EXHIBITED

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

The Unlawful
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1
Illegal States-Forming Practice, Under Color Of Congress, TEST

EXPOSE

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

The Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 Illegal States-Forming Practice, Under Color Of Congress, **TEST.**

This TEST incorporates:

The Unlawful Territories Expose & The Constitutional Amendment TEST; The Article IV, Section 4 TEST.

STANDING And STANDING FRAUD.

1. Above the Legal Question for Subject Matter Jurisdiction is the Legal Question of STANDING. Without Standing, there can exist no form of Subject Matter Jurisdiction - in either of the three branches of government - of any kind.

2. It is an undisputed condition of any legal proceeding that in order for any party thereto to carry on a legitimate business transaction in connection to the proceeding itself, that same party must have De jure Standing in whatever the matter is.

3. The term "De jure" means "Existing by right or according to law." Black's Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, page 437. That is to say, it must be legitimate as both a matter of law and fact, the fact being in support of the actual law upon which Standing is established.

4. The term "Standing" is understood as being – a de jure party's right to make a legal claim before any authority or in any jurisdiction to which such party would, by all due process, be recognizable as being the true and lawful party having right appear and stand as the proper party that it claims to be, as being in the actual capacity which it as said party represents itself to be as. In this sense, the party having standing can appear as no imposter or by false or untrue appearance to the claim of being the actual party itself required to appear before a particular

authority or other party with which it is to engage in any transaction or conduct any business on either its own behalf or on behalf of another for whom it has lawful right of representation.

5. According to Webster's Dictionary, "Standing" is "a place to stand in," and "a position from which one may assert or enforce legal rights and duties."

6. In order that a "place to stand in" be recognized as "Standing," the "place" in particular in which one is to "stand in" must be prescribed to that one as a matter of right. That is to say, No One may Stand In the Place of Another Unless That One Has the Right To Do So.

7. Therefore, if a law is so written as to require that a Particular One be required to be a particular party in some transaction or conduct of business that the law itself recognizes for the purpose which that One is to be involved in, except the law provides for any other to Stand in the Place of the One in such transaction or conduct of business, Only that Particular One can so appear and Stand in the specific capacity that the law provides for in order to have Standing to appear at all, much less to conduct or transact business with any other which the law may also have provided for as having Standing in that same transaction or business affair.

8. The requirement for standing in a court of law, as with a question for subject matter jurisdiction, is prerequisite and essential as a condition to determine whether or not a party or movant has the right to appear before such court and plead in any capacity at all. This requisite was determined so essential that in the case of American Insurance Co. v. Canter 1 Pet. 511 (1828), the U.S. Supreme Court, before it would allow the case to continue before it, moved to determine the Standing of the initial court of jurisdiction in the case, and not any court other than that initial court, such court being recognized as the territorial court of the alleged territory of Florida, one of the thirty six (36) Injured Parties (alleged as lawful States) in this action before the proposed United States courts AND before the proposed Congress of the United States.

9. So important was the concern for Standing by that 1828 United States supreme Court that, even though there had been no challenge at all as to the right of the alleged territorial court to exist, nevertheless that 1828 court issued the following case assessment, examining the question and concern for, not Jurisdiction, but for Standing, not merely as to the said territorial court itself, but much greater, to the right of existence of the alleged Territory of Florida itself, to wit:

> "The course which the argument has taken, will require, that, in deciding this question, the Court should take into view the relation in which Florida **stands** to the United States." (emphasis added)

10. Based upon the understood requirement that all parties in a legal procedure, whether before an authority of government or before each other, have First, Standing, no Act carried out, where one or more of the parties in question had no lawful standing in the very first instance on, has Standing of itself, no matter how well intentioned the parties may have been who participated in the Act so carried out, or in any subsequent act thereto, no matter how far such act may have extended itself, as a matter of law.

11. Thus, where it were found that a king of a country was discovered to have been an imposter, and had no lawful Standing to be crowned as king, the descendents thereof would likewise be regarded as imposters to the crown, and it would be the right and duty of the people, as subjects to an imposter's king sitting upon the throne, to cause or bring about that imposter king's immediate and undisputed removal, based solely on the fact that there was never Standing of the original Imposter King to sit upon the throne and be crowned as King in the first instance.

12. Examining the Question for Standing of any and every alleged Territory which was held out to be, or thought to be, made a State by the Congress of the United States, we turn over and weigh every detail of this grave concern more carefully than at any time ever before.

13. We begin therefore at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, of the Constitution, wherein we read its first five words as being:

"The Congress shall have Power." This is the same reading as we find at Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which reads, "The [Congress] shall have ~~the~~ power" (written originally as . . . "Sect. 1. The Legislature of the United States shall have **the** power to" – emphasis added).

