

EXHIBIT

THE NATION THAT NEVER WAS

**THE PENETRATION OF THE
ORGANIZATIONAL VEIL
EXPOSE, AND THE SETTING ASIDE
OF THE UNLAWFUL OR DE FACTO
EXISTENCE OF THE
[ALLEGED] UNITED STATES
NATIONAL GOVERNMENT
AS HAVING
NO STANDING
AS A DE JURE NATION - IN ANY CASE,
AFFAIR, CIRCUMSTANCE, AGREEMENT,
ACT, ACTION OR ACTIVITY, ANYWHERE IN
THE WORLD**

**This Expose Reveals The Underlying Disposition and
Conscience, or Lack Thereof, For The MANY UnLawful Acts
and acts by the [alleged] United States, Its Being, In Truth, The
Nation That Never Was, And Is Hereby Applicable To Each
and All TESTS Construed,
or To Be Construed, For The Same As:**

THE NATION THAT NEVER WAS:

I. The establishment of a Corporation, one of several forms of chartered legal entities, requires as one of its foremost procedures in a lawful and legal development, the holding of an official organizational meeting, where its prescribed board of directors, president, other officers as provided for, if any, owners and owners rights, location of its first recognized headquarters, its operating lower laws, known as by laws, its form of financial institution to be utilized by it, its official seal, and other such important matters too important to be loosely defined by the whims of single individuals, not known as to whether the same are acting of themselves or acting instead, in an official capacity, for the officially organized Corporation itself.

II. While a Corporation, organized under an already existing body of law, of government, may be given some latitude as to where it may meet for its organizational meeting, providing its own Articles, chartering its required course does not make strict demands on such organizational meeting location, in the event that it does not hold such organizational meeting as required, or does so on some improper or unlawful basis, there is definite risk that by its failure to hold the proper organizational meeting wherein its fiduciary duties may be first officially exercised, else by such failure the Corporation will devolve to a state of errors, given time, for its flagrant ignoring of the proper and lawful, organizational [first] meeting of its designated officials, before it engages in a single event of doing business, with anyone, not of the Corporation itself.

III. A newly to be established Government, to be a unique Government to itself, unlike a Corporation, having no existing government already over it, Government, to look to for its, Government's, authority, does not have any latitude to act outside of the particular constraints, if constraints there be, set forth in that instrument, whether written or proclaimed oral, which is to Charter its very course of being from the beginning.

IV. IF, within such Chartered Course of Destiny, the newly to be established Government, is not provided any specific form of other government as a guiding authority for its favored choices of decisions to be made, or not made, such Government, if it proposes to be a government, or nation, of laws and not of men, is not entitled, no matter what the objects of reason to the contrary, to look to any place but within its own Chartered Course, laid out by those whose interests were at stake at the time such

Chartered Constitution, plotting such Course, was established, for all of its immediate and future beneficiaries, from the time of the laying of its Course, ever after, until its Course shall be run, if not without ceasing.

V. The Proposed Constitution for the United States, then, *was* that Proposed Chartered Course of Destiny that had no outside government for the inside officials provided-for within its, Proposed Constitution's Charter, to look to for anything at all, rendering an unquestionable mandate that those, whoever they officially might be, seeking direction to lead them toward the Course of Government's Destiny plotted, or to be plotted, by the Proposed Constitution, find it inward within that same said Constitution for such instruction only, and not elsewhere.

VI. Hereinafter, There shall Be Proclaimed, upon the tops of the crowns of all nations, extending to the very Mouths of Authority of such nations, wherever they may be in the Earth, these following truths, destroying, sadly for many, the illusion, or myth, that there ever was a lawfully established and ongoing existence of any de jure United States at all,

VII. For, IF we, of the Proposed United States, claim and believe, that we are [to be] a nation of laws and not of men, then we are **No Nation At All**.

VIII. In the slim thread of law that was to dictate the organization of the proposed United States, there are TWO questions, among others, that immediately reveal the flaw of the establishment of both the proposed Constitution as the de jure Constitution and the proposed United States nation as the de jure United States nation, which two questions are:

Question 1. WAS the proposed Constitution for the proposed United States, ratified on September 17, 1787 by the officially delegated signers thereof, recognized within its structured legal language to be a Body of Law, and therefore Law, even though only proposed and not made effective as Law at that time?

Evident Answer 1. The proposed Constitution for the proposed United States, being ratified on September 17, 1787 by the officially delegated signers thereof, Was, within its structured legal language, recognized to be a Body of Law, and therefore Law, even though only proposed and not made effective as Law at that time.

Question 2. WAS the Resolution – proposed and confirmed by the same Convention that ratified the proposed Constitution for the proposed United States nation, following immediately after the official ratification by the same Convention that ratified the proposed Constitution – recognized within its structured legal language to be a Body of Law, or was it recognized instead as being a Body of Opinion, and NOT Law, upon which the proposed nation could NOT lawfully organize thereunder?

Evident Answer 2. The said Resolution – proposed and confirmed by the same Convention that ratified the proposed Constitution for the proposed United States nation, following immediately after the official ratification by the same Convention that ratified the proposed Constitution – WAS NOT recognized within its structured legal language to be a Body of Law, BUT WAS, and IS, recognized instead as being a Body of Opinion, and NOT Law, upon which the proposed nation could NOT lawfully organize thereunder, lawfully rendering the Proposed Constitution as remaining to be the Proposed Constitution and the Proposed United States nation as remaining as the Proposed United States nation, or The Nation That Never Was, an Imposter Nation, or De facto Nation, existing fraudulently as a Nation of Men instead, and not, truly, as a Nation of Laws, as has long erroneously been taught.

IX. FURTHER BREAKDOWN OF THE CONVENTION FRAUD THAT ENSUED IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE RATIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES, WHICH DENIED ALL POSSIBILITY FOR ANY OR ALL OF THE THIRTEEN STATES TO RATIFY THE SAME, OR TO BRING ABOUT A LAWFUL ORGANIZING OF THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES-NATION THEREUNDER.

A. From the Thirteen States,’ or from at least 9 of the 13 States,’ legislatures – without respect as to which States they might be, there never having been any establishment of a seniority or superiority of any one of the 13 original States over the others – were to Officially **Recognize** or else **Determine Uniquely**, if they should so choose, their Proposal of Senators for the still proposed United States, and their recognition of the popular

votes of the Representatives, to fill, by their respective offices, both Houses of the proposed Congress, to meet at such time as both an approximate time and lawful place could be determined for the same to organize the proposed United States, under the precepts, provisions, and constraints contained within, and not outside of, the proposed Constitution for the proposed United States itself;

B. Therefore, on this exposing evidence as to the errors made by the Convention itself, by its proposed opinion for the course of action that was to be followed for the lawful organizing of the proposed Constitution for the proposed United States, the close scrutiny of the truth and evidence on this most serious of all matters has revealed the truth to be:

1. The ONLY time and place where the Congress HAS TO BE is WHERE the land is, WHEN it has been Ceded (given, not purchased – for where would the money come from, from a yet non-existent nation?) to the proposed (not already existent) United States central government, in order that it, the proposed Congress, meeting upon such precisely ceded and owned ground or land as the Constitution[ally] proposed Seat of Government and not elsewhere, might “accept it” as provided for at Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, or “not accept it” if there be a reason for not doing so.

2. RECOGNIZING THAT Except that Article VII, Clause 1 of the proposed Constitution for the United States read as proposed as follows and not as that Clause as read as fact below, the greater part of the provisions and proposals of the Resolution of the Convention following the ratification of the said Proposed Constitution was entirely out of order, and proposed that the Constitution having just been ratified be circumvented in its function of law without delay, to the shame, dishonor, and diminishing of reputation of that author or authors who first wrote it. Article VII, Clause 1 as Proposed in order to support the Resolution to follow the ratifying of the Proposed Constitution:

“The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, to be hereafter Organized under the Direction of the Continental Congress, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.”

3. Being unquestionable that Clause 1 of Article VII of the Proposed Constitution neither provided for, supported, nor allowed for the Continental Congress, or the Congress of the Confederacy, or even under the guise of being “in the Congress of the United States assembled,” as though “federally” organized, the Resolution by “opinion” that was proposed and proclaimed on that same date of September 17, 1789, being unlawfully construed as to its application to the proposed Constitution for the United States itself, was illegally applied to the same, and was largely responsible for the grave and unfortunate errors that ensued thereafter, creating as a result a legal condition that prevented the true, lawful, and thus legal, formation of the De jure United States central government, which would have further yielded forth the lawful and legal Acceptance of the otherwise Proposed Constitution for the United States as De jure, and for the final establishment of the De jure United States Union-nation, instead of the De facto United States Union-nation that exists now in its place, rendering a Nation of Laws, having been established under Law, instead of being a “nation of ‘men’” as we now actually are.

4. To establish the evidence necessary to make this most serious and challenging matter as Manifest to all, the following reconstruction of the aforementioned errant Resolution has been provided below, Manifesting those things which were lawful to resolve or propose as opposed to those things that were not lawful as are set forth above.

5. Laid Out In the Order of Occurrence, to show the illegal establishment of the Proposed United States, existing as an Imposter Nation among Nations, a De Facto Nation, instead, the Case of - **The Nation That Never Was** – Continues to Proceed As Follows:

- 1) The Congress of the Confederation, or Continental Congress, met from March 1, 1781, to March 4, 1789, the last such meeting being at 26 Wall Street, New York, New York.
- 2) The first alleged congress of the new government met for the first time in New York, at 26 Wall Street therein, on March 4, 1789.

3) Summarizing the two events, it has been perceived and proposed in U.S. history that: “The Congress of the Confederation met from March 1, 1781, to March 4, 1789, when it was *replaced* by the congress established by the United States Constitution.”

4) By the alleged “replacement” process, it was claimed, in essence, that the Continental Congress had passed its “torch” or “wand” of authority on to the new alleged Congress for the Proposed United States, in order that the same might be enabled to do business in its stead, accordingly. Papers of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789 (Washington: National Archives and Record Service, General Services Administration, 1971), Reel 28, Item 19, Vol. 6:533.

X. Illegally Convened

A. The claim that the Congress, established under the Proposed Constitution, could elect to meet *elsewhere* than the chosen, or to be chosen, ground or land upon which its ownership and official headquarters site could *not* be questioned, gives rise to the mandatory question of which of the thirteen States referred to in the aforesaid Constitution was superior in its own authority over all others, or if more than one of superior authority, which ones they were, and by what manner of authority did either one State of more than one State arrive to such superior level of authority, so that its elected members of the new Congress could make the decision for all of the other members of the said new Congress, each in their unprescribed official locations, exactly how and where, other than at such location of land or property as was provided at Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, the same were to congregate at for any First Instance of official meeting, much less at any other continued time thereafter?

B. In order for any thing (land is a thing) to be delivered, the ones to whom it is to be delivered, unless there be any previous lawful provision for another to do so in their stead (there was no such prior provision in this case), must be present at the precise place where the thing delivered and to be Accepted, by THOSE who are to Accept it, is to take place.

C. In order to Accept a thing, the thing itself must be Delivered, in some form at least, to that which is to do the “Accepting.” That is, the Accepting of Knowledge of a thing is accepting the Knowledge of the thing, and *not* the thing itself.

D. The question, therefore, is not, did they have Deeds in those days to be delivered, that the Deeds might be accepted, for in the case of land to be accepted, it would be conclusive that there would be no place external to the land itself where the unorganized members of the proposed Congress might meet together in order to accept Deeds in particular, if deeds and not bills of sale there were to be, and not requiring the Congress to be present upon the land to be delivered itself, upon which the further question arises as to WHERE else would, or could, those proposed deeds, to ceded land, get delivered except upon the land itself to be delivered, and officially Accepted, as required by the Proposed Constitution, by the Congress at the place of such delivery?

E. For at Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, we read, “As may, **By . . . the Acceptance *of Congress, become the Seat of Government.**” *or “by”

F. Upon the alleged Congress’ meeting on March 4, 1789, **no** Acceptance of **land** coming under the aegis of the Proposed Constitution’s own Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, had taken place as it pertained to the place of 26 Wall Street, New York, New York, nor at its address thereafter in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, nor could the Congress **Accept** such places as were existent in such two States’ places of meeting, such States (New York, Pennsylvania) not being officially recognized at any time as being the two (2) “particular States” referred to in Clause 17, Section 8, Article I, for the required “Acceptance” Purpose prescribed for the first Congress therein.

G. Where the Congress is to “Accept” a thing, such as the property which was to become, at some time, “Washington, D.C., which was to be made a part of public trust, an Inherent Duty arises requiring the Congress to decide between two (2) factors; the right “to Accept” a thing also carries with it the opposite right, “to not Accept.”

H. Where it cannot be known as to the quality of the thing to be Accepted or Not Accepted without first examining the thing to be “Accepted” or “not Accepted,” the Inherent Duty to examine the item in question firsthand

becomes necessary, as a matter of duty to the people for whom such entrusted authority is to, at any time, pertain to or have to do with, to any degree that is to affect their welfare and fundamental rights under law.

