor requires particular due process to make such a thing as a "**county**" so. A **county** has, as the inherent nature of a **county** demands, — the necessity of particular "**county** officials, officers, and offices." Among these **county** officers is the one that has long been recognized as the supreme member of Law Enforcement for the **county** for which the same has been elected to serve, the **county sheriff**.

THE FULL EXHIBITED TEST FOR WHICH THIS FOREGOING PRE EXHIBIT INFORMATION WAS PROVIDED FOLLOWS, NEXT PAGE.

EXHIBITED

Proposal For Issuance of A WRIT As Deemed Necessary, Applicable and Authoritative

The Unlawful Territories Expose & Constitutional Amendment TEST

INCORPORATED INTO THE MAIN PLEADING, WITH DEMAND TO TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE, INCORPORATED HEREWITH

The Unlawful Territories Expose & *Constitutional* Amendment TEST.

I.
"Territories" Prolific; "Territories" De facto

1. The Mexican-American War was fought in 1846-1848. The Mexican-American War post-dates the Louisiana Purchase of April 30, 1803 involving the whole or else large parts of the current States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Kansas, North Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, and the eastern parts of Colorado and Wyoming, which were each and all made a territory before being made a State. This fact has its due concern in what we learn of the Mexican-American War, and the other territories, so called, which came later.

2. Other "States" of the proposed United States-nation were made subject to certain of the same "legal" conditions that the foregoing "States" were likewise subjected to, as are set forth within this Evidentiary Expose itself, to which the United States central government is made culpable as a Defrauding Party against them, the Same Several States as is alluded to and shown to be included within the context of such Evidentiary Expose herein.

3. The purpose of the Mexican-American War was, by the promptings of people in the western and southern States to expand the boundaries of the United States under the proclaimed "manifest destiny" doctrine. And on September 14, 1847, the United States military forces conquered and occupied the capitol-city of Mexico, Mexico City itself.

4. **Winner Of War Not Disputed**. The United States is not an imperialistic nation (Article I, Section 8, Clause 15 - {see The Clause 15 TEST} - does **not** provide for Conquering Power and ability, not even within the use of Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 may it do so), nor is there

any provision for it to be in the Constitution. This lack of imperialistic Agenda is **also** found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12, which restricts this nation's army to a term for which funds may be appropriated to a narrow limit of two (2) years, thus also establishing that the Union of the United States was NEVER meant to be ***any*** imperialistic, or conquering, nation, certain claims within American Insurance Co. v. Canter, 1828, **NOT*with*STANDING** [Note. Additional TEST Evidence to **The Imperialistic War Powers / Clause 11 TEST** set forth below may be provided hereafter, pertaining to the manner in which military powers were, and are, provided **for** – their very existence - under The Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 TEST, if necessary].

5. The alleged United States central government is not to be construed, Constitutionally, as being an imperialistic government or as being authorized to become one, for there never was the "right" for it to take from another country,- under any Pretext in Violation of The Clause 17 TEST and The Clause 18 TEST,- lands that lawfully and truthfully belonged to that other country and to convert such lands into "territories" of or for the United States outside of the aforementioned Constitutional **Requirement** at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 that provides for its doing so. Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 involves the willful and free acts of a free people, and not a people bound by any form of servitude or subserviency under a government's existing control.

6. One of the most simple ways to see and understand this is to look to the **two** (**2**) powers found for the **enforcement** of **the** Nation's **the** Laws (see The Clause 15 TEST), and then hold those two powers subject to the simple, though unusual, **The Imperialistic War Powers / Clause 11 TEST**, below.

7. Incorporating any that the Congress could have under Clause 11 of Section 8, Article I, by way of its use of Clause 12 of Section 8, Article I, since it would be necessary to make up the "army" by way of the induction of members of "the Militia" as provided for at Clause 15 of Section 8, Article I, which "the Militia" was and is to be made up of members of

States' Militias as provided for at Clause 16 of Section 8, Article I, we find that even the "army" provided for at said Clause 12, in its ultimate power to wage a war, must rely upon the powers contained in Clause 15 of Section 8, Article I as to its own **ability of power** ***granted*** it to do so.

8. **IMPERIALISTIC WAR POWERS / CLAUSE 11 TEST**. To illustrate the inherent Constraints imposed upon the Congress by Clause 11, of Section 8, Article I, let us suppose that the Constitution, as it was willed to be empowered by the proposed Constitution's Framers, ***granted*** the Congress the Power to establish an army – of girl scouts, and the **Power** of such army was and is to bake cookies. **In the event** that the Congress, having the Power granted it to make War, did so, question; – upon **what form of** "military" **power** would it ***thus*** be em**powered** to make War ***with***? The answer, sounding as foolish, or childish, as it *might* sound, would be to hold a "cookie bakeoff," and let the most or the best assortment of cookies be proclaimed the winner of **the** War!

9. This analogy is not provided to create a claim for jest or humor, for **WAR** is too horrible and vicious a series of tragedies for that, but to help the courts, and the people, and their governments, to come to understand the true limitations that the Constitution placed upon its **central government** – in its usage of the Clause 11 Power to declare War, **limited** to the kind of **Power** *for* military operations that we see specifically at Clause 15, of Article I, Section 8, and not otherwise.

10. In confirming this analogy as being sound in its perception, the question must be asked, **and** the answer given; Question: Does it, Clause 11, rely, necessarily, upon the kind of Power that its prescribed Clause 12 army – which derives its own ***being*** from being established *from* among those people *of the States* which make up "the [federal] Militia," derived from the States' Militias to begin with – **has** for the purpose of making war?

The Answer to this would be in the affirmative. The Congress must look to the **kind of** military **Power** that it has been given in order to determine upon what basis it might declare **any** War. In doing so, it is found, and must be found, that the **only Two** (**2**) **Powers** that were

actually, visibly, given or granted, were, *and are*, for **defending** against **Insurrections** and **Invasions**. ***Neither* of these Two (2) Powers are IMPERIALISTIC, *or* "Conquering," in their nature**.

11. We find further that a propensity to commit Imperialistic War(s) on the high Seas was **not granted** to the Congress, not even by the use of the Clause 13 Navy, for its own ability to do so, in order to successfully penetrate any land or nation with its forces, would necessarily rely upon the "United States Marine Corp," but that consideration **FAILS** altogether, in the face of certain required TESTS, as we find out the following:

> [1] As we examine Clause 13 of Section 8, in regards to the granting Power to establish a United States Navy, we find that, except for protecting all of our ships of peace from attacks upon the waters, the Navy was not particularly designed to take alleged War efforts into other nations, or that is, past their shorelines. In order to do any such thing, it would require an ocean to internal land assault force, such as might be represented by a Marine Corp. On September 17, 1787, the date that the Constitution for the United States was proposed for the Union of the Several States, NO "Marine Corp" existed, either within the provisions of the said Constitution itself, or as a matter of fact, or as ipso facto, on behalf of any of the Several States themselves. The Clause 18 TEST is to be applied from this point forward.
>
> [2] The **Continental Marines** were the Marine force of the American Colonies during American Revolutionary War. The "corps" was formed by the Continental Congress on November 10, 1775 and was **officially disbanded** in **1783**, **four** (4) **years before** the New Government of the proposed United States, under its proposed Constitution, was to be formed. The "Continental Marines" mission was multi-purpose, but their most important duty was to serve as on-board security forces, protecting the Captain of a ship and his officers. During naval engagements Marine sharpshooters were stationed in the fighting tops of the ships' masts,

and were supposed to shoot the opponent's officers, naval gunners, and helmsmen. This was not a ship to internal land assault military power.

[3] The Marines were used (to Protect the Captain, and other Sailor-Officers in accompaniment thereto, in their, Sailors, engagement) to conduct (**sea**-**port** limited) amphibious landings and raids during the American Revolution.

[4] The United States central government's **FRAUD** of establishing a military power that was **Not** Included **in** Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 itself, on September 17, 1787, *was effectuated* by the use of Clever Wording in its alleged "federal law," by its Claim that:

> "Thus in 1798 the **US Marine Corp** was officially launched On July 11, **1798** the **US Marine Corp** was "**reinstated**."

[5] **NO** CLAUSE 18 TEST POWER, or **Any *Other*** INCLUDED TEST POWER **IN** THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION has ***ever*** Existed to allow the United States Congress to "**reinstate**" - as it was claimed - a military force that:

(1) Was **Officially Disbanded** 4 Years before the proposed United States-nation even got PROPOSED to exist, and even more than 4 Years before its character ***as though any*** nation ever began to emerge;

(2) Was not Expressly Included within any of the Texts as that pertain to any existence of military Powers, **either** at Clauses 12 and 13 of Section 8, Article I, **or** at Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 (the word "**Implied**" goes to ***that*** which is Necessary – *from a **grammatical** standpoint* **ONLY**);

(3) Was Designed long after the Legal Fact -(dated September 17, 1787)- to utilize an **Imperialistic Power not available** to the Congress by use of its **Two** (2) **Limited Powers** found at Clause 15, of Section 8, Article I, **so that** the United States central government

might cause the Several States **to support its** own **agenda** to Invade Foreign Nations, **as IT did**, being therefore Unlawfully ***and*** Illegally in the "Mexican American **War**" of 1846, and other Wars thereafter.

[6] Therefore, while it is ***Claimed*** that the U.S. Marine Corps is the oldest of the U.S. military services, **the truth** discovered **is** that it **was** and **is** contained in **No Part** of either Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12 and 13, and was likewise Not included as a power of the Commander in Chief (but not the President) at Article II, Section 2, Clause 1, and therefore **FAILS** not only The Clause 18 TEST, but likewise **FAILS** the particular TEST found within said Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 itself, and has **NEVER** been established, by way of *required* Constitutional Amendment, to be made a part of the military powers for the United States, in order that the said United States might be able to be recognized as having ***any*** right at all to be an Imperialistic, or a Conquering We Will Go, Government, as this TEST proves that it is NOT, and was NEVER meant to be.

[7] Accordingly, we find that the ONLY Lawful Right that the United States has, whatsoever, to officially be in any other country or nation in *any* military sense, is where and when any such foreign nation has become a part of the United States as provided for at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1, whereupon, having the rights under the proposed Constitution for the United States as well as any other State thereof, and in compliance to all requisites found at Article I, Sections 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16, and at Article II, Section 2, Clause 1, the United States central government would have all instant Rights to extend such protections unto the same, as a lawful State of the United States, and not otherwise, except that by so doing, it be found UnConstitutional to do so in the final TEST for Propensity Fraud itself.

[8] This TEST to prove against the alleged Power for the United States central government, or any of the several States acting in conjunction or concert with it, to be employed as ***any*** Imperialist

Government, capable of waging Any War NOT as a result of its, United States,' first having been attacked by some definite means, is also found within the Constitution's particular wording of Article II, Section 2, Clause 1, wherein it states that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and of the Militia *of the several States*, ***when*** called into the **actual Service** of the United States," establishing the Truth as it pertains to another long "gotten away with" Jurisdiction Fraud and Power Fraud by the United States central government, the claim that the President is made ***automatically*** the Commander in Chief upon the occasion of being sworn in as President, when according to Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 this is exactly **NOT** the case at all;

12. Which military fact otherwise, having been recognized by certain U.S. army generals as having been *a rather more recent idea*, is reinforced by the fact, the question, of who would be required to CALL the President to be the "Commander in Chief," and WHERE would that Power to Be "Called" be found, *which* would **not** **Fail** The Clause 18 TEST itself?

13. Since it would not be within any framework of either law or sane logic to conclude that one may "Call himself/herself" as though talking to oneself in doing so, we conclude, with all reasonableness, that the Call for actual Service" must come from the Congress alone, by the use of its own particular Power found at Clause 11, of Section 8, Article I, to "declare War," the expressly granted provision for which, War, does not include, and does not go to, "police actions, "military actions, "hostile activities," and so forth, nor can the Congress transfer its War declaring Power to the President for the same reason as aforestated, that to do so would grant the President the Power to "talk to himself" in order to "call [himself] into actual Service," which act for insanity can, under no pretext, be sustained as any matter of law.