> (Note. The stricken word "the" as seen here above was deliberately stricken from its original inclusion at Clause 1 of Section 8, Article 1, in the Constitution's Official Planning Meetings, it having been included on the date of August 6, 1789, having been visibly and **deliberately** removed on September 17, 1787, and therefore is entered here so as to show the word "the"'s official continued inapplicability (not applicability) to said Clause 1, rendering all such Section 8 Powers to be "**concurrent**," in nature, between the Several States and the United States central government unless demonstrated elsewhere in the proposed Constitution to be otherwise.

14. This recognizes that this Clause 2 exists as an actual Power, one of the two Powers belonging to the Congress, existing after Clause 18, of Section 8, Article I. Reading the balance of Clause 2, we focus on the question raised by the term "dispose of," which must go to a particular part of Clause 2, which it does, the relevant balance of Clause 2 reading:

> "to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;"

15. In the event that the Constitution's Framers had elected not to provide the Power "to make" anything in this Clause 2, it would then read, "to dispose of all needful Rules *and* Regulations respecting . . ." (emphasis added)

16. This rendering reveals that the Congress has been given the Power to dispose of Rules *and* Regulations, a priority consideration in that it was still laboring under the Rules and Regulations imposed upon it by

the Confederation, and needed to have the forthwith Power, in advance, to dispose of such Rules and Regulations (not properties or places) as it might choose to dispose of.

17. No rending of such context provides an ability to dispose of "the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States," which, if doing so, would have given the Congress to literally give away, or sell, the very land given to it to become the Territory of Washington, District of Columbia itself. Therefore, Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV does not exist as a Power - on the part of the Congress - to dispose of, whether by way of sale or by way of straightforward gift, or by any other procedure not provided within the Constitution itself, any property or possession that comes to belong to it, United States central government, at any time.

18. Looking, in contrast to said Clause 2 below it, at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 **above it**, we read:

> "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress."

19. While Clause 2 grants the Congress an Actual, Though Limited, Power to do a number of things, though not ***any*** number of things, in association with such Limited Power, Clause 1 does **not** grant a Power, ANY Power, **at all**, for at said Clause 1, it grants the Congress the strictly limited Contractual **Authority**, to be exercised in conjunction with, not exclusive of, the other proposed Party in each case for Agreement for **Admittance** therein, or that is, "new States," by way of a form of Agreement for Consent that might arise between them.

20. Being only a Conjunctive or Bilateral Authority and not at all a granted Power, we find that the word "formed" therein does not convey or grant the Congress the Power and Authority to "form" a State, new or otherwise, of its own volition or accord, but rather constrains it or

prevents it, as a legal process condition imposed upon it, the Congress, from "admitting" any such State into the Union if not complying with the Authority for "admitting" new States as it, Congress, has been authorized, strictly, to do.

21. Clause 1 of Section 3, Article IV, **not** being a **Power**, but only a Bilateral or codependent Authority, as when two parties are necessary and must depend on each other in order to contract, any Act by the Congress for actively "**forming**" any State of itself (as though by its "own Power," not had) or for itself would necessarily, Constitution[ally], be required to be construed as Unlawful or UnConstitution[al].

22. To put this into closer, more exact and revealing perspective, we recreate Clause 1, with only a few parallel or synonym like variations, rendered to read:

> "*__New__ [~~Additional~~] States may be [allowed] by the Congress [to come] into this Union, but [as a condition of such allowance to come in] no __new__ [~~additional~~] State shall be __formed__ or erected [by the People thereof themselves] within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be **formed** [by the People thereof themselves] by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent [not "enactment," to such non-Congress **formed**] of the [already existing] Legislatures of the [already existing] __States__ [not "Territories"] concerned as well as of the [the other consenting party thereto, the] Congress." *The "New" States of America as opposed to the "old" monarchial States of Europe, not "additional."

23. Without regard to the Truth that the two words "the Territory," which referred ultimately to the Territory of Washington wherein the District of Columbia was to, upon ratification of the Constitution, lay, the United States Congress, under the errant auspices and aegis of the United States supreme Court, rendered Clause 1 of Section 3, Article IV, as though it actually, or in essence, read:

> "New States [or Territories] may be [allowed] by the Congress [to come in] to this Union, but [as a condition of such allowance to

> come in] no new State shall be formed or erected [by the People thereof themselves] within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed [by the People thereof themselves] by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the [already existing] Legislatures of the [already existing] States concerned as well as of the [the other consenting party thereto, the] Congress [of the United States and Territories];

24. Another rendering of the first part of this same Clause cuts deep into yet another part of this Clause 1, revealing the Truth about what is not included as any authority for the Congress, as stated here as follows:

> "New States may be **Formed** by the Congress and then Admitted [allowed to come] by the Congress into this Union,"

25. Recognizing that Clause 1 was Not written that way, the Authority, much less than the actual Power, to **Form** a State, or that is, to engage in the illegal practice of **State Forming**, is irreversibly denied as a legal possibility for the said Congress itself; such Power to **Form** a State, to have all of the characteristics of a **State**, and its particular Powers as a State, belongs **inherently** to the People for whom such State was to be established, and to none other.

