

Why Counties Matter Most – An Architectural And Functional View

For knowledge to become power – it must be exerted.

Preface

By now, one should have a sufficient view of our governmental framework as one has delved into our previous articles covering 1) the limited roles, responsibilities, powers, property, and jurisdiction of the general government, 2) the proper entity for enforcement or execution of the Constitution and our laws, 3) why the general and state governments can no longer invoke martial law, 3) the teeth and the unknown teeth in the Constitution, and 4) the specific process necessary to obtain full compliance to the Constitution. Consequently, understanding the architecture and how our hybrid Constitutional Republic was designed to operate.

In the evolution of enlightened governments, 1776 was an epoch for mankind for both individual liberty and subjugation. The Declaration of Independence was the epoch for individual liberty and individual sovereignty and what is known and referred to as Adam Weishaupt's charter for the Illuminati establishes the path to form a single one world government – to subjugate all. The former should be common knowledge to any American as the Declaration of Independence and the later was an actualization of the works of Plato's "*Republic*," as the first original thought of a statist government committed to writing, along with subsequent works from Dante's "*De Monarchia*" as well as other altruistic books. Adam Weishaupt's charter for the Illuminati, exposed in John Robison's *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe*,¹ citing Weishaupt's charter asserting "Princes and nations shall vanish from the earth. The human race will then become one family, and the world will be the dwelling of Rational Men", as all nations will be guided towards a single governance and single currency.

As such, Mr. Robinson's *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe*, exposes Weishaupt's plan to use all facets of the Government which will be employed to ensure the inculcation of the public, citing Weishaupt's charter which reveals: "The great strength of our Order lies in its concealment; let it never appear in any place in its own name, but always concealed by another name, and another occupation... establishing reading societies, and subscription libraries, and taking these under our direction, and supplying them through our labours, we may turn the public mind which way we will."² Consequently apparatuses and/or organizations that have been exposed in the past, evolved into new names, such as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society (ISS) founded in 1905, which later evolved into the League for Industrial Democracy in 1921, and then in 1960, it was named the Students for a Democratic Society.³ The education system will teach tolerance and "we must win the common people in every corner. This will be obtained chiefly by means of the schools, and by open, hearty behaviour, show, condescension, popularity, and toleration of their prejudices, which we shall at leisure root out and dispel,"⁴ in essence pervert and destroy our morals and traditions.

¹ John Robison, 1798, *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe*: http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/PROOFS_OF_A_CONSPIRACY_John_Robison.pdf

² Adam Weishaupt, 1776, <https://www.azquotes.com/quote/771598>

³ League for Industrial Democracy, Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/League_for_Industrial_Democracy

⁴ Adam Weishaupt, 1776, <https://elevatesociety.com/quotes-by-adam-weishaupt/>

The irony is sobering that both a righteous as well as an evil plan were coming forth for the governing of mankind and the culmination of these plans is playing out today. One can see how these plans have played out over the past 240 years. The infiltration of communism has been very prolific due to the lack of vigilance and complacency of the American people shortly after our nation's founding. James Madison profoundly laid out the importance of the "We the People's" involvement in our self-government in stating:

"But the great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department, consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others. The provision for defense must in this, as in all other cases, be made commensurate to the danger of attack. Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions."⁵

Needless to say, the dependence on the people as the primary control of government has failed. But why? This question opens a plethora of rabbit-holes; however, the primary reason why "We the People" allowed our Republic to drift into communism had more to do with illiteracy of our Constitution and a lack of details and explanations on the architectural and functional framework of government by the principle framers. This made it easy for those with machinations to mislead the masses. Architectural components such as the uniqueness of our bicameral legislative bodies have become a complete mystery. To be specific, the three-layer design of our governments (i.e. county, state, and federal) being interdependent in this new form of government was clearly inspired by the Divine Hand of Providence as the framers' innovated a Republican Form of government in such a design that even they could not fully understand its perfection. As a testament to its perfection, even today, as we have slid so far into a Monarchal Party form of a Democratic Socialism – we still possess the power and the tools to restore this Divine government.