14. Thus, irrespective of any long-erroneous **mis-belief**, that the President is simply the *Commander in Chief* at the time of "inauguration," it simply being **not** **so**, the particular wording at Article II, Section 2,

Clause 1 combined with the Constraints put upon the Congress at Clauses 11 and 15 of Section 8, Article I, established to a conclusive presumption level or degree that the United States central government, and no proposed State along with it, has the right to consider itself to be an "Imperialistic Nation" whatsoever, rendering ALL Imperialistic or Invasive acts of War by it to be UnConstitution[al];

15. Ruling out the ONLY part of the military forces of the United States central government that – having been mis-claimed to be a "reinstated" part of the Clause 13 Navy – has been regarded ***as though*** a true Imperialist, or Conquering, or First Attack type of military power, or that is, the **De Facto** United States Marine Corp, we find, ***conclusively***, that the Mexican American War of 1846 was an **Illegally Fought War**, ***Entirely***, however, there are yet Other fundamental reasons, that this TEST Exposes, that **proves** that 1846 act(s) by the United States central government to be an Act of **Jurisdiction Fraud** – as well as **Power Fraud**, without dispute of the FACTS so provided, here within this TEST.

ADDITIONAL FUNDAMENTAL REASONS EXPOSED:

16. **It is understood and known that being forced or pressured into engaging in a contract by way of undue legal pressure, or creating a condition of duress, is avoidable in continued contract enforceability after the fact. To place a people into a legally subservient condition first, then propose that they be given the ability to escape that subserviency to another legal condition, without first giving such people a choice of utter freedom if they chose it, constitutes no form of true free agency in doing so. The lack of true free agency in being made obligated in contract violates the necessary and inviolable mandate contained in due process, is unConstitutional, is unlawful, and is ILLEGAL. A people under any legal duress condition cannot be compelled, ipso facto, or by the surrounding conditions and circumstances, by the United States to "become a State" of the Several States of the proposed Union of the United States.**

17. **If, in the Mexican American War of 1846, the United States were indeed an "Imperialistic Nation" by right, then it would have had the right, and the imperialistic agenda mandate to go with it, to acquire the Mexico City area at the time it came to occupy it, as well as a great part of the rest of Mexico, if not all of Mexico, seeing that a United States army had just conquered the very capitol of Mexico, Mexico City, itself during that alleged-as-Constitution[al] War.**

18. **Thus, the idea that the United States is "entitled to obtain war booty" for its "conquering acts" by way of lands that fall into its possession FAILS, and is denied by the very fact that it denied itself the possession of Mexico City, *and thus* all of Mexico, when it, Mexico City, fell into its (United States') possession. But the FAILING ACT alone, aforementioned, is not the Only grounds for the denying of a claim for "war booty," in such a case, to the United States.**

19. Its *not* doing so (keeping Mexico City, and Mexico, for itself) establishes that it was understood that we, the proposed United States, are NOT an "imperialistic government," nor were we to ever be so, and we DO NOT go around acquiring great tracts of property as a matter of Aggressive War. Any such areas taken by the United States as a result of any War engaged in, the [first] freeing of such land(s) by said War which does not result in the immediate assimilation into the United States as a State or States, is a violation of Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 – "**the** Congress/**the** Territory," as well as Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 – a reasonably easy process in becoming a State, as well as Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, and Article V of the proposed Constitution at the same time, violates its, a[ny] proposed State's, right to true free agency, and is unlawful and illegal, being thus UnConstitution[al].

20. Additionally, any such areas taken by the United States as a result of any war engaged in is a violation of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, which **mandates** that the Congress purchase (not claim to "possess") all of its lands to be used for "**needful**" purposes, that it **purchase** such lands or places **from** a **free** government, or one that has a "legislature" able to give

its **free consent**, eliminating the possibility of right to, in any essence, put *any* guns to the heads of such a government in order to obtain any such consent, nor can such lands or properties be obtained by the United States by its being ceded to it, for the Power of Cession (or the Power to Give, Grant, or Convey) is granted to the Congress ***only** the **one time**, in **Clause 17**, to be from the particular States of Maryland and Virginia (Virginia declining to cede) as a matter of determined fact, further establishing the illegality or UnConstitutionality of the United States to obtain any areas or lands for any plural "territories" purpose altogether, as shall be further evidenced in both law and fact hereafter. *If claimed "not so," show which of the other Powers covered under The Clause 18 TEST provided for the "Power of Cession," or The Clause 18 TEST Right to receive – as gift(s) – any place or real property from Any Other Source than those of the "particular States." Show it, visibly, expressly, indisputably, *OR* It DOES **NOT** EXIST!

21. **Way For United States To Grow Limited**. Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 of the Constitution defines the **Only** manner in which the union (the word "union" means "an unincorporated association") of the United States may ***lawfully*** grow. NO Power can be found through the lens of The Clause 18 TEST to approve a practice of admitting "territories," in any form, to the "union" - **Not *as* STATES**.

22. The act of claiming any area so conquered not only fails The Clause 18 TEST requiring a Power to be found in the Constitution, either before or after Clause 18, which grants the Congress [a] viewable power to acquire large tracts of land for the purpose of creating and maintaining Territories **(**LARGE tracts of land do not come under the definition of "Places," or "Property" owned, for the Erection of needful Forts, Magazines, and other needful Buildings, Purchased FROM a State**)**, without first Amending Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2's "the Territory" to be changed to "territories," but fails the TEST put to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 itself.

23. IF, as in the case of either France or Mexico, the same are each presumed to be "a State" under the meaning of Clause 17, then that same recognition denies the United States certain powers under the proposed Fourteenth Amendment, and under certain U.S. supreme Court case decisions, denies the United States central government the right to reduce the Rights of States to a lesser degree than those such States had prior to the Fourteenth Amendment as it relates to any incorporation doctrine. And IF it is claimed that the "places" or "properties" Purchased from the States of France and Mexico were to be used for the purpose of erecting Forts, Magazines, and other *needful* Buildings, then it would be a sham and a fraud pretense to so claim – and not do *precisely* that very thing *all over* that "property" or "place" as the time following permitted, *but rather* to allow the "property" or "place" to *grow* in "citizenship" *instead*, then *change* that "property" or "place" over into a "State at some time thereafter.), *without first* amending Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2's "**the** Territory" to be changed to "territories," but FAILS the TEST put to The Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 TEST as well.

24. **Regions Could Be *Quickly* And *Easily* Made Into States. Considering the ease with which Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 could have been complied with, commencing with a proposal and invitation by the Congress to the people residing in the desired free region to be made a future State, that they, the free people thereof, organize their desired basic free governments, to be inclusive of a legislature, governor, and courts (the Constitution's trial by jury as a system would have been easy enough to accomplish), by *first* establishing a constitution for the people thereof to vote upon (there were plenty of State examples to be had at any time and adapted to fit the people therein, to be usable immediately upon its publicly voted for adoption), which model constitution would provide for the most sufficient ability of the said people to organize the proposed future State by, such before tried and established constitution's adoption would have significantly decreased the time that might otherwise have been required *if no* examples had been available, taking a few**

years, at most, to accomplish <u>in the event that the free people therein were freely desirous to do so</u>.

25. The fact that such straightforward procedures were so readily available for such <u>free</u> people, in the desired region, to rely upon made it possible for the alleged Congress to have relatively expediently made such desired regions into States (as the alleged Congress had done at times before), but instead was not accomplished in any such lawful and reasonable manner, forces one to consider that there was a motive and an agenda for not doing so, an unlawful one if requiring additional territories to be created in excess of the one limited to by the Constitution itself. The evidence as to the facts of what was done outside of the Constitution's restraint upon the alleged Congress for **<u>one</u>** (1) **<u>Territory</u>** only, exhibits strong evidence that a long-term agenda was at stake here.

26. <u>Results of the Mexican-American War</u>. Such lands, recognized by name of land areas, of New Mexico [Arizona – not a direct result of the Mexican-American War] and California, where the Mexican government *did* actually have official fortresses and governments located therein, only went to the **lawful, entirely setting free**, by way of purchase of said lands, **of those lands**, not in making them de jure territories of the United States, belonging, therefore, entirely to themselves. Overall, these were the affected land areas, whose conditions as territories came to unlawfully exist in association with the United States: Western New Mexico, Western Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and California.

27. **The United States, under <u>Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2</u>, has (and had) <u>no</u> authority to purchase any land from any other nation that is not/<u>was</u> <u>not</u> willing to, and does not/<u>did</u> <u>not</u>, accept a position with the United States <u>AS A STATE</u> thereof immediately, and <u>not as *a* territory</u> to be maintained *around a while,* for any amount of time**. It should be noted here that the residents of a territory, if not a part of "<u>the</u> Territory," may be treated differently than the citizens of a State, territory residents existing more as <u>subservients</u> (or more at ipso facto slavery),

subject to the will of the Territory masters than citizens of any State have the legal right to enjoy.

28. What was the immediate status for the payment by the United States for New Mexico, California and Arizona? Answer. They were each and all turned into a "Territory," whether or not written with a capital "T." Yet there was **No** Amendment, as required by the Constitution itself, to make any *thing* of land a Territory, in addition to the one, exclusive Territory, or "the Territory."

29. Purchases of Certain Areas For Certain Purposes Unlawful. The Certain Areas or the Large Tracts of Land of New Mexico and California were paid for - to Mexico - by paying $15 million for the same by the United States. Arizona was "paid for" or purchased in the same manner, by the **none**-Clause 17 TEST legislatively operated and Consenting Mexico, by the United States in 1853.

30. The fact that a territory may be made a State *later*, *somewhere down the road*, placing the lands thereof in some sort of "United States Future States **Layaway Department**" does not **take away** from its unlawfulness at the time the "purchase," or other manner of acquisition, was made. The **Principle** of the Doctrine of the Fruit of the Poisonous Tree, as well as the Fifth Amendment's demand or requirement of "due process" must be considered when it comes to legally determine what has happened in such a "deal" as that. To not do so would be to violate the fiduciary trust that the people place in any of us who have legal understanding. A determination as to the legal effect of the unlawful activities, particularly in a misuse of process and an abuse of discretion against the Constitution's legal structure of *this* magnitude must be made.

31. While payments may have been made for California, New Mexico, and Arizona, no payment was paid for Utah and Nevada, and the applicable western parts of Colorado and Wyoming. These areas were made a part of the conquering hero's booty, as "territories," and existed outside of the United States under the meaning of the word "Property,"

there having been not even a suggestion of an Amendment amending Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, and so, the United States had absolutely No Lawful Authority over these free lands at all.

32. **Purchase of Persons - Not Lawful** Or **Legal Option**, Power, Right, or Authority, of alleged **United States central government**. .. It cannot be disputed that the purchase of living persons, by the alleged United States central government, has never been a lawfully recognized practice of such said government; no Power is known or found to exist either before Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 or after it, that would go to or lead one to believe that ***any*** person, whether as an individual or as a part of any group of persons, might be included ***in any transaction*** for purchase of property ***by*** the United States central government as outlined by Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 - - of the United States Constitution, ***as though*** such person(s), or people, had ***some*** particular **value** which might be determined as being a part of such transaction **committed by**, or to, the United States central government.

33. Yet this is precisely what we see and have, as a legal breakdown begins to be made regarding the purchase of the lands now called California, New Mexico, and Arizona, for it cannot be disputed that Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 authorizes the Congress to purchase only Properties, or "Places," which cannot be construed to include the purchase of "People" along with such "Places;" no basis in either law or fact exists to sustain even a notion that the Purchase of any human person by the United States has been or ever could be justified under the Constitution Law for the United States.

> THESE EXIGENT QUESTIONS, INVOLVING **FACTS**, NOW DEMAND TO BE ANSWERED.

34. In the Purchase of the Property of Land, and Buildings, and Other Structures Thereof, of the Place Now Called California, How, According To Any Historical Record Now Available To Us, Was The Property So Purchased Separated Completely and Absolutely From The People Who

Were Residing Therein, So That It Was Distinctly Understood That None of the People in Such Land Could Be Construed As "Coming With The Land" So Purchased **By** The alleged United States central government **From** Mexico, AND

35. IF Such Lands *Were* To Be Considered To Have Been Purchased From Mexico By The alleged United States central government Entirely Separate From The People Actually Living Therein, **How** Were The People, IN SUCH SAME TRANSACTION, **Separated** *From* Those **Properties**, *At The Time* of The Alleged Legal Separation Required Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, As To The Lands Sold To The alleged United States central government By the Said Nation of Mexico?

