The Republican Form of Government TEST.

PREFACE. The Purpose of a Republican Form of Government is to Serve the People for which it was created, NOT to serve itself. This is the Supreme Inherent Principle of a Republican Form of Government. Any deviation towards becoming a self-serving government, however small or inconsequential, is a Corruption and a Violation of this Right, and constitutes a chipping away of the Rights of the People, all, at large.

Recognizing that a People endowed with Equally Shared Equal Rights have the natural inclination to progress and improve their lives ongoing, it is the Unyielding Inherent Right of the People, to be served by a Republican Form of Government, to have that Government ever increase its Perfection in Service, and to make that Perfection in Service ever available to those to whom it serves, to the least extent that it may be possible, without end.

Therefore, In Continuation of the foregoing Foreword, it was in fact the reality of the time that the True Powers of the Constitution, the Great Ones, had to be hidden from those who would do it harm, and so were taken to the graves of those honored Founders who knew the Truth, being left only with the hope that a later generation would find them, Lost, True Powers, and discern them, and bring them forth, to Restore Them as they Should Have Been from the Beginning, as is now also before us, People/people, in part, in this, The Republican Form of Government TEST.

1.1 The Inherent First Duty of a Republican Form of Government, being a Government **For** the People, is to **Serve** the People, Not Itself;

1.2 Being a form of government that exists, not as a monarchy (ruled by the opinion and decision of one person), not as an oligarchy (ruled, ongoing, by the opinions and decisions of a small group of persons), but as a representative decision in law, or by laws, that represents many people. Consequently, a Republican Form of Government must not admit an/the opinion of one person only, as a ruler, or *as though* a ruler, but must include the representation of all of the opinions, in the collective, that it possibly can include, for The Greater Weight of Intelligence Is Valid.

2. As such, a Republican Form of Government - is made up of three primary elements. It is: 1) a government that represents directly the people for whom it is to serve, in all three (3) branches thereof, not just one or two branches; anything in any part of such government less than this is not a Republican Form of Government, and 2) a Republican Form of Government is derived from laws duly and fully passed, not from rules or policies set by any organization or agency or person thereunder, and 3) a Republican Form of Government is made up of three branches, legislative, executive, and juristic, over whom the People themselves have procedural authority to exercise due control and accountability.

3.1 A Republican Form of Government is a Government of LAW, or Laws; It is NOT a government of "Opinions," or "Personal Beliefs," or "Policy" or "Policies," or PERSONAL "Feelings," or "Impressions," or "Tastes," or "Notions," or "Whims," or "Game(s)," or "Code," or "Philosophies," or "Sentiment**(**s**)**," or "Slants," or "Personalities," or "'Elite Class' or 'Elite Ideology,'" or "Estimations," or "Convictions," or "Persuasions," or "Suppositions," or "Conjectures," or "Speculations," or "Theories," or "Personal Non-Factual Conclusions," or "Attitudes," or "Ideas," or "Sentiments," or "Views," or "Upbringings," and is, further, NOT "Federal," or "Practices," or "Social-Practices or Customs," or "Rulers," or "Rules that are not actual Law," or "Thoughts," or any form of personal or individual government or government process that, as with a monarchy, can be changed by a single decision on a whim or thought or idea. Additionally, it is Not a "federal" government or a "*federalized*" government, and is **NOT** a "feudalistic" or a "monarchistic" or a social or a military or an imperialistic or a communistic government, or a government run by an oligarchy or group of "rulers," nor is it parliamentary or parliamentary-like, its sovereignty being vested only within the people whom it serves. It, a Republican Form of Government, is about Laws and Laws alone, and it is, instead, based upon Laws, or that which all may count upon, indivisibly, and nothing less, pure and certain Laws that it is to operate by and under, else there be governmental error in applying the Law any other way except as law, as the Inherent Responsibility for the Law of the People so mandates, lest the same People be betrayed by anything more or less than this.

3.2 In continuation of the foregoing, a Republican Form of Government extends in scope, authority, and power, to the applied denial of law or requirement of law *as though* or *by* any function of government, inclusive of any procedure where contract law is involved but where such contract would not otherwise be lawfully binding when obtained under duress of government threat of punishment but would be set aside for any other person in contract under ordinary contract conditions between civil parties.

4.1 A Republican Form of Government ***Always*** Has Three (3) distinct and separate branches of government – over whom the People for which such branches of government are to serve, are- as a people (as in "We, the People", not We the Individuals) – not as individuals, as we see by the very examples of the first 13 Original States who were to make up the new proposed United States-nation or Union of the Several States, that none of them had less than 3 separate branches of government at the time they each proposed to become States of the proposed United States.

4.2 Nor did any other [State] that followed thereafter, when being "admitted," have less than 3 branches of government set forth in their constitution, exemplifying by that fact that it was understood that a Republican Form of Government, in addition to the two foregoing recognized principles that pertain to its essential structure as to its Republican Form, within its State constitution, an inherent document crucial to its Republican Form formation, can be identified by its having an executive, a legislative, and a jurist (not particularly a judicial) branch of government for the ongoing benefit of the people it must serve.

5. And it is how the people of a given local area are directly represented by those said same Laws. Laws, NOT "policies," NOT opinions (of the one), and so forth as set forth above. Anything more or less than this, is corrupt, evil, and is UnConstitution[al], and exists as a matter of **Legislative Abuse**, or other governmental abuse, and is the crime against the sovereignty of this nation known as Contempt of Constitution.

6. A Republican Form of Government is a government that already contains within its character and form, from the first instance that it is, without any external influence, command, or mandate, *electively* formed, the power, inherent to every person coming within its scope, of "due process,"

from the inherent Law of Balance, not needing any amendment to a proposed constitution to provide for such said power *and right* to and of "due process;"

7. This because of the manner and process in which the vested Republican Form law comes to be laid upon the People to whom it is to pertain, the Vesting Process coming to settle over the such People, each and every one of them indiscriminately, becoming thusly, in its conclusion, Equally Shared Equal Rights, *Empowered Forthwith* upon Each of Them *Concurrently* or that is, equally and at the same time.

8. Since the vesting process that leads to the establishment of a Republican Form of Government's Equally Shared Equal Rights, it also stands that Equal Protection Under The Law is an inherently existing fundamental right, not requiring an Amendment to grant or extend such protection rights to the People whom such government is ordained to serve.

9. Because Equal Protection Under The Law is an inherently vested, incorporated, mandatory element of a Republican Form of Government, it is a likewise mandate that a Republican Form of Government deny all forms of titles of unordained nobility, the People being denied any such ordination power where they themselves have not been ordained to it by any power higher than themselves, such forms of titles including being entitled to privileges or rights not imbued equally upon all others on an equal right to hold and exercise basis. This includes titles and entitlements from ancient England times to the present, and includes any claim for title of honor, among other titles, where honor is only assumed under a claim for law or practice or theory or custom, not proven as a matter of law sustaining fact, treated as honor only because the one attaining to such standing has done so in service and not in self-service to Equal Others as a Republican Form of Government requires. To this end regarding the alleged authorizing of any such titles of nobility for the use of or in Government, no form of school of learning, whether of law or any other form of knowledge, whether general or specific, or that which is obtained from any college or university, has the right under a Republican Form of Government to proclaim, grant, or extend to any person a title of nobility - that of a philosopher's degree not being a recognized title of nobility, which lawful Government itself cannot provide for a citizen protected by such Republican Government Form.

10. As a consequence of the manner in which a Republican Form of Government is **vested** in the People that it represents or pertains to, all of the People - each - existing as a Real Party In Interest in the way such Government executes or exercises its duties under the Law, there can exist no discriminatory right *or* power that provides an allowance for such Government to invade or entwine itself, whether or not indelibly, into the personal life or lives, either in a social sense or in a religious or a philosophical sense, of the People, or either of them.

11. As a matter of government, the People in a Republican Form of Government, as to anything existing outside of the Common Law, can only ordain government to directly represent them and not otherwise; therefore there can be no lawful claim for law or the use of any law that "Society," a non-governmental function or appearance of the People, has or can ordain or authorize any person or agency to perform either as a part of government, or as a representation or representative of government, or else as a private enterprise as though the same represents the People for whom such Society pertains.

12. This same Equally Shared Equal Rights of the People, between the People, for the People condition likewise excludes such financial reporting agencies, as have arisen as though agencies of undoubted power and right, claiming any quasi power as though from either the People or their government(s) in cases of debt where it must be and is understood as a part of any matter of debt consideration that (1) debt is not a matter of law, (2) neither is debt a matter of *claim*; but rather (3) debt is a matter of fact, and must be tried by a trier of fact, or by **Trial BY Jury** procedures only (Not ***Trial By/With Judge*** OR ***Trial By Board*** of Pardons), in order for there to exist *any* lawful and legal condition that would provide any right to act in defamation of the financial character of any person coming under the protection of a Republican Form of Government at all;

13. It also being the case corresponding to the foregoing, the purpose of a court not being to support, enhance, or diminish any particular commerce among the People, that inasmuch as it is a considered purpose of a court procedure to determine moral guilt or innocence, and not commercial worthiness or unworthiness, on any point of accusation of an accused for

potential "penal" purposes, and not ever for alleged "correctional" purposes, neither is any such a financial reporting agency entitled, in a Republican Form of Government, to represent or proclaim any of the People's affairs - any one of them - between them and government, for either any form of additional "punishment" by way of the lawful "penal" system or, even less, any form of alleged and entirely unlawful "correctional" system, whether or not as a matter of any claim or else proof of fact of either of them.

14. A Republican Form of Government cannot be vested selectively; to do so would be discriminatory to either a biased or a prejudicial degree, and would show predisposition of either a monarchy (one) or an oligarchy (small group) behind it, creating an instant defect or decadence of what a Republican Form of Government actually is. Such an unlawful vestment, if carried out, would inherently deny the existence of a Republican Form of Government, and would require a purging or correcting to the true required form the instant it was realized as to what was done to make it other than its true intended form was to naturally be, or that is, as aforestated, To Be Existent as an Equally Shared Equal Rights, or Concurrently (or equally and at the same time) Empowered Forthwith Form of Government brought about by this very natural vesting process.

15. By which vesting process, aforementioned, all of the People to be made part and party to a Republican Form of Government, being imbued with the precise same rights at the precise same time as every other one among them, by which condition "due process" becomes indelibly inlaid and inherently imposed upon those very same People and the Republican Form of Government that represents them, can proclaim, as any matter of law, that there is even one among them who is above or below them, no matter the claim of position or authority, or name or title, all of such as this being, ironclad, denied, there can exist no lawfully supportable claim among such People as to the idea that one person can or may own another person, for any length of time;

16. Or that is to say, because of how a Republican Form of Government exists and works, it becomes an exigent and mandatory matter that there exist **no condition or existence** of **Slaves** and **Slavery** among them, the People, and their Republican Form of Government;

17. For any claim that might propose that there exist a right, any right, of one person owning another person, is a claim of "belief," "personal belief," based upon a moral, or, as the case may actually be and is, immoral assertion, "I [person] have a right to own you [person]."

18. This claim instantly stands in **Violation** of a Republican Form of Government, which, based upon its very inherent nature of going to each and every person thereof *indiscriminately* and concurrently, denies even law enforcement, every kind, which - acting lawfully in pursuit of the Republican Form of Government inherent objective - is Disallowed to Enforce the Claim (personal ["moral/immoral"] belief) of the alleged Slave owner against the wrongfully acclaimed Slave, no matter the passage of any alleged "legal law" associated therewith.

19. Consequently, even though not known to this extent, there never was an Article IV, Section 4 "**right**" to continue ***or*** maintain Slavery to any extent, within the proposed United States, because any alleged right for slavery to EXIST - or to *continue* to EXIST - at all *ceased* on the day that the People gave their due respect to the support of the proposed Constitution for the United States, post September 17, 1787, with its included Article IV, Section 4 Guarantee or Mandate that every State exist under a Republican Form of Government, and not otherwise;

The "13th Amendment ***for*** Slavery," UnConstitutional***!***

20. As has been indicated, the 13th Amendment ***reconfirming*** and ***converting*** Slavery did nothing to abolish the **already *required* abolishment** of **slavery** and **slaves** - as was the pretense that was promulgated at that time, but rather, as a matter of express procedure, merely converted slavery from a commercial form to a governmental form, with all of the conspiratorial evils and ills that such conversion brought about in doing so, for before that time there existed no underlying cause for government, any government of or within the United States, to create conditions that would foment crime; after such acclaimed conversion of slavery from one form to the other there arose every conceivable and vile reason to make laws and social standards as to make crimes the # 1 subject everywhere that it could be thought of, the sad conclusion of the conspiracy to continue the slavery condition on post Civil

War, that being precisely what the acclaimed 13th Amendment **for** Slavery in fact did;

21. Which discernment of Truth brings to us and causes us to understand this Heavily Impacting Discovery also, that the said 13th Amendment **for** Slavery, by the fact that it constitutes a conversion of the one commercial form of Slavery to a governmental form of Slavery, is, by a particular virtue of Law and Vesting Procedure, UnConstitutional;

22. For as a matter of legal procedure and due process, it is impossible for a thing to be converted into one form from another form when the form converted from – Had, As A Matter of Supreme Law, NO Right To Exist . . . . . To Begin With! "End Of Story." "**End Of Slavery**!"

23. For as we have already discerned and brought forward, there existed NO True or Actual Right under Article IV, Section 4's Mandatory Guarantee for a Republican Form of Government for Slavery to Exist AT ALL, and whether or not this was precisely understood by even the People whom such Supreme Law was created or reveled to serve is irrelevant, and fails to sustain a claim for the UnLawful Conversion process that the wickedly produced 13th Amendment brought upon, not to, the People and their governments, irrespective of the long taught notion that Slavery was forever abolished by its "glorious" (actually "inglorious") addition to the proposed U.S. Constitution itself.

24. Consequently, the aforementioned 13th Amendment ***for*** Slavery is not UnLawful or UnConstitutional merely because it represents a conspiracy, *put into actuality*, to defraud the People of ***their*** Right, purchased by blood, to **NOT** have the vile practice of **SLAVERY** – in ANY form – continued in any form at all, let alone to deliberately **disguise** it and make it look ***almost*** "**righteous**" by making it, deceptively, a conclusion of "due process," but the 13th Amendment **For** Slavery is UnLawful and UnConstitutional because Article IV, Section 4 of the proposed Constitution, not having FIRST been Amended by any Amendment at all to allow for such a thing, denied Slavery to EXIST At All, Inherently, or By The Nature of WHAT a Republican Form of Government Truly Is. Therefore **Slavery**, in ***every*** aspect and condition which it does or may exist, **MUST BE** ABOLISHED; the

Inherent **Power** of and within the Article IV, Section 4 Republican Form of Government ***Demanding*** It.

25. It is impossible to convert a thing to exist in a state of "something" from out of "nothing," or "non-existence." But this is precisely the condition that this secretly vile and decadent, alleged amendment holds out for us; it supposes an ability to ***convert*** Slavery from a form that, under Article IV, Section 4's Republican Form of Government, has no Lawful and/or Legal Right to EXIST in the first place and so as a matter of that Form of Government Consequential Law does NOT Exist, - or is a Negative Law, that is, from the De Facto "Commercial" Slavery state — to a Consequently De Facto "Governmental" Slavery state, or is made a Positive from a Negative; the existence of a Negative that which absolutely can NOT be proven.

26. A **Negative**, being inescapably that which ***can not*** be proven, or is Not Provable - even to the **smallest** extent, makes the reasonably inferred *conversion process* alluded to, by implication, and incorporated in the 13th Amendment ***for*** Slavery, an Impossible Process altogether, and that which is **Impossible to Do** has NO Lawful or Legal Right to be Enforced to Any Extent, or Is **Not** Lawfully Enforceable, in the First Instance.

27. That which was never Lawful *as a matter of Law* to take place has never taken place (never took place) as a matter of Lawful Law.

ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4 — AN INSTANT, STATE BY STATE, SLAVERY ABOLISHMENT LAW.

28. There was a Founders' Good Conspiracy to **abolish** Slavery in the proposed United States just as had already been done in England and other parts of the world, which Good Conspiracy was embraced right within the pages of the proposed Constitution itself.

29. The first part of this quiet approach to Abolish Slavery was to not only Abolish its Maintenance within each and any of the Several States by use of the Power of Article IV, Section 4's Republican Form of Government Inherent Restraints, but to abolish the Slave Trade itself, by providing only 1 (one) Rule ("an . . Rule) for the issue of migration or naturalization (Clause 4,

Section 8, Article I), which Rule would allow the opportunity to deny the Slave Trade's continued importing of Slaves into the United States, but to make the passing of that one (1) Rule possible in the year of 1808, at which time the possibility of making one ("an") uniform Rule, to be extended to each and all of the Several States as was provided for; to make, by that One Rule, the Prohibition of the Importation of Slaves – into any of those Several States – The Law.

30. Unfortunately, due to an already reckless Congress, bent on doing whatever it elected to do at any time, not in strict compliance to the proposed Constitution, and in violation of both Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 (see The Illegal States-Forming TEST) and Article IV, Section 4 (The Republican Form of Government TEST), the alleged Congress began to manipulate and orchestrate, "politically," which States would be "allowed" to come in as "Slave States" and which ones would be "allowed" to come in as "Free States," there being NO Power to do such at Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 (see The Illegal States-Forming TEST), all of which blinded the foresight provided for at both Article I, Section 8 Clause 4 in conjunction with Article I, Section 9, Clause 1 (**abolishment of the Slave Trade** by "an .. Rule") and Article IV, Section 4 (the **abolishment of Slavery** already within the Several States), bringing the proposed United States-nation the same freedom from Slavery that England and certain other European countries had already achieved.

31. Accordingly, under the mandates of an Article IV, Section 4 – Republican Form of Government, each proposed State of the Several States who were orchestrated to come in – as "Slave States" would have been, and Article IV Section 4 was to be Constrained from Continued **Slavery** at the very moment that each such State became a proposed subscriber to the proposed United States Constitution, no matter its plans and intent to be a "Slave State" before and up to that time.

32. Resulting in the Legal Constitution[al] Fact that, had the proposed Constitution's Article IV, Section 4 simply been Enforced to every extent *as required* of a Republican Form of Government's true nature, then there would have never been a need or cry for any amendment to labor over the issue otherwise, and particularly an amendment whose abolishment of the

vile subject and condition of **Slavery** was a **Fraud**, a **Betrayal** as a **Heinous Act** to Continue **Slavery**, and a *Legal* **Procedural** *Impossibility* to begin with.

THE MANSFIELD CASE, England - June, 1772.

33. Judge Mansfield: "People are considered slaves when they are compelled to perform involuntary labor for a person or group, usually under conditions that make them socially inferior and deprive them of most of their rights or freedom."

Slavery Has Existed In Many Forms Throughout Time, Throughout The World.

34. It would be foolish and grossly incorrect and inaccurate to conclude that all forms of Slavery, for identifying Slavery purposes, were based upon Roman law, for that would conclude that, in all of the world's history only Romans had Slaves. Most obviously, all Slavery forms were not purely Roman in nature, for the vile and decadent figure of Slavery reared its ugly head in the civilized nations of China, Japan, and other parts of Asia, and of Greece, Germany, France, India, Egypt, Israel, Arabia, Portugal, France, Spain, Russia, and Turkey, and in many, many other nations, large and small, where Slavery existed other than as Romans in Italy defined Slavery to be, in the days of the Caesars thereof.

Recent Conditions of World Slavery, Continued, Reported.

35. When a ship carrying hundreds of people was recently turned away from Benin, Africa, officials suspected that the children on board were human Slaves. The incident once again brought attention to the problem of Slavery. At this moment, millions of men, women, and children—roughly twice the population of Rhode Island (once the largest Slave-trading State in U.S. history)—are being held against their will as Modern-Day Slaves.

36. Sometimes referred to as bonded laborers (because of the debts owed their masters), public perception of modern Slavery is often confused with reports of workers in low-wage jobs or inhumane working conditions. However, modern-day Slaves differ from these workers because they are actually held in physical bondage (they are shackled, held at gunpoint, or else ***threat*** of gunpoint, etc.).

37. Modern-day Slaves can be found laboring as servants or concubines in Sudan, as child "carpet Slaves" in India, as cane-cutters in Haiti and southern Pakistan, and as “prisoners” for a conviction of, and “as a punishment for crime” in the proposed United States-nation, to name but a few instances. According to Anti-Slavery International, the world's oldest human rights organization, there are currently **over 20 million people** in Enslaved, or Slavery, bondage. And this does not include the millions of Slaves, Still Existing under Color of governmental Prisoners, in the Several States of the proposed United States-nation, as well as of the United States central government itself.

Coloring Slavery By Color Of Authority By Government Names Fraud

38. Physical mutilation is practiced upon Slaves, not only to prevent escape, but **to enforce the Slave master’s / overseer’s ideologies**. Note that enforced personal “ideologies,” one of the trademarks of Slavery, is a Prohibited Condition of an Article IV, Section 4 – Republican Form of Government –, but with the Slave Masters or Slave Overseers, being Colored Slavery’s “Parole Officers” *and* “Probation Officers,” “personal ideologies,” or personal opinions and subsequent options, **not** reliant upon any actual form of Passed and Concrete Law, are exactly what such Parole and Probation Slave Masters or Slave Overseers **practice** upon the Assigned Slaves, to which they, Slave Masters or Slave Overseers, are allowed to Gain Periodic Tribute from.

Who are the faces behind these atrocities?

39. Slave Masters and Slave Overseers, in today’s world, most often wear cleverly designed masks, and most of them wear “legal” masks that bear the Color of “Righteous” Government, or even “Righteous” Indignation, under Color of Law and Color of Authority, behind them.

40. Slavery has been in existence for thousands of years, there are records of it in early Roman history including well known instances such as the children of Israel in biblical writings.

41. Slavery has been a vehicle to gain wealth and power. Because it has lasted in various forms throughout history, it is fair to conclude that this practice of placing others in servitude is learned.

42. One of the most obvious characteristics of the practice is that those in power do not like to surrender their power, wealth, or the "privilege" of owning Slaves (people). Historically, the tools to eradicate this practice have been war and legal changes forced upon society by people willing to lay down their own lives that others, being **Slaves**, might be free.

43. In the proposed United States-nation, it was falsely claimed and believed for many years that the Civil War was the answer to stopping it, Slavery, forever, which was and is UnTrue, but in England a series of cases and conscientious acts, as witnessed by The Mansfield Case, stopped the existence of Slaves and Slavery from continuing altogether.

44. The reason why people - nation after nation, inclusive of the famous, alleged "Great Nation" that has long pretended to be free of such abhorrence and social decadence - have been en*slaved* so long and treated so inhumanely was because of chattel Slavery; it has been argued that mentally dehumanizing Slaves enabled them to be overworked and beaten without normal negative remorse and pity, to the great **financial** and **power benefit** of those who maintained that Slavery, in one form or another, was an acceptable standard for a free society and government.

Coloring Slavery. Government Names Fraud "Laws" Greater Clarified.

The Color of Parole / Probation; . . . The Color of Secret Slavery.

45. It has never been unusual in a number of cultures and subcultures, in different countries, for a person to be made a Slave as a punishment for some crime or offense committed against another, particularly if that someone is of a higher social and financial standard, as a way to compensate the injured person or party for the wrongdoing charged with.

46. A Slave can be forced to work (known in some cultures as "workforce") and even be required to periodically pay tribute in some amount that the Slave Master or Slave Overseer wants. At times this arrangement is also worked into law "as a punishment for crime" so that it doesn't look so bad to the public, who might oppose the Slavery form if they only knew it for what it actually was, and is, and that Slavery in any form still existed.

47. The fact that the Slave Master or Slave Overseer does not require all of what the Slave earns in such cases is to be attributed to the necessity of the Slave's basic upkeep, so that the Slave Master or Slave Overseer does not have to get involved with those mundane and often costly chores, leaving it to the Slave to make his or her own way in upkeep, housing, and so forth, so that the amount of the periodic tribute received from such forced work is virtually free and clear to the Slave Master or Slave Overseer, being unearned income paid to the Slave Master or Overseer off of the work or labor of others; the long traditional mark of Slavery and the Slave Trade – even under Color of Government and under Color of "punishment for a crime."

48. It is Indisputable that if government were to openly use such terms as "Slave Master" or "Slave Overseer," it would be met with immediate and open, strong opposition, because the existence of Slavery in any form is such an abhorrent reality, that is comparable to a putrid Sickness where the afflicted proponent has sunk to depths of depravity and decadence that makes such proponent less human than what they would be if cured of the **Slavery Disease** altogether.

49. The maintaining and spreading of the **Disease** of Slavery is brought about by use of **Name(s) Fraud**, done in order to desensitize and alter the reasonable and conscionable judgment of the People themselves - to whom the Republican Form of Government has been ordained to serve.

50. The existence of **Government Names Fraud(s)** is **not** new. **Government Name(s) Fraud** is the creation and use of a name of a thing that disguises its true purpose or meaning so that those who are predisposed to rely upon the same won't, without exceptional knowledge and understanding, realize the actual purpose and meaning of that same, which would in the greatest likelihood imbue the affected and associated persons with an opposition to the condition for which the specific **Government Name(s) Fraud** itself was created to cover up.

51. Government Name(s) Fraud is just as Illegal (once it is exposed for what it is) in virtually every Jurisdiction as is any other form of Fraud, and is often aggressively charged against because of the fact that it most often covers an injury to society that is comparable to an open sore, waiting and needing to be closed before infection further sets in and destroys, in spirit and

in temporal fact, all that such society, at its loftiest level, has been indelibly made to represent.

52. From this we begin to perceive and to understand that the creation of "probation officers" and "parole officers," neither of whom perform their official acts **strictly** under, if at all under, **Law**, but rather upon their own opinions, their personalities, their beliefs, in pursuit of "policy" or "policies," whether public or private, which are NOT Law, by use of **personal** decisions which are based entirely upon their own **personal** desires, based upon the foregoing **personal** character attributes, which can and often do result in harsh and even tragic consequences, though no actual enforcement of actual law may be at the core or center of what they are doing, as their personal decisions would have it be.

53. Under Color of law, which law **Colors** Slavery, and is the **Color of Slavery**, these governmental made **Slave Masters** and **Slave Overseers** hold socially respectable positions, make considerable salaries, and make, in addition to their salaries, a Monthly Tribute, usually from $20. to $40. or more per month, is required as owed and due for each such governmental Slave over whom they "Parole and Probation Officers," have been - in a Master's or Overseer's position - placed.

54. Even though the **governmental** Slave may not bow and scrape before the modern-day **Slave Master** or **Slave Overseer**, though some may have been made to, - *or* wear a collar with the Slave Master's or Slave Overseer's name on it, there can be no mistaking of what is taking place under Color, government's Color of Officiality, creating the Public Distinction of the **One** (the "Parole or Probation *Officer*") being the **Good** and the **Other**, their governmental Slaves, being the **Bad** (diminished as Socially Inferior, and thus Deprived of Rights).

55. Being *reminded* again that the distinction of Slavery as a fact does **not** require that one be at all deprived of **the right** *to* **vote**, for such vote deprival was simply a distinction of Roman Slaves under Roman Law, **not** the identification *of all* Slaves in *all* countries throughout history; – It is in fact *always* the case that "Parole and Probation *Officers*" are directly connected to the "punishment for a crime" determination, whether or not actual or true due process was actually used, and that distinction connects them to the

proclamation of the UnLawful or Article IV, Section 4 Conflicting "13th Amendment **FOR** The Unlawful Continuance of Slavery, and based upon their own lawlessly execution of "offices," in Direct Violation of Article IV, Section 4's Mandate of a Republican Form of Government, makes them what they are, Slave Masters and Slave Owners, and nothing less.

CONDITIONAL SLAVERY.

56. Conditional Slavery is a form of Slavery that is of the most difficult nature or design to detect, for it often exists, in character, ***as though*** in close proximity to a person who is "free" from such corruption, yet falls short of the concept of total or actual freedom, in its broadest meaning, that the Article IV, Section 4 – Republican Form of Government demands for those who have subscribed to its principles, and, at any time, its vested existence;

57. For **Conditional Slavery** makes an appearance ***as though*** the Slave - who has been granted certain privileges, not actual rights - is not actually bound to be a lesser person than those others around him or her, rendering the **Conditional Slave** to be a lesser person than those others, or People, to whom a True Republican Form of Government holds out an ever vigilant arm *to equally protect* – by and under the legendary "long arm of The Law" itself.

58. As a result of the **Conditional Slave's** well covered existence in an otherwise free society, the created - by "law" - **Government's Names Fraud's** Slaves Master and Slaves Overseer (for each of them are placed over more than one Conditional Slave) or "Parole Officer" and "Probation Officer" are looked to by a naïve or unsuspecting Society as being lawful (because it has been adjudged as being "legal"), with the "Parole Officer"/Slaver Overseer acting under *other* Color of Slavery also perpetrated upon the unsuspecting Society as a "Parole Board," which Parole Board form of internal prison government is and has been established to function for the unlawful Correctional System purposes that the Conditional Slavery Society has been mis-convinced to be an honest and moral application of the Republican From of Government required form of Law.

"FEDERAL" SLAVES AND SLAVERY;

CHILDREN AS "FEDERAL" SLAVES:

59. While it has already been recognized that adult Slaves are the result of the 13th Amendment **For** Slavery's "punishment for crime" scheme routine, the existence of which is and always has been UnConstitutional under the mandatory requirements of Article IV, Section 4 of the proposed United States Constitution, we find further that this 'federal" corruption scheme has been extended to children, all also in violation of The Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 TEST (along with supporting TESTS thereto), and The Clause 15 TEST, with both said TESTS being underpinned by The Clause 18 TEST itself.

60. The following represents Revealing Information From the "Federal" Bureau of Prisons itself on the subject of "Federal" Slaves coming from the Children sector of our Several States, and not being continued as State subject matter concerns the way that this TEST and the other above referred to TESTS demand.

61. Not that this means that Children should be made Slaves of the State either, for nothing could be further from the truth than such as that, and even though the below information is very brief, the ramifications of what it depicts are serious, and can no longer be brushed aside with a comment that "it's just the way things are done in this country," for the answer to that is, "No More." Those points added between brackets are included to emphasize the Real truth about this Sickness which would cause people to believe that "everything is okay in America." Stated exactly as it is written at the official U.S. Bureau of Prisons itself at www.bop.com.

"Federal Juvenile [Child Slaves] Population.

62. "'Federal' [Slave] juveniles are a special population with special designation needs. Each juvenile [Slave] is placed in a facility that is appropriate to his/her security and programming needs. Several factors (e.g., age, offense, length of commitment, and mental and physical health) are considered when making placements."

63. [**ADULT FEDERAL SLAVES WORKING AT SLAVE LABOR WAGES, FROM 9 ¢ TO 40 ¢ AN HOUR. WITH SO MUCH MONEY SAVED BY WAY OF USE OF "FEDERAL" SLAVES TO OFFSET COSTS OF GOVERNMENT, WHY ARE TAXES AS OTHER COSTS**

OF "FEDERAL" GOVERNMENT EVER SO HIGH, TO BE PASSED ON TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SEVERAL STATES?]

64. "Federal Prison Industries (commonly referred to as FPI or by its trade name UNICOR) is a wholly-owned, Government corporation established by the alleged Congress on June 23, 1934. Its mission is to employ and provide job skills training to the greatest practicable number of inmates confined within the Federal Bureau of Prisons; contribute to the safety and security of our Nation's Federal [illegal] correctional facilities by keeping inmates constructively occupied; produce market-priced quality goods and services for sale to the Federal Government; operate in a self-sustaining manner; and minimize FPI's impact on private business and labor.

65. "FPI is [alleged to be] a ***correctional*** program."

> NOTE. Any "correctional" program that either any State of "federal" government establishes or utilizes in place of a straightforward Penal system instead, exists and is operated in direct violation of Article IV, Section 4's Republican Form of Government.

66. **"**FPI's principal customer is the *Department of Defense, from which FPI derives approximately 60 percent of its sales. Other key customers include the General Services Administration, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Social Security Administration, Department of Justice, United States Postal Service, Department of Transportation, Department of the Treasury, Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Veterans Affairs.**"**

> **(***see The Clause 18 TEST, Part 2, for the intense Truth about any alleged U.S. department).

67. "The Electronics Group offers [Slave Produced] precision manufacturing, cost-effective mission critical technologies. Product lines include: Cable Assemblies & Wire Harnesses, Circuit Boards, Electrical Components and Connectors, Lighting and Power Distribution, Fiber Optics, Office Furniture, Communications and Plastics/Molding Technology, Clothing & Textiles, Fleet Management & Vehicular, Industrial Products, Recycling - Computer and Electronic, and [Slave] Services."

68. All produced by way of Slave Labor, in violation of Article IV, Section 4's Republican Form of Government **Inherent Mandates**. **Distinguishing the Inherently Unlawful Slavery and Slaves Since the Beginning of Time.**

69. From the Stone Age to the Middle Ages, the color of one's skin was not, and is not, *what* determined, or determines, a Slave**;** most Slaves in Europe and West Asia were White, and many Slaves in the United States of North America are White, although most are either Black or Hispanic.

70. People have become Slaves in different ways. Soldiers or their families captured in war (prisoners of war) have been made to be and have been $old as $laves as a way of raising money for the conquering side. Another way people have become $laves in some cultures is by getting deep into debt. If you owe somebody money and cannot pay it, he or she, your debtor, can make you a $lave and sell you, or your $lave's services, to get the money. Thus, many people *who have once been free*, even today, have later become Slaves.

The Flesh Peddlers.

71. At times, even today, free people sell, or have sold, their own children into Slavery, because they need money and cannot afford to take care of their children, or else are made to feel socially inferior if they keep them, particularly if the child or children are born out of wedlock. Such children are sold to **Flesh Peddlers**, often for a good price, and sometimes based upon the color of their skin and the color of their hair or eyes. This has been documented, even as late as 1998, and even in the proposed United States-nation of [North] America itself.

72. These **Flesh Peddlers** exist, among many ways, under Color of Adoption Agencies (NOT **Orphanages**) or Private Placement Agents, a number of whom are "Attorneys at Bar," a vile "practice" which makes the **appearance** of what is being done all the "more" 'legal,'" and thus "more 'moral.'" While the **children** being thus **sold** may not be *treated* as Slaves - but as actual children only - *by the **people** who **buy them***, it is nevertheless the **Mark** of the **Slave Trade** to put a price or value on the human person as

though they (*only* ***children***) were just another product (and to the Flesh Peddlers they are just that) in the human products marketplace.

73. So profitable is the peddling of human flesh, or bodies, because they are, after all, "***only*** children," that there have been accounting in different countries where pregnant mothers have been kidnapped, taken to concealed places, their pregnant stomachs ripped open, and their unborn babies taken directly out, to be Sold off to the highest bidder among the Flesh Peddlers, or Adoption Agencies, or Private Placement Agents, even in the alleged "great and free country" of the "United States" of America itself, while the mother is simply left, coldly, cruelly, as she was torn open to be, to die. And the alleged Congress has even passed "federal" laws that are supporting of this vile, dastardly practice of the **Flesh Peddlers Trade**, under a number of different "moral" guises. Look to the practice of "placing children" wherever they want them (most times never with close relatives as the traditional orphanage, not for profit, was prone to do), not *to the* name under which this vile practice is yet, still, **disguised**.

74. Under Article IV, Section 4's **Mandate** for a Republican Form of Government, those "only children" also have the Equally Shared Equal Rights **not** *to be* **sold**, for ***any*** price and under ***any*** condition (noting that historic orphanages are not the same thing as "adoption ***agencies***"), to be turned into a chattel product the way that Slaves, which included the Slaves' children, were or have been for *thousands* of years, and still are.

75. Where any Constitution, even a proposed Constitution, holds out a Mandate for an Article IV, Section 4 Republican Form of Government, Inherently Prohibiting Slavery, in Every Form, Altogether, it is these very **Flesh Peddlers** whose Contempt of Constitution Crimes are among the most abominable forms of Contempt of Constitution known, because they make their living as **Flesh Peddlers**, not by selling the more apparent Adults as chattel, *but* by selling little children, for a profit, placing all **Flesh Peddlers** among the dirtiest of the wicked dirtbags who do these heinous, inhuman things, in the false name of "in the best interest of the child" covered Contempt Crime.

76. An additional expose regarding the problem of Slaves and Slavery has come about by way of the **Betraying** 13th Amendment ***For*** Slavery's *deceitful* use of the term "involuntary servitude," which sounds like one can be made to *serve*, with their labors, *another* for the commission of a crime, without the RIGHT to say "NO." A Republican Form of Government simply does not recognize or support the "involuntary servitude" condition to exist therein; an "involuntary servitude" renders the same condition as existed, and does exist, in England, where the people thereof are considered to be "subjects of a monarchy," required to bow and scrape before "royalty" or "nobles" as a claim for "due process of law" therein.

77. **But** under the **Mansfield case** of England itself, June 1772, it is perceived that even this form of ***involuntary servitude*** is to be regarded as a condition of Slavery; England having finally outlawed Slavery therein based upon judge Mansfield's judgment in that particular case, wherein judge Mansfield stated, revealingly:

> "**People are considered slaves when they are compelled to perform *involuntary* labor for a person or group, usually under conditions that make them socially inferior and deprive them of most of their rights or freedom**."

78. As we begin to examine and consider the words "Involuntary Servitude" contained side by side with the term "Slavery" in the 13th Amendment ***FOR*** Slavery, "passed" in 1865, we begin to realize that "Involuntary Servitude" is in truth *just another* ***disquised*** term for "**Slavery**," for in the prison system there is essentially no difference when it comes to one's rights to be either treated equally (Equal Rights) or else paid on any different scale than a person having the same occupation or profession on the outside of the Prison **Correctional** Scheme itself.

79. That is, an actual "Involuntary Servant," in addition to his/her not be subject to Equal Treatment as a person who is actually Free and on the "outside," must be paid the same price of wages for same services rendered as any person of the same or equal skill level if such is a recognized pay level for that particular skill or profession when performed on the "outside" and not on the inside of the Prison **Correctional Scheme** instead, ***revealing*** that the "Involuntary Servant" performing an "Involuntary Servitude," whether

for a private person (this would be looked at and regarded immediately as a condition of Enslavement if a private case) *or* for *government*, **IS** in [F]actual Reality nothing more or less than a **Slave**, existent in the **Continued Slave Condition** ***perpetrated*** *by* **Name Fraud**, by and within the UnConstitutional 13th Amendment FOR The **Continuation** of Slavery by way of Inferred **Conversion** *from* a **Commercial Slavery Form** (Illegal existence under an Article IV, Section 4 Republican Form of Government), pre 1865, to a **Still Illegal**, or **UnConstitution**[**al**], *Governmental* Slavery Form, post 1865.

80. In Consequence to these things foregoing, the arising People concurring that Slavery was never actually abolished in and by the 1865 **Illegal Amendment** and it being that the **Disease of Slavery**, now allegedly ***converted*** to **Governmental Slavery**, needs to be abolished altogether, finally and forever, THEREFORE, the Government(s), none of them, should have any qualms of simply agreeing that Article IV, Section 4's Republican Form of Government **Denies and Prohibits** the **Existence** of Slavery and Slaves in any and every form, and further recognizing that the 13th Amendment **FOR** Slavery Was NEVER Constitutional (can't convert from an alleged right of nothing - {commercial Slavery not having ever been Constitutional in the first Republican Form of Government instance} - to a something as a result of the illegal application of a negative right), and that therefore there can be no further delusion that any person may be made an "Involuntary Servant" or a Slave for the commission of any crime;

81. AND SAID SUCH GOVERNMENT(S) ARE TO, WITHOUT QUALMS OR OBJECTIONS, SET ALL OF THE SLAVES FREE, and Proclaim Abroad, Loud, Clear, and Long, that There Will Be No More Slaves, In Any Form, within the proposed United States, ***or either of them*** – In America;

82. CEASING thereby the recognition of the proposed United State's supreme Court's historical **Cover Up** of the **continued existence** *of* **Slaves** *and* **Slavery** herein, as was done in the case:

> "**SLAVE OF THE STATE**" Jones v. North Carolina Prisoner's Labor Union, Inc. 433 US 139 (1977). (Marshall dissenting quoting Rullin v. Commonwealth 62, Va. 796 (1871).

83. The case being about the prison inmates being Slaves of the State. The U.S. government, by way of the support of the alleged "U.S. Supreme Court," in order to **Cover Up** the Continued Existence *of* Slavery at all, changed the name of Slavery to that of Involuntary Servitude (same thing) to the State by conviction of a crime. The phrase "**SLAVE OF THE STATE**" IS IN THE TEXT OF THE CASE**!**

84. **Slaves** and **Slavery** FAILS, in ALL forms, The Republican Form of Government TEST altogether; the **Illegal** 13th Amendment **For** Slavery **did NOTHING** to Amend Article IV, Section 4 at the time of 1865, or thereafter.

85. Article IV, Section 4, **NOT** being Amended by the said 13th Amendment ***FOR* Slavery**, PREVAILS OVER And DENIES the said 13th Amendment **FOR Slavery's** Continued "Legal" Existence. **Period**. **Done**. End of "Story." "**End of Slavery**." **IN ALL FORMS.**

Other Amendments In Constitution Also – Each – Defective On Their Face; Mandatory Republican Form of Government's Shield Against Defect Tyranny.

86. Had the Great Founders, those who knew the Truth behind the Constitution and its unyielding designed Powers, not been caused to be suppressed in their ability to educate the People as to exactly how a Republican Form of Government was able and due to work, the history of this proposed nation would have been entirely different, different in the ways and the means by which the People's daily lives would have been greatly and significantly affected by those very governments that were to be ordained to serve them.

87. We reiterate, or state again, that it is the manner of Vesting or the Direct Overlaying of a Republican Government Form ***over*** the People, for whom it is directed to settle upon, that creates the unwavering existence of Equally Shared Equal Rights that is laid, indiscriminately, among them and upon them in all of their future forms of Government, and it is this precise condition that we examined and found that applicable to the question of Slavery, showing forth that – once a State agreed to come under the proposed Constitution's contractual authority over it, which authority required an Immediate Subjugation to Article IV, Section 4 as to the form of

Government it was to convert itself to, ever thereafter, it would have to dispense with all of its **Slavery** and Slave Trade lusts and diseases, all "popular" political policy interests to the contrary **not*with*standing**.