Thomas Jefferson described the political power in this new government as outward-flowing like centrifugal energy. The distributive responsibility and power is what makes our Republic impenetrable from all external threats. This is why the vulnerability of the Republic is the pulling in or the centralizing of power using centripetal force instead of centrifugal forces. Pulling political power into a central government destroys our Republic; whereas, allowing political energies to flow outward expands and strengthens our Republic.

What is paramount today, if we are going to restore our hybrid Constitutional Republic, is restoring the people's power over their direct government by restoring the architectural and operational structure of our self-government. In other words we have to restore the government where all political energy is to originate with the people and their direct government, our county government.

Our Declaration of Independence succinctly states that our government is instituted by "We the People".

⁵ James Madison 08 February 1788, Federalist Paper # 51.

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.— That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government.”⁶

Consequently, the following sections will not only provide the insights of the framework of our hybrid Constitutional Republic, but it will also unravel the perverse work of those seeking to subjugate the world with unconstitutional roles, responsibilities, powers, and properties (RRPPs) – all of which are direct violations to the Constitution. More importantly, we will also provide the insights as to how HIS design can flawlessly wipe away these RRPPs as well as those attacking us simply by getting a basic majority to stand up for the rule of law. In a simple adaptation of Joshua 24:15 as a call to serve HIS Constitution, choose you now this day if you will serve, support, and defend the Constitution as the Supreme Law against its’ enemies foreign and domestic, for if we do – we can vanquish any foe among us. With yet another adaptation of Malachi 3:10, and prove the Lord of hosts if HE will not open the windows of heaven and pour out a blessing to you and this nation if we simply move forward in faith seeking obedience and demanding full compliance to HIS Constitution.

A Confederated Republic – Not a Federation

Technically “We the People” did not originally institute our government. We inherited the remnants of a Monarchical government that employed a degree of republicanism and democracy. Therefore, starting with the creation of the Union, the Colonies quickly adopted the term State which already had a local government called a county, district, or parish (in Louisiana) that actually was formed by the colonists. The first Constitution in the colonies was the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut; however, these were more-of-agreements granted general powers or delegating most powers to the discretion to those who governed. These Constitutions and governments were not perfect but as applied to the colonies the people felt their liberties were more secured. Subsequently, Constitutions were the mechanism that formed our governments, and established the newly formed governments’ roles, responsibilities, powers, and even identified the properties it has the authority to possess; more to come on the Constitution for the United States later.

While the colonies were finally convinced to pursue independence with their unique structure of disparately formed States with very different paradigms in religion, labor, and economics; John Adams was one of the first to state the obvious in his article *Thoughts on Government*, stating:

“That the only valuable part of the British constitution is so; because the very definition of a Republic, is "an Empire of Laws, and not of men." That, as a Republic is the best of governments, so that particular arrangement of the powers of society, or in other words that form of government, which is best contrived to secure an impartial and exact execution of the laws, is the best of Republics.

Of Republics, there is an inexhaustable variety, because the possible combinations of the powers of society, are capable of innumerable variations.”⁷

Keep in mind, the original colonies were actually formed by the British Crown via charters – and within each colony the “people” formed their local government and both the people and the government were subjects to

⁶ The Declaration of Independence, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/declare.asp

⁷ Thoughts on Government, John Adams, Apr 1776, <https://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch4s5.html>

Britain. One cannot emphasize enough the importance of why these charters in forming the colonies were so critical to the evolution of our hybrid Constitutional Republic.