26. Irrespective of the fact that said Clause 1 of Section 3, Article I, provided the Congress NO Power OR Authority to Form Any State to any degree, the Congresses over many years have disregarded or denied this specific Constraint and gorged themselves in the practice of State Forming by turning properties, irrespective of how they obtained them, into alleged Territories, for the purpose or else possibility of making them into States at some later date, but without regard to the legal consequences also possible if doing such a thing regardless of what the Constitution itself had to say about the matter.

27. Which, not reading any such way as heretofore set forth, its, Congress' and supreme Court's errant concept Locked In ALL States that were ever made to be alleged Territories first and not allowed of their own accord to be Free, New States, imbedding them, alleged Territories,

in such a state of corruption, that it is to require an Extraordinary Remedy, or else a Frank Admission as to the Truth, in order to extricate any of them out of it.

28. In order to comprehend better exactly what Clause 1 of Section 3, of Article IV is saying, we need to recognize the precise meaning of the word "admitted" as is contained therein.

29. As the word "admit" means "allow," the word "admitted" means or parallels the word "allowed." The proposed Congress has been given the authority, but **not** the ***Power***, to "allow" New States to come in - to the Union, or unincorporated association. The States to be Allowed to come in must not exist as Old States, such as the monarchies of Europe, they must exist in the same kind of condition as did the original Thirteen States, which had minimally a legislature, a governor or executive branch, and a judicial branch upon which the people thereof might rely.

30. Those requirements being met, the proposed Congress was provided the authority, though **not** "the Power," to allow such a New State to come in – to the Union, meaning that while the Congress might ***wish*** such a State to come into the Union of the United States, **it** would **not have** the **Power** (this was **not a granted Power**) or Authority to **force** the said State (inclusive of *the* manipulative Power of Duress, as with a subject territory) to come in; it, the State, would have to come in, as the other side of a contractual agreement to do so, by its own, State's, consent.

31. As such, the New State to be "allowed to come in," would necessarily have to BE an Actual, Existing State, BEFORE, **not** AFTER, its act of "coming in" took place, otherwise it, in whatever form it might otherwise exist, i.e. such as a Territory, would have NO authority of its same self, as a non-State, to agree to come in – to the Union, upon which the required Agreement or Consent between the two authorities, that is the legislature for the New State (not "proposed" State) and the Congress, or legislature, of the United States, had to be based.

32. At the time or point that a particular area and existence of a people, not under any monarchy or else subserviency - such subserviency being such a thing as a territory - decides or elects to come into the Union of the United States, that people's authority to so decide must be in the form of a New State, already free as such a State, or Nation-State, before, not after, the time of the decision to "come in" to the said Union of the United States.

33. Setting aside, for the moment only, the surfacing of the errors involved in the United States making anything into a Territory outside of the One, the Territory of Washington, that it was authorized to have, this means that, where a particular alleged "possession" of the United States existed purportedly as a "Territory," before such "Territory" could be admitted as a New State, in addition to the requirements for a New State established for the United States based upon its accepted practice and purpose to do so, such "Territory" would have to be set free, totally, to become a [New] State with all of the fundamental requirements under which other New States, inclusive of the original Thirteen, had been allowed.

34. Understanding Now That, as a [New] State, if the Congress were at any time to have "set the [alleged] Territory 'Free' First," such State, in order to be recognized as such a State, would have had to had the Right – As A State – to decide for itself that it did Not Want to be a part of the Union of the United States, no matter what it had thought or said before that time as an alleged "Territory" or whatever other form of legal entity that it was proclaimed to be.

35. In order to determine that a State, allegedly made first a "Territory," had been "set free" so that it might be regarded as a [new] State, having all of its free powers to act as a State intact, we would necessarily be able to find somewhere within the laws of the Congress, which laws would necessarily, to this end, require a connection to an actual Power – existing either Before **or** After Clause 18 (see The Clause 18 TEST), an Act or Law, in essence stating, "setting the Territory of Territory-Name free in order that it might become a new State of its own

accord, with its own power as a State to join the Union of the United States, or not."

36. Searching the records of the obvious history of the United States, we find nary such a law or act, not even connected to the Congress most widely used, and unlawful, F & L (Fast and Loose) Power that it has employed for many, many years, far too long under a government supposed to be Constitution[al], not as an oligarchy, and certainly not a monarchy.

37. In short, even if, under principles of law and procedures for law, a "Territory" were desired to be set "free" by the Congress for this purpose, the question would necessarily be raised as, Upon which of the Powers, before or after Clause 18, in the Constitution itself, would it, the Congress, set them, States, any of them, "free" by, no matter how desirous it might be to do so, in order to admit or "allow" any such new State to "come in?"

38. The answer is, there is No Power anywhere in the Constitution, upon which the Congress may rely or have relied, to "Set a territory or possession 'Free'" for any reason or purpose, no matter what that reason or purpose is, or was.