I. Since it would be impossible for any Congress, irrespective as to whether they were to receive copies of deeds, if Deeds were what was to be examined and accepted or not accepted, to know of any ceded property's value without any ability at all to see it for themselves, it stands to reason that the members of a proposed Congress would need to visit directly the place to be Accepted, or not Accepted, in order to make such a critical decision as that.

J. Further, on the question of "Deeds" to property, if such were the fact, it would raise the instant question as to "where" those Deeds would necessarily be sent to for such an "Acceptance" or "not Acceptance," bearing in mind that no State of those original thirteen enjoyed even a footnote of seniority and superiority over any of the others, in order that any proposed elected Senator or Representative thereof might decide for all others that such "Deeds," if any, be sent to a single States' elected officials over all others, in order that the "Acceptance" process begin in such single State for all of them, which condition also would, and does, reveal the flaw in what the Convention's unlawful Resolution of Opinion, on September 17, 1787, brought about in place of the Proposed Constitution's own legal workings contained exclusively therein.

K. RECOGNIZING that there existed at that time NO copy machines with which to make several copies of one's Deed, or fax machines, etc., to use to transmit the same to the Proposed Senators and Congressmen of that time, yet living in their respective States simultaneously, the question must arise as to which of the Proposed members of the Proposed Congress would be those "Special" or "More Important" Members of the Congress to receive it over all others?

L. The answer must be, in such a case, resoundingly, None Of Them, For The Delivery of the Property Proposed in Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, to be Accepted or Not Accepted could Only Be Delivered and Accepted, or Not, Where the Property itself actually Was at the time that it was to be "Accepted," or Not "Accepted," and nowhere else.

M. It Is Just A Matter Of Fact; there was nowhere else for the Delivery of the Articles of Property, or Land, to be Ceded (or “Given,” because it was to have had No Money of its own at its beginning, and NO lawful way to receive, lawfully, any money prior to its beginning by way of its lawful Organizing as such) to the United States – to be Received At, at any other than the very Place but the Place of Actual Delivery itself, the location of each part and parcel of land itself, exactly as was proposed to come to be in time, and not just as quickly as the Proposed Congressmen might meet wherever they choose (nation of men), not the Place of Delivery itself, in order to “Accept” or “Not Accept” that which they had no ability to see for themselves in order to actually, officially so “Accept” same as Required of them, equal Congressmen and Senators.

N. The factual question must arise, as it pertains to HOW the Congress, proposed *within* the Proposed Constitution for the Proposed United States, would acknowledge the Acceptance or Not Acceptance of any land proposed to be ceded to it without physically travelling to such land in order to do so.

O. There appears to be no answer for this question other than that the proposed persons elected, supposedly for a lawful purpose, by the eleven to thirteen States originally provided for within the Proposed Constitution, had no lawful place to meet anywhere other than such property to be secured on behalf of such new proposed governmental entity, to be first obtained procedurally by:

(1) patience; reasonable patience requiring the necessity of waiting whatever essential time it took in order to have the first parcel of ground - at the least - upon which elected members of the new Congress could meet, **stand**, and commence such official acts as the Proposed Constitution provided for therein, converting such Proposed Constitution to a de jure Constitution instead;

(2) by notification by their own States’ governments, by whose election they were to officially proceed, that such ceded property or properties had been acquired as required by the soon-to-be governing Constitution, to congregate thereon at such time as was expediently possible, to meet with other elected members of the newly proposed Congress for the first time, in order that the newly proposed government of the United States might commence its Organizational Meeting at such a location as could be confirmed to have been

ordained for its lawful use, in contrast to any other place where it could not be so confirmed as ordained for lawful use.

XI. EVIDENCE OF RECORD OF REALIZED ILLEGALITY OF CONVENED CONGRESS, GIVING RISE TO IRREVOCABLE FRAUD AS COVER UP; –

THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AS WITNESS:

1)) To this following Section of this – **The Nation That Never Was Exhibited Expose**, we have added additional supporting Exhibits, being copies from the Library of Congress of the Journals of both the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, as was ordered prepared by the Congress between the years of about 1820 to 1826, and officially representing the proposed United States dating back to March 4, 1789, the highly proclaimed date when the aforementioned, proposed Constitution itself was duly “accepted” by the alleged Congress *thereunder*, and thereon. These additional Official Records serving as Expose are exhibited and placed under the cover page of “**Organizational Meeting Records of the Congress of The Nation That Never Was.**”

2)) Based upon the number of the original thirteen States that ratified under the auspices and aegis (direct control) of the continental congress, there were to be **22** senators total that were to have been made to exist on March 4, 1789. But due to rain over the weekend just prior to that date, only **8** senators total actually showed up at 26 Wall Street, New York, New York, March 4, 1789, the place decided upon by the continental congress of the confederated government that had met in that same place, just two days before. Out of the twenty-two required senators, of which there were only twenty officially recognized as existing at that time, the Senate needed twelve present to achieve a quorum to conduct business.

3)) The following words were taken from a historical review of the proceedings of that day.

“At the appointed hour for the new government to begin, the eight senators-elect climbed the stairs of New York's old city hall. Hoping to convince Congress to make New York the nation's permanent capital, city leaders had recently named that building Federal Hall, and tripled its size. When the eight senators reached their elegant chamber on the building's top story, the Senate literally became the ‘Upper House.’”

4)) We rewrite this statement now in order to get a more clear perspective on just what this is saying.

At the ***appointed** hour for the new government to begin, the eight senators-elect climbed the stairs of New York's old city hall. **Hoping** to convince [the continental] Congress [at least] to make New York the nation's permanent capital, [**New York**] city leaders –[pursuing the practice of “**policy**” and not that of respect, but rather of *disrespect*, for the Law of the proposed Constitution itself that was *supposed to be supreme* over all other laws, prohibiting such very “**policies**” existence]– had recently **named** that building "Federal Hall, and tripled its size. When the eight [not 22] [**continental Congress (not Constitution) obeying**] senators reached their elegant [royal *decour*] chamber on the building's top story, the Senate literally became the “Upper House.”

5)) *If we were to ask, “**appointed**” by WHO, the obvious answer would be; by the Continental Congress, under the **guise** of its being referred to as “the United States in Congress assembled,” in order to prevent the people from distinguishing between the old government that was to no longer exist and the new government to come — (which proposed new government was not supposed to have to answer to the [old] continental congress at all) — so that the corrupt political (or “policy”) powers and loose practices of that same – continental congress – **could be continued as it was**, or “**as is**.”

6)) This “appointed hour,” along with the “appointed” place of 26 Wall Street, New York, New York – **as though** “law” (a resolution when demanded to be followed under some alleged authority of government is presumed to have the Power of Law behind it), but not, however, any “law” arising under or contained within the proposed Constitution for the United States – of America itself, we find and scrutinize and examine the words of the alleged United States House of Representative's own Journal for that first date of March 4, 1789, in which we read and find our answer:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, begun and held at the city of New York, on Wednesday, the fourth of March, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-nine, pursuant to a resolution of the late *Congress, made in conformity to the resolutions of the Federal Convention of the 17th September, 1787:” * “late Congress?” Before March 4, 1789?

7)) The aforementioned historical review of the “U.S. Senate’s” proceedings of that day continues.

“All eight were men of distinction in government and **politics.**”

8)) This reference to “politics,” which is by definition the making and enforcement of “policy,” **not** “law,” became at that time what it still is today – even though under the Proposed Constitution, for its Article IV, Section 4’s mandate that the States **all** have a Republican form of Government, which Government was to be a Government of Laws and **not** of “men” or “policy,” **denying** “Policy,” and thereby, as a matter of logical consequence to that fact, making Politicians and Politics forever UnConstitution[al], for there is No part of the Proposed Constitution that makes it otherwise – Corruption, one level of Corruption building upon the one before it, for this proposed nation – “of men” - was built upon Corruption from the very day of its Ratification of the Proposed Constitution, **Second Session** thereof, September 17, 1787.

9)) William Maclay of those first 8 would keep the only detailed record of what happened behind the Senate's closed doors during the **alleged** as lawful (but **not** lawful) “first Congress.”

10)) Continuing the **historical legal investigation** of the occurrences that took place on March 4, 1789, we find within the alleged United States Senate’s own 1820 Congressionally reconstructed records that:

“Without a quorum, the eight senators wrote to their missing colleagues ‘earnest[ly] requesting that you will be so obliging as to attend as soon as possible.’ Two weeks passed before William Paterson ambled over from New Jersey and Richard Bassett arrived from Delaware. This left the Senate two members short of a quorum, as the House of Representatives waited impatiently on the floor below. Finally, on April 6, the necessary twelfth member arrived. The [alleged] Senate then turned to its first order of business—certifying the election of George Washington—five weeks after his presidential term had officially begun.”

11)) You will note that in all of this, never once was it mentioned or indicated that someone should make contact with the United States Senators for the State of New York, **the very place** that the Continental Congress had “resolved” that the first United States “Congress” should meet. Why

not, you may ask? The answer can only be a presumptive conclusion; certain officials of the State of New York, not the city of New York, had come to realize that the proceedings taking place within their State, however flattering or honorable they might appear to have been, were **not** “**legal**” or “**lawful**” under the proposed Constitution itself, which apparently they, the New York State officials, yet respected enough to hold out against all other States with whom they had, prior to that time, been associates to in good faith.

12)) Reference Items:

U.S. Congress. Senate. *The Senate, 1789-1989*, by Robert C. Byrd, S. Doc.100-20, 100th Congress, 1st sess., Vol. 1, 1988. Chapter 1.

13)) The following is taken directly from the Journal of the alleged Senate of the United States –of America, Wednesday, March 4, 1789.

“March 4, 1789

The following members of Senate appeared and took their seats:

From New Hampshire, the Honorable
John Langdon, and Paine Wingate,
Massachusetts, the Honorable ... Caleb Strong,
Connecticut, the Honorable William S. Johnson, and Oliver
Ellsworth,
Pennsylvania, the Honorable
William Maclay, and Robert Morris,
Georgia, the Honorable ... William Few.

The number **not** being sufficient to constitute a quorum, they adjourned from day to day, until March 11, 1789.”

14)) In Examining the facts surrounding this alleged creation of the claimed first senate, we find that, by count of the names of the 8 plus the names of those to whom they wrote, virtually begging them to come forward to take part in the alleged as lawful process, we discover that there were yet two senators short of the number 22, which was to be the total number of senators established for the 11 States that had “ratified” the Proposed Constitution at the behest and under the aegis (control) of the

continental congress, the almost lawless group of confederation officials that virtually “flew (or “governed”) by the seat of their pants,” meeting here and meeting there, with respect to nothing that told them they could not do so whatever they chose to do, as they alone chose, at any time.

15)) As it turns out, the two “missing” senators would come to be, in time, Rufus King and Philip J. Schuyler, both of the State of New York, however, there is nothing that recognizes that those two existed officially in that capacity for the State of New York on that date, nor would they yet exist in an official capacity for showing up for any official “U.S. Congress” meeting to be held – in New York City, New York – for some time to come. (In Fact, Neither King nor Schuyler were to make any appearance as New York “U.S.” Senators at all until very late July, almost to being August, of 1789, missing entirely a number of vital events that would have demanded their legitimate presence, such as the inauguration of alleged President George Washington himself, on April 30, 1789.)

16)) For neither of them were recognized as being “missing” U.S. senators upon which the March 4, 1789 “Congress” (see attached Exhibit showing 8 Senators’ letters to other known, named “U.S. Senators”) *could* and would *call upon* for help in making up the first necessary quorum to conduct business as a Congress, as were the “missing” 12 senators that were named in the “Absentee” list of the senate’s own records (see the alleged first Congress’ Records Exhibit attached hereto), those that allegedly could not make it due to (or because of the) “rain” over the weekend before that date. (**8 + 12 = 20, not 22**).

17)) But rain in New York should have been no problem for “New Yorkers” to make it to the place “**appointed**” by the Continental Congress, for the meeting, to be held at 26 Wall Street, New York, New York, considering that there were “Senators” who made it there, irrespective of the rain, from as far away as Georgia and Massachusetts and Connecticut.

18)) *Surely* senators from the great State of New York could have made it to a place right there in their very own State at *some time* well before they actually did, unless the reason that they couldn’t make it was because neither of them had been yet officially established and provided by the State of New York itself. Or that is, **they simply didn’t Exist!**

19)) And why would New York, of all States, already having ratified the proposed Constitution, July 26, 1788, hold back, or refuse, not “fail,” on electing and providing United States Senators, as well as United States Representatives for the House of Representatives, for the very first, *very* important meeting of the first alleged Congress?

20)) If not for the rain, for it is obvious to all that *that* could not have been the reason for their long absence, their being held back had to be for some other reason. Such as that, they, the officials of the government of the State of New York were not in complete agreement with the claim that New York was a proper place to hold such a meeting if the new government was to be organized under the proposed Constitution, and not by a directive of the very same government body that was being abandoned in favor of the new proposed government.