88. As to who among the People that such a Republican Form of Government would instantly apply to as a result of that very vesting process, since, as is said, the process of overlaying the Government Form over the People is absolutely indiscriminate as to any Person thereof, no matter the Person (only Natural Law affecting the question of children as a part of those People), then no discrimination can be assumed, no matter what the social practices may have long been among the People up to that point in time, male and female would necessarily have equal rights in all things not affected by Natural Law, without the necessity of any law or Amendment to grant or procure for them any, for there is no indication that women were not to have such equal rights to vote and to be naturally employed within the proposed original Constitution itself, therefore where a Republican Form of Government was to be guaranteed, women's rights to vote was to be a sure and certain thing, any "policy" opposition thereto being as illegal, or as UnConstitution[al], as any thing "repugnant" to the proposed Constitution could ever have been.

89. It is in the "14" Amendment, post civil war, at Section 2, that we find **for the first time** the word "**male**," and its inclusion is now concerned with the **male** being the one who has, under IT, the "right to vote," *however* the proposed original Constitution **contains no such language or proposal**, *therefore* **under** a Republican Form of Government, mandatory to be implemented by each and every State of the Several States, Women **Had** (or Would Have Had) the **Right To VOTE**, **Day 1**, upon its due ratification, acceptance, and enforcement, by the Several States, each and all of them.

90. We are astonished to realize this, that **women were Denied** this **Equal Right** *all of that time*, mainly ***because of the utter wickedness of certain men***, those who would also have scrapped the proposed Constitution were they ever to have learned that it would bring their precious **Slave Trade** and **Slavery Power** to an *abrupt* end, one of the key reasons that Mr. Founder Madison, Mr. Founder Jefferson, Mr. Founder Franklin, and others,

developed a fear and an aversion from trying to continue to enforce a Republican Form of Government upon any of *them*, States, at all.

91. It is very fortunate that a Republican Form of Government works in this distinct and indisputable manner to **also** preserve women's rights to this precise degree, **as it was meant to work so all along**, for as we examine Section 5 of the post civil war "14th" Amendment, we see there the same words that renders the Thirteenth Amendment ***for Continued*** **Slavery** as **Defective On Its Face**, and is therefore **Void** back to the time of its 1868 passage as being UnConstitution[al] – in the face of The Clause 15 TEST, and The Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 TEST as well.

92. And it is in that same "14th" Amendment, Section 2, that we find the first proclaiming of a Power that the alleged Congress *never* lawfully had, for any such claim to Power entirely **Fails** The Clause 18 TEST, that is, the Non-Existent Power to pass either law or resolution involving the **age** of *any* Person, as a citizen or resident of any State, in order to determine any **alleged** "age of maturity" for any national lawmaking purpose.

93. For we ask the question as to just how the age numbers of "18" and "21" came about to begin with, and while those sources are herein available to be known by us, the People, the source itself does not exist as any The Clause 18 TEST authorized Power or Authority for any Congressional purpose, but **Fails** The Clause 18 TEST for the Congress to have ever had **any** authority to pass **any** law regarding anyone's age, **Utterly**.

94. As we read the words of Article I, Section 2, Clause 2, we do the math as they relate to these particular words thereat:

> "No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained the Age of **twenty five** Years, and been **seven** Years a Citizen of the United States. . ."

95. Twenty-Five minus Seven = **18**.

96. Reading also the words of Article I, Section 3, Clause 3, we again do the math as it relates to the particular words thereat:

> "No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of **thirty** Years, and been **nine** years a Citizen of the United States . ."

97. Thirty minus Nine = **21**.

98. This age "**21**" result is also the same number difference, or result, as involves the alleged presidency of the proposed United States-nation.

99. But It is a **deception** to hold that such numbers had anything to do with any person's state of maturity in that era of time, but the actual concern was over the matter of *somewhat* established and proven loyalty - and potential for education, or knowledge (though not any *guarantee* of it), for there was no more the ability to officially certify one's Actual Maturity - or educational level, Awareness and Comprehension of life and its surrounding conditions - in those times than there is today.

100. For the Existence of Actual Maturity of any person is Not a matter of Law, Neither is Actual Maturity a matter of Claim; Actual Maturity is a Matter of Fact, the determination of which starts at the foremost original point of Republican Government, or that is, with the Parents, existing also as Citizens of the Actual Republic, having the Inherent Power to Try and to Determine, under Nature's Law, the level of Actual Maturity that may Pertain to the child, their own child, whose Actual Maturity is in focus, such parental authority to be ceded to the Republican-Government-Representative Impartial **Jury** ONLY when, due to the such Parents' evidentially demonstrated inability, if any, to determine, according to Nature's Law, the Actual Maturity of such child, then the Impartial **Jury** Alone may Determine it.

101. Yet it was from this first UnLawful, UnConstitution[al] example that the Several States, influenced by the UnLawful age *and* gender wording in the acclaimed Fourteenth Amendment, began to engage in "age" and "gender" laws of every kind, slanted toward both the male and female genders, ignoring both the Natural Law and the Common Law, which Law relied heavily upon Parents' Rights as were passed down to them by previous generations, not cruelly over the upbringing of their, not government's, children, continuing, ever continuing to remove or diminish Parental Rights, a Fruit of the Poisonous Tree doctrine/**principle** that the States became guilty of, as there was NEVER any *actual push* by the proposed United States central government to enforce a Republican Form of Government, as it was actually designed and meant to be, on any of them.

102. In a Republican Form of Government, the rights of the parents of a child, or children, are embraced by both Natural Law, or Nature's Law, as well as by the Common Law, the Nature's Law providing the primary discernment of the rights of parents in relation to their children and the rights of children in relation to their parents.

103. Again further, in a Republican Form of Government, no statutory law established that denies or offends either Common Law or Nature's Law has the right to be sustained or continued, such forms of law being fundamental, or unalienable to all; it being that any statutory law that exists in violation of Common Law or Natural Law, where an Article IV, Section 4 Form of Government is Guaranteed, or the Right to that same has been proposed to the People to Receive it to any degree or extent whatsoever, in the Final Analysis of Law, Must Fail altogether, and Must Be Abolished in Every Detail and Part of its, statutory law's, Existence.

104. DEFECTIVE AMENDMENTS. Because, minimally, of the Defective Enforcement Language within both the 13th Amendment **for** Slavery and the "14th" Amendment, the same are now understood each to be, **legally**, Defective On Its Face, but so are Amendments XV, XVIII, XIX, XXIII, XXIV, and XXVI as well.

105. Such issues as the lawless, arrogant Congress engaged in from the first, to do those things that were to be reserved and preserved to the Several States, the Founders gave forth Article I, Section 10, Clause 3's **Compacts** – under the consent of the Congress, but this unionizing of States for a common purpose would not have served those who lusted for "federal" power, and so was sidestepped, or else scantily regarded the need for Interstate Compacts between the Several States, thus *abusing* the States by lustfully Denying them their, States, own lawful trust and duty to do so, in favor of UnLawful "federal" power in their stead.

106. The Article IV, Section 4 Republican Form of Government, to have been Guaranteed, NOT "suggested," to the People of each State was to have been the sole form of government that each of the Several States were to have existed as the moment that, in all proper Standing to do so, they became a State of the proposed United States-nation, or the Union thereof.

"Rulers" Article IV, Section 4 UnConstitution[al].

107. As we examine the correct understanding of the meaning of a Republican Form of Government as Guaranteed to us (is to be Warranted) by the [alleged] United States central government itself, we begin to see many areas of State governments that have gone astray. In order to correct those straying parts of State government, however, it must be understood that such corrections are to be made with as little to no liability to the State's officials as possible, the first time through, so that the proposed United States has reasonable ability to bring those errors in State governments to a stop, in favor of the correct form that is represented as a **True** Republican Form of Government, as guaranteed or warranted ultimately by the Constitution itself.

108. Judges, whether or not elected, were never meant to be made "rulers" in or "of" the United States. A judge had no possibility to offer anything more than his or her opinion, no matter how learned or even true that it is. A belief of one, even though educated, is still only the opinion **of** the **one**. Two would be more than an opinion, but could bind the legal system up indefinitely on any split decision. **Three** judges, or a **Tribunal**, would be the first level of judicial authority capable and competent to not offer an absolute opinion, but rather a real verdict, as demanded by the principle we call "Justice."

109. While an election of a Tribunal of judges is more correctly pertaining to a Republican Form of Government, Article VI, Clause 3 of the Constitution holds judges, even three of them, underneath itself for their decisions. Only a Jury is **not** seen or **present** in Article VI, Clause 3 ***as*** being required to be found ***under*** the Constitution, therefore the Jury must be over it, the Constitution, for Republican Form of Government principle purposes. A Jury, in its most impartial, impaneled state, therefore represents the highest form of a Republican Form of Government as it pertains to exercising such Government Form directly over the Constitution, and because the preservation of rights relative to the Constitution is always and forever essential to due process and one's just liberties, the term "preserved" (Seventh Amendment) meaning – to make ready for use at any time, requires all cases in all courts, inclusive of courts involving minors, to be subject to direct Jury control and domination, with a magistrate standing by, outside the court, as a member of the executive branch, having power to enforce, by

executive order, the juristic decisions of the Jury as to both the law and the facts.

110. In a Republican Form of Government there can be no procedure referred to as a "Jury Demand" or equivalent, as called for by any judge, for there exists in every case a **Jury Mandate**, meaning that a Trial BY Jury is Mandatory without the asking, requiring no special or particular procedure for its preserved engagement or docketing, being made available for the use of the People in a Republic, during a court's normal daily business hours — **at any time**.

111. As Such, judges are not likely to appreciate or believe this definition as to what a Republican Form of Government is, nor is any BAR association likely to go along with it, yet a careful examination of the facts as to what a Republican Form of Government is and is not establishes that it is the Truth as to the way that it actually **is**, and as required to be by the proposed Constitution for the United States, irrespective of the way that errant acts of errant governmental actors (employees/officials) have caused it to be thus far instead.

112. A Republican Form of Government does not provide for a system of judges to Rule the people. Article IV, Section 4 guarantees the people a Republican Form of Government. A "Republican Form of Government" therein is **not** referring to a "republican political party." It means that the people are being, or are to be, most directly represented in government (for they are the people themselves), which a judge cannot and does not do, because a judge is made a RULER the moment he or she is made a judge. That is the historical fact, going back thousands of years in time. **IRONCLAD**.

113. The Common Law and Common Law Rules. An integral part of a Republican Form of Government is the inherently incorporated existence and use of the Common Law (or The Law of the Commoners), and the Common Law Rules which govern that usage. The Common Law Rules (not the Common Law - Laws themselves) are presented here in the order in which they historically arose or were recognized as being applicable to the common people to whom they were made to pertain.

THE COMMON LAW RULES

(Or The Law of the Commoners)

114.1 The First Rule of the Common Law, or The Law of the Commoners, is that **all** men, and women, are equal, equal as to their word, or presumed honesty in the telling of the Truth, no matter who that person may be, and no matter what office or title or condition of long servitude that person may hold, or else not hold. In this Rule, Honesty is Everything while Dishonesty is Nothing; **No Disregard** of **Equalness of Testimony** can be regarded by this Rule.

114.2 This Rule of the Common Law, therefore, recognizes that the word of an individual person, whether on a single point or upon an entire matter, is no greater than the word of another individual person, no matter the other person, and that, except there be a witness to a matter in question above the one only, the case at hand is not made;

> [1] Knowing full well the consequences of the faults created by the "**Men of Straw**," and of the consequences of Star Chamber Trials, too notorious to be too long or forever sustained, the Common Law, or the Law of the Commoners, recognizing the requirement for a greater number of witnesses than one, became the cause for England's own practice for Bobbies being assigned to travel two by two, not particularly for security force purposes, but for *witness***es** (see the Sixth Amendment itself) purposes, in recognition and compliance to the Common Law, requiring recognition of equality of the word between persons, where a *greater* weight of word is not otherwise established.
>
> [2] The rejection of the continued possibility of the Men of Straw *in testimony*, requiring the Sixth Amendment's own requisite for **two** *or* **more witnesses** in every event of procedures of law, even in face of alleged evidence in support of an alleged crime, as a sustained part of the Common Law Rules, being also sustained by The **Unus Nullus Rule**, made applicable and extended by the Sixth Amendment's "Confrontation ***with*** *the* witness**es**" to the Unus Nullus Rule that a claim for evidence be, in effect, "**the testimony of one witness** [*no matter the witness, i.e., in principle going to the Common Law and not*

an other form of claimed law] **is equivalent to the testimony of *none***." Black's Law, Sixth Edition, as Reference. Also, equally to be applied as extended and mandated by the Sixth Amendment in criminal cases for "witnesses" and not witness, in Black's Law, Seventh Edition, "The evidentiary principle that the testimony of only one witness is given no weight," which goes to the saying,

"**The Greater Weight of Intelligence Is Valid**."

[3] NOTE that the particular wording of the Sixth Amendment in its reference to "witness**es**" and not "witness," being a purposed by the Amendment's Framers, was to extend the Unus Nullus Rule required of the Common Law to all criminal prosecutions as a matter of Constitution[al] requirement, or mandate, not to be compromised away by any conscionably acting court's impartial Jury called for any prosecutorial purpose thereunder.

114.3 The requirement, not proposal, that the "word" or testimony of each person is equal, and to be accepted upon the same basis of presumed honesty as the word of every other person having an opposing claim, where the same is not proven to be lesser than this standard for honesty's and justice's sake, is The First Rule of the Common Law Rules for the impartial *Trial* Jury, and for the people, and for the people's law enforcement, to rely upon.

114.4 The First Rule of the Common Law, because it sets ALL men and women, no matter their "title," as Equals, **denies** and ***reinforces*** the Constitution's own mandate**s** at Article I, Section 9, Clause 8 ("federal") and Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 ("State") that there exist NO "titles of nobility" in government, no matter the title, or unequal entitlement. This includes those who might refer to themselves as "lord" in any special sense not being provided for within the proposed Constitution for the United States itself, or any act engaged-in - in such an entitled way - so as to believe that they, private persons, have the right to "lord it over you" because of who they are; and it includes such titles of knight, esquire, and gentlemen, or gentlewoman, or else "lady," such as, "First Lady," if it is used in such a way as to raise their level of esteem above that of everyone else, and you are to understand that the term "esquire," such as is used with lawyers or attorneys, IS a British Title of Nobility, coming *precisely* between the historic English

"knight" and "gentlemen," both being British titles of nobility also, and such Title of Nobility owes its *final* allegiance to the Crown of England, and to its Nobility (look to Webster's Dictionary for this confirmation).

114.5 The People/people of the Several States and the Republican Governments thereof, are informed of an Amendment to the Constitution, that the evidence shows was - **illegally** - **made** a **Missing** Amendment to the Constitution, which was numbered as the Original Thirteenth Amendment, also known as the Titles of Honor and Nobility Amendment (Honorable judges will quickly tell you that they know of no such Amendment, or that it didn't really pass after all), because it made those who professed such things non-citizens of the United States and unable to hold ANY office in the United States, proposed in 1810, almost ratified by 1812, interrupted by the War of 1812, but reconvened by President James Monroe in 1818, following the War's end, and finally ratified by the State of Virginia, by its official acts of record, delivered by mailing, to President James Monroe, from the date of **March 12, 1819**, but which was **illegally** made to come up "**missing**" during and after the Civil War (it took *that long* for sinister elements to conjure up the scheme to deny it), merely by the claim that it had not really been passed by Virginia after all, although Virginia's own records shows that it was in fact ratified by that State.

114.6 The People/people are informed that there exists, and has been preserved in various archives throughout a number of States, actual **evidence** pertaining to this Missing Amendment's original, legal, existence.

114.7 For the government cannot explain just how the International BAR Association, "BAR being the acronym for "**B**ritish **A**ccreditation **R**egistry," headquartered in London England, having been around all of the years from before the American Revolution to well after it, suddenly came up "missing" itself, vanished from the shores of the United States – without a trace as to why it did leave, from the years of 1820 and thereafter, never to be seen here again, but to resurface in 1871, After the Civil War, as the American BAR Association, or the American **B**ritish **A**ccreditation **R**egistry Association, carrying with it, again, the titles of Nobility, the Esquire, worn by the Barristers of England, in Direct Defiance and Contempt of TWO (2) Places in the United States Constitution that Prohibited such Titles of Nobility as these.

114.8 The government not having any way to explain (or that is, the government can**not** explain) **why** the International Bar Association **suddenly** up and disappeared back to London, England, *without a trace or* an *explanation* as to **why** it would do so, after having been so well ***entrenched*** in American life and politics for so long, therefore members of the impartial Jury are to be instructed to know that the evidence that each of them, as Jurors, have in front of themselves as per these instructions demands that each Juror regard no person carrying or claiming to have the right to refer to himself/herself as an "**Esquire**," or as an "**Honor**," is to be considered a suspect, when the foregoing is considered, to not being a true and lawful citizens of the United States, no matter what the People/people and their Juries may have long believed to the contrary before the time of this reading, and Each is instructed to know that it is a Crime known as the Crime of Embracery for a judge to presides **over** an impartial Jury where the term "Trial BY Jury" (not "with Jury") is the Law, such as the Law at Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 of the proposed United States Constitution. UnLawful, alleged Trial By Jury, but actually being Trial with Jury presided over by a judge, is at the heart of the People's/people's foremost legal problems in the world today.

114.9 Thus, when we say that The First Rule of the Common Law means that ALL are to be regarded as Equal, that is EXACTLY what is meant; The First Rule of the Common Law, *as seen in the Sixth Amendment itself*, "**Witnesses**," DEMANDS that there be a greater weight of intelligence, or evidence, or testimony, on Any and Every point or subject than Any One **witness~~es~~** can provide or assert.

114.10 The Second Rule of the Common Law, much like the First Rule of the Common Law, is **long voiced** in *required* oath for swearing in any witness before the court, stated, as a question, in famous legal wording, as "Do you swear to tell the truth, *the whole truth*, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?' (emphasis added).

114.11 The use of the word God, or a denial thereof, is not at question here as to the Second Rule of the Common Law, however, the middle phrase thereof, or that is - "to tell . . . the whole truth," IS.

114.12 The procedure for Trial By impartial Jury when requiring "the whole truth" to be heard by any person witnessing to any matter before the court requires that the witness not only do *just that*, tell the whole truth, as the witness alone understands or believes it to be, without ceasing until done, with the full allowance of the court in doing so, without a single intervening manipulation by any attorney or counsel, whether for the prosecution or the defense, until after testimony has been completed by that witness, as confirmed.

114.13 Only after a witness has completed the full or whole testimony which he or she purports to be that whole Truth as sworn to, does the counsel for either side of the Trial have any actual right to commence questioning the witness, to break down or else confirm, such testimony, as a part of the due process procedures that are to be followed by a Republican Government's court where a Trial By an impartial Jury is underway, to get at the real truth that the purpose of the impartial Jury manned court is obliged to find out, when it can, and uphold.

114.14 To tell the "Truth" is certainly the primary principle upon which any court of justice must and ought to be based, but the Second Rule of the Common Law comes from that second phrase of the sworn oath itself, the agreed to obligation and duty – to tell **the whole Truth** – right at the time of testimony to be given, else the witness has breached his or her Instant Oath, presented to the Court of the impartial Jury, agreeing to do so, and neither counsel for the prosecution nor counsel for the defense has the right to either prevent or dissuade the witness from doing precisely that obligation at the appointed time where the witness, before the impartial Jury, is to be heard as a procedural part of the Trial By impartial Jury itself.

114.15 As a part of the Second Rule of the Common Law, the witnesses, every one of them for both sides of the charges, are to be made known to the impartial Jury, so that the impartial Jury may have the right to hear the testimony of each and all of them, without any omission of the least of them, before the case can be concluded and done with, for any Just Trial purpose.

114.16 Proclamation Of All Witnesses To Be Called. It is a Fraud Upon the Court, or the impartial Jury or Assize, for either side of the charges laid to proclaim a Witness who is Not a Witness in Fact; there is no way in which a

Witness can be determined to be or not be a Witness in Fact *except* such Witness to-be-Called-to-Testify, as the same was purposed for, give testimony as to the Whole Truth, as is demanded of the same under the Common Law Rules of Trial Procedure in a Court of Law and Justice; - Which Court, an impartial Jury –(as an "Assize" – or a fully impaneled Jury without a judge)– is to preside over.

114.17 Therefore, this Common Law Rule requires that each and ever witness proclaimed to be the same, whether for the prosecution or for the defense, must be called and heard in their entirety of what their testimony may reveal, before the impartial Jury may proceed to conclude the Trial by the same to any extent at all. This is done to prevent any testimony that may be given by a proposed witness from being held back (creating alleged grounds for an appeal or other motion) when such testimony may reveal to the in-charge impartial Jury the actual and whole truth, without which such whole Truth may never be known, from which Justice may never be rendered – for the sake of the People, and the actual person or party aggrieved.

114.18 Testimony of the Accused As Witness For Self. {**1**} While it is the right of the Accused to not be required to testify against the self, as protected by the Fifth Amendment itself, as a right under the Common Law Rules, there is nothing to be found in the said Amendment that denies the Right of the Accused to still testify for his/her own self (it has been a lawyer's and judge's trick that has altered this Right of an accused), to such extent as the same may determine to give testimony, while waiving the continued Right contained in the said Amendment while doing so. Such practice denying an accused of this Right has been an error *against* the Common Law Rules, which is the Right of the Common People themselves, and exists as no lesser right than this. The Right of One to Testify, on the stand, for Oneself, and Not Testify Against Oneself at that Same Time, is Possible to do, and Is an Inherent Right of an Accused, also preserved under the Ninth Amendment itself.

> {**2**} Thus, an Accused has the Right to provide such **narrative testimony** as suits the same to give for his/her own defense, *without fear* for compulsion that the same shall be, at any time, required to give any answer or response that the same Accused is not desirous to give, without the requirement that the same proclaim the following words, "I

take the Fifth Amendment," but rather that the same, Accused, has the right to simply maintain silence as to a question asked, without such silence being construed as an incrimination against the same for not so answering, OR may just step down from the witness stand without subjecting himself/herself to any questions at all. The Right to not take "the Fifth" while Testifying for one's self, yet Testifying with the Fifth Amendment Right still preserved and in place, is a Ninth Amendment Right.

{**3**} The prosecution may attempt to show, following such **narrative testimony**, by use of other witnesses and/or evidence, if any, that the Accused's **narrative testimony**, whether in whole or in part, was somehow wrong, but the prosecution may not suppress the Right of the Accused to testify in his or her own behalf by violating the Fifth Amendment itself, or by forcing the Accused to use "the Fifth," and subjecting the Accused to instant defamatory or suspicious conditions thereby, as has been the Errant and Wicked BAR Controlled Courtrooms practice in the past.

114.19 The Third Rule of the Common Law pertains to the recognition and Admission of Evidence, a secondary requirement to the necessity of the Rule requiring "witnesses." The Common Law Rule for the Admission of Evidence demands that the impartial Jury have timely **access** to **all of it**, and that it be the impartial Jury alone who determines the validity of any evidence adduced or to be adduced, before it continue the case further, for in relation to the meaning or admissibility of fact, the impartial Jury alone as, minimally now, the Trier of **Fact**, "It is **not** the judge's role to determine "the truth of the matter," Big Apple BMW, Inc. v. BMW of North America, Inc., 974 F.2d 1358, 1363 (3d Cir. 1992) (quoting Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc. 477 U.S. 242, 249 (1986)), cert. denied, 113 S. Ct. 1262 (1993), exposing, again, the judicial error, or else judicial ultra vires, that has a judge trying fact as before the trial of the fact itself by the only qualified discerning body empowered to do so – the impartial Jury itself alone.

114.20 Either the impartial Jury itself, during its selection of the impartial Jury Director therefor (formerly as foreman or foreperson) or else the clerk of the court, or an assigned assistant thereof, may sub-docket the admission of the evidence, to be presented in form but not in fact, by each side before the

impartial Jury, to be presented by either prosecution or defense as may best serve their interests, as determined by the same thereafter.

114.21 The Fourth Rule of the Common Law has to do with protocol, or respect and manner of conduct, which includes, without the necessity of saying or writing, form of apparel, appropriate content of non-offensive speech, gestures, respect for equal rights in proceeding and being heard, and so forth, as any other court of law has ever had right for and reasonably expected in order to maintain the virtue and integrity of the court.

114.22 The Fifth Rule of the Common Law, as with mandatory, non-waivable "due process" under the Fifth Amendment, pertains to the **findings** of and the ***enforcement*** against the offense or violation consisting of the **Inherent Offense** -from the **Inherent Power** - of Contempt of Constitution. While it is recognized that a court's highest form of judicial power rests within its inherent right to summarily prosecute for contempt of court (N.M.—State ex rel Bliss v. Greenwood 315 P2d 223, 263 N.M. 156 and Tenn. L—Pass v. State 184 S.W. 2d. 1, 181 Tenn. 213), such similar acts of Contempt which violate with impunity the rights of the people's impartial Juries to find and hold for and protect *their* Constitution by way of *prosecution of* - for **Contempt of Constitution** - *criminal* government, such discernment and assertion, being procedurally a respectful challenge of all Inherent Powers in question, and The **Order** In Which They Prevail - one over the other, as to the proper and true authority or the integrity of the court with its prerequisite impartial Trial Jury itself only, Contempt of Constitution is an Inherent Power in Law, Still Existing under the Common Law and its Common Law Rules, which lies *indisputably* with the impartial Jury itself alone, and not otherwise.

114.23 The purpose, as stated in Wis—State v. Cannon, 221 N.W. 603, 604, 196 Wis. 534., for the inherent power of contempt of court, being ordained to accomplishes its purposes, to maintain orderliness, to secure the court against unlawful acts committed against it or its participants, and preservation of soundness of lawful integrity, being recognized as an integral part of that "highest judicial power," aforestated, it is understood that the ***power greater than that of contempt of court***, being, for the same or similar reasons, to establish and maintain orderliness, to secure the Constitution against unlawful

acts committed against it or those who are justly in reliance thereupon, and for the preservation of soundness of lawful integrity, being recognized as an integral part of that "highest power of government, vested in the hands of the people, through the vesture of impartial Juries," is known as **Contempt of Constitution**, which ***inheres*** to the rights of the people, endowed by Guarantee for a Republican Form of Government, by the rights to the direct representation thereof, and as a direct and indisputable power thereof, of the impartial Jury, for Trial BY impartial Jury only, and not less.

114.24 The inherent power of contempt of court, coming, **completely**, under the auspices and aegis of the power of Contempt of Constitution, the impartial Jury – by its own the-people's direct-representative right – is to execute such power against such elements that may cause any destruction to their, the People's/people's, Constitution, *along with* the power of contempt of court itself, such power being originally grounded – by the understood consent of the King – in the sovereignty of the nation for which it was recognized, it being that Contempt of Constitution, grounded by Right at Article I, Section 6, Clause 1 – "Breach of the Peace" (not being either a felony or misdemeanor), being an Inherent Power of the People alone, was, at Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 and the Sixth Amendment, entrusted and placed directly into the hands of the impartial Jury, as the **highest Power** in a Court of Law in the nation, and **in the hands of none other**.

114.25 An attorney or lawyer may not testify as to the truth of any matter of fact, except the same be an accused testifying in their own behalf in a case that is against himself/herself, Or except such attorney or lawyer is the actual plaintiff in the case and not acting in his/her professional capacity in the representing of another. In short, an attorney may not testify as to fact, and as to the law, such proposals of applicable law to be considered by the impartial Jury must be submitted to the impartial Jury for its due review and consideration – well before the Trial By impartial Jury begins, and is to only be restated during the summation, or ending, phase of the Trial itself;

114.26 Nor is the Accused to be denied assistance of Counsel based merely upon the proposal that the same Counsel is not a member of a BAR association-Union. If the impartial Jury, as well as the Accused, is reasonably assured that a person whose presence with the Accused is a proper

person to be before the court, the "court" being, itself, the impartial Jury, then such decision to allow the same "assistance of Counsel" before it shall stand as the Rule to be continued under.

114.27 [1] One of the most fundamental Rules of the Common Law Rules is the Rule, enforceable under the Common Law, known as;

1) **Standing**, or the Right of a particular Person to Stand in a particular Place, and to Speak for himself/herself on any subject at all, and the Subsequent Right be Heard from that same place where one has been recognized as having the Right to Stand altogether;

2) OR the Lack thereof, of the Right to Stand in a particular Place, and to NOT be allowed to Speak (NO Right to Speak, and NO Right to be Heard, No Right to be Considered).

3) The people coming under a Republican Form of Government, and not just those of the Republican Government itself, are empowered under the Common Law to recognize, or not recognize, whether or not a person appearing before them has the right of Standing to be there, before them, in the first place.

4) As such, the Right for Standing, being the Right to Stand before the Authority, whether that Authority be of Court, Administration, or Legislative, in order that the same may be both seen , heard, and considered as to the very existence thereof, denies Standing where there shall be a Lack of Standing, which Lack of Standing means or goes to the following:

(1) **No Right to Speak**; (2) **No Right to be Heard**; (3) **No Hearing is Officially Accomplished**, No Matter the Hearing itself; (4) **No Right to be Seen**; (5) **No being Seen is officially Accomplished**; (6) **No Right to be Presented or Present** as an Official Matter; (7) **No Right to be Considered** from the beginning when Standing is first challenged *and* that challenge is not met.

[2] These foregoing points of meaning of Standing, or Lack thereof, are **juristic authorities** that may be used by the impartial Jury at any time the same shall have due cause to question the legitimacy of the presence of any person or claim of evidence before it.

114.28 As a reasonable expectation of any impartial Jury to exercise its Right for, where there shall be any lack of knowledge on any point of law or fact that neither the prosecution nor the defense has provided at any point during the course of Trial, the impartial Jury, one or more of its members, has the Right to seek such review of law or information on facts in any library, whether or not a library for the law, or other reasonable resource for the facts involved in the case themselves, in order to correctly ascertain the basis for the Truth which it is to hold before itself, impartial Jury, as the final Rule under the Common Law upon which its own Power to Try All Crimes (including crimes of contempt) is based.

114.29 The Common Law Rules of Procedure, under the Inherent Constitution of a Republican Form of Government, supersede all conflicting statutory rules made on the subject, for statutory Rules of Procedure, made by government, can only be made for that same government, its officials, its employees, its offices, and for none other. The Common Law Rules of Procedure are directly applicable to the impartial Jury, being an assize, although they may be relied upon by law enforcement itself, in their connection to the enforcement of the Common Law itself.

115.1 Rights of Witnesses under a Republican Form of Government. A person, being one witness of two or more witness**es**, who has witnessed a wrongdoing, or an illegal act committed by another, in addition to the right of the primary one to not to be made to suffer from the unresolved or unpurged knowledge of such witnessed Wrong, has the right, where an injured party either does not speak out or cannot speak out concerning the wrong done, to press or prosecute against the wrong done themselves, except that in order to do so, such witnessing person must have "witness**es**," two or more of them, not "witness," before proceeding.

115.2 The Right of Witness**es** is embraced by the like Right at the Common Law known as "Citizens' Arrest," requiring a minimum of two witness**es**, though depending on the seriousness of the case, three witness**es** is most

often preferred for Citizens' Arrest purposes, in order to be assured of sufficient evidence and cause against the accused.

115.2 However, as noted at the proposed Constitution's Article III, Section 3, Clause 2, two (2) witnesses in open court for a charge of treason is a sufficient number of witnesses to, upon conviction, send an accused for this most serious of crimes to his or her death.

115.3 It being the Fundamental Truth that "attorneys" or "lawyers" are NOT the Fundamental Right of a Republican Form of Government, but that it is the Fundamental Truth going to the Fundamental Right to be an individual citizen only, without the assistance of either attorney or lawyer, whether or not a Bar member, or even of either "counsel" or else "a friend," such Fundamental Right of the individual citizen existing thereby under that UnLawfully disrespected legal term, "pro se," nevertheless.

115.4 It is to be noted here that the term, "pro se," while being a Fundamental Right of an individual citizen in a Republican Form of Government, does not imply any confirmation of legal skill or knowledge for any defense or prosecution purpose whatsoever, but only pertains to the preserved right that Still Exists, Inherently, in Republican Government on the part of each person, as a citizen, who makes up the sovereign body of the Republic.

115.5 While UnLawful, "politically" induced, Non-Republican Form of Government statutes ***suppress*** the Right of Witnesses to take direct part in an attestable wrongdoing's prosecution, or that is, to prosecute it, wrongdoing, themselves, providing that there are two or more witnesses sworn, on record, attesting toward the offense averred to have been committed by the accused, is as Equally Fundamental to the right of the Republican Government Citizen as is the same right, conversely, to defend oneself on an individual basis.

115.6 Simply put, this means that just as one has the Right to defend oneself, "pro se," in a Republican Form of Government, one also has the right to prosecute, as long as there are two or more "witnesses" (see the Sixth Amendment's "witness**es**") to support the criminal action against an accused, "pro se," or that is, as one witness of two or more accusing "witnesses."

116.1 **The [False] Doctrine of the Universal Courts.** In order to gain UnLawful Power over the people in a Republican Form of Government, it has long been the thrust and purpose of the UnLawful Bar Associations to insist that the Court(s) are ***everywhere***, and everyone, ***everywhere***, no matter the "***where***," must be "protected" from the "**unauthorized** practice" of "law."

116.2 This "notion" or "proposal" that "the Courts are Everywhere" means that if a citizen, not a member of some "bar," or the acronym for British Accreditation Registry, should undertake to even give legal advice to another, even though not actually present in any court (whether of alleged justice or law is irrelevant) at the time of so doing, must actually still be under the jurisdiction of "the court" somewhere, and such "legal speech" or advice or assistance MUST BE SUPPRESSED, QUICKLY, BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE, else the person providing such "assistance" or "legal advice" is to be regarded as taking place, somehow, "in the court," regardless, constituting the "unauthorized practice of law" thereby.

116.3 Consequently, were a husband and wife to be present together in any private room in their own home, the "Universal Courts" is THERE also, and if either spouse turns to the other in ~~the privacy of their own home~~ the Universal Courts and gives his or her "legal advice" on any issue of concern that may affect that other spouse's legal advantage or legal outcome, the person giving such "legal advice" or "assistance" in ~~their own home, or other non-court place~~ the Universal Courts has **broken** ~~the law~~ **public policy *turned into*** alleged law, and should be, Must Be, **Stifled** before the "State's Society?" "gets worse" for such Universal Courts (bar power) **damaging** action.

116.4 The Idea that "the Courts are Everywhere" and the People Must Be Protected from Someone's/Anyone's "legal advice" is not only a False Legal Concept or Implied Doctrine, but VIOLATES, CONTEMPTUOUSLY, the Fundamental Principles of Free Legal Speech as provided for in both the First Amendment and the Ninth Amendment's First Generation's Retained Rights as well.

116.5 In all of this, there is much ado about the actual legal meaning of the term, "practice law," with no hard fast distinction of its actual meaning across the several alleged jurisdictions of the Several States.

116.6 The Reason that the term "practice law" has been so illusive, so unclear, as to create any discussion of the term at all in the first instance, is because … it Never Was a Lawful = Legal" "term at Law" in the first place!

116.7 That is, when we look to the Sixth Amendment's own "assistance of counsel," we understand "assistance of," and when we look to the word "counsel," if without Bar Bias, then we also Understand that word also, so that we get a distinct understanding of the term, "assistance of counsel" without difficulty or confusion.

116.8 This is because This Term, "assistance of counsel," is the Actual Term that the proposed Constitution's Framers actually meant for the "legal profession," and the common people, to rely upon, NOT "practice law," as a "legal weapon" being wielded by some Bar Association's jealous members and officials, being a thing so unpolished, so imperfect, with material defects all over, so defective, so corrupted or flawed that, on the face of the meaning of the term, "practice law" itself, it is simply not good enough to present openly to the public as is, and so is only "practiced," even when before an open "court of law" itself.

116.9 While it is true that some law school graduates and scholars are better at the understanding of law than others, the "practice of law" is an obvious corruption of the falsity of the Universal Courts and the Bar Associations, one and all, and constitutes an Absolute Legal Breach of a Republican Form of Government, Inescapably. It is responsible for incalculable injustices, frauds, corruptions, breaches, and betrayals of the People, one and all of them.

116.10 It was the Assize, or impartial Trial Jury without a judge, that the Constitution's Framers hoped to embrace for the benefit of the People, by which embracement the important aspects and principles of the Republican Form of Government were to be ever maintained.

117. Perfecting the impartial Trial By Jury / Perfecting the impartial Jury. In a Republican Form of Government, the process of to "Try" contains or involves of the inherent duty known as "responsibility" to that which is to be Tried. Thus, when the person who is to try out a [new] car involves that person's direct control of the car to be Tried, it is understood instantly that the Trying of such car incorporates the principle known as "responsibility" on the part of that specific person Trying the same.

118. It is not enough to impanel the impartial Jury, or assize, in order to produce actual Justice by way of its Verdict (which "Verdict: means, literally, "True Word"); more is required of it, individual, impartial Juror by individual, impartial Juror, than that.

119. The rule that has been employed, at times, by some judges, of rendering a full written disclosure of the evidence presented for Trial purposes, along with his complete assessment and reasoning pertaining to it, is no less the inherent duty of each and every Juror making up the impartial Jury, no matter the weight or importance of the subject matter of the Trial itself, or of the importance or reputation, or lack thereof, of the person or persons being Tried.

120. Responsibility of Each Impartial Juror to keep a written record of the evidence, whether tangible evidence of fact or of unimpeached witness(es), and to show deductive reasoning of the evidence, for or against the accused, being Tried, and how that deducting reasoning fits the accused to a reasonable degree of believability.

120. Because there exists a direct responsibility to the people themselves in a Republican Form of Government, the impartial Juror's "vote" to be cast towards guilt or innocence in a case does not provide for such conclusion to be based upon irresponsible opinion, for as stated previously, the term "Try" incorporates, indispensably, the inherent element of Truth known as Responsibility in and to that very same process, and does not allow, at all, for the elements of "opinion" or "belief" (not evidentially demonstrated) or "policy" or "impressions" or "upbringings" or "philosophies" or "tastes" or "notions" or "whims" or "games" or "personalities" or "estimations" or "convictions" or "persuasions' or suppositions" or "theories" or conjectures"

or “personal non-factual conclusions,” even if that has been the acts of the same by way of alleged “practice” up to this time.

122. The necessary keeping of individual Trial Records, or a Kept Record, by each and every impartial Jury member, being a necessary part of the Inherent Duty of each and every one of the same, must be able to show the actual facts as the impartial Jury member has heard and been shown him/her from each side of the Trial proceeding, both that which is against the Accused and that which is for the defense of the Accused, which each Kept Record is to be subject to the review of all impartial Jury members before their Trial Verdict may be reached, as well as being subject to publishing to the People/people themselves, so that there can exist no impartial Juror Trial Fraud as has been committed, whether or not under influence of offense or Bribery or Embracery, by which Justice may be Cheated and the Rights of the People/people in a Republican Form of Government Defeated, to the ultimate potential ruin of the same.

123. Because the element of Inherent Responsibility is ***indispensably* contained** within the principle of “Try,” going to “Trying” and “Trial,” the individual – impartial – Jury member is not granted *any* right to simply receive and Try the materials of evidence produced at Trial in a Reckless or Irresponsible way so as to allow for a False Conclusion brought about by way of a Dereliction of the impartial Juror’s Duty to do, to a precise extent, otherwise (this is why the decision reached by an impartial Jury was to be called its “verdict,” or “True Word”).

124. Because each and every one of the **Kept Records** of impartial Jury members are to be recognized as the property of the Court (the term Court representing the People/people in general and specific), at the conclusion of Trial, they must be turned over to the Clerk of Court, to be fully secured for the protection of the Trial itself, and are to be subject to secure public inspection and certification thereafter, whether for the benefit of the Accused or for the benefit of the People/people for whose sake the Accused has been Tried, accordingly.

125. Because the **Kept Record** is the personal production of the impartial Jury member in Trying the case before him/her, the same may, by option, keep a copy of his/her own Kept Record for further reference (as a backup

record, but not a secure record) in the event that there should be a need for one, but may not obtain a copy of any other impartial Jury member's Kept Record as a matter of any right to do so. Kept Records may be called upon for investigational purposes, within a reasonable time period thereafter, should there be any concern for Jury proceedings integrity raised thereafter.

126. Thus, upon examining the Kept Record of each impartial Jury member, where it is found that the reasoning of the same shows no rational support of the Accused's guilt or innocence, whichever the case may be, the impartial Jury member is granted no authority to go against that which he or she has to show, in writing, within the Kept Record of the same, any notations or comments that may involve "feelings" or other subjective elements, if any, notwithstanding.

127. Consequently, if the evidence presented at Trial and recorded within the impartial Jury member's Kept Record demonstrates, by the major weight of it, either for or against the Accused, the impartial Jury member is not entitled to just throw all known deductive reasoning aside and reach (as with a "hunch," "theory," "unsubstantiated belief," etc.) and reach or pronounce a conclusion devoid of or contrary to the very prevailing evidence recorded within the Kept Record by the same, nor may the impartial Jury member escape the further responsibility of committing to writing the deductive reasoning that he or she has determined, by way of thought process of the same put into action, before rendering a final conclusion of either guilt or innocence on the part of any Accused. To do so with reckless disregard for the Truth, even though by an impartial Jury member, would be contempt of court (which the impartial Jury now represents), falling under obstruction of justice, and would subject the Contemnor Jury member to such punishment as the law, duly and lawfully and justly established, provides for.

128. If it were other than this, the term "Verdict," or "True Word," could possibly be A Lie instead, and would exist as a Solemn Mockery to the whole principle of Justice and Jurisprudence - altogether.

129. It has never been the right of an appeals court to know the conclusive reasoning of a Trial Court being appealed from *so much* as it is the Right of the People/people of the Republic to know for themselves what has been

reasoned out from that evidence which has been presented to the Court, before the Court, and during Trial.

130. At one time, the Corruption of the Courts-as-Judges provided for the actions by some courts to write down, for the record, exactly what their reasoning was that lead to their decisions, or [UnLawful] "Rulings," however when people began to look closely to many of those conclusions and regard them as either flawed or skewed, or even exhibiting aspects of bribery or other suspicious influences, Judges in general quit doing so. This has lead to extraneous appeals litigation taking place just to obtain that which the People/people had every right to all along, being inherently vested in impartial Juries, to be impaneled everywhere for every consequential Trial occasion.