39. This means further, that No alleged State of the Union of the United States which was first made a Territory before it supposedly became a State – there being or having been No Power and subsequent authority to release it to first Become a State, and there being no Act, even as a De Facto Act or even the Appearance of an Act in the first place, to set such a Territory "Free" to become a State First, in order that it, new State, might Agree to be Allowed to be made a part of the Union of the United States – Is in legal Constitutional Fact A State of the United States, lawfully, going to legally, to this Date.

40. This is NOT a question of the Right to Withdraw from the proposed Union of the United States-nation; this is a Statement of the Fact that – No Such State **ALREADY IS NOT** a State of the United States, from the very moment that it, under such a de facto (factual but illegitimate)

power *as though* a State, decided, as an alleged Territory, to become a State of the Union of the United States, and nothing at all more than this is any such alleged State exist as – still a non-State, but Territory Only – Else not a Territory Only as a matter of Jurisdiction Fraud.

41. Being Locked In (as with a One Way Street) to this legal dilemma, we find that there are only two ways out of it.

42. One is to simply pronounce all thirty six (36) alleged States, 34 of them having to be established, allegedly, as Territories again, and to begin to deal with such 34 alleged Territories as literal Insiders of the United States, inclusive of all of the millions of individuals therein – Insiders; to be subject to all lawsuits thereby, from all of them, as Insiders, with no way available to provide for such "Territories" to be set free (disposed of) to become States, no matter how strong the desire to do so, and to bear the consequences of all of such lawsuits from with**in** all of such permanent alleged Territories, whatever they may be, and;

43. Two (2) is to declare frankly and openly that all such thirty-four (34) States were **never lawfully existent** "as territories," and therefore must be recognized immediately as Free States to themselves, subject to the decisions of the Free People thereof as to what they might do and become, and HOPE that the People thereof might forgive them, the proposed United States Congress, and elect to join, As States, the Union of the United States, under such Agreements between them as the both of them might mutually accept.

44. In conjunction with the advancing of HOPE, aforementioned, to this grave legal dilemma now before this court, other courts, the legislatures of most of the several alleged States of the United States, to come before the Congress and the President of the United States in its own due time, we provide as potential for Remedy, the stipulation to legal intent to sue the United States central government for its damages causing role in the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law has been grounded or embodied in **The Great Extraordinary Writ For The Great Extraordinary**, sued hereby for issuance against the Same United States central government, its proposed Congress thereof, to be

considered as to its possibilities for remedying and removing these handicaps from the proposed United States, all of them, else alternative problems and dilemmas brought about by the injured party alleged States, and the People thereof, be the consequence where no other sufficient remedy be timely found.

45. The alleged Territory/States to whom this revealed-as-illegal condition applies are:

> Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, **Kentucky, Louisiana, ***Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, *➶West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

46. In all of this, two particular States were unlawfully caused to be "formed" by the proposed United States Congress into territories and then States, by first Forming them into alleged "U.S. districts," the first non-actual States to be so named as "districts" in the UnConstitutional Judiciary Act of 1789 (so they could easily be made "territories" for the proposed United States central government, then alleged "States," being definitely **formed** under the auspices and aegis of the said Congress, in violation of its constrained authority at Clause 1 of Section 3, Article IV, to do so. Those two alleged States are **Kentucky and ***Maine.

> **In the case of Kentucky, while it was made into the Territory of Kentucky in 1790, having first been UnConstitution[ally] made, by the Congress, into the U.S. District of Kentucky by the unlawful Judiciary Act of 1789, as having been up to that time a County of Virginia, unlike the remaining thirty-three alleged Territories made States above, did have as its historical origin some de jure part of the United States by way of its Virginia connection. Upon its being determined that its separation from Virginia by the unlawful Judiciary Act of 1789 caused or brought about its position as a Territory, done in large part to circumvent the Constraint found in Clause 1 of Section 3, Article IV, Phrase 2 thereof in order to

diminish the State power of Virginia in the Congress, is to be returned or rejoined to the State of Virginia itself, from which it was first wrongfully taken.

*** In the case of Maine, having first been UnConstitution[ally] made, by the Congress, into the U.S. District of Maine by the unlawful Judiciary Act of 1789, as having been up to that time a part of Massachusetts, and having been brought into alleged Statehood while still a recognized U.S. district, with no for of official release from that condition prior to its alleged organization as an alleged State, thus not being a State for actual free rights in being so purposes, did have as its historical origin some de jure part of the United States by way of its Massachusetts connection. Upon its being determined that its separation from Massachusetts by the unlawful Judiciary Act of 1789 caused or brought about its position as a U.S. District, done in large part as an influence, by the United States central government itself, in the formation of the once Territory of Maine to become a State (State Forming) that Massachusetts might be diminished in its State power in the Congress, is to be returned or rejoined to the State of Massachusetts itself, from which it was first wrongfully taken.