21)) In fact, there has surfaced evidence to that very end, that during New York City’s (not New York State’s) own self-proclaimed **political** (politics or “political” **do not** substitute for law) “**right**?” to elect a Congressman from that self-decided as legal area (not in conformity with Article I, Section 2, Clause 2’s – “**the State of** . . . [State’s name] . . . shall be entitled to chuse), that is, the alleged “election” of John Lawrance as a U.S. Congressman representing New York City (not precinct, not district), that as a part of that same “political turmoil” there was underway an effort to dislodge both the alleged “U.S.: Congress and the alleged Constitution that such alleged U.S. Congress was using to be there – **from out of** the State of New York altogether!

22)) That would explain why a Political FRAUD **had to be** conjured up, to cover up the Truth of the illegality of what was being done, and to get the people of New York first and foremost to “**accept**” **all** that was being done *as* “lawful and legal;” well, legal anyway (If New Yorkers could be made to believe that everything done there was all lawful and legal and bona fide and so forth, then they would spread the word abroad themselves as to how well the organizing of the proposed nation’s first government body had gone, and convince the rest that what had been done in New York was binding upon the rest of the proposed nation – as though from a “constitutional” point of view, but without requiring that anyone scrutinize the matter too close for the greater truth of it), then the “new nation” would be on its way to wherever it was going after that.

THE NEW YORK **FRAUD** CONNECTION

23)) **NOW WE INCORPORATE STRAIGHTFORWARD FRAUD INTO THE RESULTS OF THE UNLAWFUL ACT OF THE CONVENTION, SECOND SESSION, HELD SEPTEMBER 17, 1787, WHICH FRAUD NOW ELEVATES THE CHARGE AGAINST THE PROPOSED NATION'S CREDIBILITY FOR ITS LAWFUL, DE JURE, EXISTENCE!**

CONTINUING:

24)) Such a Political FRAUD as to let it be known that New York's highest-ranking STATE judge, Robert R. Livingston, would be the one who would administer the Oath of Office for the newly elected President of the United States (as **he, State {not "federal"} judge Robert Livingston**, performed for the April 8, 1789 alleged members of House of Representatives as well – see exhibited Official House Records).

25)) This would explain why we do not find any senators for the State of New York present at any of those original, critical meetings, not even on April 6, 1789 when the alleged Congress held its "claimed" [UnLawful] full quorum! Though the New York Political Bribes didn't work quite so well as expected; the alleged first two senators not appearing in the Senate Journal record until, at the earliest, July 25th and 27th (almost August), 1789!

26)) The House Journal shows virtually the same thing. The States that showed up March 4, 1789 were Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and South Carolina! All making it there through that "***terrible***" **rain** – as far away as South Carolina.

27)) So, we find the same thing within the claimed U.S. House of Representatives as existed within the claimed Senate. Even though being held in New York, New York, **not one member** for the U.S. House of Representatives – **for and from the State of New York** – showed up! For Quite Some Time! "**Rain**" again? For **them too?**

28)) Not even by the late date of April 6, 1789; the date of the alleged first full quorum of both houses; not even then do we find among the claimed official members of the alleged U.S. Congress, the Senators and House of

Representative Members of the State of New York attending the “official” goings on! Must have been a downpour *wherever* those few Senators and Representatives from the State of New York, still not present, were at!

29)) Considering the FACT that **neither** the alleged U.S. Senate **nor** the alleged U.S. House of Representatives **could establish a quorum** for the purpose of doing Congressional business, or that is, the business of the Congress itself as Required – supposedly NOW – by the proposed Constitution itself, the [?] **Congress, either** as the House or the Senate separately or as the both of them combined, had **NO STANDING as the Congress**, or that is, the alleged Congress of the proposed United States LACKED STANDING (“no right to speak;” “no right to be heard;” “no right to be considered – as though officially existing”) to conduct any official business whatsoever, including any formal recognition or alleged acceptance of the proposed Constitution, aforementioned, itself, for that date of March 4, 1789, as has long, *too long*, been erroneously believed.

30)) The very alleged Congress itself **NEVER** having had **STANDING as the Congress** on March 4, 1789, or thereafter, to Officially Accept and Recognize the proposed Constitution itself, the proposed Constitution was never given a time when it officially, as a matter of any due process, became the De Jure Constitution for the proposed United States — of America, and so, being continued in that same state of being to this last very date, is still thus only Proposed, and the alleged nation that surrounds it and attends it is yet The Nation That Never Was, or De Facto Nation, being Imposter Nation among nations, nations true who have never suspected the truth to be otherwise:

“**A nation of ‘men,’**” not “of laws,” for **IF** we proclaim ourselves to be a nation “of law,” meaning that we have arisen and were first organized under actual law made, in truth, applicable to us, *then we are* “**No Nation At All.**”

31)) We see this clearly in the fact that, the acclaimed Senate's first president pro tempore, John Langdon, elected by the its first acclaimed full quorum, being proclaimed and recognized as an actual official of the newly proclaimed United States, would certainly have been, at the least, a more logical choice for one to swear in the “new, first President.”

32)) BUT WHAT COULD BE DONE TO HIDE THIS OBVIOUS CONDITION OF POLITICAL MISCHIEF? IF IT WENT ON TOO LONG WITHOUT BEING RESOLVED, IT WOULD BE CERTAIN THAT SOMEONE WOULD FIGURE IT OUT, AND THEN WHAT WAS DONE SEPTEMBER 17, 1787, SECOND SESSION, WOULD BE *UNDONE*, AND ALL THE PLANNED CORRUPTIONS FOR CONTINUED POLITICAL POWER WOULD BE LOST.

33)) The fact that someone within the Congress, for obvious cause, called upon the highest judge of New York to swear in, or administer the oath of office to President Washington, who would come marching down the streets of New York to be sworn into office, April 30, 1789, was a part of the **cover up**, and thus the **FRAUD** (Fraud always hides the truth by making there be an appearance of legitimacy to what is done) of the inauguration of the President himself, to be Used as a “political” manipulation to get those hard headed New Yorkers to listen to reason, to come aboard, as though the “ratification” of the proposed Constitution July 26, 1788 had not been sufficient for the purposes of holding the new nation’s first, very important, “organizational meeting.”

34)) For it is clear, when reading the proposed Constitution itself, that there exists **NO** requirement that the President, or any other office of the United States central government, be sworn in **by** anybody, for it is to be realized that NO United States supreme Court yet existed by that date, so there could be **NO** “Chief Justice” thereof to do the “swearing in” as we are accustomed to seeing at today’s alleged inaugural events. But if Not the “Chief Justice,” then **BY** who?

35)) The Answer. By appearing before the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representative, jointly called as is indicated in the Constitution itself, and simply reading the words required for his Oath at Article II, Section 1, Clause 8 aloud - himself, the President -elect would become the President, and that would be the extent of what he would be bound - by the proposed Constitution itself - to do, for the reading of the proposed Constitution does not state that the Oath is to be administered to him **by anyone** for the taking, but that HE shall take the Oath, bottom line, not that he shall receive it from another - in order to make it valid.

36)) Simply established, there was *nothing* that required the alleged newly elected President, Washington, to have the Oath administered to him **by** anyone else, but the fact that choosing to do so regardless, by not choosing an employee of the United States (such as the President of the Senate Pro Tempore, at that time provided for), but rather choosing someone from the State of New York, someone of high authority and respect from that State, that State which was refusing to supply both senators and congressmen to those supposedly most vital organization meetings, can only but compel us, without discretion, to suspect, no, not suspect, realize that **something was WRONG in New York City, in New York State**, to bring about this most unusual sequence of events.

37)) BUT, the **Political Dirt** of USING New York State's Chief Justice as a tool to commit such Political Frauds to Convince the People of New York that they were all really, HONESTLY (in this instance, means sick) included in this "new nation's" "organization" process, was not the first time that the alleged U.S. House undertook to **dishonorably USE** mister Robert R. Livingston, C.J., New York State official. NO, the alleged "U.S." House of Representatives used him first, not only to be the one to swear in the rest of the alleged members of the aforesaid alleged House, but that swearing in of the alleged House members by judge Livingston, on April 8, 1789, also included – coincidentally – NOT – New York City's / State's 1st alleged official at all, attorney John Lawrance.

38)) YET, it was from this same UnLawful, or UnConstitution[al] "swearing in" of all of the existing members of the alleged "U.S." House, as though having been vested in the alleged "Speaker of the House" to do so, that all other "swearing in's" were made to take place from and by, thereafter, and so continued to this date, Fraud having been sworn in by an Act of Fraud, and thereafter, Fraud Swearing In Fraud, and Fraud Swearing In Fraud, from one generation to the next, acts of Impostering and Impostership, done appropriately by an Imposter Nation, its being so De facto, as .. **The Nation That Never Was**.

39)) IT IS THE RECOGNITION OF LAW, In A Number Of States, to Hold that Those Who Do NOT Take Their Required Oaths of Office BEFORE Taking Office, render their own Acts as being Unofficial Acts of Government, and therefore, Such Unofficial Acts are construed as Not Binding As Though of De Jure Government – At All.

40)) So, **dirty** “**politics**” (politics, by definition, is the concern with and the enforcement of “**policy**,” **NOT** **Law**) was used to commit this most Serious of Frauds, to create and perpetrate the illusion that the place on Wall Street, at 26 Wall Street, New York, New York, as directed by the Continental Congress and **NOT** being organized under the proposed Constitution itself only, was **WRONG**; some certain ones of the good people of New York must have felt it, knew it, understood it, but were no match to the orchestrated Frauds committed in the name of Truth and Right and New Hope for the people of the proposed United States, no less.

41)) And So, the **POLITICS** gets **DIRTIER** when we discover that, from that 1st alleged day of March 4, 1789, on to April 8, 1789, **not one** Senator, **not one** House member, came into the “session,” and – **before** doing anything else before all others there as witnesses – professed to take their Article VI, Clause 3 required “Oath of Office,” even by pronouncing the easy words of, “I [name of oath taker] take an oath (or affirm) to support the constitution for the United States,” or even if without giving their name, but at least saying it in front of those witnesses who knew who they were. As a consequence of this one fact alone, among all of the other facts that shout UnLawfulness to the World, **NO** “U.S.” House member or Senator of that first alleged Congress ever took his “oath of office” by way of a lawful source, as would be required if the same’s existence existed as a “nation of law(s)” and not “of men.”

42)) There can be no doubt that this was what was happening, right before everyone’s eyes (“appearance of legitimacy,” one of the key elements to every **Fraud**) General George Washington, now “appearing” as **alleged** President George Washington, was being **USED** to create and perpetrate a FRAUD, to help publish the Illusion that all was well [in New York City, the **appointed** (by who?) national headquarters] in the newly proposed United States ————— of America. We, all of us reading this, should be **Ashamed**, that any such things as this Ever took place, as though done by way of Law, or the Law of the proposed Constitution itself, alleged to have been done by actual men of “Law” as though for any of Us. We, Who Do Respect The Law And The Proposed Constitution As Law, Owe NO Respect or Allegiance To These Kind of “Men” Or What They Claim To Have Done For Us, At All.