131. Perfecting the impartial Jury by way of Standard of Knowledge or Education. Because the efficient and effective performance of an impartial Jury is (according also to Mr. Founder Madison) essential to the laws of liberty, nature's laws, of truth, justice, and equity, and the ongoing opposition to injustice, falsehoods, slavery and enslavement, and the denial of understanding in punishment based upon conditions surrounding an accused that may warrant mercy, or equity, to one extent or the other, based upon a condition of fairness according to preset and prescribed rules therefor, the impartial Jury, in a perfected Republican Form of Government, must be provided every opportunity and requisite that they be given, minimally, a Standard of Knowledge or Education commensurate to their responsibility to the people that they are to serve, for the Trial of All Cases, both civil and criminal, in order that the Fundamental Rights of those same people for whom any trial is to be for, be not compromised, betrayed, altered, or denied, according to the requisite for Trial by impartial Jury that such perfected Republican Form of Government must have in order to protect the interests of the people and their Essential Republican Government itself.

132. Financial Responsibility to Perfected impartial Jury, A Republican Government Duty. Because the importance of the Trial of All Cases by impartial Jury is essential to a critical degree for the maintenance of a Republican Government, much more so than the role and authority of any alleged judge ever was or could be, it is likewise a necessity that there be a

Financial Responsibility to the Perfecting of the impartial Jury, that they - as Directly Representative Members *of the* People themselves - be reasonably, but not excessively, compensated for their daily, weekly, and longer, periods of time for which they are impaneled to serve the People in such upright and forthright capacity. Consequently, to underpay or barely pay the impartial Juror for the performance of his or her critical duty to Try All Cases brought before the impartial Jury, so that the impartial Juror does not harbor any undue resentment or prejudice toward the calling of Juror to which the same has been ordained to or embraced, but rather embraces such service willfully, with every honest intent to remain impartial in all cases to be tried throughout the duration of time for which the Juror's service is called for. Perfecting the Financial Responsibility of the impartial Jury, then, is as essential to the maintenance of a Republican Form of Government as is the impaneling of the impartial Jury itself in the first instance.

133. In a Republican Form of Government, there is no such thing as a level of law enforcement "too small or unimportant" as to allow or justify any law enforcement officer to have no primary or authoritative law enforcement officer over, in position of authority, the same, who is un-elected and not accountable or un-responsible to the People or Public being or to be served.

134.1 Attorneys NOT Fundamental In Government. Attorneys are not a fundamental right. It is Indisputable that Attorneys, as much as many of them believe themselves to be vital to the administration of good government, are NOT actually fundamental in any form of government found anywhere upon the earth, **are not** required or considered as ***indispensable or fundamental*** to the government of a **monarch**, are **not** required or considered as indispensable or fundamental to the government of **an oligarchy**, **and** most definitely are **not** required or considered as indispensable or fundamental **to** a **Republican Form of Government** as the same is required to serve the People in a Republic and not a "nobles" class of self-serving individuals or parties otherwise.

134.2 As such, in a Republican Form of Government, attorneys not being regarded as being an essential and vital component thereof, inclusive of the claimed exigent office of public prosecutors, whether State, County, City, or National, the bare truth and reality is that in a Republican Form of

Government it is the immediate and direct responsibility of the elected office of Law Enforcement therefor that is to act and serve as the prosecutorial department under the Executive branch of Republican Government, no matter the fact that an attorney's office may exist as an elected office for that same purpose as a matter of law.

134.3 The view here is to look at the Government as though there never was any such thing as an "attorney" to be considered for any prosecutorial purpose, and look immediately past such a non-existent point to see what would appear in their absence. As a result of looking through such a lens, we would find that the agency of law enforcement itself would be the one immediately in possession of the facts of wrongdoing, and would have the immediate and substantial responsibility of bringing those facts, combined with the applicable laws relative to such facts, before a court of original and competent jurisdiction.

134.4 There are those who would insist, however, that the person representing the prosecutional side of this issue be reasonably educated in the law in order to have an effective ability for that purpose. While that is true, it is fundamental that knowledge and compliance with actual law should be a prerequisite for law enforcement itself in order to bring any prosecutional action against an accused before doing so; therefore the Republican solution is as simple as requiring the elected sheriff, before becoming a qualified candidate, to be formally or more greatly educated in the law, not shunning an education in the Common Law - as well as the written Constitution(s) also, as would be expected of anyone finishing his or her required law courses education, not extending itself thereafter to become any part of any union or association of those who may lawfully profess law not prohibited by a Republican Form of Government for title or entitlement of nobility as such.

134.5 In addition to the foregoing, there is yet another problem with the creation or maintaining of an attorney's office for prosecutorial purposes, for such offices, coming between the actual law enforcement agency and the required Trial Jury, hold a Power that is literally against the words at Article III, Section 2, Clause 3, wherein it states, "The Trial of all Crimes . . . **shall** be **by** Jury," and where a prosecutor, inserted in between law enforcement making the arrest and the **required** Trial Jury itself, has been given the

UnLawful Power to **decide** (UnLawful Opinion) to Try the Accused for the crime alleged or else, on whatever claim or Whim, dismiss the charges made by law enforcement, not by the Trial Jury, altogether; . . .

134.6 By which we find such a ***claimed*** Power, and therefore the prosecuting "attorney's" office also, to be patently UnLawful, no matter how long the alleged right to establish or maintain the same has gone unchallenged or uncorrected for Republican Government purposes, for it allows the crime, as charged, to actually be Tried, for the most part, by ONE person (NOT By Jury), the prosecuting attorney(s) assigned to the case, providing for such **illegal** practices as "plea bargains," "pre-trials," and straightforward dismissals, a **Right** of the Trial Jury, **NOT** of the prosecution (The Trial {decision making} of ALL Crimes **shall be** BY Jury); . . .

134.7 Pointing the correct way to be that the prosecution is to be actually carried out by the same law enforcement department that took the complaint and made the case be what it was to be come in the first instance, requiring that such same law enforcement — from its own lowest ranked officer thereof to its elected head - to be in charge of the final prosecution of the accused (except where the injured party shall elect to conduct his or her own prosecution – liability to government already having been waived by the signing of the required averment itself) — hone its own prosecutorial skills to a degree of proficiency, not dishonesty in such prosecution process.

135.1 Full Sheriff. "Attorneys" or "Lawyers" are NOT an actual prerequisite of the existence of any government. If no attorney or lawyer were to exist within the functions of any government, who would be responsible for prosecuting a criminal case on behalf of the People? The answer forthcoming is: The one who was elected by them, the People, or that is, "the Sheriff."

135.2 It is therefore seen as the innate responsibility of the Sheriff, the Full Sheriff, to not only oversee the arrest of the suspected offender, being that very one who is both expected and required to gather all evidence and witness to the alleged crime under one roof, but to bring that evidence and witnesses forward in an orderly and intelligent manner for a prosecutorial purpose. This is precisely where the first responsibility of the "Prosecution" was made to lay as described in the proposed Sixth Amendment to the

proposed Constitution for the proposed United States, and there is NOTHING in any text coming from that document that changes or redirects or transfers the inherent authority and duty of a "Sheriff," as a Full Sheriff, to be the first official on the scene to prosecute a suspected offender over to any conjured or established attorney or lawyer, no matter the claims of "modern day society" and its media to the contrary.

135.3 Even if this means that a "Sheriff" who is to be recognized as a Full Sheriff, or one having ALL of a Sheriff's ordained and inherent Powers from ancient times, must enroll in a recognized and competent school of law before offering a Sheriff's services to the People to be served, then this is what must be required for a Sheriff to be considered to be a **Full Sheriff**, and not just a Partial Sheriff, on a Sheriff for whom the People did not knowingly vote for to hold that office.

135.4 Therefore, a "Sheriff" incapable of prosecution, or refusing to prosecute, [of] a suspected offender, whether being because of a legal incompetence to do so or for any other reason, or if because, specifically, such Sheriff lacks sufficient understanding of law and/or training in prosecutorial procedures, not just how to conduct an arrest and subsequent jailing operations, in order to perform the duties of a **Full Sheriff**, *ceases to* or does not exist as a **Full Sheriff** in that instance, and must be subject to a recall election by the People who elected that same, giving another qualified candidate the opportunity to be elected to that office as a Full Sheriff in that lacking Sheriff candidate's stead.

135.5 Consequentially, even though originally being made to deal primarily with the Common Law alone, being a long misunderstood office, the Office of Sheriff, being the same, from original days, as a [**Full**] **Sheriff**, is more than just a officer whose duty it is to be the one who "shoots the straightest," is "the toughest," is "the strongest," is "likely the best leader of the deputies," and so forth, even if having gone through and graduated from some form of law enforcement academy to prove alleged qualifications for the job, but in a Republican Form of Government is to be the first executive duty representing the executive branch of that Government itself, which does not end, and is not transferred or transferable to a separated operation, such as to attorneys or lawyers holding themselves out to be ("district attorneys," "attorney

generals," etc.) of any claimed jurisdiction, no matter just how important such attorneys' existence are made to appear to be, for the truth is, the existence of attorneys is **NOT** an Inherent Right of the People, **NEVER Was**, and **NEVER Will Be**.

135.6 It is the Sheriff, *as* the **Full Sheriff**, that must be better trained to step forward and take charge of all prosecutorial functions involved in all criminal cases coming before that same, or else be willing to relinquish that office, by a newly called election by the People, to a more worthy other, if not being willing or able to execute the duties of a **Full Sheriff**.

135.7 The People, even as the people, of any and every county, whether naturally, organically or formally organized, of any and every country in the world, inclusive of the proposed United States of [North] America, has the inherent right to have, at their disposal for joint protection by the people, a **Full Sheriff**, not a partial sheriff who must rely upon an acclaimed "attorney's office" to perform the prosecutorial function of that (Sheriff's) office for him/her.

136.1 Citizens Testimony Versus Law Enforcement Officials – Numbers. Centuries ago, a philosopher, in pursuit of his scriptural analysis of the question of those unseen creatures - whether being considered by any person as either legendary or real - called "devils," raised the question in regard to their actual size, as to "how many devils can fit on the head of a pin;" the key to the question being "how many." The parallel to that question, **in principle**, is "How many *citizens* does it take, in a Republican Form of Government, to **equal** the official testimony of **one** member of law enforcement? One? Two? A Hundred? A Thousand? Ten Thousand?

136.2 Courts - in violation of the first rule of the Common Law as to everyone's word being equal, no matter the title or position of the person alleging testimony in any case or event - tend to believe just one law enforcement officer's testimony when pitted against the testimony of a "common" citizen, the Rights of the "common" citizen being a Core Right of Process under a Republican Form of Government, many abuses and denials of the Truth have been made possible by such governments who, under pretext or color of being a Republican Form of Government, allege that the word or testimony of a single individual, when laid against the testimony of

another single individual, where the latter individual may be either a member of law enforcement, a judge, a magistrate or commissioner, a senator or representative, a governor, a president, king, or other great sounding title or position, is, where no other proof or evidence is given, not absolutely equal to that same, is bogus, a fraud, and a Contempt of Republican Form of Government, which is for all intents and purposes, Contempt of Constitution also.

Republican Form of Government and The Fourth Amendment.

137.1 Recognizing the fact that Mr. Founder James Madison, both during and after the 1787 Constitution Planning Meetings, opposed the idea that the proposed Constitution needed a Bill of Rights for purposes of controlling the "federal" government and in 1788 still considered the Constitution, As Written, to still be essentially perfect for that same purpose, compelling us to wonder what he could have had in mind, as a source within the Constitution, for such Amendments as the Fifth Amendment and its vital "due process" term therein, coming to recognize that it was and is Article IV, Section 4's "Republican Form of Government that provided for such Power and Protection of Rights, we now extend that same consideration to the Fourth Amendment also in order to determine just how the Fourth Amendment, in principle, was already at the heart of Article IV, Section 4's Republican Form of Government, and how it was actually meant to work therein.

137.2 One of the first things that we are astonished to realize about this Inherently Embodied concept, different than what we see today, is that the matter of issuing warrants, whether for arrest, search, or seizure, was an Executive Branch Power and Authority in and of itself, NOT a Judicial Branch Power and Authority; . . .

137.3 … This irrespective of the "writs of assistance," issued by Eighteenth Century English courts in their violation of Republican Government's Common Law protections -- the Common Law being the greater compulsion of the law of the acclaimed republic of England -- being the Great Law before England's hierarchy began to wield, unlawfully, the power of England's courts, using such writs, in order to wrongfully invade the homes of British citizens, for which Contempt of [England's own] Constitution crimes – by

"writs of assistance" – the Fourth Amendment was constructed and established in the proposed United States Constitution to defeat.

137.4 As we read the Fourth Amendment, we discover that nowhere in it does it even remotely mention or refer to a judge having to be the one - in the proposed United States, or either of them, to issue a warrant. The idea that a warrant was to be, or should be, required to be signed and issued by a judge at all arose as a false or misguided assumption only – by judges-promoting or else law-misunderstanding legislators, and that assumption and conclusion was and is wrong.

137.5 The Truth is, warrants, when coming under the proposed United States Constitution, are to be issued under the 4th Amendment of the Constitution. But at one time, warrants (at State level) were not issued under the 4th Amendment of the Constitution. This is a legal, historical, fact.

137.6 For, unknown to most of the American people, the Bill of Rights were taken away from them, UnLawfully, Yes, but taken away, definitely, in all but "federal" cases, for over a hundred (100) years this was the case.

137.7 Why was this so? Because of the case of Barron v. Baltimore (1833), as ruled upon by John Marshall, the infamous alleged supreme Court Chief Justice who had **seized UnLawful Power over** the Constitution in 1803.

137.8 In contradiction to the actual truth on the matter as demonstrated by Mr. Founder James Madison, as Congressman Madison, before the House of Representatives, June 8, 1789, at paragraphs 28, 29, and specifically at 43, said Marshall "ruled" in the 1833 case that the Bill of Rights did not, *at all*, extend to the Several States, but were only for "encroachments" committed by the federal government against them, the People.

137.9 Originally, however, irrespective of Marshall's erroneous 1833 **claim**, and before that occasion, warrants were already largely an executive function – usually of a county's sheriff or other appointed county or town official, and continued to be a State executive function following the 1833 "**ruling**," for post 1833, any claim for a "4th Amendment Right at State level ceased to exist as though a "Constitutional Right" and all matters of "arrest, search, and seizure," had to continue under a different source of authority, which it, by

the natural order of things, for those who believed in Republican Form of Government principles, did just that.

137.10 Although under local State authorities the 4th Amendment State-right had ceased, post 1833, as a "federally guaranteed Constitutional Right," nevertheless those same principles of required "arrest, search, seizure, and sworn-to testimony" continued in many jurisdictions, requiring that a warrant to be issued be at least roughly written and issued on such paper as could be obtained for such use, as needed, and endorsed, as a matter of record, by the sheriff, upon a complaint by the local citizen who had been injured;

137.11 For although such 1833 case had unlawfully removed the 4th Amendment from local use of the People of the Several States as a Constitutional Right, the *spirit* of the 4th Amendment lived on in spite of the illegal clipping of such Right by the de facto acting, acclaimed, U.S. supreme Court of 1833;

137.12 For the truth was that in the beginning, the Common Law (the Law of the Commoners) was the prevalent law of the People of the Several States, which was, in actuality, the form of law that worked off of the **practicality** of what was possible in order to maintain law and order as a common right of a common people;

137.13 And the fact was that many communities were sparsely settled with significant travel distance and time between them, and as such those practical conditions denied a judge, and judges - as a matter of fact, known to travel on horseback, wagon, or coach, from place to place in order to "help out" with their judicial wares - from being always around when a warrant for the area in need, for whatever purpose, might need to be issued for an arrest, a search, or seizure.

137.14 The judge not being around when the need for a warrant might arise (this was just a fact, for judges were not as numerous as they are today), if judges were to be the expected mandate as they have been made to be today, would have created a severe and abusive condition for the People to have to deal with, justice would have been routinely denied for want of a signed warrant for the smallest of offenses, on to larger ones; nor did judges have

such power and authority at that time to do what they do today (how did they – lawfully – get this power and authority);

137.15 For as long as a person was willing to provide *witnesses* and swear under oath as to what was done against the law, the local sheriff could process the called-for arrest without any kind of "judicial authority" at all around, and the trial would be held by such a Jury as the county or town and sheriff could assemble, because judges had not yet reached the stage of being thought of as the "irremovable furniture of the court," including especially issues of "voir dire" (jury selection), for those judicial frauds had not yet reached the stages froth with millions of such unlawful judge-in-courtroom cases, daily, as they exist today.

137.16 This being, since a warrant was actually a part of law enforcement, or the executive branch (for a warrant must be ***executed*** – not adjudicated!), and *not* the court, the sheriff had all power and authority necessary to sign the warrants himself, and issue them, responsibly, on the spot when need be.

137.17 However, under the Fourth Amendment, having a sheriff be empowered to do this posed no problem, any error or liability on the part of the sheriff being absolved by having one witnessing private citizen (2 or more witnesses to the same crime was/is required under the Sixth Amendment) sign an affidavit or oath swearing under penalty of perjury as to the facts and nature of the offense complained of, for which the arrest was to be sought, as being true, thereby putting the liability back upon a falsely or recklessly testifying witness if the ground for the complaint proved to be less than reasonably honest, or outright fraudulent.

137.18 Thus, by allowing the citizen to swear out that warrant, and take an active part in the prosecution of the crime for which said citizen had complained for, the sheriff's/government's liability would shift to the accusing citizen, for a possible "false arrest" lawsuit if wrong.

137.19 In this sense the Fourth Amendment worked beautifully, for the correct governmental body, the sheriff's department, had control of the warrant, had the use of it as needed, but for fear of negative voter opinion and reaction at the polls (plus the fact that the sheriff, a public official, could actually be impeached, just like other public officials, if charges against said

sheriff were serious enough), was encouraged not to issue them at the drop of a hat, but not to sit on them when citizens found themselves in need of professional law enforcement help.

137.20 Over Time, it came about that in order to (Bar) seat judges into undisputed power, judges were (Bar) written into being regarded as though pieces of courtroom furniture and (Bar) fed to the media and the public just that way - by bar association corrupted legislators, into the newly assigned duty of being permanently housed in courthouses and in issuing warrants – under the theory that they were protecting the public from bad 'ol law enforcement officers by doing so.

137.21 A built-in protection of the Fourth Amendment concept of protection was that it required that there be an actual injured party as a result of an actual violation of a cognizable law, inclusive of the Common Law, that had been broken, and with limited exceptions, denied members of law enforcement or of government as being qualified to act as though they themselves were injured parties to any claim of crime as being committed by a potential accused, and could only serve as *witnesses (*Sixth Amendment) of a crime, for arrest purposes, when there were at least two or more of them together at the time that a crime was to be witnessed by them (the reason that "republican" England required its "bobbies" to go on patrol, "two by two" at a time.

137.22 Consequently, the weight of the liability of the warrant ***fell back upon the very citizens in need of them***, requiring an "injured party," to have at least two "witnesses," *somewhere* at hand, although not necessarily present nearby, before an accused could be confronted by law enforcement, and at least one person to aver, or swear under oath, that a crime had been committed by the accused, all of which, when brought together under the authority of law enforcement, Indemnified that same law enforcement in the event that the grounds pertaining to any arrest should happen to turn out as wrong – or on an utterly fraudulent or deceptive basis.

137.23 Noting also that, whenever law enforcement officers, of themselves, have sufficient enough witness to testify to the commission of a crime, no judicially authorized warrant is requisite at all in order for them to go into action in order to arrest an offender, the concept of the warrant on this

occasion presumed to be an Inherent Authority of them, "them" being actual Officials of the Executive Branch and not the judicial branch, demonstrating by ongoing common practice and fact that the condition of the warrant is, and always was supposed to be, an Executive Authority and not a "judicial authority," when setting aside the errant 1833 Marshall theory that the Fourth Amendment was not meant to go to the States when in fact that was the precise body of Government that was the main or major target of the Bill of Rights themselves.

138. ANY LAW that is to be considered to be a supreme Law of the United States as provided for at Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, in order that it shall be determined, for any and all enforceable purposes by any State court of the Several States of the United States, Must First Pass Through *This* **The GREAT PORTAL**, the **Article IV, Section 4 TEST**, **Like a Doorway** To Remarkable and Great Truth And Light, For It Was The Heart of the Constitution's Greatest Founding Fathers, That **THIS** Is What We, the People / the Several States, Should **BE** In EVERY Detail of It, To A Zero Tolerance Degree of **Not Less Than *That*, Nothing Lacking**.

The Existence of "Policy" In All Forms – a Violation of Article IV, Section 4's Republican Form of Government, And UnConstitution[al].

139. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Merriam Webster) 1976. At Page 882:

> **police** . . . "2. a : the department of government concerned primarily with maintenance of public order, safety, and health and enforcement of laws and **possessing** executive, judicial, **and** legislative powers."

140. With a scope of power of law enforcement such as this, there can be no wonder as to why "politicians," private interests, and self-serving private individuals, work at both local and national levels to have various forms of "police" departments, headed by non-elected police chiefs or directors, to replace non "policy" endorsing or bound to elected sheriffs, with, considering "the police, with such almost unlimited scope of power as is demonstrated above, can truly "get the bad guys" with whatever it takes, even if it happens to violate Constitutional, or Republican Form of Government Rights, at the moment, requiring that the particular People injured thereby Suffer Pains for

those violations until something can be done to address and cure them, if anything, as a result of such devastating power, can be done at all.

141. This same concept of "**polic**y" and its Unlawfully powerful enforcement "polic~~y~~**e**," being the discretionary Power derived from the limitless scope of the Monarch, **is the enemy to Law**, for it, policy, contains no preservation of security and reliability of what is to be relied on, moment by moment, by the People, so that a government based upon "policy" is but a step away from anarchy, a state of lawlessness, where nothing is sure, trustable, and to be relied on, and where life itself is based upon "everyone for himself/herself." A direct illustration of the fallacy of "policy" comes from a question posed to a judge, "Sir, what is your policy?" **"**My policy is, **I do what I want to**." "And **I** can and will **change** my **policy** *and what it stands* for - **at any time**. *That* is **my** policy.**"** A correctly *enforced* Republican Form of Government **prohibits**, **denies**, and **prevents** the **existence** of "policy" anywhere within the scope of its applicability.

142. Politics and Politicians. Politics, by definition, deals with the making and enforcing of "policy." Politics does **not** concern itself with what may be deemed as certain **law**, but serves law on a superficial, self-serving basis, based upon whatever the popular Whim of society may be at any point in time. As a matter of the mandatory requirement for a Republican Form of Government guaranteed, or warranted, at Article IV, Section 4 of the proposed United States Constitution, the existence of either Politics" or "Politicians" thereunder **IS** UnConstitution[al].

143. A Republican Form of Government, denying and prohibiting "policy," requires that those who serve in such government in any and every capacity carry out their duties in relation to law **alone**, to rely upon law **alone** for the making of law, law for law for law, so that "policy" has no part in it, Government, rendering or resulting in a **Sure Law** and a **Sure Government** upon which the People can forever ***unwaveringly*** rely and depend.

144. Political Parties. Simply put, in a True, *Strictly Enforced* Republican Form of Government, **all Political Parties**, being obsessed with "policy" first and law maybe, **are** likewise **UnConstitution**[**al**] the same as both "**Politics**" and "**Politicians**" **are UnConstitution**[**al**].

145. Debtors Prisons**.** The principle of "impossibility to do," a Common Law condition of contract law long recognized by the legal profession and scholars of law alike as being unenforceable, is and has been a recognized inherently wrong condition arising and existing in Debtors Prisons, both those of old England and other monarchies of Europe and those of the Several States of the proposed United States, for the following minimal reasons.

145.1. **Free Agency.** In a Republican Form of Government, because the Agency of all is Equal, and therefore Free from Denial on any Biased or Prejudiced Basis, the **Right** of Free Agency on an Equally Shared Basis is Inherently Mandatory, and may not be compromised away by any government claim for waiver of any such alleged "Right."

145.2 The "Catch 22" Offense Against The People. A "Catch 22" refers to a false dilemma in a rule, regulation, procedure or situation, where no real choice exists. In probability studies, it refers to a situation in which multiple probabilistic events exist, and the desirable outcome results from the confluence of these events, but there is zero ("0.0") probability of this happening, as they are mutually exclusive.

145.3 A "Catch 22" condition, existing as an "**Impossibility to Do**" breach of both Inherent Human and Commercial Rights in Law, is the enemy to Free Agency, and therefore constitutes an offense against a Republican Form of Government and the People and their Commerce to whom such Government Protects and Pertains, and the necessity to enjoin and cause - by lawful force if necessary - such an Catch 22 Injury to Inherent Free Agency to cease and desist is as Exigent a Duty of the People themselves to deny and abolish further existence of that same as any other vital function of a Republican Form of Government is or might ever be.

145.4 When one, because of debt, is placed, by government, in any jeopardy or prevention of paying all or part of that debt at any time, then there has been the creation of a "Catch 22" financial pit from which the debtor can never escape, for the claim of Free Agency for the Debtor is thus made entirely Moot, or not factually existent, thus the sentence for debt becomes a life sentence, violating the most basic or fundamental Rights of the People in whom such Republican Form of Government has been vested, rendering any

condition that either is or approaches a Debtor's Prison, even if such condition does not factually exist within an actual prison itself.

145.5 This includes any State's claim for either law or court where a person under such State's auspices is caused to be subject to either actual imprisonment for debt or else the threat of imprisonment in the event that such debt is not paid as demanded of the person by the State government, or court thereof, itself. This form of **debt** for which Imprisonment is Republican Form of Government *UnLawful*, ***includes*** Court Fines Debt, Tax Debt, and any other form of Debt, public or private, providing that any and ever form of Debt, to be justly collected upon, be collected and collectable only by way of such civil procedures as garnishments, due process seizure and sale of property, and due process levies upon monetary accounts, including court fines directed directly toward such existent or future accounts (similar to garnishment), but may not include any condition which creates a forced work condition by which the person becomes an EnSlaved person as a Republican Form of Government violation all over again.

145.6 One State's government was found to have so **degenerated** itself to low class financial brutality and lust for money, at the blood-loss expense of the People that it alleged to serve, that its legislature caused its courts to fine convicted persons for crimes alleged and then make the fine a debt of an extreme punishment measure by charging the alleged offender 6.9 % interest on the unpaid balance, daily.

145.7 This means that in just 10 days, if an alleged offender could not afford to pay off the court's fine/debt all at once, the interest would climb to 69.9 % interest on the unpaid fine/debt, 209.7 % interest over 1 month, and 2,551 % interest over a year. It is not known if it is the greatest offender as a State government, but it IS an offender as a State government. This particular State's financial brutality may change during the interim of time that this TEST has arisen to expose, clarify, and confirm the true nature and importance of a Republican Form of Government to the awaiting People.

145.8 Debtors' Prisons, or Debtors' Prison Conditions exist, and have ever existed, as a punishment imposed by monarchs, oligarchies, and otherwise misguided or deceived governments, for to deem it otherwise would be to purport that the very People - to whom such conflicting powers

would grossly affect - would choose, *as though a part of the Republican vesture process*, to vest such a vileness upon themselves, for Debtors Prisons' and Debtors Prison Conditions' existence works against basic humanity and *encroaches* upon critically important Free Agency, one of the most essential and indispensable elements of a Republican Form of Government ever perceived to Inherently Exist for the benefit of the very People to whom such Government pertains, **not to be compromised away** to any point or degree, forever, whatsoever.

146. **Government's** **Names Fraud** is such a heinous application of Corrupt Government, more than its usual level of Corruption, because if creates a Condition of a **Cover** of the **Disease** of **Secret** **Slavery**.

147. Even though many of the known horrors of traditional **Slavery** are not still maintained in today's **Secret** **Slavery**, the Slave Whippings or Beatings, the Roughing Up or even the Beating Up (not the same as a Beating) of the Slave under claim of bringing the Slave back into "legal" control, it is also recognized that some Slave Owners/Masters tended to behave more *kindly* to the Slaves that they exercised Slavery "authority" over, some of the more domestic Slaves being so lavishly treated that if it were not for the color of their skin one might not have realized that these People (too), irrespective of appearance, were not free in the same sense that others were, such "appearance" not diminishing the fact that Slaves - by any other appearance or color – were, and are, **Still** Slaves after all.

148. In short, the more "righteous" and "law enforcing," the more convincing that the government makes their "Slave Masters" and "Slave Overseers" to appear as "lawful," the more we are sure that the question of Slavery – Under Color of **Conversion** of Slavery - in order to ***claim*** "'Abolishment' of Slavery" – in this late day and age – has never been abolished, but has instead been made more **Secret**, more Deceptive, more ***Guileful***, more **Insidious**, than at any time of the World's history in order to keep those in Power forever in POWER, despite the extent of the wickedness in their being so.

149. But the **Slavery** of today, resulting in the Slave's imprisonment, isn't really that much different from the Slaves of the Nineteenth Century, for like the Slaves of those times, today's Imprisoned Slaves can be –

(1) separated from their families for a period of time, creating such hardships as great financial losses to those left behind, emotional trauma that forces wives to disrespect their new Slave husbands as one no longer worthy to be with ("divorce"), children asking questions like, "***Mother, where's* our daddy**?" or for today's imprisoned **Slave mothers** and wives, "***Daddy, where's* our mother**?";

(2) at times separated from their families, never to see them again (died of disease, or actually killed in prison by other Imprisoned Slaves), death not being the actual punishment that they were Imprisoned as a Slave for;

(3) to being severely beaten by Slave Masters or Slave Overseers *when no one is watching* ("Secret Punishments") - (compare to the Rodney King beating by Imprisoned Slave Supporting police, alleged as though Article IV, Section 4 "law enforcement," but not the case);

(4) to having little if any essentials such as soap, a simple pillow, blanket, or other items that non-Slaves regularly enjoy, unless a friend or family member who is not a Slave, on the "outside" of the Slave Imprisoning Place, is willing to provide money for the Imprisoned Slave to be able to do so ("Reverse Punishments" back on the People);

(5) acquire sad reputations as **Former Imprisoned Slaves** (even though perceived under Name Fraud to be otherwise) which cause people to be prejudiced toward them, irrespective of the kind of crime-tragedy that made them a Slave to begin with, making life extra hard for the former Slave to obtain employment or a place to live, causing many such Slaves to never really fit in, and not always because of the color of their skin. This is the **Slavery Disease** that never goes away, that never heals either spirit, mind, or emotion, except there be an overhaul of the People's government, and the **Still *Existent* Slavery** Condition purged therefrom and done away with forever.

150. Whether the **Disease of Slavery** is out in the open or has been, in some way, kept **hidden** from the discerning eye of the People, **Slavery** and **Secret Slavery** are institutions of government that, under this Expose of the **ILLEGALITY** of the Thirteenth Amendment **FOR** Slavery, **MUST Be** Done AWAY WITH, **FOREVER**! ***NOT*** A *Maybe*! As with any Disease, it is to be noted that in order to Eradicate it, the Cause of the Disease must be

Terminated, or Eradicated altogether, and it is the Responsibility of the people themselves, as it is their Republican Government Form made vulnerable to this Hate Mongering, Power Mad Illness, who are to attend to insure that it is so done with, and that it, the **Disease of Slavery** and those who are the continued Cause of It, are done away with forever.

The "13th Amendment" - FOR Slavery - IS The *Betraying* Amendment.

151. The "legality" of the 13th Amendment **FOR** Slavery flies in the face of Article IV, Section 4's REQUISITE Republican Form of Government, the laying of the two side by side, exposing more fully just what a Republican Form of Government is and is not, and how it actually works and doesn't work, but it is not until we examine # 2 of this corruptly converting Amendment To Continue Slavery that we discover that, by applying both **The Clause 15 TEST** *and* **The Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 TEST** to the provision for Congress' **national** "legislation" in order to **enforce** against the pre-1865 **Commercial Slavery** Condition, "the [federal] Militia" as being the only Lawful **national law enforcement** authority to have the Power and Authority to Execute "the nation's [the] laws," such Clause 15 [federal] Militia having ONLY the Power and Authority to "suppress insurrections and repel invasions;" . . .

152. . . . Where anyone, whether in a State or in a 1945 ***falsely created*** "U.S. district," or else, under The Clause 15 TEST, *even in the District of Columbia, Territory of Washington itself*, should elect to engage openly in the practice of Slavery **again**, even if claimed as a Crime by anyone, the [federal] Militia would **not** be Duly Empowered to enforce against the Crime of Slavery at the "federal" level, leaving this most vital issue to the States' governments, making the necessity of the Enforcement of Article IV, Section 4's Republican Form of Government's Absolute DENIAL of Slavery and Slaves an Exigent Concern of the Highest Order, **this because** - due to that aforestated condition at # 2 of the 13th Amendment **FOR** Slavery ———

The "13th Amendment" IS Defective On its Face!

153. The above assembled pages that constitute this, The Republican Form of Government TEST, while providing a greater depth of knowledge and understanding of precisely what a Republican Form of Government is and is

not, or should and should not be, it is by no means to be construed that such points of law and fact revealed herein are all that are to be considered for future purposes, for we are also to consider the profound words of Mr. Justice Johnson, a justice of the alleged United States supreme Court, and a devoted follower of Mr. Founder Jefferson's unique wisdom, who honored us with the following wisdom:

> "In attempts to construe the constitution, I have .. found .. it to [go to] .. the simple, classical, precise, yet comprehensive language, in which it is couched, and ***when*** its intent and meaning is **discovered**, ***nothing*** remains but to execute the will of those who made it"

154. The minimum rights and responsibilities of a Republican Form of Government was also confirmed in the following case, stated as follows:

> ***New York v. Miln***, 36 U.S. (11Pet.) 102 (1837);
>
> "If we look at the place of its operation, we find it to be within the [State], and, therefore, within the jurisdiction of [the State]. If we look at the person on whom it operates, he is found within the same [State] and jurisdiction.
>
> "A State has the same undeniable and unlimited jurisdiction over all persons and things within its [State] limits, as any foreign nation, where that jurisdiction is not surrendered or restrained by the Constitution of the United States. That, by virtue of this, it is not only the right, but the **burden** and **solemn duty** of a State, to *advance* the **safety**, *happiness* and **prosperity** of its people, **and** to provide for its general welfare, by **any** and **every** act of legislation which it may deem to be conducive to these ends; where the power over the particular subject, or the manner of its exercise is not **surrendered** *or* restrained, in the manner just stated.
>
> "That all those powers which relate to merely [State] legislation, or what may, perhaps, more properly be called internal [State law enforcement], are not thus surrendered or restrained; and that, consequently, in relation to these, ***the authority of a State is complete, unqualified and exclusive***."

155. The principle of the "general welfare" referred to by "MILN" above goes to the availability within a State's borders of the availability of money, those instruments or objects that the People, by necessity of practical, safe, efficient, and concise usage as a proxy replacement of the historically original "barter," or "trade" system for paying debts, obtaining things by purchases made, and so forth, leads us to the concern for how "money" in a Republican Form of Government is to be dealt with, bearing in mind that Article I, Section 8, Clause 5, the use of the word "money" is not a newly created word or term; the word itself well preceded the dates and times of the planning of the Constitution itself, for the concept of money, and its production and control, have been the subject of various government forms, kings, and rulers, for thousands of years, inclusive of how money is to be produced and controlled in a Republican Form of Government as such.

156.1 Money Control. Except there be an expressly stated and formally and officially dated event where the people within the realm or boundaries of a Republic have knowingly yielded their own inherent Power over their own financial affairs, or such Fundamental Money as is truly their own, whether that Fundamental Money be represented by trade or barter, or by gold, silver, copper, tin, clam shells, diamonds, wooden sticks (including tally sticks), wood derivative rectangles, pewter, or other proxy representations of their own valued labor or owned assets, then such people/People have retained, and yet retain, that inherent Power for and unto themselves, and no federated claim for a federated monetary system has the right to come between them, People/people, and their absolute and undeniable **Right** to Financial Survival.

156.2 Even where their own more localized Government, existing in the capacity of a Republican Form of Government, may have conveyed or constrained its own right to issue its own money to another acclaimed government or power, the Fundamental Right to Financial Survival denies this same governmental constraint from going to, or applying to, the People/people themselves, to any degree at all.

156.3 This becomes more evident, that the People/people of any and every proposed State of the several States of the proposed United States, did not and have not lost this Fundamental, Inherent Power, as we examine, with deep and concise focus, on the proposed Constitution's wording at Clause 5,

of Section 8, Article I, commencing with the generally applicable words at Clause 1, to wit:

> 1. The Congress shall have Power (noting that the earlier version of "the Power" has been removed from this Clause, rendering the legal effect to be a Concurrent Power, NOT an exclusive one) . . . 5. To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin;

156.4 We **Notice**, and Sovereignly Note, that the wording at Clause "5." does **not** include the Power, or *any* Power, "To Coin **THE** Money" or **THE** Power to "regulate the Value thereof," nor does it apply itself to THE Power to "regulate the Value . . . of Foreign Coin," such wording being applicable Solely to the alleged United States central government alone, and to no other government form did or does said Clause 5 apply to.

156.5 The TRUTH Is that, as of ANY Date where it came to be believed that the proposed Constitution had been duly "ratified," there was NO Demand – the day after, the week after, the year after, the ten, twenty, fifty, and even a hundred years, etc., thereafter, by the alleged United States central government that "everyone out there must NOW use, exclusively, Our Coined Money as the One Money of the 'Realm' or boundaries Only, and STOP using anything else, including Foreign Money that you may have in your possession, because we say so," *and* Clause 5 also says so." BECAUSE Clause 5 does NOT say so, or say anything close to that, conclusively.

156.6 It didn't work out that way, because the Section 8, Clause 5 Requirement, or Constraint, did not actually give the alleged United States central government ANY exclusive or monopolistic Power over the People themselves, to be the "one and only" authority over the subject of "the money supply" as it was to Inherently Exist amongst the People/people themselves. To even imagine it so would be to purport that the People/people of that immediate time was to be immediately Financially Devastated, and that it was the Intent by the proposed Constitution's Founding Fathers, or Framers, to make it just that way; from financial stability to absolute financial chaos in a single day.

156.7 Even though the Several States governments, allegedly to become Republican Governments within themselves, submitted and subjected, to a limited degree, their own sovereign Power (which States' sovereignty was yielded to them, States, by their own People/people) at Clause 1 of Section 10, Article I, by the reading of that Clause:

> "No State shall . . . coin Money; . . . make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts,"

156.8 The People/people, NOT being any "State" or "State Republican Form of Government," We find NO indication of an inclusion of the Inherent Rights of the People themselves (The Ninth Amendment TEST shows a clear distinction between "the People/people" and the State's government itself – see the TEST by that name) to have been ceded or conveyed, or transferred, to the alleged United States central government, along with the Right to use, without limit, other artificial, or made, instruments (such as, but not limited to, direct trade and barter of inanimate objects, or animals, not persons of any kind) than "gold and silver Coin" as "a Tender in Payment of Debts."

156.9 There being NO Power or Authority over the Inherent Private Tender Right of the People/people to use – anything that they, at any moment in time, might choose, there can be, and can have been, no Power or Authority of Private Taxation over their own Property, from whatever source derived, but only over a public activity, or publicly made transaction, at the precise moment of its occurrence, hence only over the transaction activity as an "activity tax," or a "sales" or "purchase" tax, commonly attributed to merchants in business, and not extended to private transactions between private persons whatsoever.

156.10 The Right of the People/people over their Own Money, uniquely not included with that limited, or Constrained, Power to "coin Money," but NOT "to Coin the Money – of the Realm," the Right to Financial Survival, and so the Right to Control their own created forms of Privately Created Monies, IS Absolute, and may not be either denied or Controlled by ANY Government, except, being a Harsh, Malicious, Tyrannical criminal offense against the People/people, the Right of the People/people to prosecute for Contempt of Constitution be Duly Ordained by and among them, People/people.

157.1 Production of Money in a Republican Form of Government State. As set forth above, the Right of the People to have their own unique money in a Republican Form of Government cannot be question, or lawfully suppressed, oppressed, denied, or prohibited. And as indicated, their Power to "coin Money" from whatever source derived is to be regarded to be a Right and not a privilege or permission by any government.

157.2 In fact, as we narrow our focus on Clause 5 of Section 8, Article I, in combination with Clause 1 of Section 9, Article I, we ask certain questions as to who was to have been considered for the source of the money supply, to either any State's government or else the alleged United States central government itself. The only answer that is at all visible as to who was to be expected to supply "gold and silver Coin" to any State's government upon the proposed Constitution having been lawfully ratified and accepted by the alleged United States central government, is confirmed by process of elimination, so that we are sure to make no mistake on this very important matter.

157.3 First, we consider the alleged United States central government as the sole source of the money supply, in order that the Several States, as required by Clause 1, Section 9, Article I, would have capability to pay, each their debts, respectively, for it is undoubted that the States, which were already operational at the time, had debts that had to be paid by some monetary form.

157.4 But the alleged United States central government had no gold and silver coin of its own as of that instant in time, for it had no President to ratify any law whereby it could raise a single dollar by way of any duty, impost, excise, or tax, from any source at all, nor, if it could have "conjured up" any money at all for its own affairs, would it have had any manner or purpose to pay any of that money out to any of the Several States so that they could Each pay their "Debts" in gold and silver Coin" as they were mandated, by the proposed Constitution, to have. The alleged United States central government, as any expected source for the national money supply, Fails to be the Actual, Lawful Source for the States' Money, upon which the Constitution's Framers had designed the Constitution to provide for.

157.5 Next, we look to each of the Several States' governments themselves, but we run into the problem that, while before a State might have had its own Right to coin Money, under the Constraint imposed at Clause 1 of Section 9, Article I, that right had been relinquished to the alleged United States central government, so that it, State, no longer had the Right to coin its own money, but was now made dependent on whatever source might be *lawfully* available to it otherwise, that had not been done away with by the ratifying of the proposed Constitution as it supposedly had done following the September 17, 1787 original ratifying event. But this too Fails any expectable source of either the national money supply or even the State's money supply; the State could not, any longer, coin its own Money, so how was it to pay its Debts with gold and silver Coin as was now being newly required of it.?

157.6 Bear in mind that in 1787 to 1789, and for a long time thereafter, there were no "U.S. mints" as exist today, largely existent after the 1913 Corruption that began the monopolization process of the People's National, Inherent Money Supply in favor of the banks.

157.7 Residing within each of the Several States were the People/people themselves, most of whom had either foreign coin made of gold and silver, or else had the ability to obtain, from other mining resources, such things as gold powder by which new gold coins might be minted. These were to be the One True Source for the Several States,' and the alleged United States central government's, Money Supply, to the last dollar, to the last penny. No other source is known or can be known that had capability of obtaining either existing gold and silver Coin or else obtaining new gold and silver sources for new gold and silver Coin coining operations.