36. IF we were to conclude that the people residing on the lands purchased by the alleged United States central government were not a part of the lands purchased, and so did not *come with* the places *or* properties so purchased, this would conclude that by that same transaction the people residing in the buildings, houses, structures, towns, and cities, wherever they may have been located therein, were to be legally deprived of those same properties that they otherwise enjoyed, by that same act of purchasing the same by the alleged United States central government from Mexico. Certainly we realize that this was not true, as none of the people residing and otherwise existing in any of the structures, towns, and cities, etc., were made to leave them standing and to vacate them as would have been the case if it had been understood that they, those same people, were not a continued part of such dwellings, and other privately needful buildings. Consequently, we can only conclude that those said people, being an inseparable part of the properties contained within the lands purchased by the alleged United States central government, were necessarily made a part of the same transaction of said purchase, and thus such said people were purchased by the alleged United States central government from Mexico, even if it is realized that Mexico did not actually proclaim ownership over any of them before that time, it, Mexico, did so on an instant basis as a matter of the involvement of the aforesaid sale and purchase transaction itself.

37. It cannot be denied that Mexico, at the time of the Mexican-American war, did possess sufficient sovereign powers to determine that all people residing in a particular land that it owned, might not be regarded as "owed property" of said sovereign nation also, on an instant basis at the least, for the nation of Mexico did not have a constitution, as a constitutional government, to deny this potential for its sovereign powers to so do or regard the occasion to be appropriate for transactional purposes to construe it so, and the fact that the two nations were both wrong in how they proceeded to transact business involving the rights and liberties of people is irrelevant as to what it lawful and legal under the law of nations, as it applied to contracts and commerce, particularly where one of those nations is prohibited from purchasing people for itself, as the alleged United States central government was construed to be prevented from being able to do.

38. **Reckless indifference to the truth** in transacting is the Failure that often causes many legal entities to go astray, and pay the consequences of that failure somewhere down the road, even if such failure happens not to be immediately, or even in their lifetime, where perpetuity of the legal entity is a fact, as such consequences of the unlawful transaction act must be borne by the heirs of the same, until the fraud uncovered has been cured, to the legal satisfaction of all concerned.

39. These "Federal," as well as State Questions are Now Extended to the Transactions Involving the Lands of California and New Mexico, and of Arizona as well, recognizing that the lands called Nevada, Utah, and Western Wyoming and Western Colorado did not merit *even* a condition for Purchase, but existed rather as simply being **seized** by the United States as a "War booty," without any authority whatsoever under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 in doing so, and the taking into alleged ***subservient custody*** of the people residing in such lands by the United States was an act Altogether Unlawful as though the people residing in such lands were so much property to be taken over, without so much as a farthing paid for any of them, or in a technical sense, little more than slaves, or else the future servants, as subjects of the unlawful "territories" thereof, for the

alleged United States central government, **not** of the **principle** called "America."

40. The foregoing principle exists to extend to other "States" which have been, unwittingly and unknowingly snared in the United States central government's early-on UnConstitution[al], Illegal Practice of States Forming, which Charges shall now come forward Under the Right of the Union of the Several States, **AGAINST IT**, not "them." Such "States" as were first, by ANY MEANS, made or accepted by the United States central government as being any "territory," in straightforward Violation of the Constraint against the same at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2's "The Congress / the Territory, and at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1, as shall be further, inescapably evidenced hereafter.

41. **Conclusion of Both Law and Fact**. **IF** It cannot be determined or proven as a legal fact – brought before the People of the Several States of the United States – that the Transaction for "Purchasing such Properties" as were Indisputably Purchased BY the United States – Were Legally Separated From The People Who Were Residing or Abiding In Any of Them At The Time of Such Said Purchases, **Then** it Must Be **Admitted** That Such Transactions Were Illegal From Their Inception, Constituted A Fraud Upon The People Thereof, And Upon the Taxpayers of the United States-nation 'Proper, whose Money Was So Unlawfully Used For Such Vile and Illegal Purpose, And As The Conditions For **Fraud** Goes, Without Limitation of Years in the act of doing so, IS **VOID** Hereafter.

42. Turning again to the matter of the fact that, in its quest to extend its borders from the constrained area of ten miles square, except for the purchase of lands for the use of forts, magazines, and other needful buildings, examining the transaction of the purchase of the lands now known as California, New Mexico, and Arizona, not to mention those lands that were a part of the Louisiana Purchase, it is discovered by such examination that the United States, in its unlawful purchasing of such lands, made as a part of that purchase a purchase that it could not purchase, not with all of the money in the world, except that it had an Amendment first allowing it to do so.

43. Since it cannot be disputed, by the Purchase of the real properties of California as primary example, that California's purchase was for the United States central government itself to possess - in its "State-Layaway Department," which was inclusive of the houses, businesses, government buildings, towns, cities, and other structures existent in such lands as California was known to have, we find it necessary to question and to discover what other kinds of structures might have been also included in the purchase transaction for the lands now called California.

44. **In considering this matter carefully, it comes to our attention that among those other expectable structures there existed - without question or dispute - churches, cathedrals, synagogues, houses of worship, parishes, monasteries, sanctuaries, baptismal fonts, river and lake waters used for baptismal purposes, all of which the United States central government did purchase, in *violation* of both the First Amendment AND Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, along with which the United States central government did also purchase - without separation of the same from such structures - religious ministers, preachers, pastors, reverends, rabbis, priests, nuns, monks, deacons, alter boys, bishops, archbishops, congregations, and *other religious persons'* bodies and persons officiating in other religious denominational clergy or ministerial capacities and positions, the like of which the United States, under the Constitution's First Amendment, Had NO Right For Power (or for Claim of Power) to purchase, In Utter Violation of the Constitution and the purposes for which it was framed by the Constitution's Framers and Founders, a true Contempt of Constitution, a sovereign criminal offense, now laid at the feet of the United States central government by this averment that the same is a matter of fact and not a matter of law.**

45. It would take no great intelligence to recognize the utter illegality of these transactions borne of Constitutional recklessness and unconscionable acts by a United States alleged Congress already out of control, even as early as 1789, and thereafter. It cannot be imagined what the States' governments and the people having abode, or residing, therein,

will do when they learn the truth, and they will, of what has been discerned by these Exhibited Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. The fact that one cannot do wrong and forever expect to get by with it is the issue of the hour as it pertains to this TEST, even if that one happens to be the alleged United States central government, now exposed as to the matter and concern for Jurisdiction Fraud, and **Power** Fraud, and Propensity Fraud, among other causes for concern for Frauds of which the alleged United States central government are also "guilty."

46. Realizing that the United States central government, in **fact**, **purchased, On EVERY Occasion and In Every Case whereby it Purchased and "Obtained" for itself a[ny] "territory," - - Religious Denomination** Buildings, monuments, and symbols and articles of Religious Worship, of various kinds, *and their corresponding clergy as inseparably connected thereto*, is only the beginning of what the significance of these findings mean. In the case of the lands now called Western Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada, such lands were not even esteemed enough to be *purchased*, even if unlawfully so; they were just TAKEN, as a matter of "**War booty**," which means that all of the same Religious Buildings as referred to above, in conjunction with the Religious Clergy that were inseparably, or ***Inherently*** connected to those said Religious Buildings, were seized, or taken, as though an act to enslave the same, with no thought or caring as to what the outcome of the legality of that transaction would ever be, if it were at any time determined as to what the Constitution[al] truth of such heinous transactions made known to the people of the several States of the United States to be.

47. This goes to the charge of the Propensity of the alleged United States central government to commit Fraud against the governments of the Several States, and against the people therein. The Propensity to commit Frauds such as these will go to prove other great frauds committed by the alleged United States central government, which goes to the heart of the charge for a total L**ack of** Subject Matter Jurisdiction by

way of Jurisdiction Fraud, and by way of a **Lack of** Standing, compounding the matter still further.

48. As stated above, unlike the lands now called California, New Mexico, and Arizona, to name only a few that have been **illegally** done this way by UnConstitutional transaction, the lands now called western Colorado, western Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada, were not only not purchased, people and all, by the United States, but such lands were merely seized – people and all – by the alleged United States central government under the pretext that it had the "1828" right to do so as a matter of "War booty," for no indication has ever been found or determined to establish that the alleged United States central government at any time purchased such lands from Mexico, only that it took them by "agreement" as a matter of having been the one to have won that "American" / Mexican war, or as "War Booty."

49. This condition for "transaction" exposes to us the truth of the conditions of any land called a "territory," where such land's people can be just "seized" without so much as a requirement to pay for any of them, if such payment could be at any time lawful, reminding us of the activities of early slave traders as they operated in the black-people-areas of Africa, to just go in there and "seize them," all for the purpose of **profiting themselves** by, even if "somewhere down the road," as though with a kind of United States **Future-States Layaway Department**, constituting in the interim a form of peonage, ipso facto, such peonage form being utterly unConstitutional as to the right of any people having the right to the equal rights of all others for a Republican Form of Government, as manditorially Guaranteed to them by the United States itself.

50. Without Uncertainty, the United States central government's making those lands into "territories," when it was denied by the Constitution from having only one (1) specific Territory, being the Territory [of Washington] wherein the/such District [of Columbia] became located, to the same extent as it, along with the Several States, was denied from having but **one** (**1**) "Congress" (**the** Congress"), did so for the purpose of its own **immediate** "**benefit**" (or "self-serving"), and for its further

benefit, given that it had the right to manipulate such territories in the meantime to become, each, what the United States central government, -- not they, people of the areas designated as "territories," -- wanted them to be, "somewhere down the road."

51. The foregoing discovery shows the additional reasons as to why the acts of the alleged United States central government involving the creation of "territories" **beyond** the **One** was and is UnConstitutional *and* Unlawful. The discovery against "the Territory" having *ever* been considered as lawful or Constitutional in support of an assumption for "the territories" to the contrary, without an Article V Amendment being ratified by three-fourths of the several States first, continues.

52. **The alleged United States central government, under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1, working in conjunction with Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, has no authority *to* purchase any land from any other nation-State, where the required free people thereof are not willing to, and do not freely, accept a position with the United States AS A STATE thereof immediately, and not as a territory (violating Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2) – in order that the same may be "maintained *around a while,*" for *any* amount of time**.

53. It should be noted here that the residents of a Territory, if not a part of "**the** Territory," may be treated differently than the citizens of a State, territory residents existing more as subservients (or more at ipso facto slavery), *subject* to the will of the Territory masters than citizens of any State have the legal right to enjoy. This condition of creating citizens in a territory which is not factually and legally a part of "the Territory" as established by the Constitution, creating a subservient or inferior status to the citizens of any of the several States, creates a condition for duress going to motive to insist that those territorial citizens desire to become citizens of a State instead, exuding an unlawful force, denying true free agency, to be made a State, as though willfully under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

54. **What then was the immediate status for the payment by the alleged United States central government for New Mexico, California and Arizona?**

Answer. They were each and all turned into a "Territory," whether or not written with a capital "T." Yet there was no Amendment, as required – the same as would be expected to be required for "the Congress", to make any thing of land a Territory in addition to the one, exclusive Territory, or "the Territory."

55. While it is proposed that the official act to ***make*** California a Territory failed in Congress in 1850, the Truth about the facts existing at that time are something different; the Territory of California, having already come to exist long before as a matter of fact and law and so not being necessary for additional declaration as a matter of formal political law, was established as an alleged Territory of California, ipso facto, as follows:

56. In August of 1846, **Commodore Robert F. Stockton** (for which Stockton, CA is named), having established control of the Pacific coast of California from San Francisco to San Diego, armed with the errant and vicious ruling of the U.S. supreme Court in the 1828 case of American Insurance Co. v. Canter that the United States was entitled to "just take," and **not pay for** – [whatever it wanted]

(the Act of a **Common Thief** – {Though This is a True Statement – Common Thieves Are Always Dazzled By ***Better*** Thieves}),

property as a matter of War Booty, arising in equality of law and fact as a **Declaration of Enslavement** of a Free People, (**compare** to African Slave Traders ***of those*** same ***times*** who took over black people's lives ***as*** **Property**)

Declared the California region **by default of control**, **to be** the **Territory** of California, and that [ALL in it was to be] **the** Property of the United States. ALL means ALL, thereby rendering, in legal effect, by such statements, more fully:

"The California region by default of control, to be the Territory of California, and that **the** Property of the United States central government."