*➶West Virginia was manipulated and basically forced into a ipso facto form of Union military controlled territory during the Civil War by the use of Union troops to prevent voters who were sympathetic to the South from voting against the West Virginia region of Virginia becoming a State.

47. Additional alleged Territories which have also been unlawfully taken, along with the people, the religious buildings, and the religious ministries thereof, having been illegal from their outset to be made such and still a part of these illegal conditions for doing so are: Puerto Rico, Guam, U.S. American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. Where there be other alleged U.S. territories not referred to here, this action includes those alleged territories as a part of the legal disclosure and expose, as charged.

48. **Charged As True And Now Binding – Upon The Alleged States as Named, And Upon The United States – as a Matter of Law Beyond its, United States central government's, De jure Control.**

49. The above is to say that certain of the current alleged States, as Territories, had no actual Standing as States in order to be admitted to the Union of the United States in the very first instance of the agreement between the two to be signed, or ratified. Each of the foregoing alleged States having no Standing, ab initio, to become a State as required in order to become a de jure State of the Union, the requirement for Standing was not established, not having first been freed as a State for being so, at the conclusion of the first year from the date that each such State was Not a State of Standing, nor at the conclusion of the second year, nor the third, or fourth, onward to perpetuity, to the present date of this action to reveal the Fraud in the Factum of same.

50. The Power granted the Congress at Clause 2 of Section 3, Article IV, to "dispose" does not pertain to any Power to dispose of property owned by the United States, for as we read the Clause straight through without that question, we read:

> "The Congress shall have Power to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

51. As to the words "dispose of," the Congress is not being given the Power to dispose of the Territory of Washington itself wherein the District of Columbia is to lay, and where the Congress itself also is to be seated, so the words "dispose of" must refer to something else other than property or places.

52. The reverse order or use of the words "dispose of and make" "Rules and Regulations" was done so as to clarify for the new Congress that it was to have the immediate right to dispose of such Rules and Regulations that may have been prescribed for it in advance of its existence by either a remaining influence of the continental congress from before or else any

agreements for that same purpose that may have arisen in the Constitution's own planning Convention itself, showing that the new Congress was to be totally free of any fetters that the Confederation might have otherwise imposed upon it.

53. Consequently, we find NOTHING by way of a Power in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, that would provide the United States Congress the ***authority*** to dispose of, by the setting free of the same, any "Property" or "Place" that it might have acquired, no matter what legal condition such Property might be claimed to exist as, once it, the proposed United States, had acquired it.

54. Recognizing that this level of Jurisdiction Fraud, which first arose from Power Fraud existent in the United States supreme Court case of American Insurance Co. v. Canter 1 Pet. 511 (1828) (see also The Territories Fraud Expose TEST) renders that thirty-six of the existing alleged States of the United States at no time had STANDING to become admitted as States of the proposed United States-nation or Union (unincorporated association) in the first instance, we realize the gravity of the Acts of State Forming concocted and orchestrated in the name of law, but accomplished instead under Color of Law and under Color of Congress, and under Color of Federalism, not under a flag of a Republican Form of Government where "federalism" can in no wise be allowed or "admitted" therein, except the same be Contempt of Constitution, a Sovereign Criminal Offense against a Republican Government of People, in the Highest Order.

55. While some would hold that "God could make a Territory into a State of the Union in the 'twinkling of an eye,'" if He were to ever elect to do a thing like that, it is for certain, as a legal procedure, that the Congress of the United States was never so empowered. This acknowledgement does not purport to recognize any religious principle in this TEST, but rather to recognize the fact that such Powers as may be Legendary were at no time granted the Congress of the United States for any alleged use or purpose, nor to any of the other two branches of the government thereof.

56. The proposed Congress of the proposed United States, under any color of claim for authority and power to do so – does **not** have the power to generate or cause to be generated, of its own accord, a Clause 18 TEST Power to do so being lacking – the organizing or forming of any State – in the "twinkling of an eye" or by instant transformation, without any planning, organization, or decision making, inclusive of the Right to Say NO to the proposed United States, as would have been the [il]legal condition had any Act of acknowledgement not been the very other legal fact that, as an alleged "Territory" first and NOT a State already formed, independently unto itself, but being, allegedly, rather the "property" or "possession" of the proposed United States, would have been the Act of the proposed United States contracting with itself, which act of insanity or else pure fraud it could never have done, the Fraud of it being VOID ab initio, the 36 alleged Several States each being All Free from what they never lawfully and legally were, without further act required to do so than their own recognition, at any time hereafter.

57. There having existed No Legitimate Authority for any agreement to exist between the proposed United States and itself (appearing as though additional "territories" to the [one] Territory of Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, if they never First and Only had STANDING As States, rendered the States Forming Fraud committed under Color of Congress as its own never-ceasing illegality of Impostership as States, all 36 of them, which the law of Impostership never denies the State of Impostership itself, no matter the years, decades of years, centuries of years, or millennia of years, "gotten away with."