157.8 While the People/people continued to have every Right to rely upon other sources of "Money representation," as they alone might choose by that same Right, it was upon the People/people alone that the entire nation had to depend, for there was simply no one else to turn to.

157.9 By this we Understand that the People/people, being the Answer to the Source of the National and State Money Supply, which Right was Retained by the People of the First Generation (see The Ninth Amendment TEST), still Remain as the Answer to the Money Supply of a State existent as a Republican Form of Government today.

157.10 This of course means that the nationalization of the entire proposed Nation's "National Money Supply" in 1913, and thereafter, constituted a Violation of the Inherent Rights of the People/people to be the Actual and Ultimate Source of the National, State, and **Vitally Local** Money Supply as they had been all along, or that is, such 1913 Act and the like Acts that followed, inclusive of the Errant = Illegal Executive Order of 1933 and thereafter, were entirely UnConstitution[al], were in Violation of the People's/people's Inherent or Fundamental Right to Financial Survival, for which even an Article V Constitution's Amendment would be hard pressed to deny them. To so deny the People/people this most Vital and Unalienable Constitutional Right, it would take a Power of Corruption, a Lawless and Unconscionable Act, designed to Monopolize in the place of the Natural Economy that was the Right of the People before and up to that time.

157.11 Because these Rights, long held by the People/people, were their own Natural Rights of Survival, their own Fundamental or Unalienable, or Inherent Rights to Live and Prosper as they alone might determine, the Actual Rights themselves could NEVER be done away with; only Covered Up, Misdirected, Deceived, Lied As To Their Existence, Suppressed, all of which said Acts to do away with the People's/people's Fundamental Rights to Financially Survive constituted Sovereign Crimes of **Contempt of Constitution**, as they still do.

157.12 From this we Ascertain that, in a State that has determined that it Is going to exist and perform as a Full Republican Form of Government only, it has the immediate Right to look to its own people, or citizens, for such gold and silver Coin resources as my benefit it in the payment of its own Debts, although this is not to deny its right to utilize paper-like Certificate Instruments to represent such gold and silver Coin in the place thereof.

157.13 It is also a Republican Form of Government's Right to encourage its citizens to transact business using any such gold and silver coin certificate representations, so long as the source and the validity of such gold and silver coins can be confirmed and certified. Recognizing that Clause 1 of Section 9, Article I, does not demand or clarify any particular method as to how such gold and silver Coin is to be moved about, it would be deemed a permissible discernment of the proposed United States Constitution to keep such gold and

silver Coins in the same safe place, always, utilizing certified instruments to assure the consumer in commerce that his or her, or its, "Money" is legitimate, nothing in its declared value excepted.

157.14 There are a number of Resources that a Free Republican Form of Government State might call upon to increase and stabilize its State Treasury, for the sake of its Lawful Operations only, and for the general Welfare of its citizens, or People.

158.1 The Inherent Rights of Private Persons In Private Contracts. A Republican Form of Government has No Lawful authority (in Contrast to the Lawful and Inherent Authority Against It) to enter into any contract with particular private individuals, thereby violating, among other things, the Equally Shared Equal Rights Inherent-Mandate brought about by the Vesting of such Government upon the People/people for whom such Republican Government Form was, and is, ordained, **nor** does it have either right or authority to interject itself into any contract between private parties, to become or serve in any proxy capacity for either of them, **nor** does it have either right to authority, or claim for capacity, to initiate or create or establish Any form of Contract between any private parties or persons not already cognizably established, on their own part, by a meeting of the minds between the involved parties or persons, **in order** to effectuate by way of such UnLawful Interjection, **any** judgment in favor of the one party or person, to whose side it has taken, against the other, by way of its, Republican Form of Government's, UnLawful creation of a Contract between parties or persons, no matter the claim for necessity, necessary, or "human rights," to be accorded by such UnLawfully Created or Established Contract between Parties or Persons found or findable within its boundaries, or any other boundaries, that it thinks it might have jurisdiction over.

158.2 The rendering of any Judgment against an adverse party to its own *alleged* Proxy Standing, created or established by its own interjection of itself into any contract between private persons or parties, whether such contract shall be an actual contract between such private persons or parties, or else a contract created, whether alleged to be for the benefit of any private person or party, or any associated family member, irrespective of age or gender, or for the alleged benefit of the Republican Government Form itself, even though as

an acclaimed matter of "law," UnLawfully and thus Illegally, by an alleged Republican Form of Government, or if not so, then by whatever other form of government UnLawfully exists in its place, no matter the government form, **constitutes** a CONFLICT OF INTEREST, and an OFFICIAL CORRUPTION, on the part of those government officials who actively sought to Corrupt such Republican Form of Government, *as though*, therefore, being both responsible and liable to the People/people thereof generally, while not actually being responsible and liable to a specific or single one of them, as to any bias there-for, whatsoever.

158.3 A MILN Principle, Restated. In the historically recorded legal action known popularly as New York v. Miln, 36 U.S. (11 Pet.) 102 (1837), the majority of justices of the acclaimed United States supreme Court entered, as their own discernment of the subject matter of the case, affirmed the following legal existence of a State's government, the basis of which confirm in Truth and with preciseness the state of being of a Republican Form of Government, applied to each State of the proposed United States, as:

"***The authority of a State is complete, unqualified and exclusive***."

158.4 But the restated Miln Principle at this part, does not stop with the Republican Form of Government itself; but extends to the very People/people, on a person by person, inherently vested, Equally Shared Equal Rights basis, themselves, to be held inviolate, and so defines the Responsibility, Accountability, and Liability of each person as being of the People/people, as it applies to the People/people themselves. No Republican For of [State] Government has either Authority or Right to replace the Exclusive Authority, and with it the Responsibility, Accountability, and Liability, of any Private Person with its own, and Consequently, can in nowise Stand as a Proxy Figure in Place of ANY Private Person's adult Responsibility, Accountability, and Liability, accordingly.

158.5 Private Persons NOT Public Persons. There is no process existent as any principle of Due Process, Due Process being an Integral and Inherent Component or Right under a Republican Form of Government (as has been heretofore set forth above) that provides for the transformation or alteration of a Private Person to become, at any moment in time, a Public Person instead, except in the capacity that such Person, of his or her own volition or

willingness, is employed by a Public Entity, in which case the existence of such Public Person is **Constrained**, absolutely, to THAT particular form of employment only. Laws pertaining to Public Persons can only operate upon the same and are limited to the duties, responsibilities, and liabilities that pertain to their office or employment status, and do not extend themselves to their existence as a Private Person upon their own vacating of such public office or employment, at any time, their occupation as a Public Person, on a day to day, week to week, annual duration basis.

158.6 No law can be passed to *force* upon any Private Person the role, employment status, or office of being or becoming a Public Person, nor can any Contract, whether or not alleged -whether alleged to be private or public- be initiated or established to be invoked upon a Private Person unwilling to be made a party to such alleged "public" Contract, except the law alleged be construed as a direct offense against a Republican Form of Government, and a Contempt of Constitution of the Inherently Existing, and/or Written, Constitution representing the People/people thereof.

158.7 Since a State government, under any requisite or warrant that it be a Republican Form of Government only (such as a *guarantee* that it be that same), **not** being a Private Person or Party, cannot enter into, or interject itself into, any Contract/contract between any Private Person or party, OR have **Standing** – and another Private Person or party, requiring, thereby, a Private Person's non-State knowledge (or that is, the Private Person being, ordinarily, "Out Matched") and lawful consent, as though the Private Person or party to be made a party to a State contract had somehow been advanced – (except it be by abnormal process)- to a status of being a Public Person instead, the only form of "Person" upon who the laws of any State's Republican Form of Government, in Contract Law, my pertain.

158.8 Any Government, no matter the source of it, required to operate in the capacity of being a Republican Form of Government, has either authority, right, lawful Power, or Standing to form, or perform by way of, any Department of Recovery Services, except that such performance be limited to be enacted upon Public Persons and NOT Private Persons, at any time whatsoever.

158.9 No Standing = No Right for a *claim* for "recovery," nor any actual recovery, whether or not alleged as any service to the People/people, being so, in fact, on behalf of any private person or party instead thereof. All Acts, acts, and activities that have been instigated or effectuated on this regard, are Contemptuous against all originally known laws of Contracts, are Contemptuous against the Republican Form of Government itself, that is to be Inherently Ordained to the People/people themselves, along with any Condition of Warrant or Guarantee that may pertain to it, is Contemptuous against the People/people themselves to the extent that it is a Pretense to be other than what it lawfully and legally is, and as a matter of being a Contempt of Constitution, is a Crime, which Crime may be further grounded under the Law of Nations and Nature's Law for its actual UnLawfulness.

158.10 The use of any form of "recovery" process or department in order to make more efficient a government's use of lawful taxes paid by taxpayers, or the People/people to whom they may pertain, providing for such government the greater ability of such government to waste the taxes paid it by those same People/people, exists as Contempt of [the] People, or else Contempt of Constitution, Committed by the Legislators/legislators who first proposed it, and those who afterwards, by their entrusted votes, passed it.

159. Among the Serving Powers that exist within a Republican Form of Government, existing for the People to be served thereby, are **its** Inherent Powers, which Inherent Powers include, among many others, Unalienably, the Power of Contempt of Constitution. The Power of Contempt of Constitution **belongs Inherently** *and* **Inescapably to the People** and to the People **alone**, and exists along the same lines of necessity as the courts claim their own contempt of court (a much lower power than Contempt of Constitution) power of enforcement to be for, to insure the greatest possible efficiency and proper working order of **their**, the People's, Constitution, whether de jure or proposed, or else constituted indelibly upon their hearts, among them.

160. A Republican Form of Government, requiring no federalized power to dictate to it its responsibilities, has all necessary power and authority to investigate, expose, and prosecute such crimes as con games, frauds, antitrust, unlawful denial of equity, treason, breach of the peace, which

breach of the peace goes to the sovereign crime, or crime against a Republic, a Republic being tied Inherently to the People and ***their*** fundamentally (or naturally and unalienably inseparable) existing Constitution, known as Contempt of Constitution, a ***criminal*** offense against them, People/people.

161. This, The Republican Form of Government TEST, incorporates The Article VI, Clause 2 - Contempt of Constitution TEST.

Progress and Republican Form of Government.

162.1 At the proposed Constitution's Article I, Section 8, Clause 8, it states, continuing from Clause 1, and replacing "the Congress" with the Republican State's "Legislature:"

> "'The Republican Government's Legislature shall have Power' . . . …. To promote the **Progress** of Science and useful Arts, by securing for **limited** Times to **Authors** and **Inventors** the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

162.2 In this Clause 8, Section 8, Article I of the proposed Constitution, we find that - The **Right** of **Progress** belongs to the People, ***not*** the State; - ***not*** to government *at any level*.

162.3 Restated more comprehensively;

> The Right of **Progress** belongs ***inherently*** to the People, and may not be covered, or diminished, impaired, altered, or denied them, except the ***inherent*** offense of Contempt of Constitution of their ***Inherent*** Constitution be the Result thereof.

162.4 UnLawfully Suppressing and Oppressing and Prohibiting and Impairing and Preventing Progress by Government.

> 162.4.1 As a part of the UnLawful Threats in the Factum which lead, and have lead, the various "securities commissions" agencies or departments to regulate "investment causes" and to have thereby Unlawfully Instilled Fear, even ***Terror***ism, in actual Inventors and Authors, much of the rightful progress of the People has been diminished, denied, and prohibited, and has been all but stopped for the development of many lawfully creative purposes altogether.

162.4.2 For those who operate these said commissions either do not know and understand the fundamental rights and necessities for protecting inventors and authors as are provided for at Clause 8 of Section 1, Article I, or do not care that such rights and necessities for protection of the progress provided by inventors and authors exist at all;

162.4.3 But instead include the progress causes of inventors and authors in with all other general causes which do not fall under this category, so that those of this to-be-protected group who need funding help from people anywhere they may reasonably find them, are made afraid, and are even openly prohibited in doing so, under the guise of "securities regulating" of the public in general, no matter the vital purpose or scope of the inventor's or author's created (not ordinary) project or cause for which Clause 8 of Section 8, Article I, was included in the proposed Constitution as it was, and as it does continue to exist, without repeal, to the date of this TEST.

162.4.4 Whether this act of Over Regulating, or actually UnLawfully Regulating, of this specific group of special individuals is and has been done naïvely or without consideration of them, inventors and authors, and their preserved rights to pursue the very causes in progress for which they act, even where the credibility of such causes may be well established for all provability purposes, is irrelevant, for such persons, as alleged "regulators," neither exist as elected officials, as being either a Full Sheriff or else working for one, nor do they provide, under any conditions, any condition for exemption from the reasonable laws that are purpose for regulating all other causes in commerce who do not fall under that Clause 8, Section 8, Article I distinction;

162.4.5 Applying instead their own "overriding" ideas, beliefs, opinions, suppositions, and theories as to why the to-be-protected inventors and authors, so long as they be able demonstrate that their cause is product of intended progress is true, or factual, and is honestly pursued as to its development and production, is to be included in the same group of persons whose causes cannot be equated to this special profession, by requiring them, inventors and authors, to "register" with

them, "commissions," before such inventors and authors are "allowed" to proceed with the development of their creating craft;

162.4.6 Which opposition to the progress of inventors' and authors' right to proceed to obtain the funds necessary to bring their instruments for progress forward for the benefit of the people/public was never meant to be inhibited, diminished, or prevented or stopped altogether by the proposed Constitution's Framers, by anyone, let alone by the use of "regulators" whose self-serving powers were given them by "politicians" who cared not for either the law or for the progress of the people;

162.4.7 In additional violation to the fundamental law of "due process," which requires that an offense be First Committed by a person Before ANY Claim of Wrongdoing is to be asserted or charged as, **Never Presumed** Before the Fact to be a thing that Might Occur as the myriad of "securities laws" exist as; and further violates the Prohibition for the passing of laws, before the fact, that "Impairs the Obligation of Contracts," a Violation of Republican Government also provided Expose within this TEST;

162.4.8 In consideration of these things foregoing, recognizing that the Only Lawful form of "law enforcement" within a Republican Form of Government, State by State, is the elected Full Sheriff and not otherwise, that all forms of "police," whether "unified" or not, "marshals," "troopers," "bureaus," "agencies, are UnLawful and UnLawfully Established by the UnLawful Politicians and UnLawful Politics that created them; recognizing further that all such "securities commissions" that have and do exist have, from their first instance of creation, existed in gross Violation for the Right of the Progress of the People/people that was to have been granted Protection for by the proposed Constitution's Clause 8, of Section 1, Article I, and that their existence also Stands in Certain Violation of the Fifth Amendment's Fundamental "Due Process" Law (not "suggestion") as well as in Certain Violation of Clause 1, of Section 10, Article I in its confirmation that the Republican Form of Government not Pass *Any* Law, either *before* or *after* the fact, that would, in any way or sense

Impair the Obligation to Contracts – not already in violation of laws of Moral Turpitude or of the Common Law …;

162.4.9 Then it becomes Plain *and* Clear that the existence of any and every form or sort of "securities commission," Not "Lawful Laws" that assure punishment for people who commit acts of actual fraud, punishable fraud, as though existing as some form of "consumer protection" agency or department, also before the fact, none of which exists as having the Lawful Powers of a Full Sheriff, IS Utterly and Entirely UnLawful = Illegal, and exists as De facto Only, altogether, and has been so from its very inception;

163.1 The **TRUTH** and nothing less than the **TRUTH** is an Exigent Necessity, Indispensable, and an **Inherent RIGHT** of every person in a Republican Form of Government, for it goes to the immediate and most vital and basic human rights that each and every affected person made part of any Republic, *under* which a Republican Government Form must *serve*, without denial or discrimination of any part thereof - - which said "going to" must be Equally Applied to each and every affected person within the scope or grasp of such Republic (for this is the core nature of a Republic – not being a dictatorship, a monarchy or oligarchy, nor a feudal system imposing a rulership of a class of nobles, or that is, is not a government of classes, and is not parliamentary) - - that there exist no prosecutorial or executionary right of injury or damage from government where no offense has been committed by an Republican person, such Republican person being of the sovereignty of the Republic itself, demanding and mandating that there be no process whatsoever allowed to stand, or continue upon its discovery, that would mask, veil, cover up, or deny that **TRUTH** which may not be dispensed by government upon the basis that it, government, did "say so."

163.2 In an effort to resist the Republican Form of Government **Purging Process**, **an Inherent Power** of the People within a Republican Form of Government to do just that, it is recognized that Corrupt Government, whether long or short existing, will loudly proclaim its Defective and Failed "Right" to proclaim these words, as though being "sentiments" of the People themselves, but **NOT** … "The Public has been exposed to the practices and customs in question for so long and has accepted those practices and customs

as being the equivalent to law that," continuing *as though* in essence *to say* "[**even if there be fraud within those very customs and practices, whether or not those customs and practices have been made into any alleged law**], ***due to such long 'accepted' practice and custom by the People of those fraudulent things as charged*, the government and/or the government's courts are, nonetheless, to be justified in their UnLawful Refusal to rule in favor of the Actual True Condition of Law and the Inherent Rights of the People, and not diminish or deny the continuation of corrupt government as it is, no matter the level of corruption or dishonesty and no matter the Evolving Harm that may come upon the People at some later time as the result of such Official Corruption, or Malversation, by this very CORRUPT Government**."

163.3 *This above CLAIM for UnLawful or Corrupt Continuance of Corrupt Government IS* Contempt of Constitution*,* a Sovereign Criminal Offense of the Highest Order*, and as such, ANY and Every such Statement of Claim, above mentioned, is Indisputably* **VOID** *from the time of its inception and articulation, no matter the claimed authority of the official(s) making it.*

163.4 The answer to the above "Claim for Unlawful or Corrupt Continuance of Corrupt Government" is Prosecution – Under the Limits of the Eight Amendment Principle Only – for Contempt of Constitution, by the People themselves only.

163.5 Statute of Frauds – The claim or statement that there has been or is any "public acceptance" of a **Public Fraud**, no matter the length of time, in seconds, hours, days, years, or centuries, such **Public Fraud** has existed, – Fails, has Failed Forthwith, and is Set Aside by Consequence of these Urgent and TESTED Discernments now Appearing before the Right of the People to Know Them, to Perceive Them, and to Employ and Enforce Them – for the First Time, and Every Time Hereafter.

163.6 For as it pertains to such issue of Frauds, and no less particular or important, but more so, Public Frauds, It is for the very following reason that we proclaim and know that, as an original and yet general assertion of legal fact, "There is no such thing as a 'statute of limitations' on fraud," because one, including more specially a great number of such "ones," cannot be held

to a standard of "Impossible To Do." The standard of "Impossible To Do" is a standard prohibiting, by the virtue of the fundamental principle represented thereby, that condition to which such principle is associated from being deemed as enforceable, and not subject to lawful enforcement accordingly.

164. In a Republic, a Republican Form of Government has ***no*** **authority** or latitude **to stray** from that form of Government to which it must Inhere, or Exist, ***in the least detail***, **at any time**. Consequently in a Republican Form of Government **all** of its citizens, each and every one, likewise exist in the capacity of being a Real Party In Interest (irrespective of any attorney or law profession opting or claiming, by any pretext of law or rule, or alleged judicial authority, to dominate) in any case, act, or condition whatsoever, which violates their vested Republican Form of Government irrespective of any degree of education, or lack thereof, in order to have the right where another is not, of their own right, taking up the cause of correcting such Republican Form of Government to the exact degree, involving the exact Governmental condition or violative act that has caused the Wrongdoing, that the People's Republican Form of Government may never be lost, but be rather forever maintained in place, which is the Inescapable Right of the People, Inherently, Forever.

165. Impossible To Do Denied/Providing A Way Required. Because one of the fundamental principles of law involves the denial of enforcement of any thing imposed upon one that is actually "impossible to do," the fundamental responsibility that goes along with any law proposed and passed by a Republican Government's Legislature is that it provide a way for the People to do or comply with what is being asked, or demanded, of them, which way has to be both realistic and achievable by any one of them in a meaningful way, else the Republican Form of Government has diminished itself in character, has badly erred, and has started itself on a different path**;** an UnLawful, Illegal Path in Government, which **must be** undone *by the People* of the Republic before it goes any further to the **Utter Ruin** of them.

Intervention Into A Republican Form of Government By Way of A Treaty. The Treaties TEST.

166.1 Regarding the atrocious acts that have taken place out in the Several States under the guise of the alleged United States central government's some

approved Treaty, some of which acts have been acts of murder or manslaughter of a citizen or citizens of a specific State of the Several States, which were given alleged immunity against prosecution, by way of such alleged-as-lawful Treaty, of the foreign individual guilty of the High Crime so perpetrated, this Part of this TEST addresses this matter so that it may be clear to all that there is no such thing as an Abuse of the citizens of a State existing as a Fully Empowered Republican Form of Government State by way of any Treaty between the alleged United States central government and any other nation anywhere in the world.

166.2 It is requisite that we First understand, and know, that a Republican Form of Government, as was and is to be Guaranteed it by Article IV, Section 4 of the proposed United States Constitution, has its own unique Right of Immunity from all foreign invasions, both civil and military, into its borders, which includes such persons, other than actual Article I, Section 2, Clause 2 "United States citizens" and Fourteenth Amendment "United States citizens," as it desires to prohibit entry into its borders for good and lawful cause shown, for Article I, Section 9, Clause 1 gave the alleged United States central government only the Power to "prohibit Importations" of people, not to actually "import" or "deport" them to anywhere, thereby being – The Clause 18 TEST, Part I and Part II Constrained to "prohibit [an] Importations" only, which as seen through the Clause 4, Section 8, Article I Lens by which we view the words, "an Rule," we come to understand that post 1808 "Importations" were to be limited to **slaves**, and the **slave trade** itself, being brought into certain of the Several States from Africa.

166.3 However, under certain alleged United States Treaties, alleged by errant governmental officials and professors of law to be equal to or superior over the proposed United States Constitution itself, such foreign individuals as the alleged United States central government, in its reckless and governmental child capacity, has determined to be covered by its particular Treaty, may be brought into and house within any State that IT chooses, and there's nothing that the State's own government can say or do about it.

166.4 To Expose this Fallacy, we now look to Article VI, Clause 2, which commands that:

"The Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, *under* the Authority *of* the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land."

166.5 The proposed Constitution for the United States itself is the supreme Law of the land, standing therefore as the First Authority for the same;

166.6 That the laws of the Congress itself - when passing every Constitution[al] TEST found within the said Constitution – in pursuance thereof, being the Second Authority for the same;

166.7 And the Treaties made, being "made" by and "**under,**" not over, that same Second Authority, places "Treaties made" as the Third Authority **only**, at best;

166.8 As is Therefore NOT either "equal to or greater" than the Constitution itself;

166.9 And is Consequently NOT applicable out in any of the Several States so as to alter, pervert, or deny ANY Guaranteed Rights for a Republican Form of Government thereby, are, under such specific conditions, collectively and separately, the supreme Law of the United States;

166.10 The United States not being entitled to extend the authority of ANY Treaty made by it out into ANY of the several States so as to convolute or compromise the Rights of the People therein - to be protected as to their Guaranteed Rights for a Republican Form of Government, any such Treaty as may have been, of itself, so extended unlawfully into or within the borders of any Republican Government State, is **VOID** as to such part of any such Treaty found capable of being so extended;

166.11 As Such, All Treaties made are to be given regard for lawfulness Only as they may apply within the strict confines of **the** Territory of Washington, District of Columbia, or such other Clause 17, Section 8, of Article I's "Places" as the alleged United States central government has lawful, not necessarily "legal" (see The UnLawful Territories TEST) ownership of, and as that may apply to the other Nation or Nations which may be included in such Treaty, whereby the Certain and Real Constraints in

the Constitution for the United States are still to be applied thereto, for the Certain Benefit of Each and Every State of the Several States, for such said Treaty's lawful enforcement thereunder.

166.12 External Treaties, or Treaties not specifically including the consent and participation of a State's Republican Form of Government, cannot be used to invade a Republican Form of Government and State, nor may *any* Rights coming under the proposed Constitution for the proposed United States, for the Protection of its own State's citizens, be injured or nullified in the least, by either the alleged United States central government itself, or by any person who has been included in one of its alleged Treaties as well.

166.13 No Treaty Right for Protection of any foreign person can or does exist under any alleged Treaty law that is capable of denying, altering, nullifying, or abolishing, the Constitution's Rights of the citizens of the Several States, and each of them.

Real Property Rights under a Republican Form of Government.

Rights over Private Property against Income to Incame Taxation.

INCOME DEFINED. The In-depth Definition of "Income."

The Deep and Hidden Meaning That The Agencies Of Particular Governments Have Never Wanted The People To Find Out About Or Understand.

167.1 Question. What does the word "Income" actually mean, and how must we construe its proper application?

167.2 To understand how to define the word "Income," we must first learn something about how to define some words.

167.3 For example, the Concept of the word "knowledge" arises from the two word parts, yielding its true definition as being "a "ledge" upon which you "know," or "knowledge."

167.4 The word "understand" comes from the Concept of … to – "stand under."

167.5 It is the same for the word "Income," the word is broken apart so that it can be construed as to its most basic meaning and application.

167.6 We look at the person to whom the "income" concept is to apply as being without anything, literally naked and bare from all or any of the world's goods.

167.7 Such person, *having* nothing, is thus subject to "anything" that comes in, or that which is coming in to such person is to be regarded as . . . "income," or that is, it is that which "comes in" by actually "coming in."

167.8 The process of ANYTHING and EVERYTHING coming in to the person must be recognized as a process of things moving toward that person, in order for that person to receive anything at all. This process of movement is known, and recognized, as an . . . "activity."

167.9 As an activity, combined with a financial value being defined as a part of such activity, the entire process becomes recognized as a "transaction."

167.10 It is impossible for any "thing" to literally "come in" to anyone without such process being defined as an "activity," and in the case of a financial activity, it is further defined as a "transaction."

167.11 The equal concept to any such activity involving a transaction as a part of that concept . . must go to the *point of the transaction* itself in order to determine that a transaction exists at all, for a transaction is a precise event that takes place at a precise time and place, under exact conditions applicable to both time and place.

167.12 This is known as the Point of Transaction for the Activity itself.

167.13 The type of financial transaction which uses Point Of Transaction operations is recognized as "purchases and sales," depending on which side of the transaction you are on.

167.14 In its final form, the Point of Transaction is recognized as a form of consumption-oriented *activity*, to the benefit of the person receiving it, for those items have now, at that specific moment in time, "come-in" to the same.

167.15 In order to impose a tax on that activity or transaction process, as with any "sales/purchases tax" or else "activities tax," the tax must be collected from either one of the "transactors" at that specific time and place, but is usually considered the responsibility of the one who is receiving the "in-come," else the nature of what has "come-in" changes drastically, and the true nature of the type of tax that would be employed changes along with it.

167.16 **In-come**, or **Income**, is in realty then, a Transaction or Activity Process, and an "Income Tax" can only be ***correctly*** **defined** as a "Sales/Purchases Tax" or a consumption oriented tax.

167.17 This fits with what the Constitution's Founders had in mind in fortifying and amplifying commerce throughout the country. (Article I, Section 9, Clause 5).

167.18 However, that which is called an "income tax" is currently being implemented and collected, not as the Transaction or Sales/Purchase Tax that it actually is, but rather as though a "property tax" (see Property Tax hereinafter) . . . which not even the acclaimed Sixteenth Amendment, along with any proposed State's "policy" – in support thereof, provides a legal basis for;

167.19 As such, the "Sixteenth Amendment" only provides for what the 1787 Congress already *had* at Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; that is, a tax on *activities*, such as on "imports," . . while taxes on "exports" – (Note: "export," from an accounting/accountant's standpoint, IS "income") – were denied or prohibited at Article I, Section 9, Clause 5.

167.20 When, following a brief moment to allow for either party in a transaction to be legally bound to collect, or be responsible, for the collection of the applicable "transaction" tax, the term "income" requires that the tax be recognized as being collected at that limited space in time, otherwise the nature of that which is in the process of "coming in" changes to that which now "came in," (past tense) or "incame," for it could be correctly stated of that which moved in by saying of it that "it came in," meaning that **"it is now here, I have it, *and* it is mine**."

167.21 NO, "INCAME" IS NOT A "NORMAL" WORD, … IT IS IN FACT A "COINED" WORD, OR CONSTRUCTED WORD, BUT IT **IS** THE BEST WORD, EVEN THOUGH COINED, TO DESCRIBE *WHAT* IS AND HAS ACTUALLY BEEN HAPPENING.

167.22 This statement, "**it *came* in, and it is mine**" illustrates for the first time the true nature of what items of income ***become*** once the Transactional Stage, or *movement* stage, **has passed**, for after the stage of movement of any item of property, comes the existence of one's ***owned*** "property," the transaction stage having **ceased** to exist.

167.23 Once property is recognized as having an owner, however that owner exists, it is recognized as "owned property," and becomes subject to the Fifth Amendment's "property" clause. This is illustrated by the following factual examples shown below.

The very act of putting such a thing as money, as with anything else, into one's pocket, wallet, or purse, etc., after having received it signifies that its status has been equated to that of "property."

167.24 The intent of the person to keep that property, or not, is not known by a glance, nor is it the right of government to know what one's intended use of "property" is.

167.25 Presumption of guilt for unknown intent violates the Fifth Amendment's "Due Process" Clause.

167.26 Question.

Did the proposed Constitution's "16th Amendment" AMEND, in any way, the 5th Amendment?

167.27 Answer.

NO. The "16th Amendment" in no way, shape, or form, Amended the 5th Amendment.

167.28 The government has the right to take property for pubic use, as long as its intended use comes *under* **ITS** authority of law *made pursuant to the proposed Constitution*, **but** it *may* **NOT** *take* ***any*** such *property* for **Any** Public Use ***without*** **Just Compensation**.

167.29 FIFTH AMENDMENT – Last Clause Thereof.

In the case of money as "incame," or property, the only just compensation that exists is 100 %, or, due to potential for inflation to put the citizen at an unreasonable economic disadvantage due to such inflation, more than 100 %. BUT 100 % - AT THE VERY LEAST.

167.30 The same condition of "putting' money into something, such as and including a bank account, as with other things of value stored therein, is the act of recognizing one's property, just the same as if one had put that money into one's pocket.

167.31 Because it now "**came in**" and is **owned property**, it is not correct to either define it or tax it by the claim that it is *still* "income" or transaction activity, for *if* an *income* in the truly defined sense, the proper tax should have already been *subtracted at that time*, *and* at no time afterwards.

167.32 Unfortunately, *as* an actual "income" or instant "transaction" is NOT the way that the different governments' tax collection agencies or departments have been taxing the people all of this time, but rather such governments, acting in no capacity as the requisite Republican Form of Government, incorrectly, apply each their tax collecting process as an actual "property tax," which is not authorized by either the acclaimed "Sixteenth Amendment" or the inherently included prohibition on taking one's private property for public use, being an actual Republican Form of Government principle espoused as a Fifth Amendment principle, but already belonging to a Republican Government's People/people all along.

167.33 Consequently, the ONLY thing that the acclaimed Sixteenth Amendment – or like State law that currently provides for the same kind of tax collection activity — authorizes is an Activities or Point of Transaction Tax, more commonly described as a "sales" or "purchases," or a consumption tax (as would any State's law that has proposed any "Income" tax), a process of collection which no currently existing tax collection agency to department

has, to this time, any adequately developed way for collecting the same as the Point of Transaction that it actually is and always has been.

167.34 Further, connecting the acclaimed "Sixteenth Amendment" to Article I, Section 9, Clause 5, we discover that the "Sixteenth Amendment" DOES **NOT** amend said Clause 5 to any degree, but only Clause 4 above it, thereby denying said "Sixteenth Amendment's" authority over said Clause 5, therefore contrasting and conflicting the words "No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State" with the words "from whatever source derived," rendering on behalf of the **unamended** Clause 5, of Section 9, Article I, as the senior and therefore senior element of Constitution[al] Law, that the acclaimed **Sixteenth Amendment is Defective On Its Face**.

168.1 Rights over Property against Property Tax. THE TRUTH BEHIND "THE PROPERTY TAX." How It Coincides With The Current "income" Tax Concept – at all governmental levels.

168.2 Under a Republican Form of Government, the collection of ANY property tax, ***at every governmental level***, as also with the proposed Constitution's Fifth Amendment, is, UnConstitution[al], and UnLawful. Here, below, we will find out why.

168.3 THE DEEPER TRUTH BEHIND THE PROPERTY TAX. What is a "property tax," and why are ALL property taxes UnConstitutional?

Beginning Point.

168.4 A property always has value; for as real estate attorneys can confirm, and as is regularly taught in most law schools, "real estate property itself is ALWAYS owned." And unless a property, other than real estate property, is first abandoned, or discarded, all other forms of property are also, always owned, as well.

168.5 As such, when a property is clearly owned, that property has value, *to someone*.

168.6 However, When a property has NO value - at all - to anyone, it is ordinarily discarded, or thrown away, or refused, as no longer legitimately owned by anyone at all.

168.7 Thus, we can see that there is an inherent link or connection *between* an owned property and its value.

168.8 Accordingly, the value of that owned property may be intrinsic (internal) or it may be extrinsic (external), and it may be subjective (personally determined) or it may be objective (determined by disinterested 3rd parties), but it, the property in consideration, always has value as an inseparable part of its very owned existence.

168.9 Consequently, You cannot separate, or take, the inherent value, whether extrinsic or intrinsic value, from the property without taking a part of the property from the property itself.

168.10 That is to say, if we, by any deliberately applied public process, reduce a property's value, say a property that is worth $100,000., to $75,000., then $25,000. in property value, integral to the property itself, has been taken **from** the property, for it is no longer the same property that existed at – the $100,000. **property** value.

168.11 The property has changed in its value, and is not the same, *for* it has been taken away from – for public use – even if only by one part, or tax claim, at a time.

168.12 We see this more clearly as we examine three statements which have to do with the connection of a physical property and its innate value connected inseparably with it, as a part of that same property.

168.13 The first statement reflects the general relationship between Material Property and Value Property, as to the taking of it for a public use, is:

> "**I Took a part of the value of the private property to support public operations and causes.**"

168.14 The second statement is like the first, except that it goes to the source of the taking of such property, by the individual legislators themselves. It reads:

> **"I voted to Take a part of the value of someone's private property to support public operations and causes."**

168.15 And finally we review these same words again, and we find that, even where the taking of such Value Property is for an alleged as lawful tax purpose, we fare no better than the first time in realizing that the taking of Value Property, being an integral part of the Material Property itself, is unlawful under the Fifth Amendment's last clause therein, as it relates to taking private property for public use, requiring a just compensation – before or at the time of doing so – therein. We read:

> **"I voted to take a part of the Valued Private Property, by way of claimed taxes, by use of the de facto term, "property tax," to support public operations and causes."**

168.16 This means of **Taking Property**, considered to be done administratively, or "politically," and financially, done **covertly** or "legislatively" - as opposed to just taking it - by taking factual control of it, **is a SHAM**, is regarded as a "Political Collateral Attack," for it enacts the very same procedure of "going around" the higher, Constitution[al] law in order to accomplish its purpose as the courts are prone to condemn - where someone's acts are done in order to circumvent the law designed to accomplish a particular otherwise unlawful act – the courts won't allow the person or persons trying to circumvent the law to "get away with it."

168.17 The question of ownership of property includes the value of the property itself, because when posed with the question,

> "Does the **Owner** of the private property not Also **Own** the **VALUE** of the private property **AT THAT SAME TIME**?" **Yes** or **No**?

168.18 **It must be answered, undeniably, every time, "YES!"** for if it were otherwise, then that would hold that someone else, whether known or unknown, not the perceived property owner – of ANY property, would always be required to be contacted **every time** a question of "Value" Property came up, in order to have that someone else determine its **real** and **present value** –as it actually related *directly* to the actual Material Property, if any value – in any sense at all, whatsoever.

168.19 Extraction of property values from property value or Value Property, then, in whole or in part, or in part by part by part, is an extraction of a form of the property itself, even if not constituting a physical takeover of

the property in question, and such extraction, in the case of a claim *by* an application of a property tax, **is done**, indisputably, – "**for public use**," and since the Fifth Amendment's "private property" clause requires that any government "pay" for "private property" that it uses or intends to use ("for public use"), which it cannot be denied that all governmental taxes are *supposed* to *be used* for public use, then its, any government's, extracting of a value, an inherent or inseparable part of that same property, using any property tax form without first paying for the use of such private property values (*the same amount as the property tax amount itself, being imposed*) is purely unlawful, and constitutes a Taking of Private Property *without* first *paying for it* a reasonable or just amount as Constitutionally required, or else renders its ability to actually tax a property without paying the same amount as the amount of the tax for it as a "MOOT" (or pointless) Point/Issue.

168.20 In 1896, one proposed State of the proposed Union of the Several States, came to recognize the concern of government's ability to "Take Private Property" by simply Damaging it, thereby Damaging Its Value, as the basis for a claim to thus "Take It, Private Property, For Public Use," afterwards, as it set forth in its own initial State Constitution, wherein it paralleled, almost, the words of the proposed United States Constitution's "Fifth Amendment," stated in such 1896 State Constitution as follows:

PRIVATE PROPERTY NOT TO BE TAKEN OR DAMAGED

Article I, Section 22. [Private property for public use.]

> "Private property shall not be taken or damaged for public use without just compensation." (emphasis added).

168.21 This Startling Modification Realization was done, submitted to, and accepted by the alleged Congress in 1896 by none other than the proposed State of Utah. Its Constitution's Framers, aware of what could be done by a government to private property, after, by whatever means, openly damaging it in order to "justify" its, government's, "Taking" it, Private Property, moved to not only Parallel the proposed Constitution's Fifth Amendment, but moved to Reinforce Republican Government Principles by Denying its local governments, one and all, from diminishing ANY Private Property's Value by way of ANY Public Act which could, and would, Damage or Diminish its

Value, thereby giving such government the "excuse," NOT Lawful Reason, to "**Take It**" *for* **Public Use**.

168.22 Irrespective of the uniqueness of this particular State constitution's example, we are to understand and know that this is, in fact, one of the Intrinsic or Innate, or Inherent Rights of the People/people in a Republican Form of Government, and it is the REASON why, for such a long time before the Illegal Property Tax (as all property taxes are) came along, it was possible for a Private Property Owner to leave such property behind, as with taking a trip – to anywhere, for Months or even Years, unattended and without worry, with the ability and Right to return to that private property at a later time, and have it be just as it was left, without Threat of "Property Tax" to hang over their lives, as the wicked "Property Tax Politicians" brought, UnLawfully, UnConstitution[ally], with them – at some infamous time thereafter.

168.23 Acknowledging, even if for the First Time, the UnLawfulness, UnConstitution[ality], of the "Private Property Tax," – **How Much** money would most, if not all, People/people want for their property's value? As accorded to them under the Right of the Fifth Amendment's last clause therein? And because of the inherent vesting process of a Republican Form of Government, denying any alleged right of such Same Government from wielding itself against the intrinsic right over any and every element of Privately Owned Property of all of its Unbreachable Gridlock of "the People/people," the proposed Constitution's Article IV, Section 4 Warranty, or "Guarantee," to those same People/people, like the Fifth Amendment, Clarifying the Right AGAINST any alleged law or "policy" against the practice of Taking Private Property, of any and every kind, for Public Use, without an Absolute Just Compensation for that Same which has, or is to be, "Taken," … **How Much**?

168.24 **The Answer**. In the case of land or other such private property, at least equal to its appraised maximum value (not its minimum, otherwise, more damage has occurred) is "**just**," and in the case of a "money property," then dollar for dollar, at the least, if not, due to the cost of future, likely, inflation, more, - - and no less!

168.25 Land Patents. Following the UnLawful and Wicked advent of the "policy idea" that somehow it was "okay" to begin taxing people's private property, so long as it did not include their internal household belongings (which some governments in some States actually, at one time, did), but rather attached to their private real-property land itself, there came about an effort by some of those, seeking to be entitled to that which others of the People/people would not be entitled to, by creating a concept known as a "land patent."

168.26 Although Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I, of the proposed Constitution, limits the concept of patents to "limited times," ***supposedly*** the contrived "land patent" was to make its real property owner exempt and immune from governmental acquisition, by way of property taxes, claims to damage by condemnation, and so forth, as being guaranteed against that same, absolutely, permanently, or "forever."

168.27 Recognizing that the governments, all of them, where a Republican Form of Government is the Guaranteed or Warranted Requisite, along with the Fifth Amendment's own last clause thereof, Denying and Prohibiting any and every form of "property tax," in whatever form it might appear, no matter the source of it, sets aside the claim for a "need for a 'land patent,'" which was never Lawful or Constitutional to begin with.

168.28 THE FOREGOING INFORMATION EXPOSES THE LONG ABUSED RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE (or "the people") TO HAVE THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION ENFORCED AS TO ITS TRUE AND CORRECT MEANING – EVERYWHERE, IN EVERY STATE, IN EVERY COUNTY, AND IN EVERY CITY, AND NO LONGER LIMITED JUST TO THE MATTER OF AN "INCOME TO INCAME" TAX.

168.29 Under the more recent recognition by the law profession itself of that which has come to be called "Takings Law," "property tax may be seen as another governmental "Takings Law" "Violation, by the **damaging** or **devaluating** of, and thereby Taking, each private person's private property for public use, done without justly compensating each and every such private person (as being a part of "the People/people") for the full value of the same, the amount of the assessed "property tax" itself, such Devaluation/ Diminishment Damage or Public Takings of private property being

accomplished Under Color of Property Tax, or "Under Color of Law," by which UnLawful or UnConstitutional direct property tax concept (conceived in **"**policy,**"** not in Law) the Fifth Amendment's own protection has been violated or made null and void and of non-effect, done without an Amendment to that same proposed Supreme Constitution, aforementioned, in doing so, by every property assessor's office, one or more officials thereof, in every county or city or town or State of the proposed nation of the United States, one and all.

168.30 Examples of other Takings Law violations go to such acts as:

Ex. 1. A high speed chase by police ends up with the fleeing vehicle crashing into, and severely damaging, a merchant's private business enterprise property, the unquestionable result of the high speed chase. Whether or not the high-speed chase was justified is not the question. The question is, who is to pay for the Damaged/Taken Private Property, the government that the chasing-police represents, or the insurance carrier if the property owner was insured, or the private property owner alone if not insured?