57. It should be noted here that when a military Power, unrestrained by any form of Law to prevent it to be otherwise, ***takes over*** a property by way of act of war, the civil rights of the people residing or having domicile therein is not a consideration; that which is seized by military conquest where a Constraint of Law is denied or omitted, seizes, *without discrimination*, everything therein as the Property of the government waving the military act, excluding nothing.

58. By this Act of Declaration, known as The Proclamation of Commodore Stockton, **never denounced by the Congress at any time**, made the payment for California – under the threat of the guns **aimed** at the heads of Mexican officials in Mexico City, under the **forced** "**Treaty**" of Guadeloupe Hidalgo – merely a ***confirmation*** of Commodore Stockton's earlier Declaration as to the character of the property, which **property** was inclusive (1) of the People, (2) the Religious Buildings, and (3) the Religious Ministries inherently and fundamentally associated therewith, **ALL** "**Purchased**" and **becoming** a "**possession**" of the alleged United States central government **under Threat of Death**, an official formality, existing thereafter as the **subservient** Territory of California, from which condition and under duress Californians were compelled to seek relief by petitioning the United States Congress, for the supposed lesser evil of ***alleged*** Statehood.

59. A possession, which happened to have been formerly a Territory, and so remained as being what it was as a matter of the purchase of the same as a result of the **alleged** "Treaty" of Guadeloupe Hidalgo;

60. **Congress did not**, by way of any lawfully concrete evidence produced or presented, **deny** the **Proclamation Act** of Commodore Stockton at any point in time, and therefore, **by their silence** on that matter (it not being necessary to make it ***more formal*** than it already was), acquiesced to California as being, ipso facto, the Territory of California –

Owned, as a "possession," BY the alleged United States central government, post Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

61. It was in the form and condition of this "**possession**" of California As A **Territory**, Proclaimed So by Commodore Stockton and Acquiesced to, to that end, by the Congress thereafter, that the Territory/possession of California was made, **not** being **first** made **Free**, an ***alleged*** State of the United States, Not Ever Having *Had* STANDING (no right to speak, no right to be heard, no right to be considered) as a Free State To Do So.

62. The fact that a territory may be made a State *later, somewhere down the road*, does not take away from its unlawfulness at the time the **purchase**, or other manner of acquisition, was made. The **Principle** of the Doctrine of the Fruit of the Poisonous Tree, as well as the Fifth Amendment's **demand** or requirement of **inviolable** "due process" must be considered when it comes to being legally determined as to what has happened in such a deal. To not do so would be to violate the fiduciary trust that the people place in any of us who have legal understanding. A determination as to the legal effect of the unlawful activities, particularly in a **misuse of process** and an **abuse of discretion** against the Constitution's legal structure of *this* magnitude must be made. We are NOT the nation, proposed or not, to adopt, for all time, the notion that, "the end justifies the means," and "whatever you can get away with is okay."

63. While payment may have been made for California, New Mexico, and Arizona, **NO** payment, according to history, was paid for Utah and Nevada, and for the applicable western parts of Colorado and Wyoming. These areas were made a part of the "conquering hero's" War Booty, as "territories," and existed outside of the United States Lawful boundaries under the meaning of the word "Property," there having been not even a suggestion of an Amendment amending Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, and so, the alleged United States central government had absolutely No Lawful Authority over these, *originally*, free lands at all. The claim on this matter, according to history, was that by the **alleged** Treaty of Guadalupe Hildago (February 2, 1848), these four regions of lands were

"ceded" to the alleged United States central government by Mexico, requiring no payment there-for, as was the case for the lands of California and New Mexico, recognizing that by such conditions such property was ceded as a form of War Booty, such lands not being received by the alleged United States central government in any claimed free state of being as to the people living or residing, as though also being a free people therein, in any of them at all.

64. **Free Consent** of Legislature, - **not** Armed Force By Government, Or Else By Monarchy - **Required** For Purchase To Be Lawful. "Consent of [a] Legislature" does not exist as a free consent as required under Contract Law as a result of wining a war, where the idea of, in essence, holding a gun up to the heads of the legislature and saying, "now consent," cannot be enforced as a bona fide consent of such legislature as required by Article I, Section 8, Clause 17.

65. It is without question that the alleged United States central government, as a matter of the War being won by IT, and holding ***many*** guns to the heads of the official people (people who could be made to die, or be imprisoned – If Not "Consenting") of the government of Mexico, "**forced**" any form of "**cession**" (the 2 terms contradict) of any lands to the alleged United States central government, *as well as the "selling"* of the lands of California and New Mexico, and eventually Arizona, all being acts of **malicious undue** "influence," or more correctly being **extortion**, or **theft**, or **robbery**, such said acts of "**forced cession**" not being either commercial transactions under contract law or Lawful Acts under the proposed sovereign Constitution Laws of the proposed United States-nation, and therefore not being either lawful or legal, but rather constituted **Frauds against** such said proposed Constitution, **and against** the People throughout the entire nation that it, Constitution, both represents and represented, as well as the rights of the State of Mexico and its People, due to such reckless Contempt of Constitution committed by the alleged United States central government actors at such time.

66. **Wherefore, though the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, as a result of winning the Mexican-American War, the alleged United States Congress allegedly received unto itself certain lands by way of "cession," or having the same "forcibly ceded" to it, or else by "annexing" — (compare - as it UnLawfully, without evident Power to so "annex", did annex the "Republic of Hawaii" as a "Territory" in 1898) — the same to it, it was UnLawful for the Congress to *receive* these lands under such an act, no matter how "good" the intentions of the State, or nation, was in its efforts to "forcibly cede" to the Congress the lands, as States or Territories, now in question. The same concern applies for the Treaty of Paris whereby certain parts of the Northwest Territory were "ceded" to the alleged United States central government by Great Britain, or the lands of Puerto Rico and Guam, which were "ceded" to the alleged United States central government by Spain, or the lands of Nevada, Utah, Western Colorado and Wyoming, which were "forcibly ceded" to the United States central government by Mexico.**

67. Purpose of War **Not** to "**Get Property**." No Lawful Power exists within the proposed United States Constitution which authorizes the alleged United States central government to imperialistically "wage war" in order to "get itself another State," or to "get itself some more States." Such thinking as that is the kind of **demented politics** we would expect from some backwoods politician, hic hic. The proposed Constitution's Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 provides for a free thinking people who freely desire to join us, to do so As States, not to make such people do it as the result of an Act of War, or as a condition so that, as a "Territory" they want to become a State in order to get out of the **oppression** (out of the fire into the cooler frying pan being the lesser of two evils) caused by the alleged United States central government itself, which it was and is now known to be prone to do.

68. The term "**Property**" in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 pertains to the concept of "Places" as contained in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, and does not involve or mean that the United States central government is

free to just "go out ***thar*** and buy itself one of them ***thar*** States [Property], just based upon ***thet*** buyin it did on its own, only." **hic hic**. For a land to become a State, **its** existence *has to be accomplished* on a legal basis of more than **its** just being "**Property**." **It**, as a State Only (see The Illegal States Forming TEST) must go through an ARTICLE IV, SECTION 3, CLAUSE 1 **PROCEDURE** (not hard to do, requiring only - as an **Existing State** – {1} a State constitution, {2} the proposed intention, at least, to establish a State Militia to protect itself, with the "army" taking up the slack in the interim of State ability to do so for itself, and {3} a Republican Form of Government – 3 independent branches, elected officials, laws – Not Policies, Opinions, Beliefs, etc., as its basis for existence) in order to become a State of the Union of the Several States of the proposed United States-nation. So, neither the purchasing of, nor the negotiating for land by the alleged United States central government, for the purpose of setting up a[ny] "territory" *other than* "**the** Territory," aforementioned, had (and has) **NO** Lawful, **Constitution**[**al**] **Right** to be so done, at any time, as it was and has been done.

69. **Certain Ownership Claims De Facto. The term de facto means a thing that exists as a matter of fact, but so exists on an illegitimate basis only The named areas of Utah and Nevada, and the parts of Colorado and Wyoming were not owned by Mexico. It is said that anyone can claim anything they want to, but claiming it does not make it fact. Mexico claimed that it owned the areas of Utah and Nevada and the western parts of Colorado and Wyoming. Indian tribal sources have reported that Mexico may have claimed that it owned these areas, but says that there were no forts, governmental buildings, or towns where Mexican people lived exclusively to anyone else. Therefore, such claims as were made by Mexico are not supported by actual facts that back up Mexico's claims that it ever did own these specific areas.**

70.1 **Claim A Worthless Claim**. This means that the alleged United States central government *claims* to have obtained these particular States from Mexico, with no certification that Mexico actually had evident ownership power within said States, is a Worthless Claim.

70.2 The equivalent would be like one man beating some other man up, having that man give the winner a vehicle located "down the street somewhere" that the loser **said** was his, with no title, with no **actual** indication that it was actually his, and with the winning man who beat the loser up going ahead, by using the loser's forced words only, and **taking** possession of the vehicle with an "**OK**, **I beat him up**, made him '**give me'** the vehicle I wanted, and *now* **it's mine**."

70.3 Without **proof** that the vehicle actually belonged to the second man, the vehicle could belong to anybody, and the claim of new ownership where no original ownership was truthfully proven makes the transaction a Fraudulent Transaction, and, where violence is involved, more that just a fraudulent transaction only. Of course, a dishonest person not wanting to have to realize the truth, which would cause him or her to "lose the deal," would try not to ask any questions that would contradict what he or she had been told.

71.1 **A vehicle "deal" would actually be a lot simpler to be "right about" over literally taking, forcibly, millions of acres of ground spread out over the best part of 4 States. In the vehicle example, one might not know as to whether or not the second man actually sat inside the car, drove the car, actually owned the car in some natural car ownership sense. But in the case of *that* many States and all of that land, there would be a *responsibility* to check *some* things out; {1} does the Mexican government have some troops in those States that we need to escort down to Mexico City, {2} *are there buildings that they occupy that we need to take over*; {3} since some form of mail or messages from a government would flow back and forth to its outposts - where it had actual power, being the "owner" of such lands, will there be a need to stop such messages/mail system from moving from one area to another, and from headquarters central and back, and so forth. These are only a few of the kinds of questions that would necessarily arise to be asked were there any legitimate truth that Mexico ever owned the large tracts of land under scrutiny by this discernment.**

71.2 **The Two Parables of Particular States - As Vehicles.** Continuing with exposing the Truth to all with more simple demonstrations as to how dishonesty or by criminality a certain central government works, we provide these two parables for the most common person to understand, realizing and understanding that the loftiest law professors, along with talk show hosts, should be able to pick upon the simple facts as illustrated by them, and better explain to their students or listeners, so that both past wrongs and current and future wrongs can be addressed head on, and perhaps those moral-less, unconscionable wrongful and horrific acts committed by the United States central government under the guise of "destiny" will be proven **Wrong**, also head on, and the **Wrongs** themselves - even if not the deceased wrongdoers - can be purged from our **utterly** UnLawful system, and the healing process, or salvation, can finally begin. The parables in point now follow.

71.3 **Parable One. The Two Owned Parked Cars.**

In the two cars parked on the street parable, a person from the deep Southwest is standing a short distance from two parked cars that the same owns, and has no intention of selling either of them.

Along comes another person, a "legal" person from the East, being a bully and a villain, having been told by one of its internal authorities in the year of 1828 that it can, by conquering, take whatever it can get away with, as long as its conquering armies are well Marshalled.

The bully person from the East says to the person from the deep Southwest, "Sell me those two cars there," to which the reply comes back, "I don't want to."