After the Revolutionary War, the Colonies became sovereign and independent States in Article 1 of *The Definitive Treaty of Peace 1783*, which stated:

“His Brittanic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz., New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, **to be free sovereign and independent states**, that he treats with them as such, and for himself, his heirs, and successors, relinquishes all claims to the government, propriety, and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof.”⁸

It is worth noting that the King did not recognize the “Union,” instead he ignored the existing union of these States under the newly ratified Articles of Association. This may be because States were already bypassing the Articles of Confederation (AoC) before it was fully ratified – where the month prior to when the AoC were fully ratified, 3 February 1781, a proposed amendment was submitted to the States to give Congress the power to impose duties on imports.⁹ From 1781 to 1786, eight key amendments were submitted to the States to give Congress the essential powers to save the union – all of which failed.¹⁰

The Secret No-one Will Mention

Under the Articles of Confederation, the States did not grant the power to the Continental Congress to amend the Constitution; this power was reserved by the States. The restriction on Amending the Articles of Confederation are in Article XIII stating:

“And the Articles of this Confederation shall be inviolably observed by every State, and the Union shall be perpetual; nor shall any alteration at any time hereafter be made in any of them; unless such alteration be agreed to in a Congress of the United States, and be afterwards confirmed by the legislatures of every State.”¹¹

Clearly, Continental Congress possessed no powers to recommend amendments to the Articles what so ever or to call for a Convention to revise the AoC. The States had full autonomy and control regarding the amendment process. In other words, there was nothing comparable to Article V in the Constitution for the United States within the AOC.

To Fail or Not to Fail

The Union and the States were between a rock and a hard spot due to what many of the States referred to as “Rogue Island,” a nickname given to Rhode Island.¹² Ironically, as much as Rhode Island insisted on maintaining the impotent AoC, they forced the wholesale changes that were necessary in creating a new form of government. As the AoC were clearly the failure – they provided such a frustration among the men we now call

⁸ The Definitive Treaty of Peace 1783, <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/treaty-of-paris>

⁹ The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution Digital Edition, ed. John P. Kaminski, Gaspare J. Saladino, Richard Leffler, Charles H. Schoenleber and Margaret A. Hogan. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009. Canonic, <https://csac.history.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/281/2017/07/revise1.pdf>

¹⁰ The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution Digital Edition, Attempts to Revise The Articles of Confederation, <https://csac.history.wisc.edu/document-collections/confederation-period/attempts-to-revise/>

¹¹ The Articles of Confederation, 01 March 1781, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/artconf.asp

¹² “Rogue Island”: The last state to ratify the Constitution, Jessie Kratz, 18 May 2015, <https://prologue.blogs.archives.gov/2015/05/18/rogue-island-the-last-state-to-ratify-the-constitution/>

our framers that the inevitable Constitutional Convention became the petri dish for the Divine Hand of Providence to inspire these men to do something that was both out of their individual capacities as well as their comprehension.

Understanding the magnitude of the Union failing, Rhode Island unwittingly ignited the urgency and anxiety among the States and their elite class of public servants. Finally, in September 1786 in Annapolis, during a meeting of delegates from five States in the union, they sent the following as a recommendation to the Continental Congress:

*"That there are important defects in the system of the Federal Government **is acknowledged by the Acts of all those States**, which have concurred in the present Meeting; That the defects, upon a closer examination, may be found greater and more numerous, than even these acts imply, is at least so far probable, from the embarrassments which characterize the present State of our national affairs, foreign and domestic, as may reasonably be supposed to merit a deliberate and candid discussion, in some mode, which will unite the Sentiments and Councils of all the States. In the choice of the mode, your Commissioners are of opinion, that a Convention of Deputies from the different States, for the special and sole purpose of entering into this investigation, and digesting a plan for supplying such defects as may be discovered to exist, will be entitled to a preference from considerations, which will occur, without being particularized.*

*Your Commissioners decline an enumeration of those national circumstances **on which their opinion respecting the propriety of a future Convention, with more enlarged powers, is founded**; as it would be an useless intrusion of facts and observations, most of which have been frequently the subject of public discussion, and none of which can have escaped the penetration of those to whom they would in this instance be addressed. They are however of **a nature so serious**, as, in the view of your Commissioners to render the situation of the United States delicate and critical, calling for an exertion of the united virtue and wisdom of all the members of the Confederacy.*