43)) **STRAIGHTFORWARD FRAUD NOW INCLUDED.** Because we have the presence of an actual, straightforward perpetuated Fraud found to

exist within the alleged organizational founding of this “nation,” we can no longer escape the truth of it, that we are not a “nation of law” as being “organized and founded under the law” itself that we claim to subscribe to, that supreme Law of the proposed Constitution itself, but we are a “nation of men” only, which takes us a long way to our understanding as to why so many of the governments, all, recklessly proclaim that it’s “okay” that “politics” (the making and enforcement of “policy”) be made an integral part of the laws that we are made subject to, and act out their decisions, daily, not according to any actual law being relied upon, but instead basing their decisions on “what makes them feel good,” or what the popular preference is,” or what has come to be called “public policy,” not actually pertaining to the “common law” (the law of the commoners), which flaky, incoherent forms of anarchy have caused much extreme unrest throughout the lands of this proposed nation, which politics (making and enforcing of *policy*, not law) have been the cause of the loss of knowledge of the following TESTS found distinctly within the said Constitution, virtually from the same day it was ratified, but thereafter rendered (**blindsided**) into a proposed-state only:

- 1) The Clause 18 TEST (1: 8: 18)
- 2) The United States Tribunals TEST (1: 8: 9 & 1: 9: 2)
- 3) The Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 TEST (3: 2: 3)
- 4) The Clause 15 TEST (1: 8: 15)
- 5) The Extended Powers TEST (3: 2: 1 & 3: 2: 2)
- 6) The “‘post’ Roads” TEST (1: 8: 7)
- 7) The Clause 3 Regulatory Powers TEST joined by
The Clause 6 TEST (1: 8: 3 & 1: 9: 6) and
The Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 TEST and The Clause 15
TEST
- 8) The Clause 17 TEST (1: 8: 17)
- 9) The Clause 14 Rules for the Government TEST (1: 8: 14)
- 10) The Anti-U.S. Deportation / States Rights of Deportation TEST
found at Article I, Section 9, Clause 1 in conjunction with
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 and The Clause 18 TEST
- 11) The Interstate Compacts TEST (1: 10: 3) providing for States’
abilities (and rights) to do all interstate “federal” functions now
illegally employed by the United States central government in
violation of these TESTS found in the proposed Constitution itself.
- 12) The “general Welfare” TEST (1: 8: 1 & 1: 8: 5)

- 13) The Article IV, Section 4 TEST
 - 14) The Article IV, Section 2, Clause 2 TEST
 - 15) The Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 – “the Territory” TEST
 - 16) The Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 – States Forming – TEST
 - 17) The Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 TEST joined by
The Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 TEST and The Clause 18 TEST,
DENYING, absolutely, the alleged **President** the **claim** for right to
instantly, upon being “sworn in,” be considered to be “**Commander
in Chief**,” and to **illegally** carrying on any “police action,” “military
action,” or other action, anywhere in the world, not coming under
the scope of The Clause 11 TEST (1: 8: 11).
 - 18) The Article VI, Clause 2 – The Propensity to Commit, *Inter Alia*,
Jurisdiction Fraud TEST;
 - 19) Which aforementioned The Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 TEST is
supported *irrevocably* (or “Irreversibly”) by The Legal Difference
Between a Crime of Commission and a Crime of Omission TEST plus
The Legal Rights of a State at its Borders TEST;
- 44)) ALL of these vital Constitution[al] TESTS lost to us because of the
attitudes and beliefs of certain of the proposed Constitution’s Founders
being as those of spoiled rotten children, having the disposition to have
things their own way no matter the cost, or as spoiled brats, the common
trait of **sordid** monarchy, but which, unfortunately nevertheless has resulted
in this acclaimed nation as being caused to exist as:

The Nation That Never Was, De facto Nation and Imposter Nation;

still reflecting that **same tendency** to act, not in support of actual law itself,
but in support of “**policy**” in the stead of law, to the ruin of the people of
this wished-for-nation, with whom all other genuine or lawfully established,
or De jure nations have had to deal, done in utter violation of The Article
IV, Section 4 TEST itself, again.

45)) This tendency or propensity to act in “**policy**” and **Not Law** is a
tendency and propensity, not only of the Congress at this point, but has
exuded out to both the alleged executive branch and the alleged judicial
branch, so that the use of **policy**, and **Not LAW**, has become so common
place, that the **alleged** United States has truly earned a deserved renaming
as Malversation, or Official Corruption, due to all that it has done and

continues to do, it and its official actors, against all others, within these lands alleged, and against other naïve **de jure** nations and their unsuspecting peoples throughout the world.

XII. This Discovery and Expose reveals that the high motivation among a considerable number of the proposed Constitution’s framers were of the nature of being *monarchial* in disposition and objective. That this may be known, understood and extended officially unto the heads of many nations, An earthly “monarch” is best described here as being, in essence, “**a spoiled brat,**” a **spoiled brat** being **someone who has to have their own way, no matter what the COST to everyone else.**

XIII. For what would happen if one took a document, such as the Proposed Constitution, that was to tell a such spoiled brat what the said spoiled brat could and could not do, and handed that very document to a spoiled brat to examine for constraint purposes? The most likely answer is, to tear it up immediately, even though in front of witnesses (spoiled brats and monarchs care little, if at all, about “witnesses”).

XIV. On March 4, 1789, the alleged first alleged U.S. Senate had its first meeting. Or did it? The Constitution, at Article I, Section 3, Clause 4 requires that the Vice President of the United States be the President of the Senate. At Article II, Section 1, Clause 3, it establishes the Vice President as being established in consequence of, and after, the establishing of the President of the United States. The one cannot precede the other.

XV. According to the records of history, the alleged first President was sworn in on April 30, 1789. At Article I, Section 7, Clause 3, the Proposed Constitution requires that, “Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and the House of Representatives may be necessary . . . shall be presented to the President of the United States, and before the same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a *Bill” (*or as required at Clause 2, Article I, of the same Section 7).

XVI. Without a[n] true and **existent** President on March 4, 1789 to which the Acceptance of the Proposed Constitution itself, allegedly done by some unrecorded or unwritten and so unknown “Resolution” of the alleged

Congress was able to submit its alleged “Acceptance” to on *that* said date, there could have been NO official Acceptance *by* “the Congress” of the Proposed United States Constitution itself At All, and therefore No Lawful Grounds **in Law** under which to continue any further meeting or meetings thereafter. Sorry. “**Policy**” just doesn’t get it, no matter what.

XVII. Ten (10) miles square **does not mean the same thing as Ten (10) square miles**, for 10 square miles could allow those miles to be made up of a *cumulative consumption* of square miles in segments, wherever such segments might happen to be located. Ten miles **square**, on the other hand, represents dimensions that represent an exact **square**, with no possibility of the land within the square being located someplace else other than **within** the **square** itself.

XVIII. New York, New York was **never** a part of that intended **square** (As now evidenced by the Frauds Evidence involving New York stated above). Irrespective of whatever arrangements as were made for 26 Wall Street, New York, New York, the place where the “Continental Congress” was accustomed to meeting up to the date of March 2, 1789, two days before the alleged Congress of the proposed United States central government met, even if the property were **ceded** to the United States central government itself, which, **EXCEPT** such alleged “**ceding**” of 26 Wall Street, New York, New York, was a part of the “[two] particular States,” not “a particular State,” – singular – as were intended, or else became so as a matter of fact, which, considering the implications of the word States and not State in Clause 17, then, even the ceding of 26 Wall Street, New York, New York, if any, would have been utterly unlawful altogether, and is as such beyond escapable reasoning or conclusion of that legal fact - as a matter of legal fact.

XIX. [1] Does this mean that the States had no authority to proceed with the election of the various Representatives and Senators for the Proposed United States central government?

[2] Answer. IF the First Meeting March 4, 1789, because of its Appointed Time and Place by the Continental Congress, NOT provided for within the proposed Constitution itself, was Unlawful, and thus Illegal, and as so Testified To by The State of New York itself, by its Refusal, NOT Failure, to provide either U.S. Senators Or

U.S. Representatives (ANY of them) therefor, even on April 6, 1789, then That Testimonial by The State of New York has to be acknowledged that the Continental Congress had NO Right or Authority to Direct or to Expect the 13 States to Ratify the proposed Constitution, to Any Degree, and Have or Expect to Have those Ratifications of Record be provided to them, Continental Congress, for *their* Official Records, even if or only a temporary time, which fact is not in evidence;

[3] For if one were to ask the Question, “What part of the proposed Constitution was to provide for the Continental Congress to be made the Official Director of States’ Ratification Operations of the 13 States themselves,” OR if “What part of any Other law, NOT “Opinion,” made the Continental Congress any Records Keeper at all for the newly proposed nation, its proposed Congress, and the proposed States that would take part therein,” to Both Questions we would have to, Without Exception, answer “NONE.”

[4] For the Same Reasons that the State of New York, by its Acts of Omission, or Refusal to take part in Any of the “Official Proceedings” from March 4, 1789 to April 6, 1789, and thereafter, by its, New York State’s, Evident Testimonial Given as to the Illegal Proceedings therefor, NONE of the 13 States, Including Itself on July 26, 1788, EVER HAD the Slightest Right to Follow the Directives of the Continental Congress in Organizing, even by alleged Ratification of the proposed Constitution, and NOT follow Exclusively the Directives and Mandates Contained within the proposed Constitution itself.

[5] In addition to the fact that without a lawful and legal ratification done under the actual authority of the proposed Constitution itself, and not under the direction of a “foreign power” or a power in Conflict of Interest, or simply an Unauthorized – as a matter of Law, NOT Opinion – Power or Authority thereto, there was No lawfully Appointed time and place on March 4, 1789 for any “first Congress” to meet;

[6] There also exists the fact that IF such March 4, 1789 meeting had actually been organized under the proposed Constitution itself as provided for within such proposed Constitution, then such Representatives and Senators had No Lawful Right, in Further Non-

Compliance to the proposed Constitution's Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, to have that "first meeting" until, at the very least, there was an acquisition of **land** ("if you ain't got land, you ain't nothing") upon which the Organizational Meeting of the proposed United States could be lawfully Organized, being of the most vital necessity of any chartered organization to effectuate, lest there be trouble later due to such lawful organization meeting never having taken place, or else having take place in the wrong place where another place was chartered for in that wrong place's stead, where no "temporary place" was provided for within that chartering documents specific legal wording.

XX. As to the alleged official Acceptance of the Proposed Constitution's Ratification, one House alone, with or without an alleged quorum to do so, is not and was not enough to do such Acceptance of the Proposed Constitution, no matter the importance of need for doing it, nor was it sufficient that either House meet any place other than that one singular place which was to be the Seat of the Government of the United States, *that* place made up of States, not State, whereto the Electors Votes were to be sent, **Sealed**, to be counted, in order to ascertain the First President and Vice President to officially be recognized by either house, based upon their own giving forth their own Oaths to Support the said Constitution, with no requirement that any be "Sworn In" by anyone at all, except that it be before witnesses, such as the two Houses of the Congress would so be.

XXI. Further, the States' governments had no authority to elect the members of the Proposed Congress and send them just anywhere, or expect them to go just anywhere, but only to such place as was provided to them to assemble, as provided for them in the Proposed Constitution, at Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, itself, and nowhere else.

XXII. Under the Law of the Proposed Constitution itself, the unorganized House of Representatives could not decide when and where to meet; the unorganized Senate could not decide where and where to meet; the States themselves, could not decide when and where for their to- be-elected "United States officials in the Congress" to meet (no provision in the proposed Constitution), so who or what was the true and lawful authority under which the proposed United States central government could hold its critical Organizational Meeting?

Answer. Only from within the correctly analyzed structure of the proposed Constitution itself did the proposed United States central government have any lawful right for procedure to hold its duly required Organizational Meeting, and that place was to be with any part and parcel of the two particular States proposed **for** by Clause 17, Section 8, of Article I, in order that the Seat of the Government therefor might be lawfully and successfully established, to which the Votes for the President and Vice President were to be sent to, and not elsewhere.

Continued Answer. For, ultimately, it would have been far easier and much more lawful and productive, and the correct remedy for such as the proposed Constitution represented up to that time, to have simply Called a Second Convention meeting wherein the Several States could have openly sent representatives thereto, for the purpose of convening to study and to learn – from the Primary Founders of it, just what it meant [a Rule 12 (e) principle today], and how it worked, or was to work, and what its strengths and weaknesses were, if any, and how it might be correctly applied, Under ITS Application of Law, not under the proven loose acts of the Continental Congress, ever. But BLINDSIDED by the Second Session of the UnLawfully Acting Convention – in that Session, September 17, 1787.

XXIII. WHERE and to WHOM would such Deeds for Property, if Deeds in fact were what was to be DELIVERED, be Delivered to in order for the CONGRESS, whose official WHEREABOUTS is STILL Officially Unknown, in Order that They, the [Grossly Ignorant and **Outlaw-ish**] Members of the Proposed Congress could ACCEPT such Place for the Proposed Seat of Proposed Government at that time?

KEYS TO DEFECT AND DE FACTO

XXIV. The Question of Where an Organizational Meeting, for the purposes of Organizing a Nation, when there is to be recognized no existing law under which to organize other than that law which has been chartered for its very existence, is to be held, holds certain keys in its answers, each key being of significant import, not to be trifled frivolously with, which reveals the hidden truths that have been buried in the darkened minds of pretentious legal persons, believing, falsely, themselves to be those of great

accomplishment and wisdom, but *within* whom “wisdom” has fled from them - for fear that she might be misused to trample justice, to grind the faces of the poor, to dishonor the honor of the law, for which no remedy at law can be found, except that Question be answered in all of its keys, and not just any select one of them pretended for instead.

XXV. Looking to the proposed Constitution itself as the sole lawful directive as to where the elected Representatives and Senators were to hold their first/organizational meeting, but deferring to the Continental Congress for these keys’ examples instead, allowing such Continental Congress itself to determine the Organization of the proposed United States instead of the said proposed Constitution, these particular questions, being a part of the main question of Where, are set forth as follows:

1. Would it have been recognized as lawful, ignoring the question of inappropriate, to direct that the newly proposed Congress, IF lawfully established at all, to meet in a tavern, or else a “house of ill repute,” located along a street in Pennsylvania, or New York, for the purpose of holding the necessary first or organizational meeting, as is inferred within the proposed Constitution for the proposed United States?

The answer to this question is NO. The key is that such a place as a tavern, or else a “house of ill repute,” for the organizational meeting for the founding of a nation would be recognized as being immoral; no law yet exists outside of the founding law itself as rendering such founding law to be diminished by such immorality, however, where a nation’s law already exists, the choice of the incorporators of a corporation (where a corporation is the focus of such nation’s law) to hold the organization meeting in just such a place would not be questioned, except there first be a higher law prohibiting such an establishment as being a fit place for incorporation under the established nation’s existing laws.