The bully person from the East then whips out a very large gun and holds it right to the head of the person from the deep Southwest and says, "**I said sell me those two cars there for Fifteen Million Dollars** or **I will shoot and kill you *right now***." The person from the deep Southwest owning the two cars says, "**Sold**, Not Stolen," to the bully person from the East for Fifteen Million dollars.

But don't you believe it.

71.4 Parable Two. The Two Parked Cars and the Two Part Cars – Originally Free From Ownership.

In the two cars and the two part cars on the street parable, a person from the deep Southwest is standing a distance from two parked cars and two part cars, and has no proof of ownership of any of them, and so makes no truthful claim of actually owning them.

A person from the East, passing by, sees the two parked cars and the two part cars and approaches the person from the deep Southwest and says, "Give me those two cars and those two part cars there," to which the reply is, "I don't own them."

The person from the East, having become **an insolent bully**, says, "Give me those two cars and those two part cars there," to which the reply comes again from the person from the deep Southwest, "**I don't own them, and I have no proof that I own them**;"

To which the **bully** person from the East pulls out a big gun, the same big gun that the bully person from the East has used before, and says to the person from the deep Southwest, "**I** said **give me those two cars and those two part cars** or I will blow your head off with this **big gun** that I have! I'm not going to do anything **illegal**, of course, so you are going to give me those two cars and two part cars that I want or I will send you to your "south of the border" graves if you don't **give** them to me. **NOW**!"

"**GIVEN**!" says the person from the deep Southwest. "Even though I can't actually prove that I don't own them, I 'Give' them to you, because I don't want you to kill me for such as that, and so I will just **say** to everyone that I once actually owned them, even though I have no real proof that I ever did."

"Fine!" Says the **bully** person from the East. "Do that!"

71.5 These two comparative examples, or parables, expose the Truth, the Real Truth, involved with the "purchase" of the areas or lands known - in 1846, at the time that the alleged United States central government brought forward the Illegal Mexican American War – as California and New Mexico, and the outright seizure, under the Illegal Claim of "War Booty," of the areas or lands known as Utah and Nevada the western parts of Wyoming and Colorado, where the alleged United States central government's Illegally Assembled and Illegally Imperialistic Acting "army" went to Mexico City, Mexico and, pointed a gun at the heads of the American Government and People, demanded that they either "sell" or else just GIVE whatever lands the alleged United States central government's – Illegally Acting Factions wanted from them, no matter what level of Contempt of Constitution crime would be committed in the name of **False Justice** and under the color of the 1895/1818 **False Flag** of the proposed United States (see The Clause 18 TEST, Part I, for The False Flag TEST).

72. **No *Proving* Evidence. Unlike the existence of the evidence of Mexico existing *in* California, New Mexico, and Arizona, there was no such actual evidence to prove that Mexico ever actually owned Colorado, Wyoming, Utah or Nevada. If Mexico had have owned it, and really knew that it did, and had the governmental strength to make and back up that claim, if it actually did make that claim and we were not just being told that it did, then it, Mexico, would have required *some* payment *for* those States as well (Else why the prejudice toward these 4 lands apart from the 3 that were actually sold to the United States for a profit? Being the loser of the war had nothing to do with it, for that was the same condition that New Mexico and California were bought under). But since these were *proposed* as only some sort of "booty" from the war, with no actual proof of ownership, it becomes *prima facie* that they were not owned by Mexico at all, and that the transaction of pretending to take them from a country that never actually owned them was a pretext, a pretense, a Pure Fraud on the part of the alleged United States**

central government. There is no statute of limitations on Fraud, and especially a Fraud of this kind. Not even two-hundred years worth.

73. The people occupying such land sought for Statehood, even if not immediately so, cannot at any time be compelled, by any means of undue influence, to do so, inclusive of being by "cession," or being ceded, to the United States as either a Territory or a State, in violation of the restrain Article I, Section 8, Clause 17. This Restraint at said Clause 17 is examined in more exacting detail below. Therefore, neither the purchasing of, nor negotiating for, land by the alleged United States central government, for the purpose of setting up an "added 'territory'" has had any lawful consequence, but rather, in fact, has had NO lawful, Constitutional Right to be so done at any time that it was, and has been, done.

74. **Power For Cession Limited To The One Cession Only. By virtue of The Clause 18 Test, Parts I and II, we come to understand that there can no longer be an assumption of Power for the Congress, anywhere in the Constitution, merely because a claim has been made for one. A Power for the Congress must truly exist either *Before* Clause 18 or *After* Clause 18 upon which to enact any law, or the authority for such law to exist simply does not exist.**

75. Under Article VI, Clause 2 of the proposed Constitution, we find that the proposed Constitution is the supreme Law of the land. Second to that level of Authority and Power is "the laws of the United States," passed by the Congress, which laws may not be merely passed on their own accord, **but** which must be made – **not** Presumed *or* Assumed - to concur with **All** Limitations and Empowerments in the Constitution itself, or "in pursuance thereof." **ALL** laws passed by the Congress must comply with the requirements of the Constitution; **No right Exists** to pass a single law, of whatever kind, that in any way violates the proposed Constitution, else the Constitution, proposed or not, is no longer "supreme" as stated therein.

76. A treaty is law, though is not known to be supreme or superseding law, and, in the case of the proposed United States Constitution, a treaty as law, being passed by that same "authority of the United States," a **treaty** ***cannot*** ignore, **squander**, pilfer away, **deny**, destroy, or **abuse** the **rights** *of* the **citizens** of the United States and/or of the Several States under some **pretext** that a "treaty is *really* equal to or greater than" the proposed Constitution itself; a **treaty** ranks only **third** in power and authority, being a law passed under the authority of the **alleged** United States Congress and the **alleged** United States President, who must itself exercise or execute **their** own inferior authority in passing laws and ratifying treaties, by making those laws "pursuant to" the Constitution itself only.

77. Thus, the passing of a treaty - no matter the treaty, the nation, or reason – can not and does **not** have the effect of "Amending the proposed Constitution;" a treaty may not add to the Constitution what is not already there, nor may it take away from the Constitution what is there; a treaty must be contained within the boundaries of these two principles or else that law, or treaty-law, has not been made "pursuant to" the Constitution as - in its **third place** position - it is required that it must be.

78. Presumptions, when determined to be in error, have no basis for continued support as law, no matter how long that presumption may have been engrained into the legal system.

79. At Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, we find that the Congress, as one of its **Express** Powers, has been granted the power to receive for itself, based upon the operating principle of Cession, or having **ceded** to itself, land, not exceeding ten miles square, from "particular States," such States having been intended as Maryland and Virginia, but only Maryland being an actual contributor to it, to become the seat of the United States government, or the power to have ceded to itself the particular lands ("**10 miles square**," NOT "10 square miles") for a particular use from a very particular source. This power having the right to have "ceded" to it the particular lands for the future Washington, D.C. is one of the expressed

powers included among the Powers granted the Congress by the Constitution as determined its rightful Power, and passes The Clause 18 TEST, showing the same as so.

80. Through the lens of The Clause 18 TEST, Part I, we look to find another "power of cession," or the power and subsequent right to have any other thing "ceded" to the Congress, but this search for such a power FAILS The Clause 18 TEST, and we are left without ability to conclude, to **any** extent, that such an additional power exists, at all, for the Congress to have **any** additional land "ceded" to it, for any reason, at any time, by any source not found in said Clause 17.

81. Not having the locatable power in the Constitution to have any land(s) at all "ceded" to the alleged United States central government, we find that any claim for any property or land being "ceded," or **not** purchased, to the alleged United States central government, whether or not for a lawful purpose as required by the Constitution, any claim by the United States central government for any authority over such **misappropriated lands**, for any "later use" thereafter, even if the same was "made a State" thereafter, not being made by a "legally or actually free people," was and is UnLawful, and therefore Morally Wrong, and the "rights" of the alleged United States central government therein to litigate any matter foreign to the direct, republican interests of Several States,' **or *either of them's***, local people must be **denied** or **set aside**.

82. **NOR can the Power to be assumed to be an inherent power to the Congress; inherent powers are not required to even be mentioned; they exist regardless by virtue of what they must be in order for the thing by which they are attached to justly function as it must. But when a government is being necessarily regulated by a constitution, No Presumption of Power as an inherent power Can Be Made where the mention of the power in question has been made, and demonstrated to extend such power to a particular event or condition, and not merely a mention of it, the way that Clause 17 of Article I, Section 8 does as it expressly demonstrates an extending of the Power of "cession" to "particular States," showing the**

particularity of such "cession," to allow the alleged Congress to receive such "particular" lands as would be "ceded" to it by <u>such</u> "particular" States.

83. We find therefore that the Power of Cession, or being "ceded" to, was granted to the alleged Congress, specially, particularly, at <u>Clause 17, of Article I, Section 8</u>, and NOT Generally. Without a claim for a General Power of "cession" at <u>Clause 17</u>, it cannot be presumed to exist Generally anywhere <u>else</u> in the Constitution unless it is expressly provided for such either Before <u>Clause 18</u> or After <u>Clause 18</u>, and <u>only in</u> the proposed Constitution itself.

84. Consequently, any property which was "ceded" to the alleged United States central government by any State or Nation, whether foreign or one of the several States, other than the "particular States" granted to the alleged United States central government to receive specific "ceded" property from, was unlawful, or UnConstitutional for the alleged United States central government to receive, good intentions of the giver-State not a justification for breaking of the Constitution Law whatsoever. This includes the lands of Western Colorado and Wyoming, Utah and Nevada. This likewise includes, but may not be limited to, the land of Wisconsin, as being ceded to the alleged United States central government by Britain by way of the Treaty of Paris, and the lands of Guam and Puerto Rico ceded to the United States by Spain, also by way of the Treaty of Paris, and by Florida, by alleged ITS alleged purchase from the Monarch and Monarchy of King Ferdinand VII (NOT a "consenting legislature") by way of alleged debt cancellation of a Five Million dollar debt owed to the alleged United States central government in <u>1821</u>;

85. In addition to the restriction for any Power for general "cession" put upon the alleged United States central government by <u>Clause 17 of Article I, Section 8</u>, along with <u>The Clause 18 TEST</u> itself, there are still other legal problems that any sincere and honest utilizer of this <u>TEST</u> must contend with involving the making of any of the lands so acquired by the alleged United States Congress into a territory, or territories, as our investigation continues to uncover the question as to the existence of <u>any</u>

Constitutional right to do so at any time, no matter what the belief or practice has been to this date, otherwise. These legal problems, denying indubitably, the legitimacy of any plurality of "territories" continues by this investigative action necessary for the undertaking of this Extraordinary TEST as follows.

86. **Claim For 'Territories' De Facto**. Without an Article V Amendment amending Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, the existence of all areas that were described as "territories, must be, and are, to be regarded as "de facto." This has nothing to do with whether or not money was paid for them. This has to do with the fact that the proposed Constitution of the United States was not Amended to provide for the existence of more territories than one (1). It was no accident that this was the case, because it was the intent, the purpose, from the beginning, to be a nation *of* States. That is why it was called the "United States." It was not called, or to be called, the 'United States plus territories,' or the 'United States + Territories.' That is why Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 is the only part of the Constitution that establishes a procedure for taking into the proposed United States-nation more than a few hundred acres or so, not equivalent to or greater than "**the** Territory" itself, of land for Forts, Magazines, and other needful buildings, makes a provision for "new States," but *nothing* in the proposed Constitution provides for a thing, or grants a power, to create a thing called "new territories."

87. **Violation of Inherent Rights of the Existing States**. To have done so would have been to cheat the existing States of rights that would not have been equal to the so-called "new territories." This can be seen from the restriction put on the States at Article I, Section 10, Clause 1, which prohibited States from coining their own money. These "new 'territories,'" not being States, and so not being subject to the same restriction at Article I, Section 10, Clause 1, could open up money producing facilities and start coining their own money immediately, and the Congress could not have told them "no" *as* being *against* any *part* of the Constitution itself. The potential to claim a right to "coin money" by

territories, where no specific prohibition was made against them doing so, would have been a circumvention of inviolable due process or a denial of an equal right for Statehood under the proposed Constitution - Law.