Ex. 2.1 An ordinary business owner is conducting business as usual, when a competitor falsely and anonymously reports to authority that the business owner is selling stolen merchandise to special clients that patronize his store. Observing certain people, known for their criminal mob connections, enter his store and exit with suspiciously wrapped packages, local law enforcement authorities, in believed good faith, move in and shut the merchant down, while at the same time other law enforcement authorities, operating at a different level, act to freeze his business' bank account which allows him to continue to operate, both of which acts, being seen or heard about by the public, his customers, forces him our of business altogether. In time, by carefully proving and disproving everything about the case in a court of law, he is exonerated on every material fact. All of this frozen assets were eventually returned to him.

Ex. 2.2 But his reputation, intrinsic to his former status in the community as an honest merchant, is shot. It might take years to undo the damage that took his reputation property away from him that day.

The Damage/Taking of the merchant's business, his good faith, intellectual property, resulted in his entire loss of income and future.

168.31 Some Property Takings Problems are simple, some are very complex, but all such Takings matters as they apply to the issue of private property revolve around the idea that a damage to someone's private property has resulted in the diminishment of its value, which, under lawful law and justice, should guarantee a Just Compensation, dollar for dollar, for the private property Taken/Damaged - by way of its being governmentally damaged *or* diminished in its value by such damage, where the government, some agency or official thereof, committed or caused the Damaging/Takings act, **Took** the private person's private property, whether only a part of it, private property, at the time of the incident of the Damaging act itself, *or* else the whole property instead, by that same Damaging/Takings act.

168.32 It is to be known and understood that the problem of Taking Private Property by way of "Property Taxes" usage is in nowise limited to "real property" only, but extends itself to any and every form of private property (defined as that which is not "public property"), whether it be a vehicle, a business' (not to be confused with the lawful imposts, duties, and excise forms of taxation) operating equipment, or even a private vault filled with gold, silver, diamonds, and other jewels and gems, no matter the enormous value thereof.

168.33 Vandalism Of Property. Vandalism has been defined as "willful and malicious acts as are intended to damage or destroy property." Black's Law, Sixth Edition, Page 1553.

168.34 Political Vandalism. The above definition being sufficient for this purpose, we combined such acts of Vandalism with the UnLawful = Illegal Acts of "Politics" and "Politicians," rendering "Political Vandalism" to the question of Property as being "**The Willful and Malicious Acts, Committed By UnLawful = Illegal Politicians and Political Parties, Claimed to be Lawful Law, but NOT, which are and were Intended to Damage or Destroy, One Claimed Part at a Time, the Intrinsic Value of Privately Owned Property, by Imposing, under the Guise of Property Taxes and Property Tax Liens, such Privately Owned Property's Intrinsic Value's Devaluating Damaging Process *called* or *claimed* as "Property Taxes"**

***and* "Property Taxes Liens," <u>TAKEN</u>, Incrementally, From such Privately Owned Intrinsic Property Value <u>for Public Use</u>, BUT *Without* Paying One Cent or Dollar For It, as Required by Fundamental Law.**"

168.35 <u>Unlawful Property Taxes Summary</u>. The Bottom Line, in all of this, is that Property Taxes, in every category that they have been made to exist as, are <u>UnConstitution[al]</u>, are <u>UnLawful</u>, and are therefore <u>Illegal</u> in ever such sense of the word, and have always been so since the day that <u>UnLawful</u> "po<u>l</u>icy" spewing "<u>politicians</u>" first decided to raise more money, by taxing private property for public use, offering no just compensation for it in return, for whatever UnLawful <u>Policy</u> Programs and alleged laws that they had in mind.

Rights and Limitations concerning Matters Involving Real Property Owners versus Tenants.

169.1 As has already been ascertained, both as to the Rights of the People/people AGAINST "Titles of Nobility" under a <u>Republican Form of Government</u> existing at all, as well as that Expressed Prohibition, for State purposes, that same Prohibition in the proposed Constitution's <u>Article I, Section 10, Clause 1</u>, wherein it states,

> **""No State shall . . . grant *any* Title of Nobility,"**
>
> [Note. This same prohibition was extended to the alleged United States central government at <u>Article I, Section 9, Clause 8</u>, "**No** Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States**:**"]

169.2 . . . Which, not being directed toward any one governmental branch of a State's government, extends – across the board – to all 3 (three) branches thereof, denies the State's legislature, or any State's division, such as countries (or parishes or boroughs), cities, and towns, from either passing, or retaining, any concept in its laws that constitutes a granting or a recognizing of <u>any</u> Title of Nobility whatsoever, either one that is to newly exist, or one that has already existed from historical times past, inclusive of such pre-existing Titles such as prince or princess, count or countess, baron or baroness, lord or lady, knight, esquire, or gentleman or gentlewoman, no

matter what "public policy" on the subject may be, or may have been in the historic past of any State's government.

169.3 That is to say, that when it was understood that the "We the People" that was first prescribed and ordained in the proposed Constitution's preamble was to give way to an Article IV, Section 4's Republican Form of Government, each of the Several States were Expected, and Required, One by One, to "Get Over Themselves" as to how they had previously operated as a government, and Comply, in Every Exacting Detail, to that of a Republican Form of Government, as the proposed Constitution had laid down, point by point, throughout is Well Framed and Thought Out, Supreme Words of Supreme Law.

169.4 It is to be remembered and understood that one proposing to have a "title of nobility" also is understood to be "entitled" to something that others within that same body of People/people do not have, or are not to have, based upon such "entitlement," bearing that same "Title" within it, which was the cause of rejecting all such Titles of Nobility" within that 1787 proposed Constitution.

169.5 It cannot be argued, *without doing so contemptuously*, that a[ny] government, being prohibited from "granting" a "title of nobility" can circumvent that supreme prohibition against titles and conditions that surmount to a Title or Status of Nobility (or above others), can do so regardless by merely allowing existing "titles" or "entitlements" to Continue in their existence, because every act of the legislature (or city or town council, etc.) in its meeting, without compliance to its own fiduciary responsibility to not maintain UnLawful Laws within its scope of governmental existence, and every act of every court or executive branch official – likewise,

169.6 This denouncing of all public laws that either upheld existing Titles of Nobility, no matter what they, "titles," might have been, as well as prohibiting any such future titles and entitlements was, and is, the fiduciary responsibility of all 3 (three) separate and separated branches of a Republican Form of Government, at every level of such government, no matter how long the practice of "Titles" recognition may have been practiced, and no matter how strong the alleged "public policy" may be otherwise.

169.7 As stated previously above, the Acclaimed "Granted" or "Officially Allowed" Title of "First Lady," is in fact UnLawful and UnLawfully Recognized, and thus as a Granted, Title of Nobility, Is **Wrong**, is Contemptuous, is UnLawful, Violates both the proposed United States Constitution as well as the Inherent Constitution belonging to the People/people of an Article IV, Section 4 Requisite Republican Form of Government, and IS WRONG - such being also ILLEGAL according to Actual, Fundamental Law.

169.8 In contrast to the UnLawful Title of "First Lady," One wonders, in a State with a woman governor, if having a husband, what he would be "due to be called;" "First Lord," or "First Man," or "First Gentleman," or "First Husband?" Irrespective of what tittle a spouse of a governor of any State, or of the office of presidency of the alleged United States central government, holds, where it becomes any officially recognized Title that elevates its holder above that which would be recognized by like other citizens of "the People/people," automatically violating the vesting process of the Equally Shared Equal Rights principle which makes the Republican Form of Government what it truly is, or truly is supposed to be.

169.9 Yet another set of "Titles of Nobility" has been handed down, and continued, UnLawfully, UnConstitution[ally], to be recognized – since Ancient Feudal Times, when barons and lords were the only ones who "owned real property" straight out, and were therefore the Lord of the Land so owned, known as "Landlord" and if a lady, then as "Landlady."

169.10 To match the Titles of Nobility of "Landlord" and "Landlady," because of their ownership of private real property which has been extended, by civil and commercial contract, by being to a party known as a Tenant, or more precisely, a Renter (or perhaps "Rentee" would be the more appropriate term for contract purposes), or one who is to possess and occupy, possibly from time to time, the private property so rented, we look to other examples in commerce which similarly rent to a Renter/Rentee, private property – of one sort or the other, and we ask of the following kinds of Rental Contracts, what Title would the Private Property Owners be entitled to be known as?:

169.11 If a business that engaged in the renting of privately owned cars to people to drive, instead of requiring them, people, to purchase such cars, would such a privately owned car owner be subject to be hailed as Carlord or a Carlady? And be entitled to state – **as law**, without a court's own order to assert the same instead, upon a claimed breach of a rental contract, that the car-renter/rentee was in "unlawful detainer," and act to regain the rented car without any **required** – CAREFUL Examination and Trial of the FACTS (required by a Trier of Fact, or impartial Jury) in a Court of Law – & Equity (or "Justice" – see the proposed Constitution's Article III, Section 2, Clause 2, Phrase 1) BEFORE pronouncing the Verdict ("True Word") that, to continue to possess the car in question any longer, would be regarded by the court, and thus, the government itself, as being an "unlawful detainer" thereof.

169.12 The same thing holds for a Renter/Rentee of Furniture as it would apply to the rented furniture's private owner. It would be immediately realized that to refer to the private owner of rented furniture as a "Furniturelord" or a "Furniturelady" would be a legal and a commercial abnormality, but to accord to that same titled person commercial rights that would not be due to them as with any other common person, would not only violate the prohibition against "titles," or entitlements, of nobility, but it would also violate the First Rule of the Common Law, that each person's word is equal to another person's word, no matter the title or official position or rank of authority possessed by any such other person, disallowing, or else actually prohibiting, the use of any title of nobility, no matter how long ingrained and well practiced the use of such title of nobility, or "special respect" or "consideration," is.

169.13 The Nobility Titles of "Landlord" and "Landlady," as having been left over from the Feudal system of old time England, along with the title of First Lady, are to be done away with, as a matter of a Law and Juristic Verdict of a Fully Empowered Assize, or impartial Trial Jury without a judge, otherwise the fundamental rights of the People/people for the Standard for a Republican Form of Government have not been met, and the Sovereign Crime of Contempt of Constitution, to whatever degree that it is found to exist, Remains, awaiting Justice, in its place.

169.14 While the breach of a private civil contract may be a violation of private contract law, such a violation is not – as civil contracts go – considered to be a violation of "the law," and so does not make either party to such contract a "law unto themselves" to the degree that, without first taking the matter to court, they can obtain any form of remedy as a result of such breach, even though there seems to be an assurance because of the contract's wording that they "will win when they do go to court."

169.15 By creating a special body of law and calling it or referring to it as "Land**lords** and Tenants Law," we place a Title of Nobility before the court of first jurisdiction, one that treats the alleged "land**lord**" or land**lady**," because he or she has been so titled and recognized as such – in the alleged law, as a step up from any other Property Owner, mainly because the property owned is "real property" and not any other item of owned property, such as a vehicle, appliances, furniture, a big screen TV, etc., except that;

169.16 Under the law, that is, under the Real Law, the Law that jurisprudence, not "policy," supports, there can be no distinction of the procedural rights of the property owner based on what kind of property it is that the property owner owns; **it just doesn't work that way**, for in a Republican Form of Government there can be no discrimination, either as a matter of Bias or Prejudice, for or against the Property Owner, even though the Property Owned by the Property Owner happens to be Carnegie Hall in New York, New York, or Caesars Palace in Las Vegas, Nevada, or any other place of like importance, or even what may be categorized as a "hole in the wall" kind of abode located in some ghetto-like part of Anycity, USA.

169.17 Such issues as "potential damage" to the Private Property based upon its high value, no matter the type of Private Property, may be a basis for escalating a case, but does not change the actual rights of the parties to the contract between the parties itself, "public policy" to the contrary being Condemned as **Not*with*standing**.

169.18 Based upon the principles set forth in the Ninth Amendment (see The Ninth Amendment TEST) as existed with the original Property Owners of this proposed country, the Original, Retained Right of the People/people significantly establishes that the **ownership of tenant property – is a privilege**, a privilege that comes with fiduciary responsibilities of those

property owners able to hold out rental property – for anyone, and is not a straightforward right as has, in more recent times, been mispracticed.

169.19 Unlawful Detainer. The concept known as "unlawful detainer" is, of itself, UnLawful, because it proclaims, under law's color, that the claim, whether written or orally made, of a Real Property Owner is Law, and that the other party of the contract, or the Tenant, because the Tenant is not the Property Owner [or Unlawfully, the "landlord" or landlady"] is already Presumed Wrong, no matter the facts of the case, and that the Real Property Owner, under Color of Title and by a grant of alleged law to reinforce the assertion of the same, having stated that Tenant is in Unlawful Detainer, is entitled to have the person removed or evicted, and damages awarded by the Tenant not having done so from the moment that the Property Owner claims "Unlawful Detainer" against the Tenant.

169.20 The term, "unlawful detainer," being itself, when claimed by a private person and not the result of a violated court of law's own Order, exists as both a Noble Contempt of Constitution Crime (a Contempt Crime that is based upon a claim or usage of a Title or Undue Entitlement of Nobility) as well as a General Contempt Crime for Illegal Process, and a Violation of the First Rule of the Common Law, aforementioned.

169.21 For it is the Fact that the Real Property Owner's word on the matter is NOT Law, has no basis in Law to make the word of the same Law, and while the Real Property Owner may have the right to seek damages caused by breach of contract, to whatever exact extent it has been breached – if it has been so breached and there are no other extenuating circumstances that are to be heard by a civil trial court, or a trier of fact, But it is not until the court trial for eviction has been duly called and finished, with a Verdict entered against the defendant Tenant, if such should be the case, whereupon it is Ordered that the defendant Tenant be required to vacate the occupied premise by a certain reasonable time or date, that, if not doing so as Ordered, Then and Only Then can the Tenant be regarded under Real Law and NOT under De facto Real Property Owner [or Illegal Landlord/Landlady] "law," as has heretofore, under the vein auspices and aegis of UnLawful – Republican Form of Government "Rulers," or Judges, been profusely the case.

169.22 Even when a Trier of Fact, or impartial Jury, has been employed to Try the matter before the Court, without the Embracery of any Judge, or Ruler, over it, unless there is a proven danger to the real property owned by the Property Owner, under the Retained Rights of the People, so Retained under the authority of the proposed Ninth Amendment (see The Ninth Amendment TEST), when considering the necessary Time for an Eviction of any Tenant to take place, a number of factors must be considered, beginning with the amount of time that the Tenant has resided at the real property address in consideration, going to the concern for how much property the Tenant may have accumulated at such address that will need to be moved out, from whether or not there are children residing at such address, in order to not unduly harm the rights of innocent children by the impartial Jury's decision, to the time or climate of the year, whether the time for eviction would be during winter months, or whether there has occurred any natural disaster such as violent storm, tornado, hurricane, flood, or fire, and other such real-to-life issues as these that only an impartial Jury, as the lawful and legal Trier of Fact as well as, under the 1670 William Penn Case Principle, Trier of the Law, can and must determine.

169.23 In the last two or three decades, unlawfully zealous marketers of real estate property have undertaken campaigns to turn what was once deemed as homes, or places of domicile where Real People having Real Rights, lived, into owned shell structures, sitting on land property, referred to as "houses, with no conscionable sense for the people living inside of them, and under the veil of corporations and commercial enterprises, have encroached upon the courts into changing the Fundamental Right of the People/people as to where and how they live into nothing more than a business venture or practice;

169.24 However, such acts of alleged "commercial power" going against the Fundamental Rights of the People/people in their habitation of their homes, even though under breached rental agreements, flies in the face of such commercial power's being a Ninth Amendment Contempt of Constitution offense, actionable before any impartial Jury impaneled, as an Assize, for purposes of Trying any Contempt of Constitution Crime. As such, the claim that a real property is "owned by a corporation" or other "commercial power" means that the "court's" impartial Jury has serious need

to listen to the People involved in such case, because such "commercial" or "corporate" "power" also Fails The Republican Form of Government TEST, recognizing that such Government's First Obligation is to the Natural People and not to any Artificial Counterpart, and is subject to being duly denied by any Jurisdictional Power of any court that such a claim comes before.

169.25 A further abuse of a Republican Form of Government along these lines involves the use of credit reporting in conjunction with those who rent, month to month, in contrast to those who enter into any "lease" agreement with the real property owner. In the case of a "lease" agreement where a specific protected time is at issue, the expectancy of a person of worthy creditability *may*, to one extent or the other, be justifiable, however, where the renter is one, as existed under the Ninth Amendment's Retained Rights of the People, on a month to month basis, the intervention of a credit reporting agency constitutes an affecting or the inducing of a contract between two private parties where no written contract, or complex oral contract, exists between the parties, and makes the credit reporting agency liable as to its improper advances – as one of those "commercial powers" before indicated – being among those quasi-organizations who have made themselves into a public power, with governmental honors and respects UnLawfully granted thereto, that, like the occupation of "social workers" (see that subject matter herein), were never granted the Right of Existence of Civil or Criminal Power that they currently Employ, by the People/people themselves;

169.26 For it is a Fact that these credit reporting agencies, having tasted the UnLawful Power of controlling, from an alleged commercial standpoint, the very private lives of the People/people themselves, have, in recent years, engaged in the UnLawful Practice of going into court records, obtaining information of both Civil and Criminal Judgments, and Extending Those Civil and Criminal Judgments – as a part of their Judgmental Products – into the Commercial Lives of the People/people, All Done without Any Ninth Amendment Authority or Power to Do So.

169.27 So Flawed and Skewed are the corrupt Powers of these "credit reporting agencies" that it has escaped, entirely, the attention of the acclaimed legal minds of this proposed Nation as to the following being True

concerning the matter of "debt," upon which such "agencies" purport to exert authority over:

> Debt. What is Debt? What is Debt Not?
>
> Debt is Not a matter of Law, ***Neither*** is Debt a matter of Claim; Debt is a Matter of FACT, and can only be determined by a Trier of Fact, or an impartial Jury, duly called and preserved – for its own Verdict (True Word) over the question of a Debt before it.

169.28 Since virtually all merchants, using a credit reporting agency, merely submit their own "claims" as to debt contract breaches between themselves and the other alleged parties to their business, and have never, or almost never, gone to an actual court trial involving an impaneled impartial Jury concerning such alleged breached commercial contracts, then as to the state of these same credit reporting agencies, reporting, in written form, as to those same merchants' claims, NOT Facts, with no internal knowledge of the Truth on any of it, such "credit reporting agencies," as to their future, among other remedies, are to be made defendants in such Class Action Lawsuits for Mass Action Tort Damages, as the courts of the future, manned by impartial Juries, as Assizes, may sustain.

169.29 Recognizing that these same UnLawfully existent – as Society (not commercially) Approved Organizations representing all of the People/people Equally, Indiscriminately, are Direct Interactors with those who are involved with "Commercial" Real Property Owners, we find that they are become part of the real property owner and rentor (nor renter/rentee) and tenant/rentee problem, and their UnLawful reporting practices must be taken into account under the Retained Rights of the People/people as they came to exist, originally, within the Ninth Amendment's First Generation period of time, retaining, itself.

169.30 The alleged rights of "Commercial" Real Property Owners as Against the Ninth Amendment's Greater Retained Right of the People/people to NOT a Fundamental Right against the Fundamental Right of the People to have Exacted Fundamental Due Process, which Fundamental Due Process draws into the issue All Fundamental Rights that the People, person by

person, may have in any case to be brought before the True Trier of Rights and the Law, Not the Facts only, or the impartial Jury alone.

170.1 Social workers. It is said that "social workers" came into existence as far back as the 1920's, where they were involved in acts of going into families (even in those days), taking children away, and transferring them to other places and States, to be adopted (or sold) to others, with apparently no opposition in the "political forces" of the time in doing so.

170.2 While realizing the fact that "political forces" of that time did nothing to interfere, impede, or stop the "progress" of the "social worker" occupation is *suspect* as to its utter UnLawfulness, we further discover that the "occupation" of the "social worker" is UnLawful, or Illegal, from a Republican Form of Government standpoint, when we begin to ask questions about its origin, and, importantly, its source of alleged authority.

170.3 Great Guile Constitutes Great Evil. No Greater Guile has ever entrenched itself into the government of man than that of the so called "social worker," for if we were to examine the term "social," we would recognize its similarity to the word, "society," which "society" represents the People/people in their Civil, but also Sovereign," Capacity or Existence.

170.4 When we understand that "society" in fact refers to the People/people as a separate body to the other two branches of government, that being the State and the "federal," being also construed and recognizable in the proposed Constitution's Ninth Amendment ("rights . . . retained by the people") and its Tenth Amendment ("or the people"), in which Tenth Amendment it is determinable to be the Third and most Sovereign body of Government, over the other two of them, then we must be Duly Concerned when an actual "occupation" alleges itself to represent that Third Body of Government, the People/people, *or* **Society**, as though **it** has somehow been Ordained to "work' for them, People/people, in any actual governmental form, much less actually having ANY form of Lawful governmental enforcement authority in doing so.

170.5 For if we were to ask the Question, "By way of What Amendment to the [proposed] United States Constitution did the People, as a part of their existence as "Society," authorize the creation of a 'social worker' as though

being authorized to 'work for them,' People/Society?" we would be compelled to Answer, "We can find NO Amendment that Ever Provided for ANYONE to Do That, or This. None."

170.6 Since there was Never an Act by the People, or Actual Common Law-Recognized Society, No Great Meeting of the Minds of the People, nationwide or worldwide, or even on an expanding local basis, that actually created or justified the existence of such an occupation as came to be known as the "**social worker**," we are Affirmed, and Confirmed; we are convinced that the "**social worker**" **IS**, and ***Always Has Been***," **UnConstitution[al]**, **UnLawful**, and Therefore, **ILLEGAL**, as an **UnLawful**, **Unauthorized**, or **FRAUDULENT**, **Representation**, whether alleged to be Direct or Indirect, **of the People** - and THEIR **Society**, **Themselves**.

170.7 If we were to put this to the TEST, and we are, in this TEST, doing just that, we would come to find that the term "**social worker**" began as an organized conspiracy of certain persons - even though not particularly known as to their names - to misdirect the People's/people's understanding and knowledge Away from the Truth, *that* the "**social worker**" **is** in fact just a Deceptive Term for replacing the term "**governmental worker**," which, if having been understood as that very thing from the beginning, would have forced the Questions from the People, and from government officials themselves, **"**How so? Where is the authority of the 'governmental worker,' performing acts as though for the People/people themselves, coming from – as a Lawful source of authority?**"**

170.8 Which could not be answered in the affirmative at all, except to admit, to confess, that there was No **Lawful** Authority to create, or employ, such "governmental workers" (AKA "social workers") if that is the name that they had been known by from the beginning, At All. Because the creation, implementation, and administration of the "**social worker**" was clearly Never Approved or Authorized **by Society**, or the Historic Governmental Body known as "We the People," itself, No Amendment to that Effect Existing, *then* we can only construe it as existing, and functioning, as a Contempt of Constitution Crime – Against the People, or "Society," all accepted "public" practices that may seem to have made it "favorable" for protecting children – Notwithstanding.

170.9 Recognizing at this point that It Is the Right, and Solemn Duty, of an Elected **Full Sheriff** to engage in all Law Enforcement Activities where the protection of children, for Any and Every Actual and Lawful Purpose, is Called For, NOT some alleged Occupation known or referred to as "social worker, to be recognized instead of Lawful Law Enforcement's Place. In short, where a **Full Sheriff** is operating in any County of any Republican Form of Government State, such **Full Sheriff** has all authority necessary to pursue the enforcement of the Law against any parent or parents whose conduct is UnLawfully Damaging to a child, no matter the alleged "psychology" on any case that may be brought before the **Full Sheriff**, and the **Full Sheriff**'s department. The opinions, beliefs, ideas, policies, impressions, upbringings (as though experiences"), etc., of the "social worker" is not only not needed, but it is and would be an UnLawful exercise of the **Full Sheriff**'s Duty to the People to accept, even a small part of a "social worker's" word – on anything.

170.10 Knowing how "social workers" are prone to behave, to conduct themselves as to relying upon their own personal "beliefs," policies, impressions, upbringings, ideas, and so forth, we only have to visit the definition of what a Republican Form of Government ISN'T, to KNOW that the "social worker" occupation within the confines of such a Government's operations or functions is Wrong, UnConstitutional, UnLawful, Illegal, and therefore Wrong.

170.11 Social Science. The acts and activities and beliefs of Society itself, outside of the Common Law, Not being Law, there is No Such Thing as "Social Science," denying further any claim for any alleged right of any "social worker" as a matter of law.

170.12 Seen within the context of the above definition of what a Republican Form of Government Is and Is Not, we can only realize that a "social worker" "occupation" is an utter violation of it, for at no time did the Vested Republican People **Consent** to its Existence – Ever.

171.1 Psychology; Psychologists. Another field of alleged science that UnLawful government has "latched onto" is that of Psychology. At first, because of it abundance of studies of the human experience on questions of behavior, one is lead to believe that it is in fact some sort of science that

government had ought to subject itself to as a part of law enforcement itself, but as we come to understand its actual origin, we cease to be predisposed to that end any longer.

171.2 As is known by the more educated psychologists themselves, "psychology" arose in colleges as a part or function of the Philosophy Department, which offered different courses and degrees on the subject of behavior of the human person, and how best to deal with people because of that behavior, or conduct.

171.3 Further light is shed on this matter when we begin to realize that, if one were asked about how we define "religion," the answer would resound with, "religion is philosophy." Recognizing, for the sake of neutral government, that "religion is philosophy," we must, by exchange the term, recognize that "philosophy is religion." No matter if we hold that philosophy is, in some way, "non-denominational," as other organizations have also claimed, the fact remains that the studies of man's behavior, of what is good or bad for man to do, EXCEPT where long established concerns for violations of Moral Turpitude – going directly to the Common Law – are involved issues, then employment of any form of "philosophy" for purposes of usage by government in its "law making" and "law enforcement" authority goes to a Non-Republican Form of Government, and IS UnConstitution[al], and IS UnLawful, or Illegal.

172.1 **Code**. The Obfuscation of Code, or the dimness of light caused by its usage, because "Code" is Not Law but exists rather as a means of secreting within its wording things not immediately and openly realized by the people whom it claims to have been created for, the concept of "Code" as though a Lawful Representation of Actual Law, Fails to be Sustained, and Is Not Sustainable, as a Lawful = Legal Element of a Republican Form of Government in any instance of its claimed "Code" existence;

172.2 For if asked, What may "Code" contain?

172.3 The Answer that Forward Comes, if it be for a **Non**-Republican Form of Government, Is:

> Policies, beliefs, opinions, upbringings, theories, schemes, practices, "coffee for the judge," donuts (symbolizing even the absurdity as may

be included in the "codification" of actual law), vacation, perks, rewards for the politically correct, protections for the "politically insane," inequality, nobility, privileged persons, famous people, conditions for malum prohibitum, perhaps some "federalism," *some* law, so long as the person(s) doing the "codifying" of the law "over into code" is up to and agreeable with it;

172.4 Which, without Transferring, or "Codifying" some proposed Law over into "Code," would otherwise result in the Law alleged as being transferred to the place where it be found, word for word, exactly as it is, denying immediately and altogether any actual need for hiring a "Codifier" to "Transfer" and "Transform" such Law into any other thing than what it is, denying all confusion, obfuscation, and secretness in doing so.

172.5 Therefore, the use of *any* form of "code," or any *thing* that can be remotely called "code," because of the very nature of what code is and may represent or involve, in a Republican Form of Government is **Illegal**, nor were the proposed Constitution's Framers, Mr. Founder Madison, Mr. Framer Jefferson, Mr. Founder Franklin, and Mr. Founder Washington, men who sought to Hide the Law from the People, with the exception that Mr. Founder Madison was unable to educate the People, and governments, of his time about the True and Absolute Power of the proposed Constitution as he had constructed it to be, for fear that villainous men would have sought to "scrap it" has they known such to be the case, in a "heartbeat" of time.

Insertion of Certain Government Into State Government - UnLawful.

173. IN FURTHER ESTABLISHMENT of the true application of a Republican Form of Government, we look further to the Constitution itself, and its own particular involvement in such a required local form of government.

174. Article IV, Section 4 requires the Guarantee that the State form of government be a Republican Form. A Republican Form of Government goes to a government operated by and on behalf of the local people for whom it is to serve. The local people are to come directly under the laws that pertain to them, or are to pertain to them, without respect to what such laws may happen to be. Without this particular aspect, a Republican Form of

Government *ceases* to exist (or else has never existed to begin with) in favor of another form of government, whatever form it is under whose laws the people are being made to be subject to.

175. The Constitution is construed as being LAW, the Highest Law in the Several States of the United States, and in the central government therefor itself. The Constitution **does not require** the United States ["federal"] government itself to be a Republican Form of Government, and as such, the United States central government does **not** exist **as** a Republican Form of Government, but as a "federal form" of government ONLY, instead.

176. Government For The States. The Constitution's demand for a **Guarantee** at Article IV, Section 4, that the States, and the people's governments thereof, have a form of government whose laws are to be subject to the review and interpretation of those same local people, requires that ALL forms of law to which the people thereof are to be made subject to MUST, by the Representative Authority of a Jury (and not a judge) in doing so, have authority over the same, otherwise, once again, the resulting form of government ceases – to that particular extent – to be a Republican Form of Government, but exists in the nature of the kind of government that has control of that body of law, no matter what that body of law may be.

177. It Is Clear and Indisputable that the proposed Constitution For The United States is a body of law that extends to and is made an integral part of the workings of the government of each and every State of the Several States of the United States, baring none.

178. In consideration of that fact, and it is a fact – as evidenced by the large embodiment of cases and laws that recognize their being subject to it, said Constitution, then in order for the government of any State to be a Republican Form of Government – All The Way – and not just "part way," the people thereof MUST have straightforward, unique, local authority **over** the **same**, and not one whit less than that, in order to maintain their status as a Republican Form of Government, as is due to be Guaranteed (not Suggested) to – and enforced for – them, people.

179. This means that **in a** Republican Form of Government, it is **the People** themselves that **MUST be Immediately OVER** that same Constitution, even though there may be a specific appeal process – to review the local Jury's findings for actual error as to law and fact, if any, **only,** — if appealed in Good Faith (or honesty), — for those same local decisions or *Verdicts (or *True Word), and **MUST have ALL necessary power and authority to Discern It**, to Discern its True Meaning, to Discern its Applicability, to Discern the local laws, for their Lawfulness or UnLawfulness, Under its, Constitution's, supreme Laws.

180. In other words, the Constitution itself, *by its own wording* **requiring** a "**Guarantee** for a Republican Form of Government," *and as a result of what a Republican Form of Government actually is and how such a Government is required to work*, **subjects its very self *underneath*** the ***same* people** to whom it is to be guaranteed for, *for a direct representation of those same people over it*, represented and determined by Juries only, as Thomas Jefferson himself, in 1820, came to the conclusion in regards to that same truth, that "Juries, **not** the supreme Court, should be directly over the Constitution to determine its True Meaning," as stated by Mr. Founder Jefferson in rebuttal to the Reckless Errors, Judicial Misconduct, and Contempt of Constitution, committed by alleged Chief Justice John Marshall in the Marbury v. Madison (1803) case from seventeen years before.

181. And this means that in relation to the Constitution which demands that it be Extended **Directly** to the very States themselves and made subject to the people thereof, the process of determining the meaning of the same begins with the very basic assembly of the people, or that is, the Jury, to work its way upward thereafter in the event it should be necessary to do so.

182. Only after this has been done, and an issue in case has made its way to the alleged U.S. supreme Court itself, was it ever meant that the said alleged supreme Court was to be entitled to give its collective opinions on such a matter, except of course where the matter existed purely as a matter on the part of the real United States itself, and not in any illegal existence of an **alleged** U.S. district as has been imposed upon the Several States, while being *still at war*, commencing January 1, 1945.

183. In addition to any External Guarantee that may exist, as with Article IV, Section 4 of the proposed Constitution, a Republican Form of Government is **also required** to be **Internally**, or **Innately Guaranteed** (as with a Warranty) to all of the people in all of the Several States, in all three branches of government thereof, and not to one or two branches thereof only. And the alleged United States central government itself, as does each State's own government, owes legally to each and all of the Several States of this Constitution[al] union (or "unincorporated association") and to the people thereof, who are the very purpose of a constitution – a Distinct and UnYielding **Republican Form of Government** – as the Constitution for the United States – of America – Expressly Reveals the same Unalienable Duty to be.

184. A Republican Form of Government is made up of three (3) primary elements. It is: 1) a government that represents directly the people for whom it is to serve, in all three branches thereof, not just one or two; anything in any part of such government less than this is not a Republican Form of Government; 2) a Republican Form of Government is derived from laws duly and fully passed, not from rules or policies set by any organization or agency thereunder; and 3) a Republican Form of Government is a government separated into three (3) different branches, the executive, the legislative, and the jurist (should not be, must not be, in a True Republican Form of Government, a "judicial"), all three of which are established to serve (not by appointment) the directly representative will of the people for whom they were designed to serve, accordingly.

Through The GREAT PORTAL.

Republican Form of Government, Absolutely:

185. To Demonstrate Certain Failings For The Mandate, or Guarantee, For A Republican Form of Government, Where a "Federalized" Form of Government Has Been Made a Condition In ANY State Instead, The Following Part of The Republican Form of Government TEST Has Been Provided In Order That Certain Functions of both "Federal" and State

Government May Be Corrected and Brought In Order, Whether "Again" Or For The Very First Time.

186. Our understanding of Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 (See The Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 TEST) as it applies to a crime of commission and a crime of omission changes everything in our ability to distinguish the true "where" the alleged crime has occurred. Add to that our understanding of the absolute guarantee of a Republican Form of Government at Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution, and it forces us to re-read much of Article I, Section 8 more carefully.

187. We see a number of Powers granted to the alleged Congress, which were believed in the beginning to have concurrent power application to the States as well. The erring case of Gibbons v. Ogden (1824) wrongfully defrauded and unraveled many of the rights that "we the people" should have had.

188. To begin addressing this matter in a more direct and common fashion, so that the average person might better comprehend it, we will start with Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, dealing with bankruptcies and naturalization. Note that the word "**the**" does not appear in front of Power as it does "Congress." (On June 6 1787, the word "the" did exist directly before the word "power" in the worked-on Constitution as it was being proposed to be at that time). Notice also in the first part of Clause 4, it uses the word "Rule" and not Law. And further Notice that in reference to uniform laws, they, **laws**, are to be **on** the "**subject of**," **not** the application or **execution of**, Bankruptcies, which are to be "*throughout* the United States." Section 8, Clause 4:

> "The Congress shall have Power . . .To establish **an** uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform laws **on** the **subject** of Bankruptcies ***throughout*** the United States."

189. Now that a Power has been provided, the Congress has a fiduciary duty, a Republican Form of Government fiduciary duty, to make it happen, else dereliction of fiduciary duty would be the charge laid against the Congress if doing nothing. Which raises a certain question, a question that must

comprehend any other part of the Constitution that may apply here, and not just a question that exists only at this point.

190. The question is *nOT*, ***How*** can it be done? The question is, How can it be done while applying and maintaining the requirement at Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution For The United States, mandating to the United States that IT, or the Congress first, along with the bona fide United States Courts, Guarantee to the States, as with a Warranty (and thusly to the people thereof) a Republican Form of Government**?**

191. To answer this second question, considering the fact that it is conceded as appropriate for the United States supreme Court in Gibbons v. Ogden (1824) to admit a conjured dialogue of its own into that case, in order to save time and lengthy discussion, and to get at the truth as to how things were supposed to work and could work, let us equally and likewise propose the solution to be, as though the alleged Congress suddenly cared about its real responsibilities under the Constitution, actually cared about the people out here, and did not care one whit about what the court issuing the Gibbons v. Ogden decision had to say on the matter, or may have thought or said, but rather just a Congress that wanted to do what was right, and so called all of the States together, and with all of its alleged Congressional power and authority granted it under Article I, Section 8, and Article IV, Section 4, stated aloud to the people and the States as follows:

> **A)** Congress: **"**Okay, here is what we are going to do. You (States and People) are going to HAVE your Republican Form of Government as we are required to Guarantee to you that you have it. And so, you are going to have the Right to set up your own State courts, locally, for bankruptcy, and your naturalization offices also, which will keep your controls over the same at the local, State level - local. But this is what WE *must* do, and are GOING to do, to insure that all bankruptcy laws are forever uniform – throughout the United States. We, the Congress, are going to pass laws that will set up, from top to bottom, how each and ever State owned and run bankruptcy court in every State of the United States must operate, without exception, and with severe penalties to be assessed against a State in the event that any State Court

existing among them violates the law of uniformity that we shall have established.

B) 1. **"**By doing this, we, the Congress, will have complied with our duty to uphold our Power at Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution, while at the same time **Not nullifying** our own required **Guarantee** (or Warranty) that each and every State have the **Right** to a Republican Form of Government, or a government that represents the local people, as a matter of law, not "policy."

2. **"**A Guarantee, or Warranty, as with any such degree of obligation, provides its guarantor no lawful choice where the conditions of the guarantee have not been met according to the terms for which the guarantee has been imposed.

3. **"**As with any such legal demand, wherein an Agreement, as the Constitution truly was and is, is reached to secure any benefit, by right, from an intended benefactor, the Guarantee demanded at Article IV, Section 4 has long been too ignored by the federal government in its responsibility in incorporating the same into any of its required application of powers, in law, where a State would have a concurrent power, not denied them in either Article I, Sections **9** or **10**, and where they be some ability or way that the two governments work together for the benefit of a Republican Form of Government, the claim by the United States for an exclusive power under Article I, Section 8 fails, because it must be or should be held that it could have worked a particular way except for the fact that the two governments made no reasonable effort to work the application of laws out between the both of them in order that the Guarantee, or Warranty, might be thus perfected.

C) 1. **"**And we are going to do the same thing for the matter of Naturalization, to pass one Rule, being only allowed that same under the wording of "an Rule," or "one Rule," that will be executed unto you in 1808 as the Constitution, at Article I, Section 9, Clause 1 provides us the opportunity for.

2. **"**And what we will use our "an Rule," or "one Rule" opportunity for is to prohibit the continued importation of Slaves into any of the Several States, thereby Breaking the Slave Trade among the

Several States, each and every one of them, forevermore, which will allow us to better, or more Easily, Enforce our Required Guarantee upon you, the Several States, for a Republican Form of Government; — for a Republican Form of Government **Denies**, **Absolutely**, ANY and EVERY Form of Slavery, Even a Form **Professed** to be For Government; All Done to these extents Because it is Our Duty, Our Mandate, Our Guarantee that We, the Congress, Do These Things.

3. **"**And You, Each of the Several States, will have your own local naturalization offices among you in order to implement this **One** 1808 **Rule** in Prohibiting the Slave Trade, or the "Importation" of People, No Matter the Color of their Skin, No Matter their National Origin, No Matter their Religion or Beliefs, Academic Level of Learning and Knowledge, No Matter Anything Else, for such as that Was Not and Is Not a – The Clause 18 TEST – Granted Power -- existing under either Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 or under Article I, Section 9, Clause 1, -- but ONLY as our unique modifying Power at Article I, Section 9, Clause 1, to be applied, ***in para materia***, to Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, being to Prohibit Importations and NOT to "Deport" or "Transport" anyone From Either Out Of *or* Within Any State – or Even from the Territory of Washington, District of Columbia – to ***anywhere***;

4. **"**For **ONLY a State Government** has the **continued**, or **never prohibited** *and* denied, **Power** to Deport Anyone From Anywhere, which State Deportation Process, in a Republican Form of Government, cannot be Executed Loosely or Without Regard to Actual Law and Fact in order to justify that same, if any and ever, for we, the Congress, realize that it is necessary that each of you, States and People, be able to deal with border immigration in your own State as the actual conditions and laws thereof calls for.

5. **"**And we, the Congress and the United States government, do not have any Right to tell you, States and People, what to do in these matters of immigration and naturalization, we being provided just the **One** Rule, or '**an** Rule,' for our special use in 1808, which we must *also apply* through the Republican Form of Government's **Great Portal** of Authority by recognizing that it is **You**, each State of the Several States, that has ***that*** – The Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 TEST and the

applied The Clause 15 TEST – ***Right*** to Enforce and Punish for that same, and that our own limited Right to order or punish You the States to do anything other than this exists Only Except You disobey Our **One** 1808 **Rule** of bringing an End to, or Prohibiting, the **Slave Trade** in this nation, forever.

D) 1. **"**And the same thing as in "**A**)" above establishes that we, the Congress, must also apply in that same principle to each and ever case of patents and copyrights. For we realize that you, the Several States, have the right to have your own copyright offices and patent offices - locally, so long as those legal instruments do not conflict with any patent or copyright that we ourselves may grant.

2. **"**We further realize that due to the "Full Faith and Credit Clause," Article IV, Section 1 of the Constitution, that all of the other States would have to recognize and honor the copyright and patent laws of each other, as well as franchise laws – no matter how unpopular they might be from one State to another, but recognize also that this could create, in the long run, confusion, even legal chaos, over who has the greater patent or copyright.

3. **"**And to this extent, we recognize that We Must be the one to establish the prevailing (but not replacing) copyright and patent laws for all of the Several States. However, there is still the matter of Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 (see The Article III, Section 2 Clause 3 TEST) and Article I, Section 8, Clause 15 (see The Clause 15 TEST) pertaining to our loss of criminal jurisdiction, and the denial of the right of local law enforcement of or for any crime that takes place within **any** State, in the event that anyone should commit a crime as it pertains to either of these two subjects, inside of a State's borders, thereby depriving we the United States Congress any power to try, and to enforce such a committed crime, accordingly.

E) 1. "Therefore, we Must recognize that if WE, the Congress, should grant such copyrights and patents, even if actually empowered to do so, would thereby create a condition that would in fact diminish the Republican Form of Government that we are Required To Guarantee to Each of You. So, instead of doing that, we realize that the net discernment of these two legal issues is that we are to recognize Your

Right to establish patent and copyright offices, locally in each of your respective States, but we, by Congressional law, will set the precise manner, under our laws, of your operating of them, so that uniformity, or fairness, and justice, will exist at all times, no matter in what State the people relying upon them, laws, may live.