*Under this impression, Your Commissioners, with the most respectful deference, beg leave to suggest their unanimous conviction, that it may essentially tend to advance the interests of the union, if the States, by whom they have been respectively delegated, would themselves concur, and use their endeavours to procure the concurrence of the other States, **in the appointment of Commissioners, to meet at Philadelphia on the second Monday in May next, to take into consideration the situation of the United States, to devise such further provisions as shall appear to them necessary to render the constitution of the Federal Government adequate to the exigencies of the Union**; and to report such an Act for that purpose to the United States in Congress assembled, as when agreed to, by them, and afterwards confirmed by the Legislatures of every State, will effectually provide for the same."*¹³

In response to this recommendation from the Annapolis convention, Continental Congress sent the following report to the several States:

"Congress having had under consideration the letter of John Dickinson esqr chairman of the Commissioners who assembled at Annapolis during the last year also the proceedings of the said commissioners and entirely coinciding with them as to the inefficiency of the federal government and the necessity of devising such farther provisions as shall render the same adequate to the exigencies of

¹³ Proceedings of Commissioners to Remedy Defects of the Federal Government : 1786, 14 September 1786, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/annapoli.asp

the Union do strongly recommend to the different legislatures to send forward delegates to meet the proposed convention on the second Monday in May next at the city of Philadelphia"...

That it be recommended to the States composing the Union that a convention of representatives from the said States respectively be held at on for the purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union between the United States of America and reporting to the United States in Congress assembled and to the States respectively such alterations and amendments of the said Articles of Confederation as the representatives met in such convention shall judge proper and necessary to render them adequate to the preservation and support of the Union... Resolved that in the opinion of Congress it is expedient that on the second Monday in May next a Convention of delegates who shall have been appointed by the several states be held at Philadelphia for the sole and express purpose *of revising the Articles of Confederation* and reporting to Congress and the several legislatures such *alterations and provisions therein* as shall when agreed to in Congress and confirmed by the states render the federal constitution *adequate to the exigencies of Government & the preservation of the Union.*"¹⁴

Setting the stage for the Convention, four articles were published by William Barton (Jan 1787), Benjamin Rush (Jan 1787), James Madison, (Apr 1787), and Harrington (May 1787) to help "We the People" understand the pending doom of the Union and the necessity for a more vigorous general government.¹⁵ Consequently, from November 1786 to June 1787 Each State except Rhode Island passed (being consistent with their obstinate position on saving the Union) "Acts Electing and Empowering Delegates" to attend the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. Out of the Twelve States committed to meeting only Massachusetts and New York stipulated specific changes not occur to specific clauses to Article 5 of the AoC. All States stated as New York did by stating:

"delegates be appointed on the part of this state, to meet such delegates as may be appointed on the part of the other states respectively, on the second Monday in May next, at Philadelphia, for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation and reporting to Congress, and to the several legislatures, such alterations and provisions therein, as shall, when agreed to in Congress, and confirmed by the several states, render the federal constitution adequate to the exigencies of government and the preservation of the Union."¹⁶

Fundamentally, all of the twelve States repeated and emphasized the call by Continental Congress above to "render the federal constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government & the preservation of the Union." Contrary to modern day assertions – the States did not firmly constrain their delegates to maintain the AoC and simply amend them. Had that been the case, the Convention, just like the AoC would have been doomed before they met. Thus, those who quip that the Constitutional Convention was a runaway Convention are using hyperbole to obviate the necessary discussion today as to what needs to be done.

Clearly the AoC as the functioning constitution at the time was an abject failure – in contrast to today, the Constitution for the United States is not the problem nor has it failed. The failure that is thrusting our Republic today to ruin has everything to do with illiteracy of the Constitution and out right subversion to the Constitution for the United States.