88. **Final Legal Condition Of Areas Alleged To Have Been Obtained From Mexico**. First, four areas now regarded as States, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and Nevada, were never owned *by* Mexico, and so their "giving," or "ceding," them - regions of lands - to the alleged United States central government where no prima facie evidence or even de jure condition proving original ownership by Mexico, combined with Native American tribes insisting that those lands were never under the control of the Mexican government to begin with, makes the possession of them, regions of lands, by the alleged United States central government, entirely Fraudulent, a Sham, a THEFT by Deception. Since Mexico, as a matter of evident fact, did not own them, and since the alleged United States central government could not own them under those particular conditions, the legal status of such States is that they would have been Free Lands from their beginning, thus belonging to no one but themselves. The alleged United States central government's loss to a fraudulent deal did not, and does not, give it the right to set the Frauds, committed by alleged IT, aside, no matter how long ago such Fraud-Wrongs were committed by alleged IT, and to go ahead and lay or continue claim to those now named regions of lands anyway, no matter how great the loss.

89. **As for California, Arizona, and New Mexico, it appears that the alleged United States central government paid money to Mexico for them. That, however, does not end the matter there.**

90.1 **Contract Law As To A Losing Contract**. The fact that a contractee may have made a bad judgment, and paid for an item that could not be used afterwards where it was prohibited by, or denied by any law from doing so, does not hold the other party, or seller, accountable for such loss, nor does the loss give the losing party the right to set the law aside in order that the same might not be the loser to a contract. Buying itself some "territories," without an Amendment, was not lawful. The

alleged United States central government made a losing contract with Mexico.

90.2 Even though the alleged United States central government, at the time, as a matter of Constitutional Right, lost a lot of money in its Alleged-as-Lawful "Treaty Transaction" with Mexico, the fact that alleged IT (apparently) did not read and comprehend its contractual obligations and limitations under the proposed Constitution, gave it **no authority** to turn California, Arizona, and New Mexico into "territories" and not require them to become States, **immediately**, instead, or more precisely, set the people inside of those lands immediately Free, First, and not to "**forcibly purchase them**" as alleged IT did, but to allow those people the free agency to decide for themselves, at that time or at a later time, **if** they, people, would become a part of the proposed United States-nation **as a State** thereof, or not.

90.3 **This Same Foregoing Condition** as to making a "Losing Contract" involving the obtaining of lands, or real property, by way of either any direct purchase or else by forgiving any alleged debt, by the alleged United States central government, in any of its transactions involving its acquiring any "territory," to be placed into its United States Future States **Layaway Department**, which "exists" only by way of a violation of The Clause 18 TEST and The Clause 17 TEST, applies to every other "State" that was ever made or regarded to be a "territory" of the alleged United States central government (such a "territory" could never "belong" to any of the Several States and would thus be DENIED such a relationship to the "United States-nation" itself), beginning with the first alleged "territories" of Maine and Kentucky themselves, to have been orchestrated into being made so by the alleged Congress of – **The Nation That Never Was** (see Exhibited **EXPOSE** by that name).

91. **Designers of 18th Amendment KNEW That Amendment Contained Fraud To Begin With**. An amazing thing has happened. Evidence has surfaced that gives a powerful, indubitable indication that someone in the writing of the 18th Amendment *knew* that the existence of territories in the plural was a fraud, a violation of the Constitution, but

rather than expose it to the nation, and to the States, as they should have done, tried to cover it up instead, but did a poor job in doing so.

92. **Bear in mind that at the time of the proposal of the 18th Amendment, there had been a number of lands taken, under one pretext or the other, under color of law, but with no lawful way to do it. People who write Amendments are typically well trained lawyers or else politicians who have been at it for so long that they become proficient at it. It is certain that the writer(s) of the 18th Amendment were well educated, to say the least of it. And they would not want to present something that would make people look at them and say, "*That* person doesn't even know how to talk right."**

93. **So, in the 18th Amendment, the issue of both "the Territory," never having been Amended to read "territories," and the fact that "territories" had actually, unlawfully – UnConstitutionally but factually, been added to the alleged United States central government – for "Future States Layaway Department" purposes – had to be dealt with – in an Amendment – for the first time.**

94. **Guess Someone Did Not Know How To Talk *Right*, Or Write *Right*, Huh**? Let us say, as a matter of example, we have a car lot located somewhere, which a potential patron approaches for the purpose of buying a car therefrom. Upon reaching the lot, he discovers that the car lot only has one car parked thereon. He looks at that one car, and pointing to it with his outstretched arm, says "the car."

95. Leaving the car lot for a few hours, he comes back and finds that the car lot now contains a large number of cars instead of just the one. Again pointing toward the car lot, at all of the cars in a single wave over them, he says, "**ALL-L-L-L car**."

96. Would this statement be recognized by most educated people as being grammatically incorrect? Knowledgeable answer, "**Yes**, the words 'all car' would be grammatically incorrect as a means of recognizing all of the individual cars that might be countable otherwise of themselves, in

order to make up a particular total or number of all of the cars being recognized."

97. In the careful review of the 18th Amendment, Section 1's wording, we get a surprise. The expected language that we should be seeing there is not what we see there; "the Territory" is correct grammatical language, but when we read the 18th Amendment's "**all territory**," we know that it is not supposed to read that way; it should read either "all of **the** territory," if singular, or else "all territorie**s**" if plural, but then ***that*** particular wording, suggesting a **sudden** plurality of territories, would call for sudden scrutiny as to how we *suddenly* went from "**the** Territory" to "**all** territorie**s**" as a matter of fact, without, first, an Article V Amendment to do so. To claim that the word "**all**" was needed at all would be to illogically conclude that without it, one might somehow be lead to *misbelieve* that *some* part of Washington, D.C., or "**the** Territory" (such as the Southwest Section, or the Northwest Section, or the Central Section) *might not be* construed as being included in the word "territory" if kept by itself, which in the words of Mr. Founder Hamilton, would be absurd to believe such a thing, or expect anyone else to. (See the **Exhibited Professional English Grammar TEST** accompanying this Exhibited TEST).

98. The words "**all** territory" acts as though it is ***reaching*** . . . for ***something***, to include that ***something*** *without actually saying it*, a kind of psychological request (or "mind trick") to place in one's mind something else that it needs, greater than what it is. This sort of deception is the kind that lawyers routinely use, when they find such deceptions in contracts, to break fraudulently designed contracts. Fortunately, one might suppose, the 18th Amendment got repealed and that was the end of that, but not so. Next came the 21st Amendment that did *that* repealing, and we find the elements of Constitutional Fraud all over again.

99. **21st Amendment Fraud Continues Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 Fraud/18th Amendment Fraud**. In the 21st Amendment, purportedly designed to repeal the 18th Amendment (under the circumstances we must wonder what they were *really* up to), we find that the factual existence of

the necessity of the wording "territories" has been side-stepped once more. In Section 2 thereof we find the wording referring to it as "any . . territory," suggesting that it be recognized that the factual existence of "territories" already created and claimed without an Amendment to do so, be given the new spin of being thought of as "de jure." One could say that this writer knew how to "talk right" at least. But the attempt to create a de jure jurisdiction from a de facto jurisdiction creates a condition that exists as a **Fraud**, a **second** Fraud, which **second** Fraud does not undo the **first** Fraud. **It just doesn't work that way**.

100. In contract law there is a concern that we have which goes to the very deception offered by the contract itself. This is referred to as the Character of the Contract. If the Character of the Contract is such that it offers a form of deception by its wording, then its fraud goes to a Character of Contract Deception form of fraud status. Nor is the Fraud ***curable*** *until* the Fraud has been realized sufficiently to do something about it. And as stated before, there is no statute of limitations on Fraud.

101. The foregoing, showing by both the 18TH and the 21st Amendments, using the proposed Constitution itself to cover up the Frauds committed by it against the strict limitation found at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the proposed Constitution, which Frauds brought about the other heinous and vile conditions for the Purchasing of People, by the alleged United States central government, and the Purchasing of Religious Buildings **and** Their Clergy, by the alleged United States central government, constitutes sufficient grounds to charge this matter as Count Two of the Propensity to Commit Constitution Frauds Against the Governments of the Several States, and the People having abode, or residing therein.

102.1 The establishment and assimilation of the lands of California, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada as territories and not as **States** immediately constituted Frauds upon the proposed Constitution and upon the People for which said Constitution was forged to protect, and no unorthodox, deliberate bad grammar reaching in the 18th Amendment and subtle, character-deceiving wording

in the 21st Amendment have the legal effect *of undoing* the Constitutional **Frauds** so committed, nor in constituting an Amendment under Article V that changed Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2's "the Territory," to any other language than what it is.

102.2 Because the language of the 18th and 21st Amendments were deliberately deceptive, and because they were constructed in the face of existing Constitutional Fraud at the time, with **many** "territories" having been established but not being de jure, the **Principle** of the Fruit of the Poisonous Tree **is factored** into the matter, and it arises as a conclusive presumption (a thing that may be argued against endlessly without changing the outcome of the truth of it) that Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2's "the Territory" has never been Amended to include **anything** but Washington, D.C. itself. The term "**the** Territory" is **still the Law** of the proposed Constitution itself!

103. No Lands Authorized As Territories. NONE. *None* of those lands allegedly involved in the conclusive transaction of the Mexican-American War, or any other lands coming into the possession of the alleged United States central government on any like basis, were authorized to become "territories" under the proposed United States Constitution instead of States. The fact that they did so later did not change the illegality of what was done beforehand. Therefore, the reference to "all territory" in the 18th Amendment (later repealed), was an unConstitutional reference to the truth that the principles of truth, or due process, in the Constitution, required to be published.

104. Legal Condition Of Other Areas Currently Claimed As Territories. The alleged United States central government has no Lawful authority, **without an Amendment**, to have or claim territories located anywhere in the world. This includes, minimally, the currently known, claimed territories of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

105. **NO LEGAL AMENDMENT NOT REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION HAS BEEN PASSED TO AMEND AWAY THE SINGULAR INTENT OF ARTICLE IV, SECTION 3, CLAUSE 2 OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR THE PROPOSED**

UNITED STATES. As a matter of **Jurisdiction Fraud** committed by the alleged United States Congress in this matter, it is now recognized that things must be made right in this matter, to first let the so-claimed territories of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and any other "territory" or territories" that may have been so unlawfully obtained by the alleged United States central government, be recognized as being set "free unto themselves," but with an invitation that such freed lands be given the opportunity to be made States of the proposed United States-nation, in the event that they and the Congress so agree, or to continue so to be a State if such is the case, if they want to be.

106. As we, many People joined here in knowledge and spirit, understand it and believe it to be, that IF we cannot be a Free People, with free agency to think and decide for ourselves, then we should *cease* to be the proposed United States-nation. We should *cease* to be **"**America.**"** In addition to the foregoing, the United States-nation will offer its apology to all governments of all lands that are now called States of the proposed United States, that were first made "**territories**" and ***then*** States, having been UnLawful to be made so, and will beg their forgiveness for the errors caused by this proposed nation's evil masters and its errant wrongdoers, and will grant those affected States the time to consider their relationship with the proposed United States-nation as States, and *pray* that they will desire to remain with us, by their own free agency, after all.

107. The foregoing underscores the fact that the words, "**the** Territory," like "the Congress, to the same extent of importance that we find in Article VII, Clause 2 of the ["this"] Constitution, empowers any like condition to limit the matter, without a fraudulent Amendment designed to cover up the truth, to one form in specific and one form only, of whatever the word "the" is applied to. Only one (1), specific, Territory can be claimed for the alleged United States central government, hereafter, if any, **the** Territory of Washington, wherein the/such District of Columbia is located, and no other.

108. There never having been any lawful Amendment to the Constitution, that the States were ever made aware of, changing the term of the Constitution's Pure Constrainment of "the Territory" at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 to "territories" for use anywhere, it is IRONCLAD that there could ***never*** be a lawful or legal United States "**territory**" to place ***any*** United States "**district**" into, thereby constituting, in addition to the newer Constraint of the one District imposed by the Twenty Third Amendment itself, that No Alleged District Court (see the Exhibited - The United States Tribunal Courts TEST) is lawful or Constitutional as to its very existence, nor is any alleged district lawful or Constitutional for any citizens of any State to live in, such citizens not living in a[ny] U.S. (alleged) district, without respect whatsoever of the provisions for the same at Title 28, U.S.C. Sections 81 through 144 and by the Judiciary Act of 1789, or later Act in amendment thereto, and not living in a[ny] "territory" alleged under any law, if any, as being UnConstitutional as well. This of course would not apply to actual citizens of and actually living in the Constitutional existence of **the** Territory of Washington, containing [the]/such District of Columbia therein.