58. Commencing from the year of 1790 to the present day, the Congress has engaged in the UnConstitutional, and therefore unlawful, practice of exercising the Bilateral, or Conjunctive, or Mutual Authority, **not** Power, provided for in the Constitution's Clause 1 of Section 3, Article IV, ***as though*** the same ***were*** a Power in the same sense as the Congress was granted in Clauses 1 through 17, of Section 8, of Article I, and as Constrained in limitation to specifically granted Powers by Clause 18, of Section 8, of Article I, or The Clause 18 TEST, by engaging in the

UnLawful and Illegal practice of **State Forming**, which practice was in no place provided for as a Power for the Congress whatsoever, but existed accordingly as an Authority requiring the like authority of any State who would freely elect to join or be admitted to becoming a member of the Union of the several States of the United States, To so Agree To, or else, by its own unique State decision, NOT Agree To, as it alone had the lawful Power to choose to do.

59. Following are the **36** alleged Territories (even if it is written as "territories," it is the same) that were first made so UnLawfully, commencing in the year of 1790 – in the Nation That Never Was under the authority of Color of Congress, which, under the requirement, first, for Standing as seen through the lens of the Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 "admittance" TEST, were never, lawfully, States, but exist solely as a corruption and an Impostership within The Nation That Never Was, to be regarded so by the de jure nations of the world.

60. The term "Territories" includes the claim for the term, Republic of Texas, which was "Annexed" as a part of the United States, but the truth being that it was, where President Jackson had refused to do so in 1836, annexed on July 4, 1845 to the United States as an American Territory of the United States, and, as such, did not receive its de facto status of Statehood until December 29, 1845.

61. As such, this Exhibited TEST, in addition to the unlawful and illegal condition of the Treaty of Guadeloupe Hidalgo (also, false claims made by falsely contrived maps goes to Map Fraud, which Map Fraud goes to Real Estate Fraud), 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 United States central government, which Illegal Acts for Territory/Territories Obtaining or Forming, the same as the Illegal Acts of State Forming, is Extended Specifically To; —

62. The De Facto Territories that lead to the UnLawful **States Forming's** Unlawful Existence of the 36 States, inclusive of the State or

States in which any case or condition under this TEST shall "arise,", are set forth for confirmation that they each and all were first established as though "territories," in violation of Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, and thereafter alleged as "lawful" States of the proposed United States under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1, not being any more now than then, ARE:

63.1 The ➶➶Louisiana Purchase – April 30, 1803 – which established, under the Direct **Alleged** Authority of/for the Territory of Washington, District of Columbia, the following Places now alleged as States; —

> Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, northeastern New Mexico, northern Texas, Montana, and eastern Colorado and Wyoming. The latter two "territories" were provided the western halves thereof by the illegal **Seizure** of same under the guise of the Treaty of Guadeloupe Hidalgo, February 2, 1848, along with Utah and Nevada. Particularly, because of its separate history from the alleged as lawful purchase itself, Louisiana was recognized as an official (though de facto) "territory" of the proposed United States on December 20, 1803;

63.2 Continuing with the illegal "territor**ies** forming" and subsequent illegal "States forming" acts by the proposed United States Congress under Color of Congress, we have 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.

63.3 The "States" of Maine and Kentucky were formed by the proposed Congress, under Color of Congress, by first designing those two particular places as though "districts" of the proposed United States by use of the UnConstitution[al] Judiciary Act of 1789 to do so, and from that position, were made "territories" of the United States, Maine having been originally a territory of Massachusetts, then made a de jure part of Massachusetts, then reverted to being made a territory for the proposed United States, made so, 1790, from out of the State of Massachusetts; and Kentucky having been made a "territory" (following its deliberate distinction as a "U.S. district" by the Illegal Judiciary Act of 1789) July 26, 1790, from out of the State of Virginia, and transformed by the proposed United States into a "State," June 1, 1792.

63.4 West Virginia, of all of the States alleged, was most illegally made an ipso-facto-organized "de facto territory" and then a State of the proposed United States during the Civil War itself, with "union troops" stationed throughout to assure that "confederacy sympathizers" could not vote – in utter violation of the Certain Constraints against organizing so in any such way by Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1, taking ILLEGALLY from Virginia, again, a Place that belonged to it, for the benefit of the PROPOSED United States-nation, The Nation That NEVER Was.

* 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.

---

[1] The Legal History of the Louisiana Purchase itself states of the matter, even though enacted by the errant president Thomas Jefferson, that Napoleon Bonaparte, in April 1803, offered to sell Louisiana, along with the rest of the area to be included in the "Louisiana Purchase, to the United States, and, according to LEGAL History, to which all real interest governments are Bound, it is stated that "Although the Constitution did not specifically empower the federal government to acquire new territory by treaty, [President] Jefferson concluded that the practical benefits to the nation far outweighed the possible violation of the Constitution."