¹⁴ Report of Proceedings in Congress; 21 February 1787, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/const04.asp

¹⁵ The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution Digital Edition, Commentary on the Problems under the Articles of Confederation, <https://csac.history.wisc.edu/document-collections/confederation-period/attempts-to-revise/>

¹⁶ The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution Digital Edition, ed. John P. Kaminski, Gaspare J. Saladino, Richard Leffler, Charles H. Schoenleber and Margaret A. Hogan. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009, https://csac.history.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/281/2017/07/delegate_inst10.pdf

Before moving forward into the details of the Constitution, the following points must be made regarding the AoC:

- 1) The AoC was the apparent failure, which required significant changes to save the Union.
- 2) The States also had to pay for the cost of Convention renting the venue, and compensating the delegates for travel, expenses, and time. The delegates did not get rich and the compensation was a stipend compared to today's employment standards.
- 3) Continental Congress had no controls over the Convention, because:
 - a) It was not specifically enumerated in the AoC
 - b) The judicial powers were limited to very specific objects.

In contrast to the AoC, the Constitution and our problems are drastically different:

- 1) The Constitution is not failing us, our public servants and the governments they are operating are performing palpable violations to the Constitution for the United States.
- 2) A plethora of violations of the Constitution today are direct overreach by the federal government assuming roles, responsibilities, powers, and properties not enumerated in the Constitution.
- 3) In contrast to the AoC, Article V of the Constitution grants Congress the role and responsibility to offer amendments to the States and also enumerates Congresses responsibility to call for the Convention.
- 4) In contrast to the AoC judicial jurisdiction, the federal judiciary under Article III Section 2 of the Constitution for the United States asserts: "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made under their authority."¹⁷
- 5) Though Congress has not made any laws to the authors knowledge regarding the Article V convention, they can, since it would be in pursuance to the Constitution, and there is no doubt, the insatiable Supreme Court – who has always overreached jurisdiction over things that do not arise under this Constitution such as religion, science, education, labor, etc., will find no barrier whatsoever to hear, rule and unconstitutionally legislate the functions, actions, and possibly outcomes of an Article V Convention.

This is why the proponents for an Article V Convention are being disingenuous when their primary justification for calling forth an Article V Convention is federal overreach and yet it would not be overreach for the federal government to seize control of an Article V Convention. As previously stated, the common opponents to the Article V Convention use demagoguery regarding the Article V Convention and both the opponents and proponents would have one believe that this is strictly a binary issue, when in fact, both are obviating the actual tool within the Constitution designed to hold government and our public servants accountable to the Constitution for the United States when they violate the Constitution. The process is the First Amendment right of Petitioning Government for the Redress of Grievances, which will be addressed in detail in a subsequent article.

The reasons all of this history about the evolution of government is so important is because alleged "conservative" and "progressive" factions in America today are claiming the illegitimacy of the Constitution. Again the "conservative" self-proclaimed advocates on the Constitution bring this destructive argument forward again that our Constitution was illegitimate because the delegates exceeded their commission. The Anti-Federalist who ardently fought the ratification of the Constitution based their initial argument on this point to disband the state's ratification conventions; thus, attempting to kill the Constitution. The Anti-Federalists failed in this effort. The delegates attending the ratification conventions where this question arose and most settled

¹⁷ The Constitution for the United States, Article III Section 2, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art3.asp#3sec2

this question once and for all, by vote of a majority of the delegates who disagreed that the State delegates attending the Constitutional Convention did not exceed their commission.

The progressives are now using this false paradigm along with other unfounded assertions that the Constitution must be replaced with a modern living Constitution. As Rhode Island forced the Constitutional Convention, those casting a perverted view that the Constitution is illegitimate are handing to true enemies of the Constitution an argument based on hearsay that the delegates at the Convention exceeded their commission.