109. At what time, or upon what occasion, or on what date or dates, did the alleged United States central government announce to all persons in the lands of California or New Mexico, to those actual persons residing in the cities and towns and countrysides thereof, and believed, by themselves at least, to have owned those same places of residence or domicile, and operating various and sundry shops and businesses: (example) . . .

110. . . . **"**You, the people of these lands called California, are hereby Noticed or informed, that the alleged United States central government has now purchased said lands, for **its** own use, from the free nation of Mexico, by Mexico's own consent to do so, and therefore, all such places contained within the lands called California are now real properties of the United States central government alone.

111. . . . **"**You, the people of these lands called California, no longer owning the lands wherein you have resided or done business, but now being owned by the alleged United States central government instead,

must leave. You will be provided a reasonable time to vacate all of these lands now owned by the United States central government, not being any longer owned by any of yourselves. A reasonable time for you people residing on any of these lands have thirty days to vacate the same. You who are business owners have sixty days to vacate the same.

112. . . . **"Good luck to you people**, **former owners** of the lands of California. *Please understand*, the Congress of the United States was granted in the Constitution for the United States the Power to purchase lands, or places, such as these. Unfortunately, it was never granted the Power to sell, lease, or rent, *any* of its lands, or places, back to, or to, any person, or business, or group, or State, or Nation, once owning the same, unless there exists an Agreement to do so, entered into at the time of the original purchase of the said lands, or places, in question, in which case, it would require such an Agreement, if any, be in full compliance, as to its existence, with The Clause 18 TEST, Part I and Part II, itself.

113. . . . **"Sorry for the inconvenience, folks**. You folks, of course, understand how it is. We, the United States central government, have purchased these lands from Mexico, by its free consent, and the Constitution requires that these lands be used for a particular purpose, which purpose does not include any of the purposes that your formerly owned places were being used for.

114. . . . "**You, therefore, cannot remain here**. You **must** All Go within the timeframe provided for by this announcement, or else you will be considered as criminally trespassing, and will be subject to arrest and expulsion, for insurrection - off of these now U.S. central government owned lands by the Militia of the United States central government.

"**Announcement Completed**."

115. The foregoing legal and logical analogy, or example, or discernment, of the Unlawful Conduct of the alleged United States central government, in its Illegal Purchase and use of the lands of California and

New Mexico, and the other lands of Utah and Nevada and the part areas of western Wyoming and Colorado, now referred to as States, as provided for in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, whether purchased or else seized under the guise of being "ceded" to, but being by way of "War Booty," applies to each and all of such lands so included in said Treaty, that Long Concealed Secret doing being Still Prosecutable against the alleged United States central government itself, is hereby Laid Open for All to know and understand, arising from below the ground of the earth to be cried from the housetops, until all that was done to them, People, is undone, and all are able to find peace, within and without, accordingly;

116.1 **MASS REAL ESTATE FRAUD, AB INITIO**. Which Illegal Act ALSO gave the United States central government a much greater volume of land than it, for any alleged usage purpose, was to have been entitled to, even **if** the said Treaty were lawful and legal, which it was not, providing it, the alleged United States central government, the greater ability to keep great portions of such Illegally Gained Lands back for itself, and to remit to the people and governments of the Several States themselves such internal lands contained therein as IT could accord to ITSELF without raising suspicion over what it had UnLawfully done, constituting a **REAL ESTATE FRAUD** – No Doubt –

116.2 Arising From A JURISDICTION FRAUD against the people residing and doing business in those said lands, and the governments, whether then existing or eventual to become, beyond any dispute that it, the said alleged United States central government, did those vile and treacherous things. It should also be noted that, in order to support any claim that Mexico actually owned certain western regions of lands, so that it could sustain its claims that it had lawfully "purchased" such lands from Mexico, but where no proof of any populace of native Mexican citizens residing therein factually existed at the time, certain known paid parties were hired to commit **Map Fraud**, which **Map Fraud** goes to **Real Estate Fraud**, which the alleged United States central government is a proven, or evidentiary, offender thereof, in violation of The Clause 17 TEST, as well as the Test at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, and at Clause 1 thereof.

117. IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING LANDS SO UNLAWFULLY OBTAINED BY THE ALLEGED UNITED STATES CENTRAL GOVERNMENT FOR ITS UNLAWFULLY INTENDED USE, the Conditions for Exposing the "Territories" **Jurisdiction Fraud** by the alleged United States central government also applies and extends to all other lands, whether or not purchased by the alleged United States central government, or else fraudulently claimed as an additional Power for "ceding" not seen in Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, or else by way of **War Booty**, taken under the guise of being "ceded" to, irrespective that such lands may be any State of the proposed United States-nation, having been made, Illegally, UnLawfully, an added Territory, even if for one day only, in violation of the Constitution's Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, "the Territory" of Washington, in which the District of Columbia became the seat of the alleged United States central government alone.

118. As such, this TEST, in addition to the unlawful and illegal condition of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, is extended to the Other Illegal Making of lands, whether or not as "free" by which a "free" consent of a free State's consent was ever given; to the unConstitutional making of a "Territory" or "Territories" of or for the alleged United States central government, which Illegal Acts for Territory/Territories is Extended Specifically To:

119. The Louisiana Purchase; the annexing of the ~~Republic~~ Territory of Texas (February 28, 1845 to December 29, 1845): the making of the Territory of Alabama (*1817); of Alaska (1912); of Arizona (*1853 ipso facto – February 28, *1863 – de facto as "de jure"); of Arkansas **(**1806); of California (*1848); of Eastern Colorado (*1803 - 1812); of Western Colorado (**1848); of Florida - purchased by debt cancellation of Five Million in 1821 (*1822); of Hawaii (*1899/1900); of Idaho (*1863); of Illinois (*1809); of Indiana (*1800); of Iowa (*1838); of Kansas (*1854); of Kentucky (*1790); of Louisiana (*1803); of Maine (T-1790/S-1820); of Michigan (*1805); of Minnesota (*1849); of Mississippi ‼1798); of Missouri (*1812 - 1820); of Montana (*1864 1889); of Nebraska (*1854 - 1867); of Nevada (**1848); of New Mexico (*1848); of North Dakota (*1861); of Ohio (*1783 / 1799); of Oklahoma (*1890); of Oregon

(*1848); of South Dakota (*1803 - 1888); of Tennessee (*1789 / *1790 – May 31, 1796); of Texas (stated above); of Utah (**1848); of Washington (*1853); of territorially reorganized, by the United States, of West Virginia (**1863); of Wisconsin (*1836); of Eastern Wyoming (*1803); of Western Wyoming (**1848); of Puerto Rico (**April 2, 1900), of Guam (**1898); of U.S. American Samoa (**1899); of the Virgin Islands (*1917); AND Any Other Territory, Known and Unknown, that the United States central government has procured for itself, in violation of the pure constraint at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, and as Confirmed for Fraud by the Eighteenth Amendment itself, of the Constitution for the United States.

> * Year in which the land after which the current "State" is named was made into a "Territory" of the United States, in violation of Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, and for purposes not granted at Clause 17, of Section 8, of Article I, of the Constitution for the United States.
>
> ** Taken or Seized or Made a "Territory" by UnLawful Act(s) (UnConstitution[al] IS UnLawful) by way of the proposed United States military or other government force, in violation of Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, and for purposes and under conditions not either granted or provided at Clause 17, of Section 8, of Article I, of the proposed Constitution for the United States.

120. The **alleged** Congress had **no** authority, established on **no** existing Power, found or findable either **before** Clause 18 or **after** Clause 18 (see The Clause 18 TEST, Part I) to set a single boundary for *any* place or land outside of those States ***lawfully admitted*** by **it** as States and nothing else.

121. The foregoing Acts and acts by the alleged United States central government, going along with the other Exhibited TESTS that are associated herewith, are sufficient to Charge the United States central government, one or more of its official acting actors and departments therewith, with **Propensity To Commit Frauds FRAUD**, along with the other unlawful and illegal acts that it is now found guilty of by these proceedings, accordingly.

122. **The Illegal States Forming TEST , an Illegal Practice commenced in 1790, having arisen first from the unlawfully designed, orchestrated, and passed Judiciary Act of 1789, passed by the alleged Congress of the alleged United States central government, under Color of Congress, is incorporated into this TEST by this reference.**

The Unlawful Territories Expose & Constitutional Amendment TEST To Continue . . .

. . . WITH THE FOLLOWING AS PART OF The UnLawful Territories TEST

Which Incorporates

. . . "'the' Territory" TEST Herein

II.
The 10 Miles Square / 6 ½ Miles Square / Alexandria County / Washington County / "Counties" TEST

123. Restating, On June 8, 1789, Mr. Founder James Madison introduced into the alleged House of Representatives the proposal for the bill of rights, most of the substance of which became that official Bill of Rights ratified by the Several States in 1791.

124. One particular part of the bill of rights proposed by Mr. Founder Madison on that day dealt with the two (2) Amendments to the proposed Constitution into which they were to be included; the Fifth Amendment's requirement for a Grand Jury, and the Sixth Amendment's further, corrected requirement for a Trial by an Impartial Jury. Certain language

within these two proposed Amendments are set forth in their respective paragraphs as # 28 and # 29 below (see The Founder Madison Exhibit).

> 28. "The trial of all crimes . . . **shall be by** an impartial jury . . . and in all crimes punishable with loss of life or member, presentment or **indictment** by a **grand jury** shall be an essential preliminary, provided that in cases of crimes committed within **any county** which may be in possession of an enemy, or in which a general **insurrection** may prevail, the trial may by law be authorized in some other **county of** the same **State."**
>
> 29. "In cases of crimes committed not within any **county**, the trial may by law be in such **county** as the laws shall have prescribed"

125. When examining these two paragraphs in their particular content, one of the first things we notice is the use of the words "county" in both paragraphs 28 and 29, and the words "same State" in paragraph 29.

126. By their language, which was the core content which lead to the proposed Fifth Amendment and Sixth Amendment being included in the proposed Constitution with those ideals being contained therein at all, we conclude, soundly, that the issues of both the "Grand Jury" and Trial ("Control Process") of **all** Crimes were to be by an impartial Jury, both or either of which were to be construed as involved in a **county**, or **counties**, of a **State**.

127. Which according to the wording in Paragraph 43 of the same Mr. Founder Madison Presentment, being "**some States have no bills of rights, there are others provided with very defective ones, and there are others whose bills of rights are not only defective, but absolutely improper; instead of securing some in the full extent which republican principles would require, they limit them too much to agree with the common ideas of liberty,**" we find that the Proposed Bill of Rights as Mr. Founder Madison proposed it to be, was **NOT** for the "federal" government – but very little, but rather was for the more part for

Governing and Controlling and Being Applied To the Several **States** themselves.

128. Recognizing this and recognizing that there was Not One single County (there was **Not One County** and therefore there were **No Counties**) within the land area to be futuristically provided for the alleged United States central government to be established in its own due time, for on June 8, 1789 the Clause 17, Section 8, Article I "Seat of the Government" requirements was not even close to have been complied with as was Article II, Section 1, Clause 3-Required for the lawful and legal existence of the proposed United States' President(s) as well . . .

129. . . . for a group of law-unto-themselves **False Founders**, this reality presented a Problem, the Problem being that without Any "Counties" in their Required .. "**the** Territory" .. in which the likewise Required "such [or one] District was to be established, they could establish and wield **No Power *over*** the Process of Grand Juries, and **No Power** over the Further Process of Trial **by** (not *with*) impartial Juries – over Crimes that might be committed within the future **13** [alleged] U.S. districts to be laid over the **11** then, and still, [UnLawfully] participating States (done shortly afterwards under the **Color of** the "Judiciary Act of 1789"), thereby **Impairing** (or Damaging) the **Meaning** of the Pointing Word of "**such**" going or pointing to Clause 17's the District, which was to be established within Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2's "**the** [Exclusively One and Only] **Territory**."