"2. Thus, this will maintain uniformity and potential fairness, maintain your ability to have the Republican Form of Government that we are on the hook to Guarantee, and will solve the Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 criminal jurisdiction dilemma at the same time. So Say We, the Congress, to you, the States, and to the People thereof, at this time.**"**

192. This truth above, as it is now legally revealed to be, provides us with the better understanding that Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, as well as other parts of Section 8 of Article I, requiring that laws (*not* the laws), by the Congress, be made on the subject of bankruptcy (not on the bankruptcy laws) to be made by the Congress, be for the purpose of requiring State governments, having the right to establish bankruptcy courts in their own States, operate those State bankruptcy courts, **Uniformly**, under such laws as the Congress might mandate, but be operated by State officials or employees, not those of the United States itself.

193. By this act by the alleged Congress, mandating that the establishment of laws for operating bankruptcy courts in the several States be made uniform, the bankruptcy laws, for the benefit of State owned and operated bankruptcy courts, under the auspices and aegis of the laws of the alleged Congress, would certainly be made uniform, not like the way United States bankruptcy courts are now, each adhering to their own local rules, and policies, that allows them to do whatever they like, to whomever they like that files with them, violating the supposed uniformity that the alleged Congress was supposed to bring about this way.

194 1) The same concept as with bankruptcy courts was meant to be the applied process for Naturalization, for it would have been ***unthinkable*** to ***believe***, in 1787, that the United States government was supposed to, or expected to, set up border patrols and port for catching "illegal aliens" as they came across the borders;

2) That did not happen, and it was not the way that it was intended to happen. The idea of naturalization was to set up the laws which would act as a requirement and guide for the several States; ***their*** governments were already in place, so it would make more sense to place the responsibility for overseeing new citizens coming into the United States-nation of the Several States, directly with the States, but empowered under alleged United States law, or Rule, as being over State law (Article VI, Clause 2) than to spread the United States government out thinly by trying to govern the whole country on this matter all at once.

195. The alleged United States central government *had* neither the time nor the manpower to keep up with the crowds of people streaming across the borders at that time, and so more sense would be to have delegated the States to do that, but oversee the whole thing under the supreme supervision of laws passed by the alleged Congress. That is the way that it was supposed to have worked through Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, not the way it is being made to work, contrary to the way the Constitution is laid out at Article IV, Section 4, now. Because Article IV, Section 4, Right to a Republican Form of Government Is a Right and not proposition or suggestion, the current practice represents a defraudment of the Rights of the people at the aforesaid Article IV, Section 4, and becomes incorporated into the evidence that there exists rampant Jurisdiction Frauds committed by the United States, against the governments of the several States, and against the People, clearly residing therein, and nowhere else.

196. And no less on the subject of patents and copyrights, Article III, Section 2, Clause 3, State criminal jurisdiction requirements (see The Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 TEST) apply to these subjects as well, but by providing for those concurrent powers to be established under a State's government - directly, and the United States indirectly, such concurrent establishments would render the possibility of State operated patent and copyright offices as being maintained in more local areas (Republican Form of Government), while still establishing the United States' right to issue the final exclusive right binding what the States had already done, but maintaining the necessity for prosecution of any patent or copyright crimes committed in any State as is required by Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

197. Regarding another acclaimed necessary "federal" power for "antitrust laws" in a Republican Form of Government, on the matter of monopolies and their unlawful or wrongful damage to the People in a Republic themselves, in their, People's, commerce and *their* other rights as to any necessity for external anti-trust laws; the concern for monopolies going back hundreds of years and not to any recent Twentieth Century time passed by any alleged Congress; monopolies being regarded as a violation of rights under the Common Law at a greater level against the People than the ordinary violation thereof, a Republican Form of Government is fully qualified to pass and enforce laws against them, and the People, either individually or as an affected group of them, have the right to seek redress against any such monopoly, or monopolizing effect, of their own right, not particularly reliant upon a statute passed by Government, as long as their case is made to Arise with the court of proper jurisdiction as having been duly established and maintained within the Republican-State (though not "politically" "Republican" or even "Democratic-Republican" State) itself.

198. As before stated, A Republican Form of Government is a Government of Law, and Laws Established From and Under Fundamental Law, NOT a government of Opinions, Beliefs, Policies, Feelings, Impressions, Tastes, Notions, Whims, Game(s), Code, Philosophies, Sentiment**(**s**)**, Slants, Practices, Claims, Up Bringings, Personalities, Elite Class or Elite Ideology, Estimations, Convictions, Persuasions, Rules, Rulers, Suppositions, Conjectures, Speculations, Theories, Personal Non-Factual Conclusions, Attitudes, Ideas, Sentiments, Views, or Thoughts, and is NOT federal," or "*federalized*," or "feudalistic," or "monarchistic," or military, or socialistic, or imperialistic, or communistic, or an oligarchy or group of "rulers," or parliamentary, or parliamentary-like government. It, a Republican Form of Government, is about Laws, Laws, and Law and Laws alone. Anything more or less than this, is **corrupt**, and it is **evil**, and it is **UnConstitutional**, and it is a ***crime*** against the people known as **Contempt of Constitution**.

199. As we, much greater than before, understand what a Republican Form of Government actually is, we find something wrong with the way Article IV, Section 4 is being applied by the said supreme Court itself, for its interpretation is applied ***as though*** it exhibited the following language:

> 'The United States shall guarantee in every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, **EXCEPT this** Constitution shall NOT be included as law as a part of such said same Republican Government, to be interpreted thereunder as a part of said Republican Government, to be guaranteed to any State of the United States, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.'

200. In other words, if we follow the U.S. supreme Court's line of reasoning, whether in Marbury v. Madison (1803) or in Barron v. Baltimore (1833), the very **Constitution itself** *that* ***Required*** **- the Guarantee** of a Republican Form of Government to and **in** Every State in the first place would Itself have absolutely NO INVOLVEMENT as to any interpretation therein **As Would Be *Required*** of a Republican Form of Government. Such an idea represents a Broken Law of the Constitution, is "repugnant" to Jurisprudence, and to the proposed Constitution itself.

201. Such Political Insanity as that "Ruled" upon by the two aforementioned cases, being visibly corrupting to a Republican Form of Government way of life, forced upon the people Despite the fact that Article VI, Clause 3 **demands** that ALL government officials of EVERY State **Know** and **Obey** the Constitution For The United States, each at their own level; **Not Required To WAIT** on an interpretation by such supreme Court BEFORE obeying same.

202. This **violates** Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution, under which the Constitution ORDERS, not suggests, that the United States **GUARANTEE** (or in another word, Warranty) a Republican Form of Government to the people of every State of the proposed United States.

203. **Republican Government, Inviolate**. Again, or in other words, such a government, without the main body of law available to local governments for interpretative use, would actually only be a **Partial** Republican Form of Government, **at best**. A "Partial" Republican Form of Government is NOT a such a Government as is Mandatory, or Required to be Guaranteed, by Article IV, Section 4 of the aforesaid proposed Constitution itself.

203.1 This has allowed the proposed Constitution, over the years, to be broken at almost every point, part by part, by which the resulting claim for law, created from its beginning, is made broken also from that which was broken. Wherefore, those charged with protecting the first broken law, not doing so but protecting the consequential broken law instead, become the first lawbreakers of the law, there being many that have been UnLawfully charged by them with breaking the second broken law(s), being beneath that Great Law of the Constitution in its already broken parts, requiring that we therefore espouse within these same principles of Knowledge and Truth, this, that all may know from whence that which is UnConstitutional in law truly comes, as expressed by these precise words, - for; . . .

. . . **You Cannot Break A Broken Law.**

203.2 For a law created or resulting from or under a Broken Law is of its own self Broken from the first moment of its origination; it has all of the consequences and potential for suffering of that which any higher Broken Law is able to mete out for the sake of justice against the ravages of its, Broken Law's, victims, with the liability being owed by those who benefit by its Brokenness the way that any other Contemnor, guilty of Contempt of Constitution, must be made to pay for the Criminal Deed Done.

204. These following definitions magnify and confirm the scope of the meaning for which a Republican Form of Government – Made Mandatory as a Warranted Condition To BE Enforced by the United States central government – All Three Branches Thereof, a Warranty or Guarantee NOT being a "recommendation" or a "suggestion," or an "allowance" that may *hope* to be made effective "one day." It ***Is*** LAW When Backed BY LAW, and ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4, as Proposed, When Duly Accepted by the People of the Several States, and their Governments, **IS LAW**.

205. Webster's defines a Republican Form of Government to be:

> "one in which the sovereign power is exercised by representatives elected by the people.
>
> "A republican form of government being the united will of all the people, such government can only exist as an embodiment of

laws, laws which continue from time to time, without change, stable to be relied upon, and promised to the people for their own immediate benefit and the benefit of their heirs.

"Take it away from all of the people, and the government dies; take it away from any portion or diminishment of numbers of the people, and to that unjust extent, the government, as republican, is destroyed. By such denial the State becomes an oligarchy, an aristocracy, or a monarchy, none of which exist as a conformity to the demands at Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution."

206. In Chisholm *v.* Georgia, **alleged** Chief Justice John Jay said: "At the Revolution, the sovereignty **devolved** upon the people, and *they* are truly sovereigns of the country; but they are sovereigns without subjects, and have none to govern but themselves. The citizens of America are *equal* as *fellow-citizens* and *joint-tenants of the sovereignty*." (emphasis added). Noting that the term "**devolved**," as in "**to lay upon**," also refers to or indicates being "**settled**" or "**vested**" upon, ***over***, or into, a thing.

207. The Liberty of Sovereignty. In a Republican Form of Government within a Republic, the People own all of the land not privately owned among them, equally as a body, and they merely entrust their Republican Form of Government to provide for a general use of the land, and the lands divided among the land, where the same are not prohibited by any form of reasonable, not violative, law, for the benefit of all of the People of the Republic and not a select few.

208. Consequently, the existence of any land or lands that are considered to be "State property" are in fact the property of all of the People to whom the Republican Form of Government is formed to Serve *Under*.

209. Therefore, as it was in the beginning, so is it to be again; in a Republican Form of Government, the People have Perfect Authority and Liberty to trek at their own will upon them where there is no actual danger to public safety and where such land(s) has not been designated for a particular purpose so as to be considered in the same framework of governmental purpose as is seen evident in the Fifth Amendment, last phrase thereof, or that

is, "for public use," and not for public non-use, as a fake use, just for the sake of having it but not using it, for the sake of social esteem or appearance only.

210.1 **Invasion into the People's Businesses**. Where Government is not a monarchy, an oligarchy, a feudal system, or a parliamentary government, but where such government is, in full fact, a Republican Form of Government within a truly established Republic, the purpose of Government is to **govern**, subject to the will of the People and to the Inherent Laws that pertain thereto, and any such Government therefore has No Business being in Business. Consequently, a Republican Form of Government is not entitled to engage in any form of business which even a single person within the entire Republic would have right to engage in any business form and not be found acting as such Government itself, or in a Governmental form or capacity, as any part of such Government thereof.

210.2 The Denial of a Republican Form of Government engaging itself in any form of Business in which any private citizen of the Republic holding out such Government as being Republican in its Form also goes to not merely those forms of business that involve commerce and common commercial transactions, but also goes to business forms that pertain to Social Values as well, such as but not limited to, Government owned cemeteries, mortuaries, colleges and universities, schools, law schools, hospitals, recreational facilities and halls (not inclusive of such a hall as a city hall where public interest meetings may be conducted), and such other institutions that may be a result of some form of either religious or philosophical orientation or belief, a Republican Form of Government, while not denying the any existence of God as though unreality, excludes one religion's domination over any other where no Evidentiary Supreme Deity exists, *indisputably* before the People, to require that it be otherwise.

210.3 Additionally, as a just cause against Government being in Business – it is potential, if not actual, that where Government has its "finger" in actual business of any kind, that this actuality may serve UnLawfully as an Undue Influence over the issue of Voting (so that State employees won't vote to "bite the hand that feeds them"), and therefore constitutes a breach of trust and a conflict of interest for pure Republican Form of Government interests of such a magnitude, that it can not, in any wise, be any longer ignored.

210.4 NO Private Business or Organization, no matter the contract or contractual business and no matter how quasi-public its actions and activities may be, can exist as though a part or branch of government and therefore may not act in any capacity as though being such government, any part or branch thereof, itself, except its existence and activities be utterly fraudulent against the Rights of the People to be protected by their Republican Form of Government itself.

210.5 Among Other Things, National Contracts. No government (such as a national government) not a direct Republican Form of Government can make or enter into any contract, either directly or indirectly, with the People or Citizens of a Republic, and as to a Republican Form of Government itself doing so, such Republican Government can make or enter into no contract with the people, or either of them, that it serves; it may establish such laws as are indiscriminate, which exist in *neither* a biased nor a prejudicial capacity, or as no form of "favoring laws," not based upon "policy" or other defect of not-law, which do not diminish the rights of all other citizens (a Republic includes all of its citizens) by its existence, but which benefits the people or citizens for whom its very existence was vested, from the first to the last.

211. Public Schools. Where public schools and vitally needed education and reading skills are concerned, a Republican Form of Government, by the consent of the governed People (for it was the lack of ability of most of the People, in the beginning, of being able to Read – little or at all, either the laws passed or the Constitution itself, that lead to much downfall of our proposed Republican Form of Government to begin with), may provide for the establishment of such schools or educational facilities so as to convey Essential Education to the same, but whose teachers or educators are not — even if to any degree subsidized - in trust - by such Government's specially designated public funds raised by general, lawful taxation — bound as though any official of such Government, and therefore not made to come under the auspices and aegis of that same Government, accordingly.

212. This means that while there exists within a Republican Form of Government - as within the State bearing such People's Sovereign form of Government - an undeniable necessity for the education of the People themselves so far as the ability to read the Constitution and Laws that are to

serve them and be in a governing capacity over them (not in replacement of the Common Law), where "extracurricular activities and subjects" are concerned, such exists as an UnLawful Condition in a Republic, even though "Public Policy" alleges to cry otherwise, for such same extra activities and subjects can, and will where a more perfect Republican Form of Government is concerned, be obtained through commercial and social interests outside of the Republican Government Form itself, by use of any number of known private process for doing so.

213. Therefore, a Republican Form of Government is not at any liberty to, as though acting to "govern" any particular thing, enter into any form of business, or contract, whether commercial, social, religious, or alleged secular, that can be engaged in by any private person or citizen residing, having domicile, or existing within a Republic where such Government Form is Duly Vested, not in any single instance or location, anywhere within the said Republic.

214. Were it not so, then such Republican Form of Government would be immediately capable of corrupting the lives of the very People for whom it was formed to serve, for it would find itself capable of entering into one form of business after the other with the continued guise that by doing so it was somehow serving the People themselves, even if that guise were that it, Government, was better able to fund itself over taxation, and therefore acting a though a public service to the People.

215. Because of the principles established by the process of the Vesting of a Republican Form of Government, resulting in Non-Discriminatory Equally Shared Equal Rights *Forthwith* among the People for whom it is to serve, yielding forth the Inherent Right of Due Process itself *therein*, so that such Republican Form of Government may not move even one-inch in any direction against an Inherent Right of the People (compare to the evenly spaced, immovable points of an equally proportioned grid, the points in semblance of the People), a Republican Form of Government also may not engage in any Invasion Activity of the Inherent Rights of the People, such as those that were expressed in the proposed United States Constitution's Fourth Amendment, for such Amendment was in fact nothing more than an outward, written Expression of this same Inherent Right indelibly contained within the

concept of the Republican Form of Government itself, and cannot be done away with by Government, to any degree, no matter the claim or excuse any such Government may use to do so at any time.

216.1 Creating, Causing, and Enforcing, Existence of Contracts Between UnConsenting Citizens Denied and Prohibited. A Republican Form of Government, through neither of its branches or departments, may create or cause to be created or established any form of contract between the citizens thereof, irrespective of any claim of exigent need for any contract that should exist between such citizens. Simply put, no government coming under or within the scope of a Republican Form of Government has either right or lawful and legal authority to create an obligation between one citizen or another based upon "public policy" that there should or ought to be such an obligation between citizens if the citizens themselves that are involved have not entered into an agreement where a meeting of the minds to that extent were met, for if it is possible, to the most small or single degree, that any person for whom such illegal, governmentally superimposed agreement, has the right to reject the advantage or benefit, if any, of the forced agreement, whether or not such is actually implemented by any such party, then the illegal act of superimposition of contract, whether alleged as civil or criminal, between such citizens accelerates to the Sovereign Crime, or Crime Against the Republic, of Contempt of Constitution, prosecutable as with any other Contempt of Constitution Crime.

216.2 This for of Offense against the People of a Republic includes such forced contracts as the appointment of trustees, alleged to be representative of a debtor in a bankruptcy proceeding, irrespective of what level such said trustee has been created to represent either person, on one side, or creditor or government on the other side, and likewise includes falsely or illegally Government created contracts between a male and a female involving an agreement for the financial care of a child, where no actual contract was formed between the parties, whether prior to or else after the fact of the child generating conduct, which points to a financial agreement by either party, other than that which the application of Natural Law requires, nor is it an Actual Truth that such a contract is *prima facie* in its existence merely because a condition of Natural Law exists between the parties that would make it so if they but affirmed "yes" consensually (Note. NO "Consensual

Contract" exists outside the particular biological act engaged in - if there is even *that much* Consensual Agreement at all, as in the case of a violent force of the same - as being *prima facie* merely on the basis of a biological act or result of act willingly engaged in between the parties) so that Errant, Contemptuous, Government could intervene and enforce (or **Force**) a contract that does Not exist except that actors in Government might "wish" it so, whether for the "sake of pubic policy," or for any other UnLawful and Illegal reason than that.

216.3 Another term, *now realized*, for a **Forced Consensual** "Agreement" **is** called **R A P E**, and it is, NOT merely "UnLawful" when finally discerned, or figured out, or discovered, but it is Patently **ILLEGAL**, To A Violent Degree, and Qualifies Minimally as Contempt of Constitution to a **Malicious** Degree, to the Second – Blood-At-Risk – Degree Thereof.

216.4 The creation, or alleged discernment, and ***then*** subsequent en**force**ment, by *any* government, of a **Forced Consensual** "Agreement" between two or more parties who have not clearly confirmed an Actual and Lawful Agreement between themselves, IS, ***Indubitably*** – **RAPE *BY* GOVERNMENT** – under Color of "Law" and Color of Power, and since **all** forms of law(s) of Government(s) come beneath a Constitution, *then* **Contempt of Constitution**, No Less.

217.1 Law Denied as Product. Because the Law, in a Republican Form of Government, is an inseparable part of the very People's lives whom it represents, it becomes an indisputable and permanent conflict of interest for any group or faction within the Republic to establish or attempt to establish the Law, or either of them, *as though* a product, in order to sell the final discernable meaning of such Law for a price or as a part of any alleged "practice." This reality goes to the very words that were included in the proposed Constitution's Sixth Amendment, which words were in fact representative of the only kind of business of law that can be entertained in a Republic, for which the term "practice of law" was illegally or unlawfully substituted, being "assistance of counsel," the word "counsel" being defined in Noah Webster's 1806 Dictionary as being inclusive of "a friend."

217.2 For that which is not clearly definable by the People themselves, as the concept of **"**practice of law**"** is **not**, represents a diminishment of the Truth, the Truth being an Inherent Right of the People, and a Inescapable Requirement of Government, in a Republican Form of Government, whereas an "assistance of counsel" is, of a certainty, definable and discernable both, and may include assistance that is paid for, or assistance that is free, at the discretion and ability of the one needing such assistance.

217.3 Consequently, Denial of Law as Product goes to the UnLawful and Illegal Act of Substituting or Replacing the actual term and concept of "assistance of counsel" with "practice of law" and "practice law" in order to gain Power over the People by Bar associations and courts at any level, for the Illegally Replaced "assistance of counsel" set forth in the Sixth Amendment goes to the Equally Shared Equal Rights that are and must be maintained by a Republican Form of Government, no matter the claim that the People are being "protected" by the myth that attorneys always know more about the law (which attorneys in legislatures have been guilty of devising those laws – not the Common Law in order to Unlawfully secure and promote their profession) than any ordinary citizen possibly could, or does, based on the idea that the attorney passed a test indicating superior knowledge in law – as now UnLawfully made a Product by such test, on which spurious, public-rights denied claim the People have been milked of their own right of sustenance by such same vile UnLawfulness.

217.4 The exigent requirement for Denial of Law as Product goes to one of the most fundamental principles of a Republican Form of Government's being vested, forthwith, with Equally Shared, Equal Rights, applicable, without discrimination to each person coming under its umbrella of protection, that denies any form of the illegal concept of the "practice of law," the imposing of which serves to suppress the rights of anyone to speak or assist another, whether or not for a compensation, at any time the Republican Form of Government, either branch or department thereof, causes any concern or legal dilemma for another person or citizen in his or her residing within the Republic itself, is first summed up by the following expression of those rights in their simplest terms, and then is expanded to their more applicable condition of fundamental rights immediately thereafter. Simply put from the first, the First Right is expressed generally:

"I have the right to protect the rights of another citizen which protects the rights me."

"**I have the right to protect me**."

217.5 And the Second Right, extended to reach the greater plateau of Republican fundamental rights, is like unto the First Right just expressed:

"I have the right to protect the rights of another citizen, when such protection is not denied or opposed by such an-other citizen, which protects the rights me, and those close to me who are a part of me."

"**I have the right to protect me, and those close to me who are a part of me**."

218. The Purposes of Due Process; Due Process Purposes – Step by Step. Recognizing that the principle of Due Process involves Inescapable Sequential Steps, One Step At A Time, and One Behind The Other, we also come to Understand that for each and every Step there exists a Purpose, even if that Purpose is to connect the Step before it to the Step that comes after it.

219. While "Due Process" has often been equated with proceedings in making law and civil litigation, it is also the determining factor that exposes criminal conduct as well, for it is when either a required Step is missing that challenges a False Claim for Truth and demands that the Actual Truth be revealed, or else it confirms the Wrongdoing when all of the Steps, without the slightest Exception, fit perfectly together, end to end, like a puzzle when fitting its last piece.

220. The concept of "Due" involves the concept of something that is immediately "Morally Owed," or is part of a bigger picture of a Moral End to which the Due Step is to be found to Inherently Belong as an inseparable part of that same bigger picture, upon which a Republican Government Form and the Republic's Society therewith depends for *their* unquestioned Essential Existence at all.

221. Because all persons or citizens coming under the protection of a Republican Form of Government have, instantly, or forthwith, Equally Shared Equal Rights, the principle of Due Process can only exist for their

clearly perceivable good, and never for their Undue Harm or Demerit, no, not one of them, and not even for the scantiest amount of time.

222. This is important to understand, because it goes to a condition often found in **falsely claimed** Republican Form of Government, if such is claimed at all, which is of itself a harm to any person to be protected to the true Republican Government Form which is identified here as:

223. **Control** *for the Sake of* **Control**. Control for the sake of Control, and not for a real moral reason beyond that, is a condition that is often found in legislative branches that are personal-power bent on brandishing their own errant beliefs in superiority that simply does not *legitimately* exist, even in the remotest sense, although it is more usually seen within the ranks of law enforcement as acts of power flexing that has no actual purpose beyond the act itself, and whose purpose fails as being committed for any moral purpose, and therefore likewise fails the "Due" part of "Due Process," existing instead as an Immoral Act (there exists no such thing as an "amoral" act within the real or Actual Truth required within a Republic) on the part of the law enforcement official that committed that same, even if in the name of law enforcement or alleged good at the time the Undue act was committed.

224. The very fact that within the language of the People there exists a word such as "**Undue**" points to the fact that some acts committed were "Not Due" and therefore must be recognized as Immoral or Unlawful instead.

225.1 **Democracy In A Republic**. Democracy has been defined by some as meaning "mob rule," but Founder Thomas Jefferson, before his public life came to an end, came to have a different understanding of this term, for originally he, Thomas Jefferson, considered the term "Republican," as contained in the proposed Constitution, to be of the utmost importance because it signified Republic, which Republic would require a Republican Form of Government, a most precious form of government on the earth to be regarded for the most basic of human rights of the People themselves.

225.2 The first part of the word, being "demo," comes from the Greek word demos, which is also the related root word of another associated, meaningful word, "**demonstrate**," which is essentially what the word "demos" means, plus the word "cracy" which denotes an organization or group having **power**

to do one or more things, which also suggests, by the use of the principle of the word "organization," that it is not meant to be construed as any form of monarchy, and since an oligarchy has no true *demonstrable* power without the use of many others to go along with such small group, organization in this sense can only suggest to mean a larger than small group.

225.3 Therefore, the word "democracy," in its more completely defined sense, means the ability of a group of people to express their concerns and desires by ***demonstrating*** it with a show of power. It might be supposed that one could say that there is a "Power **in** the People" far beyond that which monarchists and oligarchists wish to recognize, and although there are those who would like to insist that democracy is nothing more than "mob rule," calling it, erroneously, "mobocracy," following the teachings of Lysander Spooner, who was much wrong about a number of things (though not everything), the word “democracy,” with its true understanding revealed, comes no where close to this definition, but rather has both merit and weight as to its arguments.

225.4 For at this time it is timely to recognize that Thomas Jefferson himself, that great professor of liberty and Constitution, the founder of the “Jeffersonian Republicans,” claimed to be a political party but more precisely being an attempt by Jefferson and his followers to enforce Article IV, Section 4’s Republican Form of Government – **Guarantee** upon the governments of the Several States, before he, Founder Jefferson, had completed his life’s service upon the earth, coming to understand the vital necessity of the employment of a Controlled Democracy in a Republic, changed the said name of “Jeffersonian Republicans” to “Democratic-Republicans” **instead** – a matter of pure historical fact.

225.5 To understand this, we are to focus more thoroughly on exactly what Democracy is in actual use as opposed to simply calling it a name based upon its literary meaning, literally defined. To understand it we simply declare it as it is, for there are two (2) forms of Democracy, being embraced by the concept of the Majority which **demonstrates** it. They are:

225.6 (1) Simple Majority (or Simple Democracy), and (2) Complex Majority (or Complex Democracy);

225.7 Simple Majority. Simple Majority is pretty much just like it sounds. It is the absolute majority to its finest degree that relates to any subject. Thus, if out of ten thousand people, five thousand and one vote for a particular thing, and four thousand, nine hundred and ninety nine vote against it, the one discerning vote is still to be considered the greater weight of intelligence, and still holds as the governing principle. However, it is certainly understood here that in such a case, that one discerning vote might have, to some extent, been confused or misinformed, so therefore the Simple Majority vote process, while still being basically correct in its principle and foundation, in the event that there should have been some immediately, undiscernable flaw contained in the arguments both for and against, is the one that contains the highest risk. That leads us to the other type of democracy, or complex democracy;

225.8 Complex Majority. Complex Majority relies on the idea that there should be established some number significantly higher than a Simple Majority provides for, such as "two thirds" or "three fourths" or some other such number. You see, our Founding Fathers were not really “off” when they established the principles of the ‘weight of intelligence’ in the Constitution, as demonstrated herein, were they?!

225.9 In these two principles, both Simple Majority and Complex Majority, **Democracy holds true**. Democracy does not require that there be a one hundred percent agreement on everything just to be valid, and if one wants to dub every such occasion of majority decision as being “mob rule,” then that would make it a charge that, in that legendary biblical scriptural event known as the “Great War in Heaven,” God, having the two-thirds (2/3) on His side, was wrong no matter the greater number, and therefore the Devil being right, even though having only the one third (1/3 - the lesser weight of intelligence) on his side, should have gotten to stay and the two thirds (the greater weight of intelligence) should have been kicked out. That, however, according to the accounting as recorded, was *not* the way that it worked out.

225.10 From this, we begin to understand what Thomas Jefferson came to understand about “democracy,” in both its simple form as well as its complex form, is that it is in **fact** a **vital necessity** *without which* a Republican Form of Government would have no way to operate, no way to function, and would exist as an **ideal only**, but could never be made to be applicable as a service

to the people, there being no practical way of determining who should represent who or what, unless or except done so by use of either a singular appointment (or monarchistic) or group (or oligarchistic) means in doing so.

226.1 Electors / Electoral College. Electors, Voting Process Vital, Critical, in a Republic and its Republican Form of Government. The true responsibility and authority of the electoral candidates during qualified elections where they are used.

226.2 It has long been misunderstood as to the actual purpose of electors as referred to in the proposed Constitution for the United States, which has lead to a subsequent misuse not in the interests of the People as a Republican Form of Government would have it be. As a part of this TEST, in order to provide a full disclosure of all aspects of this most precious and desirable form of good Government, a revealing disclosure of the actual purposes and powers of the long disputed "electors" existence follows.

226.3 The true purpose of electors, also referred to as the "electoral college" for some dubious reason (for it is certain that even "college grads" don't understand it either) has been entirely misunderstood too long. Our Constitution's Founding Fathers were much wiser than unknowing people have given them credit for. By a careful examination of the Law within the Constitution, along with certain indisputable facts, we arrive at a different understanding of the true, powerful, and revered purpose of what we, at times, refer to as the electoral college employed in a presidential election.

226.4 When the question of Voter Fraud surfaces, as it sometimes does, in a presidential elections, the dilemma is that - the people have been lead to believe the solution to be the to bringing of the whole voter fraud thing before a judge in some open court and settle "who won" and "who lost" there. This is entirely incorrect, as provided for within the Constitution itself.

226.5 In Article II, Section 1, Clause 2, the Constitution For The United States provides for an official, temporary office, for use in presidential and vice-presidential elections, known as "electors." It is the job of these officials, electors, to cast the final vote for the next president and vice-president of the nation.

226.6 There have been many debates as to their necessity for existence, yet their existence has never been changed, never been denied, and still exists as a matter of fact in Constitutional Law to this day.

226.7 The way to understand this is to first understand what the correct way is not. What is not correct, but was the way it has been thought to be done, is to bring a "suit for voter fraud" against: (1) the "White House;" (2) the involved voting precincts in question; or (3) the political party believed to be behind the voter fraud itself.

226.8 There are some fundamental reasons why all three of these approaches are legally wrong. One is because, no matter how much voter fraud may be literally exposed and proven in a presidential election, no court has a single shred of jurisdiction to change anything about the outcome of the election of that president due to such fraud if proven, which they would have to be able to do in order to overturn votes (through fraud) that were directed at the lower candidates, much more than just for the presidential office itself.

226.9 For in a presidential election, no court of the United States or of any State has the jurisdiction, power, or authority, Constitutionally, to do a single thing, to change a single thing, to alter or reverse the outcome of it. No. Not one thing. For not even by a unanimous vote of all of the justices of the United States supreme Court itself could an order be issued demanding that any one electoral candidate change his or her vote for the president, no matter how much election fraud surfaced afterwards, and was proven before even that same court.

226.10 By a careful examination of the facts and the law, it is determined from every standpoint and direction that there is a Power existing during a presidential election that is greater than the power held by the alleged United States supreme Court to control the voting process that goes on in any single State, and the supreme court of the State itself fares no better over this issue than does the alleged U.S. supreme Court.

226.11 For during a presidential election, the greatest legal power in the United States, is not the alleged Congress, certainly is not the President, and not the supreme Court or any other Court, *nor* is it even the military forces themselves, but this most greatest of legal powers is **vested** singularly and

absolutely, State by State, in one group and one group alone; the Constitution's own electors themselves, and in nothing less than this is this greatest Power **vested**. This is a **critical** understanding for the preservation of Republican Government standards and integrity on an ongoing basis.

226.12 As we examine these electors, we discover some words that are to be associated, legally, with their very existence. These are such terms and words as "inherent powers" and "inherent rights," and "fiduciary," and "fiduciary capacity," and "inherent fiduciary responsibilities," and "inherent duty." And "Liabilities" - to the people's votes – and to the people; . . . with whom they, electors, with those same votes, have been entrusted.

226.13 The one group set forth in the Constitution itself - where proper jurisdiction to bring a complaint action for such a thing as "voter fraud" in ANY State of the United States, in each applicable State - is the group called the State's electors.

226.14 This truth now surfacing, we find that it is the right, it is the duty, it is the responsibility, it is the liability, of those elector candidates at that specific time, to do the following, when there is ANY element which might have surfaced indicating voter fraud, during the voting process:

1) Accept Complaints, and review those Complaints based upon any real substance for cause of alarm and/of suspicion;

2) Investigate, directly or indirectly, the nature of those complaints, and any evidence that might be found to pertain thereto, involving that potential for voter fraud;

3) Investigate, if there is a desire to do so by any one of them, any other issues of voter fraud which there might be reasonable concern for;

4) Then to Try {yes, **TRY**} the Evidence (not *any* "law") which their gathered Evidence has brought before them to consider;

5) Reach a Conclusion based upon the Trial of Evidence of alleged Voter Fraud;

6) Come to a Decision about how their own electoral votes, as individuals, are to be cast, and from that as a Group, how their votes are to be cast, but

still as individual electors if they should decide to, in the final judgment; and

7) Cast THEIR Votes, not necessarily respective to what the original votes counted may have been ONLY IF actual Voter Fraud was determined by an actual investigation conducted by them, but IF No Voter Fraud was determined, then casting their votes based upon the original votes as counted (otherwise their very existence would be fraudulent from the first instance), toward the outcome of the vote for the next president of the nation;

226.15 It is thus the **job** of the Electors to **accept** complaints from viable sources, review voter fraud evidence, **interview and** if necessary **depose witnesses**, **weigh the numbers of those votes cast**, and **minus** therefrom **any fraudulent votes cast** for a particular candidate, and then to **meet together**, privately, upon conclusion of such investigative procedures to **study**, **discuss**, **try**, and **determine how** their elector's **votes should be cast**, and then to **cast their votes**, personally and individually, based upon their own **conclusions** drawn **from** the **evidence**, if any, as reviewed on the matter, with the Power of **no court** of *any* State *or* of the nation having jurisdiction or authority to change that vote, *no matter what*.

226.16 The above procedure is the Constitutionally, Inherent Procedure and Power that all electors for president and vice-president have; it is the Power that they, electors, have always had, even if they did not know it, and no court, even in a Republican Form of Government, can take it away from them.

226.17 And to this end, it should also be known that there is NO Constitutional requirement that says that electors are supposed to cast their electors' votes the same day or night of the election itself, just because a media person is at their door, with a camera and a microphone, telling them to do so. Nor can any State's government pass any law demanding how each individual elector, individually or as a group, must pursue their determination of how they will vote, so long as it is done, not recklessly, but responsibly. It is in their, electors,' hands alone.

226.18 Consequently, any elector — acting recklessly and with disregard as to the possibility of the exposing of voter fraud - to be determined fully during the next day, or else days thereafter — who releases his or her challengable electoral vote before the public, and by so doing, influences any other group of electors in any other State, in their casting of their own electoral votes before their own voter integrity facts are known, may be sued for damages, after the election, for the cost of the presidential candidate or candidates so defeated by such reckless conduct as an elector. Noting also that, in the proposed Constitution, there is no immunity granted to an elector from lawsuit to protect that same under such reckless or irresponsible conditions as above stated.

226.19 The **conclusion** of *any* "political" party that no voter fraud exists following an election is entirely **irrelevant**. Only the election electors as established by Article II, Section 1, Clause 2 of the Constitution can lawfully and legally determine whether a presidential candidate won or lost their votes, based upon an actual investigation of any voter fraud that was revealed to them, and examined and tried by them, post election procedures.

226.20 The question as to on what grounds a lawsuit would be laid against an elector, or electors, is answered: For dereliction of their fiduciary duty, in their fiduciary capacity, *having* the inherent right and power to do so, for their failure to perform the certain inherent, or inseparable duty of an elector – to cast their vote with the integrity entrusted them by the people, and to not do so recklessly, for their, elector's, negligent failure in casting their electoral votes before the time, before any form of voter fraud could be reasonably assessed or insured against, thereby violating their fiduciary responsibility to the people in whose care their electors' votes were solemnly entrusted.

226.21 Electors in any election have been given no form of immunity from lawsuit in the event they perform their duty with reckless disregard for the consequences thereof., or are derelict in their duty to perform as responsible Electors should perform an inherent duty, even though implied but not prescribed. This lack of immunity extends to the fact that, if establishing evidence and testimony of dereliction of duty, abuse of fiduciary responsibility, avoiding inherent duty, and so forth, may also result in a presidential election receiving an actual - court of competent jurisdiction -

injunction, to stay the swearing in of a president on the prescribed inaugural date, for which said errant electors would be liable.

226.22 In a Republican Form of Government where Electors are established for insuring voter integrity, citizens of the Republic are entitled to an action against any elector in their own State who - during an election wherein such elector has been called upon to serve - acts with reckless disregard toward the duty to wait until the votes themselves have been proven in order to insure that there are no issues of voter fraud surfacing thereafter, or who, if voter fraud does surface and is made known to the public, does not seek to examine and try such complaints, based upon the testimony and evidence available, before casting his or her official electoral vote.

UNLAWFUL APPLICATION OF A REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

227. When the alleged United States central government puts ***into***, or causes to operate within, any of the Several States –(or in any of them)– ITS **own** government, **THAT form** of **government IS** what the people of those States, each State – State by State, HAVE and are being subjected to, or being made to deal with, even though in conjunction with the State's own government, without question or doubt.

228. Any government that imposes or becomes a part of the government of the people, or citizens, of any State of the several States of the United States, *no matter what the source of that government is*, has the U.S. government's Constitutionally Guaranteed Right to have *that* government – – irrespective of its source or original form and even if that government is the United States itself – – relate or have to do with the People in a Republican Form of Government **ONLY**, inclusive of such government's law enforcement, and not to impose upon such State's people or citizens **ANY** form of law enforcement that is not representative of the required - by required Guarantee - Republican Form of Government, for any reason, to any extent or degree, for any purpose, whether short sighted or long sighted as any alleged political proposal might conceive.

229. So far as is known, the alleged Officer of the alleged United States central government known as either director or commissioner, or by other title, of either the Central Intelligence Agency; Internal Revenue Service federal agency; Federal Bureau of Investigation; Federal Trade Commission; Department of the Interior; Securities Exchange Commission; Drug Enforcement Agency; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; Federal Aviation Administration; Homeland Security; Department of Transportation; Defense Nuclear Agency; Postal Service; U.S. Marshal's Service; National Forestry Service; or any other such *alleged as legal* agency of law enforcement, or any other agency, of or for the alleged United States central government has been voted upon or elected by the citizens of the State wherein this TEST shall be published to or embraced by the People and/or the Governments thereof, nor by the citizens of any other State of the Several States of the United States, and therefore violates, utterly, maliciously, and indisputably, the Guarantee of the United States that ALL government(s) of ALL of the several States of the United States-nation, inclusive of all forms of law enforcement thereof, be entitled to, and Guaranteed, as by a Warranty, a Republican Form of Government as the same deals with, pertains to, and has to do with their own State's citizens, which none of the federal law enforcement agencies or their officers does, as required of them at and by Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution For The United States.

230. The U.S. government has *interjected* itself into and among the governments of the Several States, but has not done so to any Republican Form of Government extent as demanded of it that **it** Guarantee to the people of the Several States for their own, local or State's governments, and therefore it, the United States, has **breached** its own required **Guarantee**, ***which it may not do***, except it be a Contempt of Constitution, else its reasons for doing so be found as both fraudulent, as a matter of Jurisdiction Fraud, and Treasonous to a legal degree for the reasons set forth herein above.

231. Any time any government interfaces with the people of any State, that government IS government for that State's purpose, even if regarded as ipso facto, and must be made to be a Republican Form of Government only, and instantly, else the United States has breached, by its failure to make it so, its required Guarantee contained at Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution.

AN UNLAWFUL ABROGATION AND A DEFORMATION OF A REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT; THE PENAL SYSTEM VERSUS THE "CORRECTIONAL" SYSTEM.

232. A number of other things have occurred as a result of there being no actual Enforcement of the Warranty, or Guarantee, for a Republican Form of Government in each and every State that has brought about a harsh and UnLawful Corruption therefrom. One of those occurrences is the conversion of the side of government responsible for carrying out the sentences for crimes convicted for, from the original Republican Form of Government supporting penal (or punishment) system to the now flourishing, at the People's expense, "correctional" system.

233.1 The "correctional" system that has been implemented in the place of the Constitution supporting penal system, is not only **bad** from the actual in-depth understanding of the nature of the concept, but is UnConstitution[al] from three different points of Constitution[al] LAW. Those three Constitution[al] points of Law are as follows.

1) [1] A "correctional" system [allegedly] gives a court's judge, who is proclaimed as a "ruler" (for the same "rules," not providing a "verdict" {or "true word"} on cases routinely), Power over the entire life of the often hapless party coming before "the court," and not just over the offense – for an actual punishment of that sole same as would be the case in a penal system.

[2] This Power over the entire life of a person, to search back into his or her life for any kind of wrongdoing whatsoever, even though not connected at all to the current offense before the court, is a judicial Power that was not recognized or included in the words at Article III, Section 1 of the Constitution's "The judicial Power of the United States," for that judicial Power, coming from England, was seen as it was vested in the 1670 William Penn case involving Penn's charge for allegedly violating The Conventicle Act, which judicial Power made judges subservient to Juries (except by abuse of process and abuse of discretion, as an abuse of power), for they were not allowed to Try Either the Law or the Fact at that time.

[3] **This** was, and is, the **kind** of judicial Power that the people on the American continent inherited from England, and it is the Power that was embraced by Article III, Section 1, giving it No Total Power **over** the very lives of the people (as existed under the ancient judicial Power of Israel), which lack of such total power was vested as a **penal system** and **not** as a "correctional" system, as corruptly exists today.

[4] This Illegal Power of judges, not coming from the judicial Power of England but from the judicial Power of ancient Israel instead, over one's entire lifetime rather than over single case events as they pertain to an alleged offender is exposed in its factualness by that which is known as the Presentence Investigation Report, which Investigatory Power, belonging inherently, exclusively, to the Executive Branch and NEVER for the use of the judicial branch at all, involves the actual investigation into all aspects of one's life up to the time of a most recent conviction, so that what an accused may have done in the past, not necessarily limited to actual conviction of a crime but inclusive of charges dropped; *suspected* conduct according to reputation among persons knowing the accused; to even, in some cases, religious and personal beliefs and activities; "unacceptable" persons associated with, and so forth; – thus to include all of the foregoing into the final decision of sentence itself, rendering such Presentence Investigation Reports to be nothing less than precursors (pre-directives) to sentences that are, *because of such Reports*, **nothing less than** double jeopardy sentences, **punishing the accused a second time for the same offence(s)** (there just isn't any way around this reality) for what they may have been punished for before (Contempt of Constitution), as well as punishing them for things not actually charged for (violating and abusing "due process" – a **Contempt of Constitution** to a **Tyrannical Malicious Degree**), hidden from the People by the same judges that UnLawfully, Illegally, were made to RULE over them, in Violation of Article IV, Section 4, Republican Form of Government (Contempt of Constitution), always.