2. Would it have been recognized as lawful, ignoring the question of conflict of interest, to have ordered the organizational meeting to be held within the official court of its former enemy, such as across the sea, in England, and within the palace of King George III, under *his watchful* and royal *eye*, and by *his* helpful advice,

knowing that both he and his officials, most if not all, had interests **against** the proposed nation's organization, legal or not, at all?

The answer to this question is NO. The key is that to do such a thing in face of such a nation's history would border reckless lunacy, where there were known to be enemies within the confines of the foreign nation's government, much the same way that it was known that there were still royalist sympathizers still entrenched within the ranks of the government, or Congress, of the Confederacy, being that very same "United States in Congress Assembled," that the September 17, 1787 Convention, Second Session, so grandly referred to, but dishonestly, since it knew that its very purpose was to bring about the abandonment and shut down of that same foreign government, within whom it has its own conflict-of-interest enemies, no less.

3. Considering the foregoing, would it have been recognized as lawful for a group or organization, whose operations and authority had descended to a degree that its authority existed, not as a Body of Law as it had in the prior session, but as an Openly Proclaimed and Evident Body of Opinion, to issue any directive, as though law, to any other legal entity of power and authority, and equally to the point, or greater, would it have been either lawful or legal at all for any such other power and authority, such as any of the Thirteen States, as well as the Continental Congress, or the Congress of the Confederacy, itself, to have ACCEPTED, at all, much less officially, the word or act of a group whose only admitted authority was based upon Opinions, twice proclaimed, and not to have had a duty, forthwith, to reject and deny such alleged authority as being binding upon such legal entity, or States, etc., as any duty or obligation, altogether?

The answer on the first part of this question is NO. The key is "descended authority," which was to be considered evident, since it was never understood beforehand that those delegates sent to take part in the

Convention were to be authorized to have any power and authority outside of it.

The answer on the second part of this question is NO. The key is “Accepted officially,” which condition, being an innate part of government, denotes and goes to a thing called Duty, being therefore the Law of Duty, which Duty was to examine the Act placed before it, government, for its lawfulness, not merely its proposed legality, before, not after, accepting any part of such Act into its own State’s (or else Congress of the Confederacy’s) operations, for any future purpose, at all.

XXVI. Neither the proposed Convention itself as a whole, nor any of its members as individuals, no matter how influential or impressive, had authority from the thirteen States’ governments, to do any thing other than establish a new charter, not unlike the Magna Carta, or the Great Charter

XXVII. Having absolutely no authority, though as a Convention, to direct that the organizing procedures be conveyed to the Continental Congress, under whatever more impressive name or title it should appear, what the Convention of September 17, 1787, Second and Separate Session, in its existence after its own ratification of the proposed Constitution, did, in effect, was to direct that the organizing of the proposed nation of the United States be granted or conveyed to – the leaders and officials of – another nation.

XXVIII. This would be equivalent in reasoning and lawful procedures, where no outlined or defined authority to do so first existed, to organize the nation of England, a delegation of authorized persons from that nation, not authorized for any other purpose than the one delegated for the same to do, elected by their own Opinion to convey to the King of Spain the defective authority (an Opinion, however public and well intentioned, is never actual Authority for any lawful purpose) to organize a new nation, within the very borders of England itself.

XXIX. The Confederacy of the united States, whose official government had been known in time prior as the Continental Congress, or the Congress of the Confederacy, was in fact a foreign nation to the one being proposed by the First Convention, present, in the Ratification Session, or the First

Session thereof, on September 17, 1787, wherein the proposed Constitution, beginning with the planning thereof commenced on May 14, 1787, to which the said foreign nation was not welcomed to help in its planning, being commenced as to its proposal on September 17, 1787, First Session, the Convention of the Second Session, having no authority to do so, having, by its own admission, only “Opinion,” illegally (or not legally) transferred the Powers within the proposed Constitution to such aforesaid “foreign nation,” in order that such foreign nation might determine the critical organizational meeting for the new proposed nation, with the full power to ignore or deny any thing of law requiring that it be otherwise, within the proposed Constitution, as supreme Law above the said foreign nation’s law, itself.

XXX. Here, before the World, as before the People of the several acclaimed States of the proposed United States, these matters are to be examined, with a critical and discerning eye, to put it simply, that the Convention of September 17, 1787, Second Session, following Ratification of the said proposed Constitution, violated the very principles of law incorporated into that said proposed Constitution, by granting, by way of Opinion and not by Authority, the Power over the proposed Constitution itself, to place the same, allegedly officially, before the thirteen States for their own Ratification, and then onwards to determine, outside of the proposed Constitution itself, the very essentials of time and place, for the official organizational meeting of the United States central government, to be established on behalf of all of them.

XXXI. Constituting Organizational Fraud In The Factum, its lawful and legal existence is EVER VOID, the claim, if any, by any later proposed, but only alleged courts of a De facto United States-Nation, that a condition for fraud, being void ab initio, can be overlooked or construed as having no legal effect as fraud if existing as an undiscovered or unchallenged fraud for seven or more years, considering that such alleged courts themselves could never have been established to make such a proclamation in any of their decisions to begin with, makes any attempt to escape from the snare set by the Convention of September 17, 1787, Second Session, a vain attempt, and renders the De facto Nation of the United States, The Nation That Never Was, ever more guilty as being an Imposter Nation, with every attempt it may make to undermine the facts of its own creation, that it exists at this time, as it has always existed since that fateful date, as a “Nation of ‘Men’” only, and NOT truly as a Nation of Laws, deplorable, to be despised, and

put to open shame, before all of the nations of the World who were once its benefactors, and to whom its own benefits were issue to as a matter of such fraud, and not of truth and noble stature, as has long been errantly misbelieved.

XXXII. The Evidence To the Unlawful September 17, 1787 and then the Illegal 1789 conduct (the State of New York / New York Judge Robert R. Livingston / Alleged President Elect George Washington **Fraud** of April 30, 1789) being deceptively carried on and undeniable as to its existence and obviousness of purpose – to convince the hard-refusing State of New York itself to “give in” and go along with the *rest of the Frauds* being committed in plain sight, the only question remaining is, are we a nation of laws, *for if we say we are a nation of laws, then we are* **No Nation At All**, - yet, but are a “nation of ‘men,’” being therefore, unfortunately, a Nation of ‘Men’ **MASQUERADING** - As A Nation of Law(s).

XXXIII. For New York City was **NEVER within** the Intended Area that was considered for the “Seat of the Government” on September 17, 1787; a different place altogether had to be in the mind of the Constitution’s Framers. How Can we KNOW This? For One Very Good, Plain & Simple Reason, in spite of the fact of the building at the address of 26 Wall Street, New York City’s, being “provided” for their, alleged Congress’, immediate March 4, 1789 use, was that there was *no* evidence or reasonable belief that the property owners of said New York City were ready to “fork over,” or give or cede, *any* portion of New York City – **downtown** – itself, including their very own New York City streets themselves, up to 10 square miles of it !, adjacent to said 26 Wall Street – to make up the 10 miles square described in Clause 17 of the proposed Constitution – at any time, for new governmental domination and control, not even for a temporary purpose.

The Intention to EVER Actually Do So, Plainly & Clearly, & Simply - Was NOT There!

XXXIV. Exposing we – people and Several States’ governments to the now necessary legal inquisition concerning the question of the authority of the continental congress (or the “c.c.,” not “the Congress”) – itself – to be the one to **redirect** that the votes for the president be sent to New York City, not to the “seat of the government,” it, “c.c.,” **knowing** that the place, New York City, would **not** be the “seat of the government” as **required** and called for under the proposed Constitution’s Article II, Section 1, Clause 3

and Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I, rendering in legal effect that such votes for president as were brought there, were brought and held in direct violation of the proposed Constitution's mandate for those same to be sent to the "seat of the government," and **nowhere else at all**.

XXXV. Analogous Case Example. A certain organization was desirous to be organized by a group of people (the "unifying group") under a set of laws that had become known and agreed to them to be used for establishing and operating the to-be-organized organization that they were pursuing. The Case is stated thusly:

[1] The basic and essential laws that were to dictate the organizing process, illustrated hereby, were as follows:

- 1) Two particular blocks within an area, which they, the Unifying Group, believed was to be given to them by those having ownership of those two particular blocks who were their, Unifying Group's, supporters, being also the supporters of the purposes for which the certain organization was to be organized.
- 2) Upon receiving notice of the willingness to give the two particular blocks, or such reasonable portion thereof upon which they could meet and hold their organizational meeting, which true and correct organizational meeting would be critical to their lawful and legal future existence, which would be accomplished by their, Unifying Group's members simply personally, physically traveling to the area where the two particular blocks were to be located and offered to be given them, and by an officially discerning eye were to officially "accept" at that time such given or ceded land for organizing and operating such organization upon, which newly owned land would give the Unifying Group the immediate opportunity to hold a meeting thereon for the purpose of holding their required "organizational meeting," being present there for the purpose of "accepting" said property and being immediately and conveniently able to do so.
- 3) At the time when the organizational meeting would be able to be held there – upon the newly accepted two blocks– or some actual portion thereof as given them, the essential official sponsors (being comparable unto so many non-profit shareholders to have their particular number of votes once organized) of the Unifying Group were to send along with the Unifying Group's representatives

official, signed and envelope-sealed votes as to who was to be made president of the new proposed organization, which would be opened at the same time as the required organizational meeting was to be held therefor, after which the newly proposed organization would be properly and lawfully organized, and would thus have all rightful authority to commence its operations thereafter, without delay, on that basis.

[2] The manner in which the unifying group came about holding their “organizational” meeting; not under the requirements of the laws above.

1. Certain of the members of the Unifying Group, for whatever reason, decided not to follow the stated directives of the law above stated, but elected instead to contact a certain group who called themselves the Continental Group, to have that said group - outside of the laws provided for - to assert *their* own personal proposal, directives, and instructions for organizing the proposed organization - the “Continental Group” way.
2. The Continental Group, even though it was granted no authority whatsoever under the body of laws which the proposed organization was to be organized under, those same laws as are set forth above, decided that it would undertake the authority, anyway, of directing the Unifying Group in its efforts to hold the organizational meeting as it, Continental Group, alone should determine.
3. Without respect for the requirement that the place for organizing be established within some part of the two particular blocks called for, as required *within* the aforementioned laws provided for, for such proposed unifying group’s usage in organizing same, the continental group decided to direct the unifying group to hold the organizational meeting in a different place than the two particular blocks referred to within the laws having authority over the matter, and directed therefore that the unifying group meet at a location several blocks away referred to as the New Yield area, but only at a particular small part of that area, and only temporarily, with no intent that the New Yield area could be made the permanent location for the proposed organization to be organized by the unifying group.

4. In addition to redirecting the unifying group's organizational meeting away from the required two-blocks area intended by the proposed organization's original incorporators, the continental group, without any lawful or legal authority at all to do so, also ordered that the signed and envelope-sealed votes for the organization's president - be sent by the essential official sponsors – to the New Yield area and not to the two particular blocks that were required by the aforementioned laws themselves.
5. In addition to the time of the unlawfully held organizational meeting - held under the direction of the continental group - in a different place and time than that which had been provided for by the law which the organization was to be bound to, it was further discovered that the continental group was the key organization behind directing the proposed organization's essential official "shareholding" sponsors to make their decision of supporting the unifying group's act of using the continental group for its own directions, and not those for its organizing as provided for under the law, in holding such organizational meeting as was held and not holding that same in compliance with the law as was prescribed for it.
6. Consequently, from the influencing of the "shareholders" to be before they actually became that same, to provide their ratifying support to whatever the continental group might do in its own directions for holding the proposed organization's vitally necessary organizational meeting, to the influencing members of the continental group to include its, the continental group's, personal instructions and directions on how, where, when to hold the organizational meeting, not in comparable semblance to any part of the law provided for the proposed organization to be organized under or to operate under thereafter, when the proposed organization's official organizational minutes and records were examined after the fact of its organizing, the loose and misdirecting instructions and directions that the continental group gave to both the prospective "shareholders" and the unifying group, in all that they did, was the only thing that the proposed organization had to fall back on in its claim that it was a lawfully and legally established de jure organization, and entitled to do all of the things that other de jure organizations of like kind to it could do, throughout the world.

7. Notwithstanding the fact that its first hired president served fully as a de facto-hired president for a de facto organization for the entire time, and that all future hired presidents and unifying group members thereof continued to exist in their reliance upon that same de facto organizational beginning, it being the case that the aforementioned laws that the proposed organization would have been lawfully organized under - but were not at all - did not contain any provision or authority to allow members of the unifying group to manipulate the laws of like organizations throughout the world - or for the world itself, there being no worldwide statute of limitations on fraud to deny the discovery of the organizational frauds that were so committed, the continental group itself having long before retired and been dissolved in its official existence for holding the same accountable purposes, the proposed organization could only be recognized, even in its latest existence, as being de facto, still, the lapsed time having no bearing upon its lawful and legal existence accordingly.
8. Certain of the proposed organization's parties in real interest, being caused to suffer damages at the hands of the de facto organization, whose unlawful organizing had ingrained into it the habit of continuing that same unlawful behavior, brought suit in order to expose its, proposed organization's, unlawful and de facto condition to the attention to other like organizations with whom it did, or might do, business.