[2] This reasoning is conclusive as to its Illegality, even Criminality, is summed up by the following example: "I am going to come to your place and take your new car, because the practical benefits of me having your new car far outweigh the laws which say I can't steal your car." This "practical" reasoning is the same kind of reasoning that common criminals use when they desire to obtain that which, according to law, they are not legally entitled to. And that Act, sadly, applies now even to Mr. Founder, As Proposed President, Thomas Jefferson.

[3] But Napoleon Bonaparte was a monarch, and the De Jure nation of France had no "legislature" as such from whom the proposed United States could, under the authority of Clause 17, of Section 8,

Article I, purchase ANY such places or lands from, rendering even the approach of the nation of France for such a transaction to have been UnConstitution[al] from its outset.

4 In short on this point, although Thomas Jefferson may have been construed as a great Founding Father prior to this time. he Thomas Jefferson, coldly and with a Reckless Indifference to the Truth, committed Contempt of Constitution, a Sovereign Crime Against The People, and NO Criminal Act can be relied upon as to be a sustained legitimate act before the De jure Nations of the World under The Law of Nations, or the fundamental, Inherent, Constitution for the Earth itself.

5 Thus, sadly, we must conclude, legally, that, as to the obtaining of the lands and places pertaining to the "Louisiana Purchase," Founder Thomas Jefferson, by his concurrence to that act in 1803, preceded his nemesis, Chief Justice John Marshall, as an Intellectual Property Thief to the same extent, at the least, committing Intellectual Property Fraud as said Marshall did against the people of the proposed United States in the case of Gibbons v. Ogden, 1824, where the Bay of New York was seized as a part of the "waters of the United States" (the proposed United States had virtually NO waters of its own up to this point), showing and proving the proposed United States to be a nation of men and NOT a nation of law(s), in The Nation That Never Was.

6 While we cannot disrespect the greater things that he, Mr. Founder Jefferson, did in the earlier part of his career, we cannot, in anywise, respect his decision and official act of joining those who had long before demonstrated their propensity to engage in the illegal, or UnConstitutional practice called "politics" (the making and enforcing of "policy") and Not Law, and justify upon his reputation those acts that resulted in the partial trashing of the proposed Constitution, as though its interpretation ought to be subject to every whim of mankind based upon the reputation that he or she might have achieved, where such interpretation had and has

no possible wording that supports a claim for that which is "Not Law," as the more knowledgeable of the legal profession itself are prone to say of it, which is being said, for the Legal Record, HERE, in this TEST, at this time.

"The claim for Mississippi was that it was organized as a Territory on April 7, 1798, by and under the authority of the joint "States" of Georgia and South Carolina "from lands **owned** and **ceded** by Georgia and South Carolina."

"Since the Required Contract (where State Forming is recognized to be and have been an Illegal Practice by a derelict Congress – under Color of Congress) between the proposed Congress and the continental de jure States of South Carolina and Georgia pertain to an exact legal recognition of those States' lands, by way of their precise legal geographical description (Denying the Fast & Loose Power of any Congress to discern boundaries any way it wants to), the Contracted States of Georgia and South Carolina, even under the pretext of ratification that pertained to each following the Unlawful Convention's Second Session Opinion, September 17, 1787 – See The Nation That Never Was Expose), the "States" of Georgia and South Carolina did not have any actual lawful authority to either "own" or "cede" any lands at all, existent anywhere else but where they physically, legally, geographically were.

"This would be the same thing as any "State" today, such as California, suddenly "acquiring" land somewhere, in some other part of the world, and now the State of California has been extended to that other part of the world, notwithstanding the fact that such an Agreement between the proposed Congress and California was not had between the two parties on the date that the agreement was ratified between them, understanding that such a newly added "State" could obtain additional lands "wherever it chose," no matter where, and then "cede" or even sell off those

newly obtain lands, all done under the guise of the umbrella of the Union of the Several States of the United States-nation itself.

"These Unlawful Acts by Georgia and South Carolina of "owning" and then "ceding" additional lands, not within their own contracted-with legal borders, would have been necessarily construed - if actual Law and the Honoring of the Law were regarded as important (if not, then as "outlaws" only) - of the acts of Ultra Vires violations, making the "**forming**" of the "Territory" for the United States (for to whom else would such "Territory" have been "ceded" to, in violation of Clause 17, Section 8, Article I's " cession of particular States" refer to if not the proposed "United States") as illegal an act as with the rest of the "territories" that it, the United States central government, had proposed from 1790, and thereafter.

"Consequently, the making of "Mississippi" as a "territory" and then a State was perhaps one of the most **UnConstitution**[**al**] and **Illegal** Acts of all, since it involved the UnConstitution[] Acts by two of the original States for the proposed new government, NOT being of the two particular States of Maryland and Virginia as was provided for in Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, accordingly, done first under Color of States, and thereafter under Color of Congress, all committed and done – Utterly Illegally – among the De Jure Nations of the World – within the Imposter Nation of the proposed United States – being Truthfully "a Nation of Men' and **NOT** "a Nation of Law(s)" – as The Nation That Never Was.