A New Form of Government Is Born

In referring to the design and form of the general government within the Constitution for the United States, Patrick Henry and many others referred to it as a “new government.” This is because the doctrine of The Magistrate Form of Government (i.e. a top down form of law and ruling) and the inherent roles, responsibilities, powers, and properties were surgically divided and separated within the Constitution. This new form of government with separate Legislative, Executive, and Judicial branches became the gold standard of governing in America. This is why all Thirteen States reconfigured their governments into this standard and that all new governments instituted by “We the People” would be one with full powers to govern with a three-way separation in the powers of governing.

As an aside, the Magistrate Form of Government is the oldest form of governing and was implemented in various fashions from Monarchies to Theocracies. Though there were periods of noble leaders, this design empowered the “ruler” with general powers to use with restraint or to exploit them where they would range in degrees of tyranny and oppression. Many governments today claim to be a bottom up design like communism or democracies but both are equally despotic. Suffice it to say the only government that has ever formed as a bottom up government by its design is our hybrid Constitutional Republic.

In fixing the Articles of Confederation, each State legislature sent a body of delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Even though the Constitution states “We the People,” in its creation, the Constitution was created by an elite small set of delegates from these States who were some of the most literate regarding government and politics that the States could afford to send. In other words, the application of republicanism was clearly followed by sending delegates and not the whole body of the people developing an ultimate solution to save the union.

Once the Constitution was signed, it was sent to the Continental Congress who forwarded the Constitution to the States to be ratified in a Convention of delegates who would represent their counties.

Though the Declaration of Independence predated the Constitution, it established a principle that still stands to this day. That principle is cited above in the Preface, “That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.” The point that is irrelevant in the United States is the following clause “That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government.” This is because prior to our Constitution no nation ever formed a government that could hold its elected officials and government accountable to their Constitution. We call these controls checks and balances and there are far more than what has been taught in school for over one and a half centuries.

The Constitution for the United States is the only Constitution throughout the annals of mankind that was specifically designed to limit the general government to clearly defined enumerated objects that bind the general government to very specific roles, responsibilities, powers, and properties (RRPPs). As it was articulated by George Nicolas during the Virginia Ratification Debates:

“In England, in all disputes between the king and people, recurrence is had to the enumerated rights of the people, to determine. Are the rights in dispute secured? Are they included in Magna Charta, Bill of Rights, &c.? If not, they are, generally speaking, within the king's prerogative, In disputes between Congress and the people, the reverse of the proposition holds. Is the disputed right enumerated? If not, Congress cannot meddle with it”¹⁸

James Madison, in the same debates in Virginia, succinctly stated:

“the powers of the federal government are enumerated; it can only operate in certain cases; it has legislative powers on defined and limited objects, beyond which it cannot extend its jurisdiction.”¹⁹

John Marshall, during the Virginia Ratification Debates, also asserted:

“Can they make laws affecting the mode of transferring property, or contracts, or claims, between citizens of the same state? Can they go beyond the delegated powers? If they were to make a law not warranted by any of the powers enumerated, it would be considered by the judges as an infringement of the Constitution which they are to guard. They would not consider such a law as coming under their jurisdiction. They would declare it void.”²⁰

In contrast to each of the fifty state Constitutions, not one comes close to limiting their State's RRPP's with succinct enumerations. The State Constitutions also lack the checks and balances in the State legislature unlike Congress and the counties, when forming their State Constitutions, failed to protect their republican form of government; however, many think otherwise that counties are simply administrative offices of the State. The truth is – there is no evidence of this within any of the States' founding documents.

Consequently, due to the complete lack of teaching these essentials in academia for over a century, the need to examine the architecture of our republican form of government and its operational processes becomes paramount in efforts to Reclaiming the Republic®. If we turn to the founding documents and primary source materials regarding the unique structure of America's Republican form of government, how each were instituted, and how these levels of government were to function within our hybrid Constitutional Republic, we will find how “We the People” failed in instituting governments in accordance with the Constitutional design. The primary reason for this was the prevailing thought that, for well over a century, government would never grow to a point where it would provide services to “We the People.”