[3] **Judgment Found Against The Proposed Organization.**

1. The fact that there may have been no intent by any of the members of either the unifying group or the continental group to harm the critical organizing process set forth expressly, impliedly, and inherently, in its organizational duties, the fact remains that no group or organization is entitled to ignore or circumvent the law that is provided, from any lawful source, supremely prescribed for it, under which it is to both organize itself by way of its vital and critically required organizational meeting and to continue to operate with the same required respect for all of such law's chartered expectations and requirements thereafter.
2. A reckless disregard for and a defraudment of the law itself can only mean one thing; at some point in time, someone will be made accountable for those things done wrongfully when the question of

right conduct on the part of the proposed organization comes into actual focus by any party damaged by the ways of conduct or misconduct of the alleged organization party.

3. There was never at any time a lawfully established president of the organization, the executive being, as organizations go, the most critical and indispensable of all such organizational offices; the succession of other presidents thereafter were just built upon the same unlawful condition which caused the alleged organization to become de facto in the first place.
4. Judgment against the proposed organization; such organization was and is de facto, still; its time lapse of evading the truth serves as no defense as to its unlawful existence. Its organization veil is hereby penetrated and set aside. All parties damaged by its unlawful existence have right for remedy in their own particular courts of law, throughout the world, whatever, whoever, and wherever those parties may be.

XXXVI. [1] JUDGMENT AGAINST THE ALLEGED NATION OF THE UNITED STATES. WITHOUT RESPECT TO THE VARIOUS ACTS OF THE ALLEGED UNITED STATES-NATION, WHETHER THEY BE OR HAVE BEEN GOOD OR BAD, ITS UNLAWFUL ORGANIZING BY ITS DISRESPECT, DISHONOR, AND DISOBEDIENCE FOR ITS OWN ACCLAIMED SUPREME LAW (OR PROPOSED CONSTITUTION) IN DOING SO, THERE BEING NO EVIDENCE OF RECORD TO SHOW THAT ITS ORIGINAL ORGANIZING MEMBERS EITHER SWORE AN OATH TO SUPPORT ITS PROPOSED CONSTITUTION BEFORE TAKING “SEAT” ONE ON THAT FIRST DATE OF MARCH 4, 1789, OR THAT A SINGLE MEMBER BROUGHT INTO ANY SUCH ALLEGED “ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING(S)” WITH THEM A COPY OF THAT SAME SUPREME LAW (OR PROPOSED CONSTITUTION) AS WAS TO DEMONSTRATE EVEN THEIR REMOTEST ATTENTION TO IT OR ITS INSTRUCTIONS, LEAVES US NO DOUBT THAT THE ALLEGED ORGANIZATION OF THE ALLEGED UNITED STATES-NATION MUST GO THE WAY OF ALL OF ITS UNLAWFULLY ESTABLISHED KIND;

[2] IT IS THE POWER AND PURPOSE OF THIS LAWFUL AND TRUTHFUL DECREE THAT IT BE KNOWN AND RESOLVED, THAT UNTIL AND UNLESS THERE BE A LAWFUL

AND TRUE ORGANIZING PROCESS (IT NOT HAVING YET EVER BEEN ORGANIZED, *LAWFULLY*) TO REPLACE THAT WHICH HAS BEEN WRONGFULLY DONE WITH THAT WHICH IS LAWFUL ACCORDING TO THE DUE PROCESS OF TRUE LAW (NOT ITS “LAW”), THAT THE ALLEGED UNITED STATES-NATION, AND EITHER OF THOSE THAT MAKE UP THE SAME, BE RECOGNIZED FOR ANY UNION-NATION’S PURPOSE AS BEING DE FACTO, AN IMPOSTER NATION, COUNTERFEIT AS TO ANY CLAIM TO BE “A NATION OF LAW(S),” BUT ONLY “A NATION OF MEN” FROM THE DATE OF ITS INCEPTION, AND NOW AND HEREBY PENETRATED AND SET ASIDE AS TO ITS CHARTER VEIL, FOR ALL FURTHER LAWFUL INTENTS AND PURPOSES.

[3] IT IS THE FURTHER JUDGMENT OF THIS DUE PROCESS DECREE, ARISING FROM SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS ITSELF, THAT ALL DAMAGED PARTIES, WHETHER PUBLIC OR PRIVATE, THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO PETITION THE OTHER NATIONS OF THE WORLD FOR RELIEF AND SANCTIONS AGAINST THE SAME, UNTIL THIS PROBLEM OF ITS UNLAWFUL DE FACTO AND IMPOSTERING CONDITION AND STATUS SHALL BE RESOLVED TO THE BENEFIT OF ALL NATIONS, UNDER THE LAW OF NATIONS ITSELF.

XXXVII. THAT WHICH WE CALL “OUR NATION,” THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES – OF AMERICA (NOT YET HAVING ATTAINED THE LAWFUL RIGHT TO BE CALLED THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA INSTEAD), REQUIRING THE EXISTENCE OF A DE JURE UNITED STATES CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, WAS ESTABLISHED BY DECEIT, AND BY FRAUD, NOT MERE “OPINION,” WHICH DECEIT AND FRAUD, OR ALLEGED FOUNDATION FOR THE “ORGANIZING” OF THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES, BEING BASED UPON A LIE, FOR DENIED RIGHTS OF LAW, WAS ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING FRAUD ALSO.

XXXVIII. PROPER TRANSFER OF LIABILITY OR LIABILITIES OF ALL CREDITORS AND OTHERS TO WHOM ANY LIABILITY IS OWED, TO JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY, WHETHER OR

NOT RECOGNIZED AS BEING ANY FORM OF WORLD COURT OR ANY OTHER DE JURE NATIONAL COURT OF ANY DE JURE NATION OR NATIONS OF THE WORLD, OPERATING UNDER AND BY THE LAW OF NATIONS, OF THOSE AFFECTED OR INJURED PARTIES, DE JURE NATIONS, COUNTRIES, FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, MILITARY POWERS, POWERS OF GOVERNMENT WHERE SEATS OF GOVERNMENT ARE FOUND EVER LAWFUL,

XXXIX. OF THOSE DE FACTO INTERESTS OF THE ILLUSORY EXISTENCE OF THE ALLEGED OR PROPOSED UNITED STATES, ITS CHARTERED VEIL OF ITS PROPOSED CONSTITUTION BEING FINALLY PENETRATED AND SET ASIDE;

XXXX. WHICH PENETRATION OF ITS VEIL AND THE SETTING ASIDE OF THE LAWFUL AUTHORIZATION OF THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES CENTRAL GOVERNMENT'S TRANSFER OF ALL OF ITS UNLAWFULLY ESTABLISHED CREDITORS' DEBTS, AND OTHER LIABILITIES –

XXXXI. – IS TO AFFECT, FORTHWITH, ALL OF THE FOLLOWING MATTERS WHICH SHALL HAVE BEEN, HERETOFORE, INTERNATIONALLY PERCEIVED BY ALL OR ANY NATIONS, AS PER THE OFFICIAL OFFICERS, OFFICIALS, AGENCIES AND AGENTS, EMPLOYEES, AND OTHER ACTORS, AND ACTS OF THE DE FACTO NATION OF THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;

XXXXII. ON THE FOLLOWING THREE (3) PAGES, THE FRAUDULENT RESOLUTION WHICH FOLLOWED THE RATIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION ITSELF, SEPTEMBER 17, 1787, AS IN A SECOND SESSION THEREOF, EXISTING AS “A BODY OF OPINION” AND NOT AS “A BODY OF LAW,” HAS BEEN SET FORTH FOR REVIEW OF THE PEOPLE FIRST, THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD SECOND, AND THE JUDGES OF THE LAND, HAVING HAD SOME RESPONSIBILITY TO HAVE FOUND THESE THINGS OUT LONG BEFORE THIS TIME, AND DONE SOMETHING, WITH ALL THEIR ALLEGED SUPERIOR LEGAL KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING, TO

CORRECT THEM, EVEN IF BY WAY OF “EXTRAORDINARY OCCASION,” DULY LAST.

CONTINUING ON, BY SHOWING THE ACTUAL SEPTEMBER 17, 1787, SECOND SESSION, UNLAWFUL ACT, WHICH BROUGHT ABOUT THE BLINDSIDING OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION AND THE WRONGFUL ORGANIZING OF THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES TO BEGIN WITH, WAS DONE BY VILE, UNLAWFUL, RESOLUTION, BY OPINION, IT ITS ORIGINAL WRITTEN FORM:

**Present
The States of**

New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Mr. Hamilton from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia.

RESOLVED,

That the preceding Constitution be laid before the United States in Congress assembled, and that it is the opinion of this Convention, that it should afterwards be submitted to a Convention of Delegates, chosen in each State by the People thereof, under the Recommendation of its Legislature, for their Assent and Ratification; and that each Convention assenting to, and ratifying the Same, should give Notice thereof to the United States in Congress assembled.

Resolved, That it is the Opinion of this Convention, that as soon as the Conventions of nine States shall have ratified this Constitution, the United States in Congress assembled should fix a Day on which Electors should be appointed by the States which shall have ratified the same, and a Day on which the Electors should assemble to vote for the President, and the Time and Place for commencing Proceedings under this Constitution. That after such Publication the Electors should be appointed, and the Senators and Representatives elected: That the Electors should meet on the Day fixed for the Election of the President, and should transmit their Votes certified, signed, sealed and directed, as the Constitution requires, to the Secretary of the United States in Congress assembled, that the Senators and Representatives should convene at the Time and Place assigned, that the Senators should appoint a President of the Senate, for the sole Purpose of receiving, opening and counting the Votes for President: and that after he shall be chosen, the Congress, together with the President, should, without Delay, proceed to execute this Constitution.

By the Unanimous Order of the Convention,

Go Washington, Presidt.

W. Jackson, Secretary

WARNING. The Same Foregoing Page – Rewritten.

This Is NOT A Part Of The Constitution Itself!

(IN RED = EDITING DISCERNED)

Present The States of

New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Mr. Hamilton from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia.

[BY RECKLESS AND ERRONEOUS-OPINION] RESOLVED,

That the preceding Constitution be laid before the **Confederate** United States in Congress assembled (**before the States have even ratified it – so where were the elected members of Congress supposed to be from YET**), and that it is the **opinion (bad opinion)** of this **Convention**, that it should **afterwards (cart before the horse?)** be submitted to a Convention of Delegates, chosen in each State by the People thereof, under the Recommendation of its Legislature, for their Assent and Ratification; and that each Convention assenting to, and ratifying the Same, should give Notice thereof to the United States in Congress (**which was to be established, outside of the Constitution, WHERE, HOW, and BY WHOM?**) assembled. **OHHH, They mean – Lay it before the Continental Congress – that’s who *that* “Congress Assembled” was to really be, not **the Congress** provided for in the Constitution itself as *having* such a Continental Congress Power and Included Authority! **Good One!****

Resolved, That it is the **Opinion** of this **Convention** (**not any de jure Congress**), that as soon as the Conventions of nine States shall have ratified this Constitution, (**not waiting to obtain the land for the Seat of the Government as directed and required of Clause 17 of Section 8, Article I**) the United States in Congress **assembled** - {[and how did the de jure Congress get elected to do that without being elected first by those Same States? And **WHERE** and **WHEN** were they to Assemble, and **Who**, which State(s), which official persons in which States were to make **THAT** decision, or **Quo Warranto**, or **By What Authority?**]} - should fix a Day on which Electors should be appointed by the States which shall have ratified the same, and a Day on which the Electors should assemble to vote for the President, **and the Time and Place for commencing Proceedings under this Constitution**. That **after** such Publication the Electors should be appointed, and the Senators and Representatives elected: That the Electors should meet on the Day fixed for the Election of the President, and should transmit their

Votes certified, signed, sealed and directed, as the **Constitution** requires, to the **Secretary of the United States** (a new named Officer, **redefining** the President of the Senate as the Secretary of the United States?) in (*wherever) Congress (is) assembled (**but NOT to the Seat of the Government of the United States – Clause 17, Section 8, Article I and as called for in Article II, Section 1, Clause 3 ?**), that the Senators and Representatives should convene at the Time and Place assigned (**by WHO? – NO State(s) in the Constitution had Superior authority, or ANY authority, to Make That Decision!**), that the Senators should appoint a President (**pro tempore**) of the Senate, for the **sole** Purpose of receiving, opening and counting the Votes for President (**which denies all acceptance of land for the Seat of Government**): and that after he shall be chosen, the Congress, together with the President, (**allegedly inaugurated on April 30, 1789**) should, without Delay, proceed to execute this Constitution. **AGAIN Denies ACCEPTANCE of the Constitution, March 4, 1789, RIGHT THERE!** *So, if they all jumped on a ship and went over to London, they could “assemble” there???