130. In order to Escape from the One Ten Miles Square Box that the True Founders, inclusive of Mr. Founder Madison in particular, purported to centralize the "federal" powers of the alleged United States central government into - Box, two (2) things Had to Be Done to Avoid being Forced Into That Constraining Square Box ***Forevermore***.

131. The First of those 2 (two) things was to Avoid – like the Bubonic Plague – the **NAMING** of the Actual "**the** Territory" itself, . . just simply never **Name** It as would have been Expectable and Inherent to a specified

place – to be made to Identifiably Exist at any time; and the Second was to Establish and NAME in place of the [Unnamed] Territory Not Less Than 2 (two) Counties, and "Qualifying" thereby the alleged United States central government's alleged "right" to Falsely Interpret the Fifth Amendment's and Sixth Amendment's Requirement for a "Grand Jury" and for a "Trial by Impartial Jury" -- as being for themselves (as was done in Barron v. Baltimore, 1833, and not particularly and Exclusively, in Any Part, For the States Only, as Mr. Founder Madison – in HIS own language at Paragraphs 28 and 29, and again at Paragraph 43 – had made Clear that such Two Amendments were Actually For.

132 Thus and Therefore, Two (2) Counties within the **Deliberately Unnamed** "**the** Territory" were Born, or Created by the alleged Congress of 1800, which 2 (Two) Counties were NAMED, instead, being "Washington County" on the Maryland side of the "Ten Miles Square" **Box**, and "Alexandria County" on the Virginia side of the "Ten Miles Square" **Box**.

133. This Political Trick might have gone by entirely unnoticed except for the fact that George Washington himself had been BETRAYED, Betrayed Utterly as to his Unlawfully Produced Presidency (see the Exhibited Expose – **The Nation That Never Was**), for it was the Generous, Mr. Founder George Washington, who had donated, or **ceded** or given (as was required by Clause 17, Section 8, Article I) three and one half (3 ½) miles of his Virginia Plantation to the future cause of "the Territory" in which the One "Such District" was to be Contained, the Same Article II, Section 1, Clause 3 Place where the Votes for the President were to be Sent Sealed, for the official Opening and Counting thereof, But Not to the Place Designated by the False Founders in Convolution with the UnLawfully Intervening Continental Congress, UnConstitution[ally] or UnLawfully Commenced March 4, 1789 – in the place of 26 Wall Street, New York, New York, at the same place officially occupied and despotically manipulated by the "Continental Congress," under the Deliberate Disguise of being "the United States in Congress assembled," two days earlier, March 2, 1789;

134. By which Corruption the Illicit Power of Wall Street Was Also Born (see the Exhibited – **The Nation That Never Was**);

135. **Betraying Utterly**, the Truly Honorable, Former General George Washington, causing his Venerable Self to decide, due that **Betrayal** of him, wanted and demanded that his Donated 3 ½ Miles of *his* Land Be Given Back, or Returned to him and his family, a demand of "wanting back *that* which was already *given*" not ordinarily being an honorable trait of the People of those days or years, the matter was finally settled in 1846 when the alleged Congress of that time conceded the matter and Ceded (no granted Power to do it), or Gave Back, to the State of Virginia the 3 ½ Miles of Land – formerly of the Ten (10) Miles **Square** making up the District of Columbia – that George Washington had fumed for as having been received from him **by deception** and in dishonor and used under false pretenses, leaving the future "District of Columbia" with only 6 ½ miles **square** [almost box] in its place, and Eliminating Alexandria County, and leaving the one County, Washington County, in its stead.

136. Now, no longer having ***at least*** Two (2) **Counties** *as* the **June 8, 1789** "Bill of Rights" presentment by Mr. Founder Madison called for, but a Single County Only, the UnLawfully Acting members of the alleged United States central government, still not wanting to Identify that **One Territory** indicated at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, simply changed "Washington County" to "Washington City," to Continue the **COVER UP** of What was **UnLawfully**, **Illegally Done** in the year of 1800 by the alleged Congress thereof, as a Continued Fraud by the alleged Congress of March 4, 1789 at 26 Wall Street, New York City, and then again by the alleged Congress on July 16, 1790 at Philadelphia.

137. The Legal Proof that the return of the "*ceded*" George Washington-donated property was given back to the State of Virginia surfaced in 1880 in the case of United States v. Penn, is confirmed minimally as follows:

> In **United States v. Penn**, 48 F. 669 (E.D. Va. 1880), a "federal district court" dismissed larceny charges – even though alleged to

have been committed by the defendant in Arlington National Cemetery - **for lack of federal, or United States, jurisdiction**;

Noting that Arlington National Cemetery being located in Alexandria County, had been on the Virginia side of "W.D.C."

138. The alleged United States central government lacked jurisdiction at the place of Arlington National Cemetery, a place that had formerly been included in the maps of "Washington, D.C." prior to, and even for some time after, 1846, because Arlington National Cemetery was in fact considered to be a part of the "Ten Miles **Square**" that it was held and believed was the lawful and legal compliance of Clause 17, of Section 8, Article I.

139. Because much of the Seat of the Government's "Ten Miles Square" had been Unlawfully – Clause 17, Section 8, Article I sold off or conveyed to private individuals, private firms, businesses, and realtors, and the alleged United States central government was running out of space to provide for its own official functions, Brigadier General Brehon Sommervell had an idea. On Thursday, July 17, 1941, he summoned two of his subordinates, Lieutenant Colonel Hugh J. Casey, also an Engineer officer, and George E. Bergstrom, a prominent civilian architect, and told them that by Monday morning he wanted basic plans and an architectural perspective for an air-conditioned office building to house 40,000 workers in four million square feet of space, not more than four stories high, with no elevators.

140. **The FACTS Stand and Speak For Themselves**; the maps drawn and depicted of the Washington, D.C. of 1810 and thereafter (see Attached Maps Exhibit - 1810) showed the entire area as consisting of 10 Miles **Square**, which later (see Attached Maps Exhibit - **1894**) would include Arlington National Cemetery along with other cities and places such as Jackson City, Munson Hill, Four Mile Run, and Arlington itself, though no longer being a part of the original Ten Miles Square (see Attached Maps Exhibit – post 1942); the Pentagon's current location on the Virginia side came about by way of the 1941 idea of Brigadier General Brehon Sommervell, who, by himself, had *decided* that the 6 ½

Miles area left officially to "the District" was insufficient for military purposes, and having had no precedent to lead him to believe that he was not entitled to pursue military bases or operations ***anywhere*** He chose, proceeded to plan for a military "political" conquest onto the internal shores of nearby Virginia, a sort of "taking back: what was "lost" back to that side of the river in favor of George Washington's legacy, "ceded" "officially" back to Virginia July 9, 1946. This to-be-newly, "**politically**" Brigadier General Sommervell **conquered** land - which was to be "taken back" for the military benefit of the "Washington D.C." government was known as Arlington Farms – located within the State of Virginia.

141. As if without a hitch to slow it down at all, on August 14, 1941, a little over a month later, the alleged Congress appropriated the funds necessary to construct the War Department's new home (approximately $83 million). **According to history**, the groundbreaking ceremony took place on **September 11**, 1941.

142. Alleged President Franklin D. Roosevelt, by a show of at least a reasonable concern over what was being done, affirmed accordingly that, after "the present emergency," the War Department headquarters would be returned to Washington DC **where it belonged**; no permanent headquarters building would be necessary in [the State of] Virginia.

143. Restating, Again: On June 8, 1789, Mr. Founder James Madison, in his speech before the alleged House of Representatives, at paragraphs 28 and 29 of the official record thereof, which stated at 28 "crimes committed within any **county**" and . . . and at 29 "the trial may by law be authorized in some other **county** of the same **State**" (see House Journal for June 8, 1789) which reference to such **counties**, it being that there had been as of yet no cognizable location in which the alleged United States central government was to be established on **its** own Clause 17, Section 8, Article I accepted **property** (requiring the alleged Congress to do that specifically, directly, NOT alleged President, George Washington) referred to "**counties"** as they both existed and were expected to exist within the States, each and all of them, of the Several **States**, and not elsewhere.

144. As has been stated in other TESTS related to this TEST, inclusive of The Clause 18 TEST itself, the word "the" means 1) One; - 2) One Only; - and 3) One In Specific.

145. In Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, we find, as with Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, the first two words to be "The Congress," signifying that, as for the proposed United States-nation, there can be One, One Only, and One In Specific Congress, and not any more Congresses or any other Congress than this.

146. Further into Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, we find that there exists to words following the two words, The Congress, which two words are "**the** Territory."

147. From this foregoing we discover that the Not Naming "the Territory" as is evident to be **required** in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, was in *nowise* 'accidental, but was **Deliberate**, as seen by the evidence that the alleged Congress of 1800, having the proposed Constitution distinctly before them to be followed, to some reasonable extent, by that time, as well as the-then recent records of the House showing Mr. Founder James Madison's own June 8, 1789 presentment of the Bill of Rights, which exposed Mr. Founder Madison's intent that both the Fifth Amendment and the Sixth Amendment be made directly and exclusively applicable to the Several States, each and all of them, and to the "federal" government, NEVER.

148. The 1800, and thereafter, **COVER-UPS** of the Not Naming **FRAUD** and The Two Counties Named **FRAUD** committed by the alleged 1800 Congress, and other alleged Congresses to follow, has been, **Inescapably**, **UNCOVERED**, and can Not be Covered Again, or Even Attempted such as that, EXCEPT it be Construed as **INSTANT** Contempt of Constitution to a **Malicious Tyrannical** Contempt of Constitution Degree, accordingly.

THEREFORE:

149. **No Territory**, except **the** Territory of Washington, wherein the District of Columbia is located, still *somewhat* lawfully, and to that very limited and discoverable extent - legally, Exists, and All Laws made for any alleged territory – by which UnLawful process the existence of approximately 35 States were, by the alleged Congress, "created" – other than the One, aforementioned, are Repugnant to the proposed Constitution, and **Are VOID**.

150. The above named TEST is grounded to establish the following standard, criteria, and objective for Constitution[al] purposes. ANY law that is to be ***considered*** to be a "supreme Law" of the United States central government as provided for at Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, in order that it shall be determined, for any and all enforceable purposes by any State court of the Several States of the United States, MUST FIRST PASS **ALL** Relevant and Applicable TESTS that may be found within the proposed Constitution for the proposed United States, or it, the alleged United States central government, **does not have** the Power, the Authority, or the Right to pass or hold **any** such of alleged ITS law(s) as superior over the "United States-nation," or either of them.

151. This TEST further Constrains the alleged United States central government by its Conflict of Interest, Contempt of Constitution, Rule 55 (e) of the alleged "Federal Rules of Civil Procedure," for any claim for denial of judgment against the proposed United States central government by way of any default committed or caused to exist by any legal representation thereof. Claim for any removal of ANY Case AGAINST the proposed United States central government, under ANY alleged power within its **alleged** Title 28, U.S. Code, to a Jurisdiction Fraud "U.S." court of the alleged United States central government – is likewise DENIED.

152. This TEST is to go out, hereafter, to the governments of the Several States, either or all of them, in their counties, cities, and towns, in order that it might be known, for sure, by all of them, what was done against them all, even from the beginning.

This **Unlawful Territories Expose TEST Also** Extends To:

The Title 28, Sections 81 through 131 Expose, "U.S. Districts" TEST, Which Extends To the Exhibited –
The 7604 Summons TEST, – **And To**
The Illegal States Forming TEST As Well.

Cease To *Ignore* The LAW; DISOBEY The Frauds.

DULY SUBMITTED AND INCORPORATED;

This TEST and Exhibit Is SEALED, And INCORPORATED, Against That Which Is Found To Be Untrue In The Constitution For The United States, And For That Which Is True In The Said Same Constitution, Into This Case, Now *ARISING*, Before The Lawful Courts of the Several States of the Union of "them," And Not Lawfully Concurrently Elsewhere.