The Constitutional Design

The Constitution is a Compact

Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and the framers consistently referred to the Constitution as a compact. There are a plethora of references that support this, and more importantly, the compact was also further defined as a power of attorney. A specified or limited power of attorney was used during the Ratification Debates on the adopting of the federal Constitution and the framers also pointed out that the Constitution was an instrument based upon, and subject to, contract law.

¹⁸ Mr. George Nicholas, June 10 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of Virginia, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. <https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/elliott.htm>

¹⁹ Mr. Madison, June 6 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of Virginia, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. <https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/elliott.htm>

²⁰ Mr. John Marshall, June 20 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of Virginia, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. <https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/elliott.htm>

The single-most important clause in the Constitution is Article VII. This is because this is where the Constitution establishes its identity as a Compact in stating: “The ratification of the conventions of nine states, shall be sufficient for the establishment of this constitution between the states so ratifying the same.”²¹

The definition for ratification is the same today as it was back then as a legal term:

- “The act or process of ratifying something (such as a treaty or amendment) : formal confirmation or sanction.”²²
- “The confirmation of a previous act done either by the party himself or by another; confirmation of a voidable act See Story, Ag.”²³

Bottom line, the definition and the application of ratification in the Constitution during the framers time period is the same as it is today. Distilling this word in its application of the Constitution is the formal process of accepting and giving force to the Constitution by the Parties to it.

The other reason why Article VII is the most important clause in the Constitution is the point in fact, that it clarifies the Parties to the Constitution, being the Sovereign States – who are the only members of the Union.

An interesting note in the legal definition is the point of fact that a party can void and dissolve their association. There is plenty of support for this within the Ratification Debates on adopting the federal Constitution and the Federalists Papers – but that is a separate subject for another time.

A Republican Form of Government

That short phrase that is so passionately expressed by Patriots is wholly inadequate to effectively describe the complexities of our government; however, at this juncture we need to cover the pecking order of political power to help create clarity for all seeking to restore our government into its original design. In a subsequent article we will dive into what one can refer to as the different planes of our government but for now let’s focus on the details of that pecking order.

In citing James Madison assertions in Federalist Papers # 51 above, there is merit in analyzing his assertion regarding the creation of a limited government in such a way that the government itself can guard against the dangerous centralizing of powers; consequently, the bold italics highlight these points:

“But the great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department, consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others. The provision for defense must in this, as in all other cases, be made commensurate to the danger of attack. Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? ***If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary.*** In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. ***A dependence on the people is, no***

²¹ The Constitution for the United States, Article VII, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art7.asp

²² The Definition of Ratification, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ratification>

²³ The Law Dictionary, <https://thelawdictionary.org/ratification/>

doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions.”²⁴

Some of the precautions that were integrated into the Constitution have been covered in our preceding articles, “What is the Real Problem,”²⁵ “Martial Law in the Twenty-first Century,”²⁶ and “The Unknown Teeth in the Constitution”²⁷ that lend to understanding the jurisdiction, roles, responsibilities, powers, and property as established by the States at the time of the Ratification of the Constitution for the United States. Though the entire assertion above by Madison can be emphasized, what is not emphasized needs to be highlighted specifically as Madison elucidates on the challenge the framers in the Constitutional Convention contended with as “In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.”

In stating “you must first enable the government to control the governed,” the convention’s solution to this was not to grant “general powers,” whatsoever. The framers were well aware of the principles of powers of attorney, framed the constitution into one of a specified or limited power of attorney. A very brief historical look into the practice of powers of attorney is as follows:

“There are records that are 2500 years old from Mesopotamia, evidencing the appointment of a person to handle monies for another person, reflecting the essence of a modern Power of Attorney. From the 14th century comes the Latin maxim “Qui facit per alium, facit per se” meaning, “he who acts through another, acts himself.”²⁸