[5] The claim for a judge to employ a judicial power that can extend over one's entire life, to render a judgment over that life in any detail, and to apply that judgment in connection to any current offense at hand, convicted for, represents the ancient judicial power of ancient

Israel, as with the Court of "Ruler" Solomon, being both a king, and yet differently, unlike his father, as a "ruler," over the court which he ruled over, not strictly under the law, but under whatever claim for wisdom and insight that he chose to employ for any case brought before him.

[6] Unlike the judicial power from ancient England, the judicial power, or the power to "rule," coming from ancient Israel, was based upon its theology that such a ruler was to be "**ordained** by God" (*that was the belief of ancient Israel*), and without being so ordained, was a blasphemy against God for being made an "UnOrdained Ruler of Israel" as a judge in government (see The Courts and Judges TEST).

[7] Ordinarily such a subject would not be raised, it would be construed as inappropriate, but since the judges of today have dared to extend ***their*** judicial powers, clearly beyond that judicial power of Article III, Section 1, then it is appropriate to discern and discuss just what it is they, today's judges, are doing - and have done with reference to their involvement of the Article IV, Section 4 **Guarantee For A Republican Form of Government TEST Challenge**.

[8] For the Power to review the scope of one's entire life, and to rule upon that life and how whatever might have been done is to affect a judgment in a current case, Is NOT the Article III judicial Power being enjoined to the courts of the United States, upon which the legacy of the current courts for their monstrosity of **Added** Judicial **Force** Vis Major over the people in such cases before them. It is a Different Power from that judicial Power enjoined and preserved at the proposed Constitution's Article III, Section 1, and if it should ever be determined that the theology under which such judicial power originated is True, then such Unlawful Usage *will be certain to have its own* "*reward*" for those same judicial acts performed under it, UnOrdained.

2) [1] The second point deals with the actual operations of a "correctional" system itself, and how that "correctional" system **violates**, routinely, the Republican Form of Government mandate that it not involve "upbringings," opinions," "tastes," "opinions," "beliefs," "impressions," "policies," "practices," "code," and so forth, but which Article IV, Section 4 **Violations** do exist in the following minimal "correctional" system formats.

(1) The prisons, alleging to "correct" the offender, act to impose policies, theories, opinions, and beliefs upon their prisoners, yet with all of the years that the "correctional" systems have been engaged, there are few reports indicating or confirming that they actually "correct" anybody the way that they are "supposed to." A Penal System makes no *pretense* of "**correcting**" the offender, but is **straightforward**, a **punishment**, as is meant by its meaning, and the Penal System is, as a matter of law, a measuring the punishment to fit the offense, without the idea that the punishment given may not be enough once it is proclaimed "done," and that it must be continued, "even after done," in order to make that offender "pay" on top of "payment" on top of "payment." That latter approach belongs to – the "correctional" system alone.

(2) On the outside of the prisons and jails, there are the "probation officers" and the "parole officers," whose very existence is a direct offense against the mandatory government required of Article IV, Section 4, for it is a matter of a record among the people that these "officials" routinely imposed upon their hapless "clients," more at victims, their own personal beliefs, opinions, ideas, impressions, and even their, "officials," own upbringings, none of which have a thing to do with any law, just whatever the probation or parole officer is desirous to require of their client –for the moment, for which Article IV, Section 4 abuse the client – being "corrected" by the said correctional "official" must pay an additional money-fee to, **above** whatever Taxpayers' money that is to be paid to the same for his or her "services" of "correcting" the offender, creating an obvious condition for corruption, that the probation and parole officer "correcting" officials often become more abusive as to the Rights of the offenders (such offenders do still have rights in most cases), than the offenders are often found guilty of themselves.

(3) This function of the "correctional" system does not work to actually "correct" the offender-**victim** *of* the overall "correctional" system, it just makes a number of probation and parole officers (or Slave Masters and Slave Overseers), once

ordinary people from an occupational standpoint, very high-income earning people (salary + many client fees) within their own circle of governmental employment.

3) It is the last condition for violation of a Republican Form of Government by the use of a "correctional" system instead of the penal system that this proposed United States was founded upon, that is the most disconcerting, for its realization holds nothing but disgust for those State governments who, with obvious lack of Constitution[al] responsibility and a reckless indifference to the truth, for it is **A Violation of the First Amendment**, joined by **the Ninth Amendment**, that becomes the corrupting cause against the Essential Guarantee for a Republican Form of Government at every turn.

4) For, the truth behind the concept of making a government, whose officiating people are not-perfect, flawed, faulty, imprecise, inaccurate, inexact, uncorrect, deficient, inadequate, incomplete, erroneous, fallacious, fallible, specious, wrong, and imperfect, as being "correctors" over those who such government says are "offenders," holds an ulterior motive behind it, which is best personified in religious terms, not "secular," for it is largely "religious aspirations" that dictate the quality of "correction" over punishment, based upon the following *hypocrisy*:

> Says the Corrector to the Correctee, "**I see something amiss in *you*. Let me put out the beam that is within *thine* eye, that thou mayest be *corrected*, that you may be made perfect like unto me (or we)**."

233.2 Additional Truth About The "Correctional" System: Hospital of the Mind?. The Unconscionable Lie.

(1) There are many illnesses or sicknesses in the world, some capable of being treated with just a medicine or two, some requiring the simple work, or the extensive work, of a skilled surgeon, some illnesses for which there is no cure, but yet requires the services of trained and skilled physician in order that the person afflicted can be made not to suffer until that final fatal moment shall come.

(2) When complications of illness become so severe that the common medicine or outpatient form of surgery will not work, we admit and transfer such ill person to a place called a hospital, or a place where the physically ill person may be given qualified, special care sufficient to bring about the healing, whether eventual or virtually immediate, or curing of same from the illness that was diagnosed before being admitted to such hospital at all. "Correcting" bodily functions as a matter of biotechnology or applied medicine is a process that is deemed reasonably possible for the benefit of the afflicted person in order to achieve some specific physical health goal that the physician has in mind as a result of the diagnosis or prognosis being administered to the person in need.

(3) While there are, today, hospitals for the mentally ill, such hospitals do not ordinarily proclaim guarantees for cures for mental illness, yet to the extent that they admit patients for treatment of one form of mental illness or the other, the concept of "patient care" is, the same as hospitals for physical illness care and treatment, a fundamental or core condition for their very existence.

(4) These things, however, cannot be said of prisons and jails as though their alleged "correctional" system is one that was or is designed so that the "ill person" alleged as needing treatment will come out "healed" or "cured" of whatever the alleged illness was supposed to have been at the time of "~~diagnosis~~ / "~~prognosis~~" / arrest and conviction, whether or not duly effectuated, for there never was a prison, or a jail, that was ever thought of or claimed to be any sort of "hospital" for either the mind or the spirit of or for the People, a place where, upon their coming out, would find them "healed" or even "cured" from whatever form of malady that caused them to be "~~admitted~~" incarcerated therein in the first place;

(5).1 For it cannot be argued that a prison or a jail is a place where the ~~Hospital Staff~~ Guards - ready to ~~care for~~ shoot and kill, or else ~~gently guide~~ beat the ~~patient~~ inmate ~~to a cured/healed way of life, resulting that such~~ with a club until senseless, or otherwise manhandle, the ~~patient~~ inmate - exist as though that some form of physician, whose specific duties include the administering of some form of prescribed treatment, tender caring, or even some kind of physician's surgery (Beatings and Bullet Holes do not qualify for any known form of physician's surgery) in order to help the ~~patient~~ inmate to get ~~well again~~ "corrected" in all that has gone wrong with him/her

since ~~he/she came down with the diagnosed illness as a result of some bacteria or bio-mental brain deficiency or other~~ he/she broke some law, whether or not alleged, that landed him/her in that ~~Prisoners' Hospital~~ Prison or Jail so that he/she could be ~~Cared For, or Even Cured, and Gotten Well Again~~, Hypocritically, or Falsely, "Corrected," Even if takes **Beatings**, **Committing Reverse Punishments Upon The Public**, **Shooting and Killing** Them (that'll "correct 'em every time) ***in order that*** the alleged Now "Corrected" One that **Had** the Beam-In-The-Eye **can go** "**Free**" **Again**.

(5).2 The fact that there are those prisoners that go the entire time in ~~the Correctional Hospital~~ Prison and finally get out without being "Corrected," or Healed, or Cured, at all, Establishes that the Prisons were/are NOT actually meant for that sort of thing to likely occur - to begin with.

(6) While there are, today, prison physicians who provide a physician's care for inmates as patients, and there are a form of "case workers" who provide some kind of "emotional stress relief" form being inside of a prison, not actual therapy or healing or curing the actual problem that existed on the "outside," the fact is that it is still the guards and the warden that make up the so-called "correctional" system inside of those Pretentious, UnCaring Walls, exposing the whole "Correctional" Institution as the very Fraud and Farce that it is, in addition to the fact that such "Correctional" Concept exists as a Violation, Without Doubt, and a Breach, of a Republican Form of Government, which when Guaranteed to Exist for the People, MUST Deny and Prohibit such Governmental "Correcting" Conduct and Procedures, Altogether, Forever.

(7) As we begin to see here, along with all of the foregoing discerning subject matters on the issue, the claim that the Prisons and Jails somehow exist as a "Correctional" Remedy for the Social and Legal Problems and Dilemmas of the People, whether locally or throughout the world, IS A LIE, an UnConscionable Lie, and those who continue to proclaim it for the world in which all must live in will ultimately go where all other **Liars** have gone before them, In The **PIT**.

234. It is a revolting, upsetting thing to have to realize (for most conscionable people) at this late date, but it is the nature of what we as a people have **degenerated** to, because we **failed** to require that the **required Guarantor** of Article IV, Section 4's Republican Form of Government, that

is, the alleged United States central government, **prevent us** from **devolving** and **degenerating** to just such a degree, and degrees, as those that are aforementioned here. But it is not just that the alleged "correctional" system in its replacement of the "penal" system is a recognizable Failure in doing what its UnLawfully Acting Progenitors brought about many decades ago; It Is The FACT That **It Is *Against THE LAW***, and so constitutes a Violation against the kind of government that *was*, and ***is***, **required** for all - at the proposed Constitution's Article IV, Section 4, to the benefit for each and all of us, and for our posterity to follow us.

235. Enhanced "Correction." Where there exists any *claim* for an "enhanced punishment," or a greater degree of punishment for a crime committed, and where that claim for an enhanced punishment does not go to the very same kind of crime that was committed before the enhancement condition is called for, such a claim for enhancement constitutes an Unlawful act to "correct," not strictly punish, the accused, and so, is Unlawful in a Republican Form of Government. As a matter of the Truth in Punishment, as in a penal system, the condition for a sentence for an enhancement cannot exceed the minimum necessary measure of real punishment that is to be made applicable to the actual crime itself, and cannot be made as comprehensive of the crime before it.

236.1 Ex post facto law/laws.

The term "ex post facto" means "after the fact;" –

The word "fact" means a thing that exists, that has come to exist and does exist, provably, without question or doubt; –

And when applied to the word "law" or "laws," means a law or laws that have been passed after the fact of that which has does exist or has come to exist;

Based upon the precise reading of the term, ex post facto, itself, without externally applied interpretation, as from any form of policy, opinion, belief, or desire, proclaimed for a particular end, applies to any law or laws in focus indiscriminately, irrespective of whether the same be for civil law or criminal law;

… "ex post fact law" or "laws," when prohibited to government, denies such government any and all authority, no matter the claimed end result therefor, to either propose or

> actually pass any law whose execution is to be brought into force, or enforced, after the fact of a committed [f]act, whether by commission or omission, which might be considered an offense, either civil or criminal, if committed after a law relating to the same alleged offense was first passed;

236.2 It is the Right, the Unquestionable Right, of Every Person to NOT Do Wrong at Any Time, Whether such Wrong be Considered to be Civil or Criminal; This is One of the Inherent Rights of Nature, and Universally It Can Not Be Lawfully Denied or Altered.

236.3 Because an Ex Post Facto Law, passed after the fact and made, Statutorily Retroactive to a Time BEFORE an Act in Question was First Committed, Making the Person Performing Such Act an Offender, Either Civil or Criminal, the Entire Concept of an Ex Post Facto Law VIOLATES, VICIOUSLY, With Malice and Venom, the Fundamental and Inherent Rights of a Person NOT to do or commit Any Wrong Whatsoever, Whether Civil or Criminal, Both are Made an Indispensable Subject the Prohibition of "Ex Post Facto Law(s), No Matter the Claim, Reason, or Alleged Purpose that Government, Or its UnLawful = Illegal Parties, May Have Conspired or Schemed to Violate, or Betray, to Its Own End Purpose, No Matter What Such Purpose May Be.

237.1 To Impair the Obligation to Contracts - Prohibited. Violation, by Circumvention, of this Prohibition Constitutes one of the Most Frequent Shams At Law that Governments, today, Have Come to Employ For Their Own Self-Serving Ends, and is Prolifically Regarded or Claimed by them as though it is their Right, after all, to Make "Laws" that Make a Mockery of those Assembled Words, at the proposed Constitution's Article I, Section 10, Clause 1, Having Ever Been Written, At All, In the First Place.

237.2 Because a Law, if passed to be made applicable After The Fact, is Recognized as being an Ex Post Facto "Law," the same as being Utterly UnLawful = **Illegal**, and is Utterly, Inherently UnConstitution[al] in Every Sense of It, the Only Way to "Pass a Law" that would prevent a people from engaging in an activity, Not in Violation of any law of Moral Turpitude Where No Due-Process Offenses has First Been Individually Determined,

Where Control of that which would Otherwise be Free, Commercially, to Be Engaged In Otherwise …

237.3 … Is to make such to-be "Passed Law" apply to the existence, or potential for existence, of Future Contracts BEFORE "two or more persons" have the chance to enter into and "obligate" themselves to such "Contract(s)," in whatever form they might potentially or conceivably exist, which would cause such "obligation to contract" to fall into the Ex Post Facto "Law(**?**)" category if attempting to impose a Law going to a committed [F]act after such "obligated" [F]act, even though such [F]act was Willfully Entered Into between two or more Freely Consenting Persons engaging in Commerce, the Right to Do So being an Inherent and Fundamental Right of People whose lives come under the Fundamental Authority and Jurisdiction of a Republican Form of Government, not that of a "Federal" Government, a Monarchal Government, a Parliamentary Government, an Oligarchic Government, or any other form of Government Not Openly Consented to by such People, instead.

237.4 Realizing these things, there exist certain principles of Law that necessitate how such Acts "Passed" to prevent Parties in Commerce from Contracting Before they have a "Chance" to do so, are Legally and Lawfully Defined, for it is well settled by the legal profession in general that to Circumvent, or Attack, the Rights of a Person or Persons by the Creation of some form of [alleged] Law or other "Legal Act" Constitutes a Collateral Attack (meaning, at law, to "go around the law) and is a Sham Law or Legal Proceeding, for it has DeFrauded those who, without the alleged Collateral Law, would have the Free Right to Contract, and the Right To Be Obligated To Contract, which was Taken Away from Them Before They Could Exercise That Right by the UnLawful Violation of the Prohibition that the Republican Form of Government NOT "Pass Any Law [IN ADVANCE – "Ex Post Facto" Already Provided For!] Impairing The Obligation of Contract(s)."

237.5 This is the Way it Was to Be, And Yet Is, with Republican Form of Government, in any form, at any level, having NO Right to Pass any Law (Code, Policy, and Even Rules - Denied) - as relating to Contract(s) - before the Fact that, where Moral Turpitude is not an issue, which would Deny two

or more persons or parties the Right to Contract together, the outcome of such Obligation, without the breaking of a Law of Moral Turpitude being at issue, NOT being the "business" of (or being "None of the Business Of") such Republican Government, whether such Contract involves/has involved Obligations of Standardly Hired Employment, Obligations of Insurance, Licenses, Transportation, of Sale Prices of Product(s), except where acts tending toward monopolization – a prosecutable offense already cognizable under the Common Law – are a part of such Sales Contracts, contracts of Care-taking, and other forms of Contracts so long as there exists no concern for provable health and safety risks at issue; simply put, a Republican Form of Government has No Lawful Authority to Pass ANY Law Before the Fact that Has the Effect of Impairing an Obligation of Contract(s) which two or more persons might Lawfully Engage In, or Enter Into, EXCEPT for the [alleged] Law itself, Existing as a Law – Malum Prohibitum, and NOT a Law – Malum In Se.

238.1 Right of Simplicity of Law. The Right for the Simplicity of Law, in Republican Form of Government, Is the Law, denying All forms of Code and deliberately worded complexities of alleged law; …

238.2 … Which denial further denies Malum Prohibitum as any part of any Republican Government Law, which Malum Prohibitum is by definition, - A thing that is wrong because it is prohibited, not because it is inherently immoral or unfair.

238.3 Therefore, in a Republican Form of Government, the people have the Absolute, Fundamental Right AGAINST All Code, All Forms Thereof, and Complexly Stated Laws, requiring that all Laws be Passed and Published Openly, Simply, – to the People's Firm and Simple Understanding – At All Times.

239. Grand Juries. Grand Juries in a Republican Form of Government, constitute a fundamental protection of the laws and the rights of the People under those laws, and so are not, as has been supposed by certain "judges," that the existence of a grand jury is barely more than a duplication of a trial jury, to be UnLawfully utilized by a government's prosecutors only so that we find Grand Jury Abuse in the stead of the Lawful Duties of a Grand Jury

to determine, most of all, the "constitutionality" of the laws that an accused may be charged with violating, not merely a confirming the existence of reasonable fact that have taken place on the part of an accused before an indictment, not a warrant, following an arrest of an accused shall take place.

240.1 **Grand Jury Abuse** is defined as the utilization of or empowering of a Grand Jury for a purpose, or by use of a process, for which it **was not** intended. "Was not" goes to the Original Intent of the *proposed* Constitution's Fifth Amendment's Founder, Mr. Founder James Madison, as we see from his words stated in his June 8, 1789 first presentment of the Bill of Rights before the acclaimed Congress of 1789, which stipulation of words by Mr. Founder Madison recognized that the concept of the Grand Jury was to be established within "counties" of a Republic or Republican State, and were never intended to be considered as being applicable to any "federal" government for its use, no matter the claimed need for use, at all.

240.2 Bear in mind that, as has been clarified herein as it pertains to the right of the issuance of a warrant for an arrest as coming under the Executive Branch, or lawful Law Enforcement (as an elected sheriff) — NOT the Judicial/Juristic Branch of Government — allows for the accused to be arrested well before the Grand Jury is to be impaneled to consider - for the purpose of any indictment to be issued – its own equally considered plaintiff and defendant outlook on the laws alleged to be broken that it is being confronted with, in order to consider the validity of those laws in the case likewise before it; Consequently, a government's prosecutor is not entitled to use, or misuse and thereby **Abuse**, a Grand Jury without any right of the defense to know of the grand jury's involvement for an actual trial by the Trial Jury (NOT "petit," or "small" jury), as in a Trial **BY** Jury and not "with Jury," and to have the right of the defense to be equal to the prosecution in its own right to present, not the case to be tried itself, but to present the issues as to whether or not there be any actual facts in the case, whether lawful procedures of obtaining those facts, by law enforcement, were by due process employed, and whether or not those laws were in compliance to the Republican Form of Government's own State/Republic Constitution, or to any greater Constitution, such as the proposed United States Constitution, if such also existed in the case before it.

240.3 In other words, the use of a Grand Jury to effectuate an arrest has long been entirely wrong, or has been one form of **Grand Jury Abuse**, and it has been because of the misunderstanding of the Right of the Executive Branch's lawfully established Law Enforcement (as an elected sheriff) to, under the usage of the principles set forth in both the Fourth and Sixth Amendment, to carry out an arrest without liability to either the sheriff or the government in doing so, following the issuance of a duly averred to warrant by that same Executive Power, not a judicial Power, that the Grand Jury has been used, or misused, secretly or without the knowledge, or else equal allowance or access, of the defense or defendant in the accused's case, so that the laws that the prosecution, or complainant, claims is at the heart of the crime alleged to have been committed, can be reviewed by that same Grand Jury of its lawfulness, or else UnLawfulness, as the case may, according to that which the Grand Jury investigating the Laws of the Case may consider them to be.

240.4 From the understanding that the Accused is already to have been arrested, it is clear that the job or duty of the Grand Jury is to oversee the legitimacy of the arrest process itself - that was used in the arrest, to determine **if** the Sixth Amendment's "witnesses," meaning, not one witness, but two or more of witnesses (in compliance with both the First Rule of the Common Law or Law of the Commoners – *everyone's word is Equal*, plus the "**Men of Straw**," or **The** "**Straw Shoes**," ***corruption***), and whether or not there was someone, as an injured party or witness, who has Sworn to the facts and the Trued Law that was broken in the case, and with all of this, it is the final job, or duty, and the Right of the Grand Jury to decide the validity of the Law, at all levels, up to the Law of the Constitution that has given it, Grand Jury, its very existence, that the Accused is to be tried under, **before** making its decision, not as to guilt or innocence of an Accused, **but** as to whether or not an Accused should be tried at all based upon the laws and the minimum of facts and witnesses that are before it, from both the Accuser and the Accused in the case.

240.5 As a consequence of its own Duties and Rights employed in a case brought before it, where both the proposed prosecution and the defense have been provided the ability and opportunity to present their preliminary sides to convince the [State] Grand Jury, always to have been a State Grand Jury, of the Truth of the matter, the Grand Jury has the Power, as an Inherent Power to

its very existence, to either issue a True Bill of Indictment if it reasonably believes, on a collective, impartial basis, that there is reasonable evidence on the part of the Accused that the Accused has committed the greater crime alleged and that the law(s) against such commission as being lawful under the greater law governing laws, or else a True Bill of Dismissal on the basis that either the law(s) under which the Accused was arrested were not valid or lawful under the greater law governing laws, or that the procedures, including the assessment of involved facts, leading up to the arrest of the Accused were by some means or in some manner defective and fraudulent, in which case such an Accused would be, and **is** required to be, set free without any unnecessary delay.

240.6 It is because of this very condition, because the Right of Warrant, originally belonging to Law Enforcement of the Executive Branch, as long-ago history -- of its own self, in historic cities and towns all over the Several States of the United States -- proves over and over again, having been UnLawfully, or UnConstitution[ally] **switched** over to the Judicial[?] Branch instead, that we have been unable to see, clearly or not at all, just how the Grand Jury was to be utilized to protect both the laws and an accused subject to them in a Republican Form of Government, the Grand Jury, as seen in the statements made by Mr. Founder James Madison on June 8, 1789, at paragraphs 28, 29, and 43, showing clearly that the Original Intent of the Fifth Amendment of the Bill of Rights was meant to be a State's / States' Rights issue and NOT a federal rights issue, as was "ruled" to be the case in the UnLawfully decided case of Barron v. Baltimore, 1833.

240.7 In clarifying these particular paragraphs of Mr. Founder Madison's important introduction of the proposed Bill of Rights for the First Time, we read at paragraphs 28, 29, and 43, of that revealing June 8, 1789 date, as follows: . . .

240.8 At paragraph 28 we read:

> ". . . in all crimes punishable with loss of life or member, presentment or **indictment** by a ***grand jury** shall be an essential preliminary, provided that in cases of crimes committed within **any county** which may be in possession of an enemy, or in which a general **insurrection** may prevail, the trial may by law be

authorized in some other **county of** the same **State**, as *near* as may be *to the seat* of the offence."

(*****This reference to the "grand jury" goes to the Fifth Amendment, and by its connection to the "**county**" within the State, proves undeniably that the Fifth Amendment's Grand Jury was (and is) to be a **State Grand Jury** and not ever a "federal" Grand Jury at all. This fact reverses the grossly erroneous, or else fraudulent, 1833 case of Barron v. Baltimore claim that the Bill of Rights were *only* for the "federal" government, for as seen at paragraph 28 of Mr. Founder Madison's presentment of the Bill of Rights, the Bill of Rights, at the Fifth Amendment, were to be applied to the Several States and **not** to the United States - **At All** - instead).

240.9 At paragraph 29 we read: "In cases of crimes committed *not* within any **county**, the trial may by law be in such county as the laws shall have prescribed." **From this We Note:**

1) That The same word "**county**" in the beginning of paragraph 29 above has been proposed **to be a part of** the Sixth Amendment.

2) That the reason that the word "district" instead of "**county**" was used in the Sixth Amendment was because a district can be easily created by a State's legislature for an area where no one, or hardly anyone, lives or does business, while organizing a **county** requires people living in and doing business in the same.

3) That is to say, "**counties**" always require people to actually be living in the area that the **county** is to be established for before those people, petitioning their State to become a recognized **county**, can officially call their area a "**county**" in the legal sense, but a "district" is a legal description of a State that the State's legislature itself can designate, without any organizing by people living therein required in order that it be established as such. This was the reason for replacing the **States' counties** in the Sixth Amendment with the **States' districts** instead.

4) That It is to be noted that in the Sixth Amendment, the word "State" and the word "district" are both joined together by the

conjunctive word "**and**," not the disjunctive word "**or**," written with the conjunction form as "State **and** district," signifying that the district to be seen in the Sixth Amendment was to be, and is to be, a **State District** and **NOT** a "federal district" (never was meant to be that way) at all.

240.10 At paragraph 43, about midway, it reads: ". . . **some States have no bills of rights**, there are others provided with very defective ones, and there are others whose bills of rights are not only defective, but absolutely improper; instead of securing some in the full extent which republican principles would require, they limit them too much to agree with the common ideas of liberty.." NOTING:

1) Thus, by this statement at paragraph 43 we see that Mr. Founder Madison DID consider the matter of a bill of rights as being necessary to be extended to the States, for as he had observed, some States were severely lacking in a sensible, non-defective bill or rights, and some States had absolutely no bill of rights at all. Mr. Founder Madison **cared** that a bill of rights be made available to the States, for regulation of the **States** themselves, seeing that he had just stated that "some '**States**' have **no** bill of rights."

2) But, as he, Mr. Founder Madison, had been disposed to believe from the beginning that the proposed Constitution, **by its lack** of a bill of rights for controlling the "federal," contained **no material defect** for controlling the proposed United States government, all three (3) branches thereof, **absolutely**;

3) In a Republican Form of Government, all of the People being Real Parties In Interest and having Equally Shared Equal Rights, the Government of the People has no possible immunity to be raised against them, and as such the members of its legislature, or its executive branch head, are no more immune from lawsuit than a number of judges have been immune when they, judges, have exceeded their authority and performed in such a way to cause injury to the People, one or more of them, due to any unlawful conduct committed by any of them.

240.11 As to this part of The Republican Form of Government TEST, we find that the Right of Grand Jury is a STATE RIGHT ONLY – being a Right of the People, and was NEVER intended for use by the alleged United States central government, AKA "federal" government, EVER! . . . and that the use of or creation of **any** Grand Jury for the "federal" government has ever Served to **ABUSE** the People of Every State of the Several States, AND to **Wrong Them** By such Abuses, - putting it the way some of the proposed Constitution's Founders were prone to put it – Indubitably, or Undoubtedly.

241.1 Immunity of Government. There is None. A Republican Form of Government, starting with the highest governmental level thereof, cannot give unto any municipality or county government "broad and sweeping powers," for to do so concludes that the highest government had such same "broad and sweeping powers" that it alleges to grant unto the lower form of government, violating the law of natural or true science that says,

> Where there is No One Else Factually Existent Prior to the Self, Who Has the Exact Thing Sought For, or Where There Is No Other Place to Factually Obtain a Particular Thing From, the Thing Sought to Be Given Cannot Be Given;
>
> You Cannot Give That Thing To Any One Else That You Do Not, At The Exact Moment In Time of the Giving, Evidently Have, ***Indisputably***.

241.2 It being the Truth that a person who has an owned-or-possessed thing and proposed to Give that thing to another, can also Sell that owned-or-possessed thing to another instead of giving it.

241.3 It is also the Truth that no person can sell more than 100 % of an owned-or-possessed thing without breaking the law, committing by such sales act criminal fraud. This is Property Fraud - Theft By Deception, a Criminal Offense.

241.4 Therefore, To Even Claim that One Can Give What One Does Not Actually Have At the Moment of the Claim of Giving Would Justify the Kind of Criminal Activity whereby the Deceptive Thief sells 100 % of the ownership interest in a thing to any one person at all, then sells above that 100 % which pertains to the item already sold, any added percent at all, no

matter how small and insignificant such claim for an added percent may be claimed to be.

241.5 Consequently, you cannot Lawfully sell or give any thing above (or more than) 100 % of its existence, neither can you ***give*** to any other the smallest fraction of a thing that you do not actually, already have yourself.

241.6 These things being Self-Evident and Clear, a government that was not already granted any form of immunity from the people and by the people for whom it was organized and ordained to serve, cannot grant any immunity, for any purpose, to anyone else, inclusive of themselves, members/employees/ officials of that selfsame government.

241.7 As a result of the way in which a Republican Form of Government vests, and is vested, over all the people upon whom it settles or imbues, providing the same equally shared equal rights ("due process") indiscriminately, all lower governments coming under the State's central government can have no authority to grant their citizens or people who pass through or around them any thing less than the principle known as "equal protection under the law," which principle at law thusly requires uniformity and clarity in the laws that are to be applied to the people underneath one form of local government, whether it be either a municipality or else the countryside areas of a county, must be applied and ordained equally, with the same rights and privileges, not in opposition or violation of the basic concepts of freedom and free enterprise, which a Republican Form of Government is ***also*** all about;

242.1 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT. In the understanding of this subject as it pertains to the rights, authorities, responsibilities, obligations, and prohibitions of both government officials and the people whom they are established to serve as they both exist together in a Republican Form of Government, it is necessary to reassert the fact that a Republican Form of Government does not exist based upon any form of "politics" or "policy," or upon sentiments, inclusive of human sentiments, nor may slant of outlook upon the Law, either of bias or prejudicial discrimination as to one group of people over or under another group of people as the Law pertains to any subject matter related to any of them, people.

242.2 To lay the foundation of our necessary understanding for this purpose, we begin by recognizing that in order for the self-elected vesting of a Republican Form of Government to produce the Fundamental Right of "due process," such fundamental right must have an unbreachable source (to be "Fundamental"), having value, upon which its very existence depends;

242.3 Within the naturally existing grid of the Equally Shared Equal Rights and the Inseparable Existence of those Rights as they go to the people, as individual persons, making up the People of a Republican Form of Government, exists a set of human values intrinsic, equally, representing each of them, for every purpose for which a Republican Form of Government has been made to exist from the first instance of its creation;

242.4 Because a Republican Form of Government, in and by its creation, produces a human grid of Fundamental Rights at the instance of its creation, none of which are either superior or inferior to each other, it is understood that nothing can move or take place, either negatively or positively, within this continuum of Fundamental Rights without affecting, in some way, the Fundamental Rights of all others of the People by that very same act. Within this continuum of Fundamental Rights is the Fundamental Law known as the Law of Balance, and it is the Law of Balance that governs every aspect of that which we call criminal "moral turpitude," as well as many aspects of the civil law and its related rights and penalties, upon which the beneficial standards of living for the People living within a Republic must depend.

242.5 As we apply the Law of Balance to an offense such as "armed Robbery," we recognize and invariably agree that the person Robbed has been harmed by the force, committed in violation of the Robbed person's rights of due process not to have any thing taken without his or her consent, forced upon him or her by the Robber, for which violation of Fundamental Rights ("due process" is a Fundamental Right) the Law of Balance requires equal payment, or restitution, so far as it is possible do so, even where the Robbed person was not physically harmed by the Robber's malicious, unkind, rights taking act.

242.6 Therefore, whatever was taken by the Robbed person by the Robber, must be returned in full, if it can be done so, in order to restore the Law of Balance within the Fundamental Rights continuum in which it exists,

inherently, for the whole of the People in a Republican Form of Government, over and above the rights of those officiating in a Republican Form of Government itself.

242.7 When a person guilty of "Armed Robbery" is caught and brought to justice, and required to return, in full, that which was wrongfully take from the Robbed Person (or "Wronged Person") as a matter of Rightful Balance Restored thereto, the people within a Republican Form of Government do *not* rise up against the Robbed Person and insist that the Robbed Person's Right for Fundamental Balance has, in some way, served as an Offense against the Armed Robber who Took away that Right of Balance at in the first instance, as having been done from the moment of the UnLawful Taking of that which was Taken (Robbed) from the Wronged Person, even though that Wronged Person is only one (1) person of the many persons that make up the Republican Government's People themselves;

242.8 "Sentiment" not being Law in a Republican Form of Government, is not - as a compensable balance for the People's Fundamental Rights continuum itself - given or granted the Armed Robber for his/her Wronging of the Wronged Person at all, *nor* - except in the face of demonstrable equity or grace - is Sentiment, *to any degree*, given against the requirement that the Armed Robber be made to suffer some compensable penalty or punishment for the Crime, or Wrong, committed, so that the Armed Robber is given a Virtual License to commit the same act of Armed Robbery, again, and again, whether against the same victim or a new victim, where no cause for suffering is required at the hand of the Armed Robber for doing so;

242.9. On the subject of "suffering," it is to be noted that the principle espoused by the Eighth Amendment as it pertains to punishment for a Crime, Misdemeanor, or for the Quasi Crime of Contempt of Constitution (or "Breach of the Peace") does not prohibit or deny "suffering" at all from being imposed against the Criminal Offender, only that there is to be punishment imposed which is known to be "cruel and unusual," meaning that Republican Government is entitled, on behalf of the Law of Balance as it applies to the Fundamental Rights continuum of the People, to cause the Armed Robber to actually Suffer, and not just return that which was, by Armed Violence,

Robbed, or Wrongfully, from the Wronged Person in that first instance in doing so;

242.10 Therefore, there can be no "objection" to the Armed Robber's condition for punishment's suffering so long as it does not exceed the Law of Balance's maintenance of the People's Fundamental Rights continuum, upon which the Constitution[al] quality of prohibition of a "cruel and unusual" punishment is duly based.

242.11 Neither does "sentiment" enter into the "picture" of Law and Jurisprudence, "sentiment" not being a protected concept, as also being "Not Law;" as though existing equal to or above the Law in a Republican Form of Government, so that any extent of "sentiment" for the Armed Robber is to not be made available to the Armed Robber in order to diminish the suffering that the same be required to undergo as a direct result of the sentence duly given, no matter the nature of the sentiment nor the group of people, as a segment part of the People, behind it.

242.12 Consequently, although the Armed Robber is made to actually "suffer" in one form or the other for the Armed Robbery Crime committed, for which the same has been duly found guilty, and sentenced, such suffering is not a violation of Law *and* Lawful Conscience for moral purposes, amorality not being a logical base for existence coming under the Law of Balance in a Republican Form of Government for the sake of the Fundamental Rights continuum of the People thereof accordingly;

242.13 Likewise, other crimes committed by criminal offenders, coming under similar scope of Fundamental Rights violations of a person, having Equally Shared Equal Rights within a boundried Republic, where a sentence is entered against an offending person for the Taking of Rights of another must be given the Balance of the Fundamental Law of Restorative Compensation for that which was Taken, for the Law of Balance in a Republican Form of Government – as a result of the indispensable way in which this most Fundamental of All People-Serving Oriented Governments must be Inherently Formed ***among and for*** the People – Demands It;

242.14 Because of the insufficiency of knowledge and understanding as to the actual characteristics and nature or exactly what a Republican Form of

Government is and is not, and the instability of Government that this condition has brought about, the same principles above, considered to be grounded in solidity, integrity, truth, fairness, honor and not dishonor, and morality and not immorality, when applied to the example of the Armed Robber, changes drastically in the minds of many when the subject changes to that of homicide, or murder, and what is to be done, ultimately, to the murderer, differently than what is to be done to the robber as it involves the Fundamental Right for Restoration of that Taken under the indispensable Principle and Power contained within the Law of Balance, an Integral, Indispensable Part of Every Republican Form of Government, no matter the time and place where such Republican Government is - for the People upon whom it is duly Vested - established;

242.15 An order from an authority commanding one "not to kill," stated to wit: "**You shall not kill**," signifies that one is not to kill another - for the first time, **or if** not called into accountability for a first killing, then not to kill another - for the second time, or - for the third time, and so forth, for as many acts of homicide as this may possibly apply to before the one taking a life or lives (or murdering) has been stopped in doing so, and brought into ultimate accountability for the wrongs so done to the one or more persons whose life or lives were **taken** by way of a criminal breach of the Law of Balance, which Balance is fundamentally innate to Republican Form of Government;

242.16 Noting here that, considering the term "**taken**" just introduced and the body of law know as "takings law," even though "takings law" *ordinarily* applies to government **taking**, wrongfully, from the innocent private citizen or merchant, their own private property for which there must be restorative balance for, there would be no dispute from the mainstream public, or any group of them, that the right of the private citizen or merchant to have that which was so wrongfully **taken** by government be restored to them in full, in every possible sense, which if applied with that same respect to the murderer who has taken the private property of someone's own life (for one's own **life** is in fact, **their** own **private property**, - so long as they have not compromised it away in such a way as to make it the "public's property," as if by committing the murder of another), there would be no necessity to TEST this matter, indepthly so, in the first instance for doing so, ***ever***;

242.17 While the law or commandment "not to kill" another applies to a person - as a mandate "not to kill "another person - whose own life will not be compromised to be lost in not doing so (or self defense being excepted), because the Law of Balance in a Republican Form of Government demands such Balance to be restored to the People, irrespective of any "sentiment" that may be proposed on behalf of the one UnLawfully taking the life (murderer) so taken, the mandate not to take a life as with "**You shall not kill**" can**not** be construed to extend that same mandate or commandment to the Republican Form of Government authority for vested Law Enforcement, whose responsibility it is on behalf of the People that it is indelibly **vested** to serve, in its **vested duty** to restore the Law of Balance under any criminal condition taken, to prevent it, Republican Form of Government and its vested Law Enforcement, from taking the life **–** by due process of procedures in doing so **–** that **took** the life or lives of another, no matter the nature and/or number of the "sentiments" or feelings or "philosophies" proffered by any person or group of persons within the vested Republic's essential embodiment of the People itself;

242.18 Measure For Measure. The Law of Balance has also been referred to as the Requirement of Measure For Measure, and it is the minimal (not the maximum) standard of conduct required under any body of People in which Justice is held to be an indispensable or essential part thereof, and it is made applicable to every form of moral turpitude known to man, and is as essential to the Common Law and Nature's Law as any one of the pre-existent rights of nature;

242.19 Public Confirmation of Consequences. An innate, fundamental right existing within a Republican Form of Government is the Right to know, at all times, the Truth on any matter to which the People's public rights are or may affected, for it is that same Right upon which many States' "sunshine laws" are based, which goes essentially to the acts or operations for punishments invoked upon criminal wrongdoers. The Right to know, at all times, the Truth as the same exists in connection to public acts and operations of sentenced punishments of criminal wrongdoers denies any concept for "secret punishments," and the idea that the people or public should not see, or should not be allowed to see, the consequences of punishment invoked upon

a convicted offender is so much "political sentiments," both of which are UnLawful concepts within a Republican Form of Government;

242.20 The right to take away from the People or Public the Right to see the Non-Secret Punishments, or Scheduled Punishments, to be Duly Imposed upon offenders worthy of such punishments is not a Right of Government, or any Group, and never has been so. Such "taking away" of the Right of the People to **openly** witness *any* particular type of punishment to which an offender has been sentenced has been done under the ***guise*** of *morality* but actually exists under the ugly raised head of UnLawful = Illegal "politics."

242.21 The Right of a Republican Form of Government to Restore this UnLawfully Taken Away Right to the People for whom it has been established to serve exists as an Inherent Duty of such Republican Government, for such Duty Connects, though indirectly, through such Republican Government, to the People themselves, and nothing within Sentimental Politics can make it any different than this, no matter the form of Sentimental Politics involved.

242.22 By eliminating **Secret Punishments** from Government and restoring Public Punishments to the Public, or People, for their direct benefit, cost effective Punishments that Make Sense are likewise restored to the People for their immediate benefit, which further extends such Punishments to the necessity that they be True and Correct, and Not False for any reason, which arises as a natural opponent to Corruption and Corrupt Government, which is precisely what a Republican Form of Government is to be exacted to be;

242.23 This includes the Public Punishments for capital crimes such as murder, rape, mayhem, armed robbery, and so forth, with the same amount of sentiment, as a matter of Law, being given to each of them the same, which amount of sentiment is NONE;

242.24 Further Determining The Question of Capital Punishment In a Republican Form of Government. Review of an Ancient Sage (Wise Man) From a Different Part of the World, From a Different Time and Age, Not Tainted With Modern Opinions On The Truth and the Facts.

A certain Book Exists, of Ancient Source and Time, From the Honorable History of the Nation of China, from an Ancient Sage thereof Known as Lao Tsu (old master).

242.25 He, the Ancient Sage, Lao Tsu, lived over 2500 years ago, at a time when "politics" did not darken the land with its whims and ever-variable "policies" over the question of life and death. Being a simple man, untainted and uninfluenced by today's "studies" of alleged reality, but being exposed to the everyday world filled with dangers, perils, injustice, unfairness, uncertainty, hunger, famine, wars, marauders, errant thinking and misunderstanding, his simple, but earnest, views strip away the masks that misguide so many of today's people on the subject of what "the studies" on the subject of "capital punishment" really mean, what the truth is behind them, and what our rights also exist as because of what is learned, the Truth, revealed, as it actually is.

242.26 From his records, under the title of the Gia Fu-Feng/Jane English Edition, the Tao Te Ching (the natural way, and its power), his book of 81 pages of very short notations, on 75 page thereof, we read, the entirety of the page as:

> "Why are the people starving?
> Because the rulers eat up the money in taxes.
> Therefore the people are starving.
>
> Why are the people rebellious?
> Because the rulers interfere too much.
> Therefore they are rebellious.
>
> Why do people think so little of death?
> Because the rulers demand too much of life.
> Therefore the people take death lightly."

242.27 There is only one sentence left on this page that reveals the simple, but certain truth, which reveals the actual truth, all politics, all philosophies, all theories, beliefs, opinions, and "studies" aside, which reads:

> **"Having little to live on, one knows better than to value life too much."**

242.28 ***And there it is*****.** The **Real** "Study" of Life, the one that shows us, that tells us, WHY the (manipulated?) "studies" of today, the ones that were supposed to have concluded that capital punishment does not act as a deterrent for homicide crime, was Falsely Concluded and Misleading. Because of this simple man's simple statement of long ago, we now know the truth of how this alleged "study" provided the "answer" that it did.