By the Unanimous Order (“**Order**”? **under the Authority? of the Opinion**) of the Convention,
A De facto Amendment

Go Washington, [**unsuspecting**] Presidt.
W. Jackson, [**unsuspecting**] Secretary

=====

By the foregoing Expose of the Resolution - by separate session after the proposed Constitution’s ratification - of **September 17, 1787**, done without any significant recorded debate (where are the historical, well published records of any such debates as would have been expected and required?), the **Proposed Constitution** ratified as of that same date was **blindsided**, rendering **all proceedings** thereafter as **unlawful**, or **de facto, unveiling a nation of men and not a nation of laws, constituting Convention Fraud** upon the people of the Several States, their governments, and upon the entire World, each and every De Jure nation thereof, itself.

THE NATION THAT NEVER WAS

KNOW YE ALL NATIONS, AND ALL GOVERNMENTS, AND ALL PEOPLE THEREOF, BY THESE PRESENTS;

UNTO THOSE WHOSE AUTHORITY IT IS, AND SHALL BE, UPON THE SAID LAWFUL TRANSFER, OF SUCH LIABILITIES, AFORESTATED, IN THEIR CONSIDERATION OF THEIR, NATIONS', OWN RIGHTS AS SUCH RIGHTS MAY APPEAR TO BE;

I. IT SHALL BE, AND INHERENTLY IS, THE RIGHT OF THE SAME POWERS OF DE JURE NATIONS, TO – THE SAME AS WITH ANY INSTITUTION'S CHARTER WHOSE VEIL HAS BEEN PENETRATED AND SET ASIDE REVEALING INSTEAD UNLAWFULLY ACTING OFFICIALS THEREIN FOR REMEDY AND COMPENSATION OF ALL LIABILITIES AND DEBTS OWED TO THE SAME – PURSUE COLLECTION OF ALL DEBTS, IN MONIES WHERE LAWFUL AND EXISTENT, OR WHERE NOT EXISTENT, THEN IN PROPERTIES AND VALUES OF PROPERTIES;

II. FIRST, THE RIGHT TO LIEN SAME, COMMENCING PRIMARILY WITH AND AGAINST ALL OF THE OFFICIALS, OFFICERS, AUTHORITIES, AGENCIES, AGENTS, PARTNERS, CONSPIRATORS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE EXPOSED, PENETRATED, AND SET ASIDE, DE FACTO UNITED STATES CENTRAL GOVERNMENT;

III. AND SECOND, THEREAFTER, DEVOLVING TO, WHERE ANY ABOVE REFERENCE DEBT OR OTHER LIABILITY SHALL NOT BE SATISFIED, THE ACTORS OF AND WITHIN THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE 13 ORIGINAL STATES, BEING UNLAWFULLY ACTING COMPONENTS CONSTITUTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNLAWFUL, DECEPTIVE OR FICTITIOUS APPEARANCE OF A LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED NATION OF THE WORLD, UNTIL ALL DEBTS AND LIABILITIES CAUSED TO EXIST BY THE FOREGOING SAME SHALL BE FOREVER SATISFIED IN FULL:

[1] AFFECTS, AND SHALL AFFECT, ALL TREATIES IN WHICH THE FICTITIOUS OR DE FACTO UNITED STATES CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, SHALL HAVE BECOME ANY PARTY TO, OR UNDULY INFLUENCED AS A RESULT OF ITS DE FACTO-NESS, INCLUDING ALL MUTUAL DEFENSE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN ITS DE FACTO SELF AND OTHER DE JURE NATIONS, AND DENIES, AND SHALL DENY, THE DE FACTO UNITED STATES CENTRAL GOVERNMENT ITS SEAT AMONG ALL OTHER HONORABLE DE JURE NATIONS OF THE WORLD, WHEREVER THEY MAY BE;

[2] AFFECTS, AND SHALL AFFECT, ALL OFFICIAL UNITED STATES MONEY AND NOTES FOR VALUE, WHETHER AS COIN, OR AS MONEY-DEBT OBLIGATIONS, WHETHER IN CIRCULATION OR NOT IN CIRCULATION. THE EURO DOLLAR OR OTHER LAWFUL WORLDWIDE MONIES MUST BE TAKEN IN ABSOLUTE FAVOR INSTEAD OF THE NEWLY DISCOVERED AS DE FACTO, OR ILLEGITIMATE THOUGH IN FACTUAL EXISTENCE, OF THE DE FACTO U.S. DOLLAR. ANY DE JURE NATION OR COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE OR FINANCIAL INSTITUTION WHO SHALL TENDER OR HOLD SAME SHALL DO SO AT ITS UTTER RISK OF TOTAL LOSS OF VALUE OF THE ENTIRE AMOUNT WHERE THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD SHALL CONCUR, THAT THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES CENTRAL GOVERNMENT WAS NEVER, AS OF YET, DULY ESTABLISHED, AND SO RENDERS THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES ITSELF, AS THOUGH A NATION, AS A NATION ACTING ENTIRELY UNDER COLOR OF NATION, WITHOUT LAWFUL LEGACY AND AUTHORITY TO ACT WITH ANY OTHER DE JURE NATION OF HONOR, WHATSOEVER;

[3] BECAUSE THE PROPOSED, BUT DE FACTO, UNITED STATES CENTRAL GOVERNMENT'S ISSUED OR BORROWED-REPRESENTATIVE MONIES ARE ALL DE FACTO, DOWN TO THE LAST ALLEGED DOLLAR, AFFECTS PAYMENT OF EARNINGS AND SALARIES TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, AT ALL LEVELS, FOR SERVICES RENDERED OR TO BE

RENDERED, AND TO ALL CONTRACTS AND LAWS ALLEGING OR PROVIDING FOR RETIREMENTS THEREOF;

[4] AFFECTS, AND SHALL AFFECT, ALL FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF OTHER NATIONS TO THE PROPOSED, BUT DE FACTO, UNITED STATES, REVERSING SUCH ALLEGED LOANS, OR DE FACTO VALUED LOANS, BACK AGAINST THE DE FACTO UNITED STATES INSTEAD, RENDERING THE DE FACTO UNITED STATES CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AS THE DEBTOR TO WHOMEVER ITS DE FACTO MONIES, REPRESENTED BY SUCH DE FACTO LOANS, WERE SPENT WITH, AS THE RIGHTFUL DE JURE CREDITORS IN DUE COURSE;

[5] AFFECTS, AND SHALL AFFECT, ALL TRADE AGREEMENTS, AND COMMERCIAL AGREEMENTS, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE, WHERE THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WAS EVER HELD TO HAVE STANDING AS THOUGH A DE JURE NATION AMONG NATIONS;

[6] AFFECTS, AND SHALL AFFECT, ALL MILITARY CONTRACTS, BOTH OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT AND MILITARY PAY, AT ALL RANK LEVELS, AND ALL CIVILIAN OCCUPATIONS WHICH HAVE RELIED UPON SUCH MILITARY CONTRACTS FOR THEIR LAWFUL PAYMENT FOR MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT, AND SERVICES RENDERED;

[7] AFFECTS, AND SHALL AFFECT, ALL CASES OF ALLEGED UNITED STATES COURTS, OF THE PROPOSED SUPREME COURT AND COURTS INFERIOR THERETO, ACTING UNDER COLOR OF NATION, ACTING UNDER COLOR OF SUPREME COURT AND COURTS INFERIOR THERETO;

[8] AFFECTS, AND SHALL AFFECT, LAWS ESTABLISHED UNDER COLOR OF CONGRESS AND COLOR OF PRESIDENT, INCLUSIVE OF LAWS PERTAIN TO ALLEGED TREASON AND OTHER HEINOUS CRIMES AS OTHERWISE PROVIDED FOR UNDER THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION

[9] AFFECTS, AND SHALL AFFECT, ALL ALLEGED PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS, WHICH ALLEGED EXECUTIVE ORDERS ARE DETERMINED, IN ADDITION TO THEIR UTTER FAILURE OF CERTAIN AFORESTATED CONSTITUTION TESTS, EXISTS LIKEWISE AS DE FACTO, BEING ISSUED UNDER COLOR OF PRESIDENT OF COLOR OF NATION, BY THE DE FACTO UNITED STATES;

[10] DEVOLVING DIRECTLY TO THE LAWS OF THE ALLEGED THIRTEEN (13) STATES OF THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES, AND INDIRECTLY TO THE THIRTY-SEVEN (37) ALLEGED OTHER STATES, AFFECTS, AND SHALL AFFECT, THE OFFICIAL ISSUANCE OF ALL BIRTH CERTIFICATES, DEATH CERTIFICATES, EDUCATIONAL CERTIFICATES, PATENTS, COPYRIGHTS, TRADEMARK RIGHTS OR USE RIGHTS, IF ANY UNDER PROPER DISCERNMENT OF THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES' LAWS APPLICABLE THERETO, WHERE ALL THE FOREGOING SAME WERE BELIEVED, THOUGH IN GOOD FAITH, TO HAVE BEEN EFFECTUATED WITHIN A LAWFUL STATE OF A DE JURE UNITED STATES, FINDING IN FACT INSTEAD, DUE TO THE BAD FAITH ACTS OF THE ILLEGALLY CONVENING CONGRESS ON MARCH 4, 1789 AND THEREAFTER, THAT SUCH STATES WERE NOT, IN LAWFUL FACT, ADMITTED TO THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES, AND THAT ALL SUCH SAID ACTS THEMSELVES, WERE AND ARE DE FACTO IN THEIR LEGALITY, ALONG WITH THE DE FACTO UNITED STATES ITSELF;

[11] AFFECTS, AND SHALL AFFECT, ALL LAWS THOUGHT TO EXIST AS A MATTER OF ANY RIGHT OF THE PROPOSED, DE FACTO UNITED STATES, AS BEING SECURED FOR THE SAME UNDER THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION THEREFOR, DIRECTLY RESULTING IN:

1] THE DISSOLUTION, FORTHWITH, OF ITS PROPOSED NAVY, AS THOUGH A LAWFUL NAVY, EXISTING SOLELY UNDER COLOR OF NAVY, REQUIRING THE SAME TO WITHDRAW FROM SUCH

PLACES AS THE SAME MAY HAVE BEEN UNLAWFULLY DISPATCHED TO, BACK TO THE COASTLINES OF THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES WHERE SUCH COLOR OF NAVY PROPOSED AUTHORITY WAS FIRST ISSUED FORTH FROM;

2] THE DISSOLUTION, FORTHWITH, OF ITS PROPOSED ARMY AS THOUGH A LAWFUL ARMY, EXISTING SOLELY UNDER COLOR OF ARMY, REQUIRING THE SAME TO WITHDRAW FROM SUCH PLACES AS THE SAME MAY HAVE BEEN UNLAWFULLY DISPATCHED TO, BACK TO WITHIN THE BORDERS OF THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES, TO THE HOMES OF THE PROPOSED SOLDIERS THEREOF, WHERE SUCH COLOR OF ARMY PROPOSED AUTHORITY WAS FIRST ISSUED FORTH FROM;

3] THE DENIAL OF THE PROPOSED, DE FACTO, CONGRESS, FROM UTILIZING OR RELYING UPON THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION, TO SET THE PUNISHMENTS FOR TREASON, AND THE DENIAL OF EITHER THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES OR ANY PROPOSED STATE THEREOF, ALL BEING LIKEWISE DE FACTO, TO HONOR ANY LAW THAT EVER PERTAINED TO SUCH PART OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION, EXCEPT THAT THE THIRTEEN (13) ORIGINAL STATES OF THE CONFEDERACY, BEING YET STILL THE ONLY TRUE AUTHORITY OVER THE SAME, SHALL SUCH AUTHORITY OVER THE SAME THIRTEEN (13) STATES AS THE CONFEDERACY DID IN 1776, AND THEREAFTER, BUT WHICH LAWS PERTAINING TO TREASON AGAINST A PROPOSED UNITED STATES, NOT BEING SUPPORTABLE BY A PROPOSED CONSTITUTION, FAILS AT ANY OTHER PLACE EXCEPT THE FOREGOING THIRTEEN (13) STATES – NOT BEING OF A DE JURE UNITED STATES NATION;

4] THE DISSOLUTION, FORTHWITH, OF ALL ALLEGED UNITED STATES DEPARTMENTS, BUREAUS,

COMMISSIONS, AGENCIES, FUNCTIONS, OPERATIONS, OFFICERS, OFFICIALS, AGENTS, PRINCIPALS, EMPLOYEES, AND OTHERS, WHOSE CURRENT EXISTENCE IS FOUND TO BE IN EITHER ANY OF THE SEVERAL STATES, WHETHER THE EXISTENCE OF ANY SUCH STATE SHALL BE DETERMINED AS DE JURE AS AN ORIGINALLY EXISTING STATE, OR DE FACTO AS A RESULT OF ANY OTHER ACTS OF A PROPOSED, DE FACTO CONGRESS ACTING UNDER COLOR OF CONGRESS, OR WITHIN ANY OTHER NATION OR NATION-STATE AT ANY OTHER PLACE IN THE WORLD WHERE THE SAME MAY HAVE GONE TO, REQUIRING THAT ALL SUCH PERSONNEL OF OR FOR THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES, DE FACTO NATION, RETURN TO THEIR HOMES WHERE THEY ORIGINALLY RESIDED OR HAD DOMICILE PRIOR TO THEIR EMPLOYMENT OR CONTRACT WITH THE DE FACTO UNITED STATES, IMPOSTER NATION, ALL OF THE FOREGOING SAME HAVING BEEN AN ACTING PART OF THE NATION THAT NEVER WAS.