64. The 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) to set a single boundary for any place or land outside of those States to be lawfully admitted by it **as** States and nothing else.

65. Having no Constitutional authority to set boundaries outside of the official boundaries of the official Several States themselves, its acts under Color of Congress, in "deciding the boundaries" of ANY areas whatsoever outside of the proposed United States-nation, as originally

historically recognized, for the purpose of "taking by conquest" or by any other method not prescribed for it to do so under Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, or by way of Agreement Only with an Existing, Freely Organized And Consenting State – And Having STANDING as a State, any lands not authorized for it by Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1, NOT one of the actual Powers of the Congress, as one of its own powers (see the illegal War Powers Resolution of 1973 for that exact term applied to it, Congress, by it, Congress), clearly denied to it, the proposed Congress, by The Clause 18 TEST and every other reasonable TEST that can be found within the Proposed – Only – Constitution for the proposed United States itself.

The Unlawful / Illegal States Forming TEST

I. The above named TEST is 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 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:

1) Shall not uphold, sustain, or recognize the lands known collectively as "the State or States in which any case or condition under this TEST shall "arise,"" as a **Formed State** under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 of the proposed Constitution for the United States;
2) Shall **NOT** uphold, sustain, or recognize, the **Formed State**, whether or not arising from a Formed or UnLawfully or Wrongfully Obtained Territory or other "possession" NOT Lawfully established under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 as being a Lawful, and **therefore** NOT being a Legal State of the proposed United States-nation as it was to exist under the proposed Constitution for the United States, the same **UnLawfully / Illegally Formed State(s)** being disclosed as is particularly set forth below.
3) Shall Call into an Accounting ALL Laws that were formed within said lands, as a **Formed State**, stated or named above, which may have been made the UnLawful subject and claim or influence for

authority Under Color of Nation, and from Color of Congress, Color of President, and Color of "Federal" Courts, the same being a part of **The Nation That Never Was**.

4) Shall Re-Review the proposed Constitution for the proposed Several States of the proposed United States, to determine such laws as may be essential for the preservation of fundamental liberty and which inherent rights, also as ipso facto, of the people thusly so betrayed by these Unlawful Acts by the proposed Congress under Color of Congress may be preserved, until such time as the people thereof, Only, may reason together how to best resolve the Extraordinary Occasion that these same Truths now reveal, by way of such Extraordinary Remedy as may occur to them, or be brought to them by a form of due process acceptable to them, to resolve the matter before them under the Authority of the Law of Nations as the same may be deemed thereby as being existent and competent under the Inherent Constitution for the Earth, whether or not at any place or time written down.
5) Shall **Insure** hereafter that such Constitution that the same People Shall Propose and Make Final, Shall Be the De jure Constitution for the United States and Never Again De-facto, all previous conditions allowing for its same UnLawful Impostering of the proposed Nation as otherwise, in the past, notwithstanding.

II. The results of this TEST, now controverting and superseding all those terrible and tragic things that were done by an alleged Congress, never actually in control to be claimed to have gotten out of control, in the name of the vain claim for the authority of forming any State of the Several States, is exposed to a bitter end, except the Several States act jointly and expediently to remedy within themselves what was done for the sake of Power, as Power Fraud, of a proposed nation gone astray before it was lawfully formed for even one day, showing these things therefore expressly and individually, as follows, to wit:

Alabama,
The State That Never Was

Alaska,
The State That Never Was

Arkansas,
The State That Never Was

Arizona,
The State That Never Was

California,
The State That Never Was

Colorado,
The State That Never Was

Florida,
The State That Never Was

Hawaii,
The State That Never Was

Idaho,
The State That Never Was

Illinois,
The State That Never Was

Indiana,
The State That Never Was

Iowa,
The State That Never Was

Kentucky,
The State That Never Was

Kansas,
The State That Never Was

Louisiana,
The State That Never Was

Maine,
The State That Never Was

Michigan,
The State That Never Was

Minnesota,
The State That Never Was

Mississippi,
The State That Never Was

Missouri,
The State That Never Was

Montana,
The State That Never Was

Nebraska,
The State That Never Was

Nevada,
The State That Never Was

New Mexico,
The State That Never Was

North Dakota,
The State That Never Was

Ohio,
The State That Never Was

Oklahoma,
The State That Never Was

Oregon,
The State That Never Was

South Dakota,
The State That Never Was

Tennessee,
The State That Never Was

Texas,
The State That Never Was

Utah,
The State That Never Was

Washington,
The State That Never Was

West Virginia,
The State That Never Was

Wisconsin,
The State That Never Was

Wyoming,
The State That Never Was

All Falsely Made States Being Made An Unwitting Part Of The

Proposed United States-Nation,

The Nation That Never Was

(see Exhibit By That Title)

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.