242.29 It is this. To the question, Does capital punishment act as a deterrent for murder? And the answer, the Real Answer, is Yes, It Does, and No, It Doesn't. No, this is Not Doubletalk; it is the Truth.

242.30 Because there are some people who "value life" enough, so that at the cost of losing their own life, they would never take another's. And there are those who do not "value [their] life" enough, so that the threat of losing their own life would not inhibit them or prevent them from taking another's life, even though the reality of losing their own life, if they did so, was before them, absolutely.

242.31 For, for whatever reason that some such people do not "value" their own life sufficiently, or "too much," to cease caring if they lose it, if the taking of another's life will be the reason for that very loss, it is the fact that those people with that form of reasoning, or feeling or caring, or lack thereof, do exist;

242.32 But so do the other kind of people, who do care about their own life very much, where, even if life's events should produce serious negative circumstances, where a person or persons were considered behind those negative circumstances for which they are made to suffer, will Not take a life, any life, because the do value their life – so much, and will not trade their own "valued" life for anything allegedly gained by taking the life of another.

242.33 This thing considered, therefore, it must be regarded as indisputable that "the studies" that concluded that capital punishment does not deter murders from happening were and are wrong, or falsely concluded, leaving us with the next, Significant Question that Must Be Answered.

242.34 **Question**. Should Capital Punishment Be Sustained and Supported (Reinstated Again)?

242.35 The Answer. Even though Capital Punishment, undoubtedly, does not deter or prevent some murders, some homicide crimes, from occurring, because those who commit them do not value, for *whatever* reason, their own life too much, the fact that they do, and can, deter others, any others, at all, from taking a life under negative circumstances that, without threat, under the law, would not require their own life to be taken as well, thereby preventing, or deterring, some homicide crimes from ever taking place, is more than sufficient reason to justify the necessity of Capital Punishment, even if the number of lives to be saved by its existence was only a very few (though it is likely that it is more than a few that would be saved), the Law of Balance being obeyed also, as the Natural Law, or Nature's Law, without Slant, in a Republican Form of Government so demands.

243.1 Reverse Punishments Prohibited. Because the Inherent Principle of Due Process mandates that a person not guilty of any particular offense with which Republican Government has to do not be punished, at all, to any degree whatsoever, in any way or form for doing so, it is found to be an essential characteristic of a Republican Form of Government that "**Reverse Punishments**" exist as Prohibited, Absolutely, Nothing More or Less than this Wavering Otherwise;

Reverse Punishments.

243.2 A **Reverse Punishment** upon the Public exists at a Cost, a Cost that none of the People, especially within a Republican Form of Government, should have to pay for, a Cost that has too long been borne by the people of this country, and probably by the rest of the world as well.

243.3 There is another money value damage that is all to often the result of the jails and prisons for punishment (not for temporary holding) system. It does not always apply to every person so incarcerated, but in the majority of the cases it does apply, particularly in those cases involving families, where the alleged offender was a part of a family orientation that had any financial dependence whatsoever on the alleged offender's productivity.

243.4 Reverse Punishments exist in the form of:

243.4.1 Collect calls to family and friends which the family and friends, not the acclaimed offender, have to pay for - **Reverse Punishment**;

243.4.2 In the form of "putting money on the books so that the offender can afford the bare essentials," which the family or other consenting person, not the acclaimed offender, must pay - **Reverse Punishment**;

243.4.3 The loss of the talents and support that family and friends once relied upon in order to uplift them in their own societal, family, financial, and other beneficial needs, now taken from all that needed and relied upon them before the offender was removed from among them - **Reverse Punishment;**

243.4.4 The increased difficulty of scheduling travel time and visiting time away from ordinary functions that family and friends engage in, in day to day life, in order that the offender may be visited, if possible to do so, at such particular times, for the emotional edification of those outside of the offender's place of confinement - **Reverse Punishment**;

243.4.5 The grieving of family and friends, even if not every moment of every day, from the loss of the loved-one, even though an offender, being confined - **Reverse Punishment**;

243.4.6 Because confinement, whether or not heavily armed in order to prevent escape, is effectuated at a high cost, ongoing, such high cost is reflected at the public level by the necessity of the high cost in taxes, which works back to the private individuals who make up the very People themselves, requiring that everyone within the public of People (including both family and friends of the offender) pay, by way of such taxes, the ongoing cost of such confinement, even though the majority of the public may not either know or be directly or indirectly associated with any person confined in any particular confinement facility - **Reverse Punishment**;

243.4.7 The knowledge, by family and friends close to the confined offender, that "**Secret Punishments**" may be applied to the lives of

their confined loved one, for which there is no actual certifiable remedy again - **Reverse Punishment**;

243.4.8 The UnLawful = Illegal use of the sentence in order to long time confine "political prisoners" who have actually offended some body politic or Illegally Operating Faction having power and technique to remove such "political offender" from among the People, in order that such "political offender" might not any longer benefit the People whatsoever - **Reverse Punishment Major**;

243.4.9 Thus, in those cases when the alleged offender is removed, and from that removal comes a loss of job or business, those whom there was a dependence upon the alleged offender's lawful productivity, in any form that they productivity may have appeared, have now lost that productivity, and with it, the right not to be punished by society for the same act of punishment that the alleged offender is being punished by: - **Reverse Punishment**;

243.4.10 Families suffer financially, not just emotionally, from this kind of punishment, for it takes from them any form of legal productivity that the alleged offender may have been able to, at any time, offer or provide the family with. And all too often it causes, among husbands and wives, divorce - **Reverse Punishment**.

243.4.11.1 Divorce caused by loss of respect, or alienation, estrangement, between the affected parties. Forced Divorces, by way of forced circumstances, that cause the remaining family members to lose feeling in their spirits and souls, and cause a sense of abandonment of those same family members, because their hope is gone, destroyed by those same people in government we entrusted to do the right thing in their lawmaking, bringing alleged offenders to a true form of justice, and to make our society a better place to live. Who Was It We Were Trying To Punish?? Not The Innocent People Themselves? [W]Rong! ….. **Reverse Punishment**.

243.4.11.2 This kind of - **Reverse Punishment** of the Public - is perhaps the most cruel to the people themselves, for it is in fact a cruelty of a punishment upon the very people that the punishment is

supposed to protect from, and Can NEVER, in any sense of moral judgment, Be JUSTIFIED.

243.5 Neither jails nor prisons, in a Republican Form of Government, whereby their existence causes, in a general sense, **Reverse Punishments** back upon the People, including family and friends of the alleged offender, and which also employ the use of **Secret Punishments**, with but limited exceptions, can be neither be, as a matter of Fundamental Law (for Fundamental Law can never sustain or justify any form of punishment upon the Innocent) justified, sustained, or maintained.

244.1 Secret Punishments. In a Republican Form of Government there can be no authorization to subject any person to a punishment system that the People cannot or do not know about, openly, so that what happens to offender or suspected offender is not within the grasp of the body of the People themselves, in order that the punishment given as a result of the lawful sentence entered, at all times, fit the crime alleged to have occurred.

244.2 However, there are such punishments existent profusely inside and outside of our current jails and prisons system that are known of by the body of the People outside of the incarceration systems themselves. You will note that the term of focus here is "outside."

244.3 This is because the **Secret Punishments** begins with our law enforcement personnel themselves. Contrary to some popular opinion, especially among those within law enforcement, law enforcement persons are not perfect in any sense, for they are fallible, virtually all of them.

244.4 In our current "grab em," "lock 'em up," "lock 'em down" orientation for punishment, we have on frequent occasions Abuses within that system which constitute **Secret Punishments**, Punishments which are not, ***officially***, supposed to be a part of the alleged offender's punitive treatment as prescribed under the laws of what should be rightfully presumed to be consenting or agreeing Republican Society and its Republican Form of Government.

244.5 Whether these **Secret Punishments** are employed by the guards within the detention system in question itself or whether they are employed

by the law enforcement officers who are involved in the arrest and capture of the suspected, alleged offender, the fact is, **Secret**, Unauthorized, or UnLawfully "Authorized," **Punishments** go on. Most of these **Secret Punishments** are physically applied, likely a minor amount of them pertain to such things as taking cash money off the alleged offender, or of extortions made against the alleged offender to pay money to be let go or to obtain some special privilege, making the alleged offender a victim of that law enforcement officer, who is now a definite criminal overseeing an alleged criminal also. This kind of conduct goes on far more often than the People of the Body Republic realizes, and the truth is, within a Republican Form of Government, Fundamental Rights being everyone's Equally Shared Equal Rights, inclusive of the Right to True Due Process and Not an Abuse of Process or a Misuse of Process, and Not Illegal Process, such **Secret Punishments** have no authority, or authorization, to go on at all.

244.6 When the alleged offender is being subjected to a system – whether being Punitive (Penal) or the UnLawful = Illegal alleged "correctional" – so corrupt, wicked, immoral and unlawful, or illegal in its core workings, as to either sustain or "look the other way" with respect to such **Secret Punishments**, no Inherently Vested Republican Form of Government is involved in its creation, operation, or perpetuation.

244.7 Among those **Secret Punishments** that exist within the "incarceration system" that are the cause of "internal (emotional/psychological) scars," in addition to those Secret Punishments from law enforcement officials themselves, are those **Secret Punishments** that come from other inmates, some of which cause the alleged offender to be exposed to a number of forms of sordid (dirty) perversions, such as but not limited to the condition of homosexuality, as well as other forms of behavior that the alleged offender is forcibly caused to be subjected to that they would not, knowingly engage in themselves, except they be Secretly (or outside of the People's eyes and understanding consent) Forced to do so, such Secret Punishments NOT being a form of punishment that a Republican Form of Government can either allow or allow for, provide or provide for, or tolerate as a matter of Law, all else other than this Failing The Republican Form of Government TEST.

244.8 The "politician's" concept of making punishments "**hard** punishments" has nothing to do with a Republican Form of Government, for it is not the purpose of Republican Government, where "politicians," "politics," and "political parties" are all understood to be a violation, altogether, of such a Government, to exact, just for the sake of claiming a punishment for any crime at all, a "hardened punishment" which leads to "hardened criminals," whose consequential conduct against society causes a more hardened society, which demands a more hardened punishment, which leads to a yet more hardened criminal, continuing the cycle of making all who are subject to such a system, ever "harder" and "harder," with no end in sight;

244.9 Secret Punishments, not being openly certifiable by the Fundamental, Inherent Due Process, and therefore existing in violation of the Equally Shared Equal Rights condition indelibly vested in a Republican Form of Government, can never Lawfully = Legally be supported, sustained, justified, or maintained by it, and only punishments that do not tax the people for the punishment of criminal offenders, except out of extreme necessity (limiting such punishments to only offenders whose crimes are actually too dangerous on their face, such as murders, rapists, armed robbers and marauders, etc., to chance the slightest form of liberty that would allow them to repeat such extreme conduct again, where capital punishment is required), where the jail, built to confine ordinary offending parties only temporarily, at most, until their direct, non-incarcerated punishments can be scheduled, or where the prison is built or maintained for those whose dangerous conduct has made them indisputable enemies to those others whose innocence, or right to innocence, would be harmed or unquestionably endangered, or whose sentence awaits capital punishment for the shortest term for which a prison may be lawfully maintained at the People's cost, not for any Constitution[ally] Fraudulent appeal awaiting purpose as has existed under "political forms of government" at previous times and places;

245.1 Bounty Hunters. (**Noting Here That** - This Part Includes the concept of the **Bail Bondsman** as being the **UnLawful Equivalent** as the "Bounty Hunter.") / In a Republican Form of Government, there is always a difference between the People and the government officials that are employed to serve them, and at no time does one exist in the capacity of the other.

245.2 This condition does not deny the subject of "Citizens' Arrest," however, because the Right of Citizens' Privilege for Arrest is not a thing that can be turned into, or is, any form of Publicly Elected Law Enforcement such as is the requirement for a Republican Form of Government, which Form of Government Denies and Prohibits such De facto law enforcement forms as "police," "troopers," "highway patrol," "marshal," "undercover detective," "agent," as having actual Lawful right, or has No Lawful right, to exist at all, as also does not this next alleged form of "law enforcement," no different than any of the foregoing;

245.3 It being the Truth that the Claim, being the UnLawful Claim, that the "Bounty Hunter" is a "private citizen" only is a Sham, is a Deceit or Deception, a Public Fraud, a Lie, no differently than the profession" that involves the "practice" of the manipulation of "Public Laws" in order to Create a "Product" out of the Law) as a means of creating the "business" called "attorneys," which Public Occupation of Law Enforcement is just that, a Public Occupation and Not a "Private Occupation."

245.4 The Legal and Fundamental FACT: **You cannot be** a Public Officer, required to be Elected or employed directly by someone who is, **and** an alleged "Private Officer" (such as a Bounty Hunter alleges to be), someone who has Circumvented the MANDATE for ALL those who would perform, or even imitate naively, as though a government official – Article VI, Clause 3 of the proposed United States Constitution, such Circumvention of the Supreme Mandate of Law being also know as a Collateral Attack of the Law, and a Contempt – **At The Same Time**; It Is **Impossible** To Be So.

245.5 Consequently, the Corrupt and the Wicked people who – Ignoring Due Process and the Republican Form of Government **Constraint** that requires that ALL forms of State government, county, city, town, and district, to vest in its undoubted, fundamental Law Enforcement of Full Sheriff, characteristic attributed inherently to this type of Government – have sought, and seek, to bypass the certain Constraints that a Republican Form of Government wields to prevent them, Corrupt people, from taking advantage of an unsuspecting people or public, tend to choose the UnLawful = Illegal Bounty Hunter, because the "Mighty Bounty Hunter," allegedly **not yoked** with that "***terrible*** thing" called the "Constitution," can "**get away with**" *many*

things (for the specific benefit of the Corrupt and Wicked people who employ/control them) the same as "Lawful Law Enforcement" who are Required or Mandated to be sworn to Obey the Constitution, or the SUPREME Law of the Nation … and States … and County … and Cities … and Towns therein … and Districts as they, Lawful Law Enforcement, Must Be / **Should** Be;

245.6 The Ever UnLawfully Existent "**Bounty Hunter's**" alleged **authority** - as we closely focus upon it in comparison to that of the Full Sheriff, which Full Sheriff is required and limited to the strict Republican Government procedures set forth and contained within the proposed Fourth Amendment - exists because the Sheriff, whether or not a Full Sheriff, has chosen or else been directed by some pretext to "look the other way" as these **De facto** "Private Officers" of [~~the law~~] "Policy" are allegedly able to do "what no 'cop' can do" (making the Bounty Hunter, by this Illegal Strategy, many times more "**powerful**" than "the cop" due to the Bounty Hunter's Illegal Existence and Reckless Ability To Act in Utter "Ignorance" and Deliberate Defiance of the proposed Constitution - Altogether), because the "Bounty Hunter," being an Ipso facto (or existent by the circumstances) De facto (factually existent but illegitimate as such) Private Officer, has not been required by the Constitution's Article VI, Clause 3, or by Corrupted Non-Republican Government, to "take an oath or affirmation" to obey the Constitution in any sense of the word, and to exist, as a person of Public Law Enforcement, only within the Constraints as required of a Republican Form of Government;

245.7 For it is the Further Realized Fact that "Bounty Hunters," in their "pursuit to 'get their man,'" do not rely upon any form of court's order, or Fourth Amendment Warrant, or Article VI, Clause 3 Requirement to OBEY – At ALL Times – ALL Of the Constitution …. And NOT "Just Part of It," Constitution, "that suits 'em;

245.8 But largely, only, follow the orders of the non-governmental ALLEGED Authority that Hired or Specified Them;

245.9 Rendering such Bounty Hunters, existing, in Actuality, *as though* "Private Officers" but being instead, De facto Ipso Facto "Officers" of Policy, NOT Law, as Existing Outside the Actual Law, and thus, as reality sets in, as "outlaws" instead;

245.10 Recognizing that the role of the Real Private Citizen, someone who is not getting "Professionally Paid" in this capacity (You Cannot Pay a Private Citizen to BE a Private Citizen; they either are one or they are not, and if you Pay a Private Citizen to Perform Professionally as though a Private Citizen, they CEASE INSTANTLY to Exist as a Private Citizen, they become a De facto Quasi Public Official, requiring, mandating, that they take an Oath or Affirmation to Obey the Constitution under which they are to be employed) – is Never to be Regarded the same as a Public Officer of Law Enforcement, for the Public Officer of Law Enforcement Must Be Sworn to Obey the Law of the Constitution under which the same holds Office, and the Private Citizen – not at all seen as present at Article VI, Claus 3 – Never Has To, or Cannot Be Required To Do so As A Matter of Lawful Law.

245.11 All of which was the case where the UnSworn-to-Obey-the-Highest-Law (over the lowest or even non-existent law) … UnLawful = Illegal "Bounty Hunters" mistakenly targeted the wrong house where they believed their claimed "escaped" fugitive was hiding, in breaking into that private home (because Bounty Hunters do not *need* a Fourth Amendment Warrant to do that the way those "misguided, mentally deficient, and **powerless**" Law Enforcement Officers are required to have, .. right**?**) and killed the Innocent True Private Citizen inside, was NOT a "Tragedy;" it was Murder in the Second Degree, and not otherwise, no matter what UnLawfully = Illegally Existent Judge/"Ruler" may try to the Truth as actually being, otherwise;

245.12 For if we examine what the Actual Truth at Law Was in the Case, and Is in All Cases Still, being careful to Know the Difference between the True Public Law Enforcement Officer and the Actually Non-**Legally**-Existent Private Officer, whether under the Guise of "Bounty Officer" or some other similar Claim of Legal/Constitutionally Bound "Authority where there Actually (Bottom Line) Is NONE, then we can Only Conclude that the "occupation" of "Private" Officer, even where the claim for arrest is as though a "citizens' arrest," is and ever has been UnConstitution[al]/ UnLawful = Illegal from the moment of its Inception.

245.13 Bearing in mind, as to this confusion, that somehow the "profession of 'Bounty Hunter'" is "OK" based upon the idea that it is only employing the rightful power of "citizens' arrest" and that as such the "profession of the

Bounty Hunter" comes under the protection of a Republican Form of Government "is a crock" for the above reasons already stated, exists only because the illegal politics and politicians and unconscionable persons (not the People), with a Reckless Disregard for the Truth, with a Reckless Indifference to the Outcome of their acts, have given in to the Lust for Power and Circumvention of the Mandate that Hired Law Enforcement represent "the People" only and not "'somebody' hiring them" (*obviously* not the People) that the Reckless Existence (Not Bound to Actual Law and its Restraints as **Required** by a Republican Form of Government) of Bounty Hunters is derived for (also existing as a Contempt of Constitution for its UnLawful Respecter of Persons condition), and cannot Stand where an **honest focus and comparison** is made **between** the alleged profession of Bounty Hunters and "Police Officers;

245.14 For the "police officer" is created primarily to serve the "**policy**" of some group or alleged authority, and **Not** the Law **Only** (but what they are **told**, and are made to *believe*, is the Law), and Illegally Exists under the **claim** that the "Police Officer" is empowered for all **3** branches of government, and not **1** (one) branch only, and the Bounty Hunter which is, as a matter of "law," sworn to their client first, is created by their client, and *may* obey the Law and the Law of Due Process as long as it "does not get in their way" for the benefit of their paycheck – from the "somebody" -not the People- that is paying them.

245.15 In this respect, the Bounty Hunter's existence is no different than the "**commandos**" (those who follow commands, blindly, of some alleged authority for some claim righteous reason, not necessarily representing the People as a matter of their body of Law) or (civilian owned or employed) "**merchant marines**" that are hired by "**somebody**" who can afford them (as opposed to common persons who cannot afford them) and are thus **not** paid from Lawful government's proceeds or funds only, as contributed, by Lawful means, to it, Lawful government;

245.16 The fact that the alleged profession of "Bounty Hunters" has been made "popular" by "Hollywood," whether by television or movie, over many years and has not been exposed as such is irrelevant to the Guaranteed Necessity that Republican Form of Government come first, Denying and

Prohibiting their Existence, an Existence which never should have been considered or acted upon in the first place.

245.17 The acts and activities of Bounty Hunters have been, *Without* the Right of Protection of Lawful Law, the entering, either upon private property (**trespass**) and the simple taking of a person into custody (**assault and impersonating a public officer and abduction or kidnapping**) or the forceful taking of a person into custody (**assault and battery and impersonating a public officer and abduction or kidnapping**), or if upon public property, then the simple taking of a person into custody (**disorderly conduct and assault and impersonating a public officer and abduction or kidnapping**) or the forceful taking of a person into custody (**assault and battery and impersonating a public officer and abduction or kidnapping**), and the fact that these kind of UnLawful "private" actions were at one time common occurrences "out in the old west, long ago," is the result of the Dereliction *and* UnLawfulness that took place on September 17, 1787, Second Session, and again on March 4, 1789, and thereafter (see **The Nation That Never Was** to understand the governmental level of recklessness toward discerning or obeying Actual Law), and is Irrelevant as to Any Claim that the Actual Law Ever Provided for the Lawful Existence of Bounty Hunters otherwise, no matter who the alleged "noble" person or organization of "fame or fortune" may be, for any claim of contract fulfillment purposes to make it so;

245.18 Re-Clarifying The Matter, That a Citizen, with Two or More Citizens, Performing a Citizens' Arrest, is an Incidental Act of Citizens' Rights for which the same is Not Paid; a "Bounty Hunter" or a "Bail Bondsman," Not being of an Elected Office of Law, or Public Officer, **IS** Paid While **Using** said same "Citizens' Incidental Rights," and **IS** UnLawful = Illegal, altogether;

246.1 Repossession Agents. "Repossession agents" have the same rights of existence as Bounty Hungers; None. No more than the UnLawful Bounty Hunters, do the Repossession Agents have the right to enter upon Private Property, or even to act in a like capacity on Public Property, in order to secure or attempt to secure an item of property (such as a vehicle) upon which a debt owed has not been paid, and the private contract between the parties that "allows" them to do so is, in the face of proposed Fourth Amendment

Law (reflecting Republican Government principles) or Republican Form of Government required Public Law Enforcement Officers, duly elected by the people whom they are established to serve, and Never such a thing as alleged "private officers," who "escape" UnLawfully = Illegally the mandated requirement that they be sworn to uphold the proposed Constitution – of the People, and the fact that the contract for which the debtor has failed to comply with may represent some bank or other financial institution whose alleged loans represent the "fractionalized banking" conspired to among commercial banks, by which conspiracies such banks have, themselves, Created False Money, recognized as **Checkbook Money**, by which such banks are guilty of ***Reversing*** the Cost and Risk of such alleged Loans back upon the alleged **borrowers**, which **Illegal Checkbook Money**, or Bank's **False Money**, as a part of the National Money Supply;

246.2 Whether such National Money Supply be considered as de jure or de facto as to any constraint thereof, in its part of ***Insufficient*** **MAFE** (**M**oney **A**vailable **F**or **E**arning) being responsible for the largely unknown **Private Debt *Deficit*** created by such commercial banks;

246.3 Being, further, the result of an Illegal Mass Ponzi Scheme being perpetrated by them, banks, as a part of the 1913 "federal conspiracy" to defraud the People of the proposed United States-nation;

246.4 By which **Illegal Ponzi Scheme** banks have been able to UnLawfully = **Illegally** Control the Economy, which "necessary repossessions" are a Direct Result of;

246.5 Make the acts, alleged authorities, and claims of rights, of the "Repossession Agents" yet more dastardly and UnLawful = Illegal than where they might be if committed so for a different kind of client, even though **still** UnLawfully = Illegally;

246.6 "Repossession Agents" **not** being Public Officers having No Fourth Amendment Warrant, Averred to by the Private Injured Party (identifiable within the applicable contract), and not even claiming to be Still UnLawful = Illegal "Private Officers" as Bounty Hunters mis*think* themselves to be, Fourth Amendment Warrants NOT being available to *either* Fraudulently Existing "Private Officers," or else citizens, to begin with;

246.7 Which makes the UnLawful = Illegal acts of "Repossession Agents" to be either, if entering upon private property (**trespass**) and the simple taking of any particular item of property (**theft and impersonating, ipso facto, the power of a public officer**) or the forceful taking of any item of property (**theft and impersonating, ipso facto, the power of a public officer and, if breaking into the vehicle in order to "take it," then vandalism**), or if upon public property, then the simple taking of any particular item of property (**theft and impersonating, ipso facto, the power of a public officer**) or the forceful taking of any item of property (**theft and impersonating, ipso facto, the power of a public officer and, if breaking into the vehicle in order to "take it," then vandalism**);

246.8 And the fact that these kind of UnLawful = Illegal "private" actions have been carried out at the behest of banks or car dealer companies as though they had the right of power to replace required Republican Government Law with Private Contracts that require Public Officers to carry out the Execution of even Contracts where any potential for resistance or altercation may exist, violating the public peace thereby, **is** entirely **Irrelevant** as it pertains to such claims for Private [Repossession] Authority to be exercised physically against any person, as an adverse party, having the potential, any potential, to oppose such "repossession," even those the terms of the applicable "contract" agreed for such repossession to exist, such agreement constituting a potential for forceful opposition (if not a decision to a final verdict of a court of law) and therefore being against the Law of Due **Process**, existing Fundamentally ***before*** the contract in question was entered into between the consenting parties thereto;

247. Right of Sobriety. Because the rights of the People within a Republican Form of Government are equal and equally shared, and no right exists among them to take away such rights from any other person as the result of any act, whether deliberate or inadvertent (accidental or naturally occurring), in a Republican Form of Government the Right for Requirement of Full Universal Sobriety for each and every person, where the physiological or other health or safety of even one person may be put at risk or might be taken or impaired in violation of such equally shared equal rights, Is A Right Of The People.

248. Right of Peace. The Fundamentally Underlying Right and Power of a Republican Form of Government is the Right of Peace, for whenever a People accept the Equally Shared Equally Existing Vesture of the Authority, Rights, Responsibilities, and Powers of a Republican Form of Government upon themselves, to be imbued innately within themselves accordingly, they accept, whether or not consciously, the Power of the Law of Balance with such other Powers, for the Power of the Law of Balance also exists as that principle known as the Right of Peace, which is the Inherent Right of the People in the Republican Form of Government that they voluntarily vested and imbued upon themselves at the time such Republican Government was laid upon themselves, for the benefit of themselves, and for their posterity, without end;

249. This TEST incorporates, as an integral part of the Inherently Existing Constitution for a Republican Form of Government, # XVI, Clause 3, of The Article VI, Clause 2, Contempt of Constitution TEST.

The Words Belonging, Inherently, as a Power of a Republican Form of Government, "Or To The People," themselves.

250. One of the most penetrating errors, or defraudments, existing as defraudments in the factum, of the 1803 case of Marbury v. Madison, among such other errors (or frauds) thereof, was and is the **Unsupported**, or Never Supported or Justified as to any alleged or claimed right to do so, or never having, either within or at any time thereafter, given any form of certification of proof of claim as to right for the United States supreme Court to have Power **over** the common language of the People themselves, such language being a fundamental aspect of all contracts to be constructed and understood, and therefore existent to this date as not having been given any substantive proclamation of any branch of United States government to determine the very meaning of the words of the people themselves, whether in their application in the Inherently Irremovable Common Law or in their application in any statutory law, as though different from the rights of the people to be Required to understand them differently under the Common Law from the Common Language Understanding of the People, itself.

251. Reexamination of procedures, nor condition for a claim for certiorari, leading to a conclusion of the 1803 Marbury v. Madison, establishes that the United States supreme Court, holding that the word "public" is not the same

thing in its meaning or intent for application or use as the word "foreign," was in gross error, that the Congress' providing the Right for Writ of Mandamus to the said supreme Court did not add an Extended Power to the one involving "public Ministers" at Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, Phrase 2, which term "public" included both the "public Ministers" of Secretary of State James Madison, a public Minister of the United States *as* ***defendant***, and Congressionally and Presidentially Appointed (copy of **certificate not** Constitution[ally] **required**) Justice of the Peace for the Territory of Washington, District of Columbia, William Marbury, a public Minister of the United States *as* ***plaintiff***;

252. The Right of the People over the Meaning of ***their*** Words is a Vital Extension, Word for Word, of their most Fundamental of Inherent Rights, and Cannot, *Except* By UnLawful Act Constituting Contempt of Constitution, Be Legislatively, Judicially, or By The Executive, Changed or Redefined Without Such Alteration Being Prosecutable Under the Contempt of Constitution **Power**, Inherently Belonging to The People Alone, As The People Alone Shall or Do Will It To Be.

253. There being no distinction for the requirement of litigant positions in the **Extended Power 2** at Clause 1, Section 2, Article III, **Phrase 2** thereof, establishing by such U.S. supreme Court **error** that it was **not** so exclusively empowered, as any fundamental primary matter, to determine, by this and other foregoing reasons, the "meaning of the Constitution" itself, but that the Power to determine, initially at the very minimum, the meaning of the Constitution itself that comes before any court of the several States of the United States, rests solely within such State courts, **as a** Republican Form of Government so requires, except where it, State, should be found to have traversed the Constitution, and gone, as it were, out of control thereunder.

254.1 The People's Language and The Legislatures. Recognizing that the most basic of human elements, the power of communication, or speech, grounded in that form known as "language," is an inherent right, inseparable to a tearing degree, of every person that may be considered to be any part of "the People," or "the people," in either form written, it becomes a mandatory human right of those same people to, without the requirement of the saying,

to clarify unto a government's legislature this universal, republican government truth, to wit;

254.2 That the Legislature empowered by a Republican Form of Government has no right whatsoever, and never has had any such right, to create for itself a definition for any word, or any combination of words, that, as such words go, are a part of the very language that the people, being sovereign over such Form of Government, utilize as a part of their ongoing communication with each other, nor may they, Legislators, complicate the Law by use of any form of definition that alters the outcome of those same words combined if and when spoken by, and within the understanding, of the most common person within the ranks and file of the people, or People, themselves.

254.3 To do so, or to claim the authority to do so, constitutes and is **Contempt of Constitution** of the People's **Inherent Constitution**, for it Strikes at the Core Rights of the people themselves, and tears away at their most **fundamental rights**, the right to Know *and* Understand, without question or doubt, their own communication to another, and the right to know and understand the communication of another to themselves, to an exacting or precise extent, nothing wavering.

254.4 The fact that this vile and malicious practice has been carried out by legislators, and legislatures, for any generation of time, is irrelevant -without escape- against the Right of the people, over and greater than any legislature ever had or pretended to have, to hold each and every legislator accountable for his or her vote toward altering the People's common language, whether or not under the excuse or claim of reason that they, legislature, could not pass the particular law intended without doing so, being an attestment that they, legislature, and legislators, had no business altering the common language of the people, to the slightest degree, in any pursuit of their lawful lawmaking process.

255. Finally, under this part of this TEST, it is Exposed or Legally Revealed that in a Republican Form of Government, on the point of the act of one "throwing away the Right(s)" of another, such as but not limited to the acts of each and every legislator within a legislature, as well as the acts of each person in each department or function of the executive branch, it is to be

understood that when one "throws away the Right(s)" of another, that person has lost, or loses, his or her own rights at the exact same moment in time, and can be tried for the damages for that "throwing away of Right(s) caused to another, in a court, or else a Court above courts, *when the time comes*.

The Republican Form of Government TEST Continued And Defined

This Exhibited TEST is to reveal, put to a true light, and to clarify the Article VI, Section 4 Republican Form of Government standard, criteria, and objective conditions of such said Government for Constitution[al] Application purposes. In summary of those things which make up and are requisite elements of a Republican Form of Government, we find that a Republican Form of Government:

1. Is a government of Law(s). Being a government of Law(s) means that it is **NOT** a government of "Opinions," or "Personal Beliefs," or "Policies," or PERSONAL "Feelings," or "Impressions," or "Tastes," or "Notions," or "Whims," or "Game(s)," or "Code," or "Philosophies," or "Sentiment**(s)**," or "Slants," or "Personalities," or "'Elite Class' or 'Elite Ideology,'" or "Estimations," or "Convictions," or "Persuasions," or "Suppositions," or "Conjectures," or "Speculations," or "Theories," or "Personal Non-Factual Conclusions" NOT based on both Facts and Law, or "Attitudes," or "Ideas," or "Sentiments," or "Views," or "Upbringings," and is, further, **NOT** federal," or "*federalized*," or "feudalistic," or "monarchistic," or military, or an oligarchy or group of "rulers," or parliamentary, or parliamentary-like, and is NOT "Practices" or "Social-Practices or Customs," or "Rulers," or "Rules that are not based upon or derived from actual Law," including the Common Law, .. or "Thoughts," or any form of personal or individual government or government process that, as with a monarchy, or a socialistic or a military or an imperialistic or a communistic government, or else an oligarchy, can be **changed** or else **reinterpreted** by a single decision on a whim (as also exists with "policy") or thought or idea. It, a Republican Form of Government, **is** about Laws and Laws alone, and it is based upon Laws, or that which all may count upon, ***indivisibly***, and nothing less, **that it is to operate**, else there be governmental error in applying the Law any other way except as law, **as the**

Inherent Responsibility for the Law of the People so mandates, lest the same People be **betrayed** by anything more or less than this.

2. Is divided up into three (3) branches, a legislative branch, an executive branch, and a **juristic** (not a ~~judicial~~) **branch,** which at all times must remain separate;

3. Irrespective of the three divisions or branches aforementioned, the People, as a collective body, determined by the majority thereof, have Power to preside over them, branches, having the inherent right to reconstruct such branches as the People see fit, or else to dismantle them altogether, ***and possibly*** never to reestablish them again.

4. Is a government that has come to exist by way of having the Power of Authority vested in it being made to settle or rest, forthwith, *without discrimination*, upon the People to whom it pertains in a manner that imbues each and every person within the People upon whom it is vested with the same equal Power of Fundamental Rights, not one above the other no matter the reputation (or "title") or status of respect or reverence, so that the words "We the People," not We the Individuals, are those very words reflective of true and distinguishable Republican Form of Government itself.

5. Is a government that already *has* "due process" included or ingrained in its fundamental concepts of operation and existence at every point, not requiring any extra or external provision or "amendment" to provide for the right of each and every person to whom such government pertains to.

6. Is a government – *because of the way that it is vested* and *comprised* as an Equally Shared Equal Rights form of authority, spread out equally, indiscriminately, *forthwith* upon the instant that its authoritative vesture is laid upon the People to whom it is to serve – that denies, indisputably, the ***existence*** of **Slavery**, ***in any form and to any and every extent***, within its confines and boundaries, thereof, **expunging** all existence of Slavery *forthwith* the moment that such government is understood to become or to be of a Republican Form of Government vesture as a matter of any duly ordained Law. Under a Republican Form of Government, no one may own or possess even one Slave, **including** not any government **itself**.

7. It is a government that requires, mandatorially, at every distinct level of government, every form of law enforcement thereof to be represented by an Elected Official, Elected Directly and **strictly** by the People themselves – to whom such law enforcement is to **Directly and Locally** pertain, which **form of** mandatory law enforcement absolutely **Denies and Prohibits** the current forms of **Constitutionally De Facto**, or **Constitutionally Invalid:**

(1) police/police departments; (2) highway patrols / State troopers; (3) marshals (both State and "federal"); (4) constables; (5) undercover or secret or plain clothes investigators or agents or officers, any agency or department; (6) agents and/or officers for the FBI, DEA, CIA, IRS, INS, FCC, FTC, SEC, USDA, USPS, FDA, S.S., NSA, DI, Homeland Security, FAA, FEMA, U.S. Forestry Service, OSHA, EPA, BLM, BATF, BIA, BOP, etc., and including the DOJ itself; (7) as well as the practice of **Hiding Jurisdiction** (*secret or disguised* {not evident} law enforcement *of any kind* Prohibited) to be instantly, or **Forthwith**, **Denied**, **Prohibited**, and **VOIDED** *in every conceivable detail*, **to be replaced**, without circumvention of duty to do so, by that elected form of (sheriff's) law enforcement that was the original cornerstone of Republican Form of Government in 1787 when Article IV, Section 4 was first written and proposed to the Several States.

8. 1) **This Exhibited TEST** of the workings and clarification of a Republican Form of Government set forth in this Article IV, Section 4 Republican Form of Government TEST extends to both the Common Law (the Law of the Commoners), which may not be removed, and to Natural Law, or Nature's Law, and the benefits and constraints that each carry with them.

2) Consequently as to the Natural Law, recognizing again the Equally Shared Equal Rights of the People in whom such Vesture of Republican Government is Grounded, the Rights of Parents are no less a requirement for mandatory support of the same above that of violative government, where there exists a pretense that children are somehow become the property or possession of the State's government, for, as stated previously in this TEST, government may not either own or possess any human person *as though* for itself, inclusive of children, nor may children be taken, under any pretext of law or fact, entirely from any family, for a Republican Form of Government,

in its vested inclusion of Natural Law itself, must recognize and respect the comprehensiveness of the entire family, and the Family's Rights to their own children prevailing over "political" government's UnLawful "Policies" and Institutions, whether such as that be public or private. Amen. (or So be it).

9. Removing / Overturning <u>Not</u> Laws. UnLawfully Embedded in the Several States of the Proposed United States-nation, over the many years since the time that the first Thirteen of them were proposed to become united according to the dictates of the Morality of Freedom and Uprightness and a greater outlook of progress for the future of generations from among them, there has come to exist conditions that, being hard entrenched within corrupted governments and unwittingly supported by the common people for whom such governments are to have been established and operated for, which must be, in order to purify <u>Republican Form of Government</u> to its fullest potential for perfection, for the benefit of the people for whom it is ordained, purged of all such corruptions that are, as a matter of Law, Not Law.

9.1 NOT LAW; Black's Law, Seventh Edition, page 1090, wherein it sets forth as to the judicial decision of a judge as opposed to what the legal profession as a whole knows to be true concerning the law and the procedures wherein it is lawfully executable, that:

> "A judicial decision regarded as **wrong** by the legal profession" is NOT Law, clarifying further that "Even when it is not possible to point out any decision that affects the point in question in any one of the ways enumerated, it sometimes happens that the profession has grown to ignore the old decision as wrong . . . when it does happen . . . is one of the instances in which lawyers rather mystically, though soundly, say that a decision is 'not law.'" William M. Lile, et al. *Brief Making and the Use of Law Books* 329 (3d ed. 1914). [Black's Law, 7th Edition]

10. THEREFORE, IN A <u>REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT</u>:

"Federal Government," or "Federalism," is <u>NOT</u> Law;

Social Government, or Socialism, is <u>NOT</u> Law;

Communism is <u>NOT</u> Law;

Fascism is NOT Law;

A Parliamentary Government is NOT Law;

A Monarchy is NOT Law;

An Oligarchy is NOT Law;

The existence of any Policy, whether considered to be private policy or else is called or known as “public policy,” - is NOT Law;

A political party, the rights of or to recognize any political party under the superior and superseding veil of a Republican Form of Government, as any power or authority of the People/people thereof, is NOT Law;

A politician as a lawful official or party having Standing, rather Lacking Standing (No Right To Speak) in a Republican Form of Government is NOT Law;

That body of philosophy, claims, opinions, beliefs, theories, and other variable proposals utilized to bind the lives, properties, and rights of the People, known generally as “politics,” is NOT Law;

A police officer, police chief, or police department, each said same being established for “policy enforcement” purposes, and alleging to possess the powers of all three branches of a Republican Form of Government, executive, judicial, legislative, is NOT Law;

A court operated by Rulers, or Judges, is NOT Law;

A Bar Association, “Bar” being the acronym for British Accreditation Registry Association, originated by England’s monarchial government in London, England over 250 years ago, brought to and imposed upon the Several States, again, post 1871, is NOT Law;

The “practice of law” is NOT Law;

The existence of Slavery, Slaves, Involuntary Servants or Servitude, Slave Masters, or Slaver Overseers, in any form, is NOT Law;

"Political Science" is a pseudo science, or false science, is based upon the concept of UnLawful = Illegal "policy" and "politics" and "political parties," and is NOT Law.

11.1 The Disease of Federalism. Under ideal conditions, the production of white blood cells works to combat diseases of the body, by inputting disease fighting white blood cells into the blood vessels where disease causing parasites, bacteria, virus, and other causes of infection exist, in order to destroy these causes of disease at its earliest stages, before disease takes over and leaves the previously health body – in ruin.

11.2 Leukemia, a Disease of the Blood, is considered to be a cancer thereof, which involves the excessive production of white blood cells by the bone marrow. Originally, the production of white blood cells were believed to be good for the body's system, by overpowering the bad elements that invade the body, eradicating the potential for disease by their presence.

11.3 Much like the disease of Leukemia, federalism got its start by being believed that, if fully controlled, it would serve the people of the proposed nation well, to their better progress and pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness as to its final outcome.

11.4 Unfortunately, the **Disease of Federalism** took over very quickly in 1789, as the alleged Congress in its meeting March 4, 1789, having No Quorum for either House, whatsoever, by which to have " Lawfully Accepted" the 1787 proposed Constitution as the "supreme Law" of the new, proposed United States-nation, and began to cultivate its federal disease with the entirely UnLawful = Illegal Judiciary Act of 1789, the immediate enemy to every aspect of Republican Form of Government itself.

11.5 Consequently, None of the Several States, from that earliest date to this latest date have ever been existent as any true Republican Form of Government, except to the scantiest degree of public elections and voters only; the laws, being UnLawfully codified, are suspect, and justice, to have been maintained by the full utilization of the assize, or trial jury without judge, and State grand jury without judge or prosecution's exclusive appearance and control thereof, is fleeting if not virtually gone altogether.

11.6 To establish a Republican Form of Government, anywhere, the Disease of Federalism, and all other Non-Republican Government forms must be removed from the body of the people whom such Republican Government is to be established for, which Republican Government is to be Self Vested, NOT at the will or power of any government external to the People themselves, by which Vested Power the People will be imbued with the qualities of Equally Shared Equal Rights, from which all Republican Form of Government Attributes and other Rights continue to Flow.

THIS COMPREHENSIVE,

"The Republican Form of Government TEST,"

Presented Above, And Guaranteed In Its Effects To The People, Each of You, In Every State and Land, Is Hereby-

DULY SUBMITTED TO THE PEOPLE FIRST AND ABOVE ALL, AND DULY INCORPORATED UNDER THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR THE UNITED STATES – OF AMERICA;

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