IV. THE STANDING, OR LACK OF STANDING, OF FRAUD.

I. Power, TRUE Power, being a Vital Essence of Life Itself, is a Force of Nature and Nature's LAW that the Entire World has long quested for.

II. Among the TRUE Powers of the Earth, as we "sail upon the waters of life," we look to those TRUE Powers which are of LAW to guide us through and past such "dark waters and skies" that may beguile us, or deceive us, in order to capture us, and bring us dashing and crashing upon the rocks, wrecked to our utter ruin and damnation rather than to sustain us for the very purpose of Life Itself, and Not Life Itself for its own sake only, but for good Life, the Best Life, that we can all possibly make it or have it be.

III. Among these great looked for qualities and hoped for expectations, we take the time to Ponder Certain Questions that may have clouded our judgment and betrayed our understanding, that have made us, not wise,

“For Wisdom is the Application of the Heart to Understanding.”

IV. Because we, all of us of the World wherever we may be, are so often betrayed in Life by that thing we call “defraudment,” or “Fraud,” thus being at a minimum, a betrayal or a defraudment of Life, a defraudment of Liberty, a defraudment of Property, a defraudment of good expectations, and a defraudment of Rights, both Granted Rights and Inherent Rights, of and to all good things to come, we must Focus upon this Question of Fraud, and Frauds, and Forever Conquer It, and Put It Beneath Our Very Feet.

V. **THEREFORE**, This Next Section IS Dedicated AND Ordained For This Purpose, To Bring About The Condition That Will Provide The POWER – To ALL Those Who Justly Seek It And Have Lawful (NOT “Legal”) Need For It – TO: (1) Reverse Frauds That DO, And Yet Will For A Time, Exist; And (2) To STOP Those That Come or Are Brought Before Us – IN THEIR TRACKS; AND (3) To Punish Them By Prudence, or Wisdom, or Understanding, That We Ourselves Do NOT Err In Judgment, As Have Those In Our Past, Too Reckless, Too Unconscionable, To Take The Precious Time To Do This Very Thing That We, OURSELVES, HERE , Are About To Do.

VI. Focusing Upon the Question of Fraud, we ask, **WHAT is FRAUD?**

VII. We Answer. Among Other Things, Fraud is a Lie, whether it be a Big Lie or a little lie; being a *Falsehood*, big or small, a False Standing, to the greatest and to the smallest – ALL; UnConscionable, and *made to appear* as genuine, or legitimate, or lawful, *even though* the Fraud - for the moment - *may have* been “gotten away with” by the - **False Standing** (for Which the **Fraud** may be Justly Accused) allowing the same to appear as “legal,” even though *still*, Never Lawful.

VIII. What, we then ask, Is STANDING?

IX. **We Answer.** STANDING is the Unqualified, Unchallengable, Right to STAND in a Place and at a Time, and to SPEAK, and to Speak Forth, unto any and all others that are there before them; and in having the Right to Speak, they have also the Inherent or Subsequently Unimpeachable Right to Be HEARD, and From that Hearing, the Unimpeachable Right to be CONSIDERED, as to what was Said by he or she having STANDING.

X. **And We Answer Further,** that the Lack of Standing is the Irreversible, Inescapable, Demanded Mandate for Denial that There be NO Right to Speak; NO Right to be Heard; and NO Right to be Considered, Whether One Speaks or Has Spoken At All, or Not.

XI. Here is a QUESTION, and Questions, for the World Itself, to ponder.

WHEN does Fraud have STANDING?

WHEN does Fraud have STANDING in a courtroom?

WHEN does Fraud have STANDING in a legislature?

WHEN does Fraud have STANDING with the executive?

WHEN does Fraud have STANDING in a nation?

XII. The Answer(s).

Fraud NEVER has STANDING (has NO Right to Speak).

Fraud NEVER has STANDING in a courtroom.

Fraud NEVER has STANDING in a legislature.

Fraud NEVER has STANDING with the executive.

Fraud NEVER has STANDING in a nation.

XIII. AND THE LAW OF STANDING IS UNIVERSAL, OR WITHOUT END. ANY OTHER CLAIM THAN THIS IS, WITHOUT STANDING.

XIV. Therefore, whenever we find Fraud in any courtroom's case, we must irreversibly conclude that Not One Word which was ever Spoken (or else Written, Same As "Spoken," By Paper) — for the Benefit of Fraud — had, or has, the Right to STAND and be HEARD, and therefore must be exorcised (or Cast Away or Outward) from the case itself, leaving only what is left therein as having STANDING, or the Right to Speak, and be Heard, and Considered, that is The Truth, *whatever* that Actual Truth may be.

xv. The same thing goes with the legislature. **Not One Word** which represents Fraud has and had STANDING therein, and **when Discovered,** must be exorcised from the legislature, from the laws alleged by it, and thereafter, going to the executive who is expected and required to enforce it, must be Cast Out of *that claim* for government also. For *this* is True Jurisprudence, and this is The LAW.

xvi. The Casting Out of Fraud. Fraud must be Cast Out, wherever it has been caused to Falsely Stand, whenever it was caused to Falsely Stand there, even though such False Standing may not have been known or understood at the time of its occurrence.

xvii. To do otherwise would be paramount, if a judge or a jury were to perform it, as though saying, in effect, "No, let the Fraud Stand there, and we will *knowingly* 'listen' to the Fraud, and heed its words, that the Fraud itself may be made part of us, because we did not reject it when it was made known to us."

xviii. What then, O World, becomes of he or she who would, with knowledge, allow a Fraud to STAND in his or her presence, in a courtroom, in a legislature, in the executive, in the nation?

xix. They are *ruined,* and become of themselves, False, *without Hope, except* they repent of that same UnLawful giving of Standing - where none could be accorded to the Contemnor claiming **False Standing** before all.

xx. AND, We Are To Duly Ask, WHERE ELSE *May* A FRAUD Not STAND / Not Have STANDING?

xxi. We Answer: Look To The Last – A FRAUD NEVER has STANDING – In A [De Jure] Nation; THEREFORE, a Fraud NEVER has STANDING, or has NO STANDING - EVER, on the Nation’s highways and streets; a Fraud has NO STANDING in Any Place of Business (Denying ALL Claims for Rights to Steal by All Thieves, in All Their Forms); A Fraud has NO STANDING in or About the Home or Place of ANY Person’s Home or Place of residing or having domicile; a Fraud has NO Standing in oil fields; a Fraud has NO Standing in a back room; a Fraud has NO Standing in a closet wherein one may whisper to another; a Fraud has NO STANDING in Any Other Place in A [de jure] Nation that IS, Not Referred To Herein.

xxii. FOR IF WE WERE TO ASK OF A JUDGE, “Judge, if a Fraud came to your home, and came to stand therein, inside your home’s own walls, and you came to recognize the Fraud as the Fraud that it was and is, Would You – Continue To Allow it to STAND THERE in YOUR Presence, OR Would YOU Demand That IT Leave? Be Cast OUT of YOUR Own Place?”

**xxiii. We Answer, as we Know That YOU Would Answer:
“I WOULD *NOT!*” “Allow it to STAND There!”**

xxiv. And IF We Asked A Judge if He or She Would Allow a Fraud to Come and STAND in His/Her CHAMBERS, We Answer Concurrently that such Judge Would Tend to Be Outraged, or Else Indignant, That FRAUD had Come to Deliberately Stand Before Him/Her – In Said CHAMBERS.

xxv. AND, IF WE WERE TO ASK THE SAME THING OF A KING, WHAT WOULD THE KING SAY?

XXVI. We, Again, Answer - With Understanding, and With Purpose: The King Would Tremble with Outrage and Indignation that There *Dared* Be One to Darken His CHAMBERS, and Would Cause that Such a Fraud BE Cast Out, and Punished according to the degree of the Fraud itself, that had been attempted to be Imposed, or else Was Imposed, Upon Him.

XXVII. THUS AND THEREFORE, IN ALL OF THESE THINGS We Find That **FRAUD MUST At All Times BE Cast Out OR Else Denied STANDING Among Us**, Except That Which Did the Defrauding First Repent – or Make Restitution – to such degree as he or she might be able, Hoping for Grace, which Grace goes also to the Principle we call Equity;

XXVIII. FOR “Grace Is The Slide-Rule of Mercy,” Grace being Also that which we call, as Equity – by its own measure, Justice.

XXVIX. Thus may those seeking Equity, Find it in Grace’s Own Slide-Rule, According to the Day in which they shall seek it, whether it shall be a millennia; one’s own lifetime; or the very day in which one has made it through to any just extent. So Be It.

IV. ALL BORDERS OPEN. THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES, OF AMERICA, BEING A DE FACTO NATION ONLY AT THIS TIME, THERE BEING, AS TO ANY CLAIM FOR A DE JURE NATION, NO NATION OF THE UNITED STATES AT ALL, THEREFORE, WHETHER THE BORDERS CLAIMED TO EXIST ARE FOR THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES OR ANY ONE OF THE SEVERAL STATES, EACH AND ALL OF THE SAME, ARE LIKEWISE DE FACTO AS TO THEIR EXISTENCE, CONSEQUENTLY, ALL BORDERS OF AND WITHIN THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES BEING LAWFULLY NON-EXISTENT, **ALL BORDERS ARE OPEN** AS TO THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES, OR EITHER AND ALL OF THEM.

V. **BE IT FURTHER DECREED, PROCLAIMED, AND RECOGNIZED**, THAT ALL DE JURE NATIONS OF THE EARTH, NO LONGER INCLUSIVE OF THE DE FACTO, PROPOSED UNITED STATES, WITHDRAW FROM ACCEPTING, AND BOYCOTT ITS, DE FACTO NATION'S, CURRENCY FOR PAYMENT OF ANY KIND, THAT THE UNITED NATIONS DISPEL IT, DE FACTO UNITED STATES, FROM AMONG THEIR HONORED DE JURE NATIONS' RANKS, THAT ALL DE JURE NATIONS OF THE WORLD JOIN TOGETHER IN REQUIRING THAT THE SAID IMPOSTER NATION, DE FACTO UNITED STATES, PROVE BEYOND ANY DOUBT THAT IT WAS ESTABLISHED AS SUCH A DE JURE NATION UNDER ITS OWN SELF-PROCLAIMED SUPREME LAW OF ITS LANDS, THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AND NOT OUTSIDE OR BY ANY CIRCUMVENTION OF THE SAME.

VI **ALL DEBTS OWED** BY THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES-NATION ARE NOW DETERMINED NOT OWED TO ANY INSTITUTION OR NATION WHO, HAVING BEEN LEAD TO BELIEVE THE NATION BEFORE THEM TO BE BONA FIDE AND NOT DISINGENUINE, OR ILLEGITIMATE, WAS DUPED INTO LENDING IT EITHER CREDIT OR MONEY, IN ANY FORM BY WHICH THAT SAME MAY HAVE BEEN LENT.

VII. **THE CHARTERED VEIL** OF THE ALLEGED UNITED STATES-NATION HAVING BEEN THUS **PENETRATED** AND SET ASIDE, REVEALING THAT THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION THEREFOR REMAINS YET IN A PROPOSED STATE OF BEING AND NOT YET IN A TRUE AND DE JURE STATE OF EXISTENCE AS A NATION AMONG NATIONS, THE PROPOSED UNITED STATES, ALONG WITH ITS PROPOSED CONSTITUTION, REMAINS AS, AN IMPOSTER NATION, BEING THEREFORE, WITHOUT QUESTION AS TO LAWFUL FACT:

A GREAT EXPANSION OF TIME, NO MATTER THE TIME IN YEARS, IN CENTURIES, IN MILLENNIA, DOES NOTHING TO ELIMINATE OR REDUCE THE CONDITION OF THAT WHICH HAS BEEN, OR IS, IMPOSTERED.

THE SAME APPLIES TO THE PROPOSED, OR ELSE, UNITED STATES-NATION OF AMERICA,

THE SAME BEING, WITHOUT PERFECTIBLE DENIAL,

AN IMPOSTER NATION, A DE FACTO NATION,

AND THEREFORE SINCERELY BEING

THE NATION THAT NEVER WAS