Consequently, the concept of the application and usage of powers of attorney were profoundly understood by many of the framers. Mr. James Iredell of North Carolina, during the North Carolina ratification on the adoption of the federal Constitution stated:

“Did any man ever hear, before, that at the end of a power of attorney it was said that the attorney should not exercise more power than was there given him? Suppose, for instance, a man had lands in the counties of Anson and Caswell, and he should give another a power of attorney to sell his lands in Anson, would the other have any authority to sell the lands in Caswell? — or could he, without absurdity, say, “Tis true you have not expressly authorized me to sell the lands in Caswell; but as you had lands there, and did not say I should not, I thought I might as well sell those lands as the other.” A bill of rights, as I conceive, would not only be incongruous, but dangerous. No man, let his ingenuity be what it will, could enumerate all the individual rights not relinquished by this Constitution”²⁹

²⁴ James Madison, 8 February 1788, FEDERALIST No. 51, The Structure of the Government Must Furnish the Proper Checks and Balances Between the Different Departments, From the New York Packet, <http://constitution.org/1-Constitution/fed/federa51.htm>

²⁵ What is the Real Problem, G.R. Mobley, 30 November 2019, http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/What_is_the_Real_Problem.pdf

²⁶ Martial Law in the Twenty-first Century, G.R. Mobley, 15 January 2020, http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/Martial_Law_in_the_Twenty-first_Century.pdf

²⁷ The Unknown Teeth in the Constitution, G. R. Mobley, 18 March 2020, http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/The_Unknown_Teeth_In_The_Constitution.pdf

²⁸ Powers of Attorney Have A Long History, Brief History, retrieved 15 September 2023, from <https://wiki.powersofattorney.com/en/historydevbriefhistory>

²⁹ Mr. James Iredell, 28 July 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of North Carolina, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, <https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/elliott.htm>

Obviously he clearly pointed out that the design of specifically delegating limited powers were far superior as a “primary control” Madison referred to than granting general powers and then reserving powers and rights for the people in a Bill of Rights.

Instituting Government

The necessity of stating the obvious is required. Since the beginning of the American experiment and the evolution of the Constitution for the United States, when governments are created or instituted within this Constitutional Republic, they must be instituted by the people. This means when the County governments were formed in territories that were to become States, “We the People” needed to establish it with a Constitution, delegating those powers necessary and proper for the County government to serve the people.

The role and responsibility for the federal government to admitting new States in the union was not included in Article I Section 8, this is clearly the enumerated powers delegated to the general government. Thus, the responsibility in Article IV Section 3 assigns the “responsibility” to Congress to admit States into the Union and does not give them the power to institute government or this would be antithetical to our founding principles as to where the enumeration of powers were placed. This is also why, when States’ Constitutions were not or could not be created by any branch of the federal government, they were done by County Representatives within the territory that was ready to become a State. Consequently, the instituting of a new State was to be done by the representatives of the citizens of the county. Congress was responsible for basic entrance requirements that a new state must possess or be capable of.

Stating the obvious again, it seems that the framers of each county in the Union have failed to create their County Constitution. Still stating the obvious, the people still do and will always possess the power to call for a County Constitutional Convention and must, to begin getting their government back into the framework of our Republican Form of Government. At the time of the expanse of Union, people failed to institute their government properly. Just because they did not get it right the first time does not mean they can’t fix it now.

Suffrage

During the Constitutional Convention, there were two points that stand out as defining moments for the framers, the two S’s (i.e. suffrage and slavery). The issue of slavery was no doubt paramount, but for the purposes of this article and context, this matter was initially addressed in “The Unknown Teeth in the Constitution.” Subsequent details still need to come forth; however, the focus is reclaiming the republic.

The threat of adequate suffrage was imperative enough that the smaller States in attendance to the Constitutional convention asserted that forming a government solely based on the suffrage of the people was unacceptable, because this would empower states with larger populations the advantage and control over government. This is why the Virginia Plan failed and the following New Jersey plan keeping suffrage equal for the States as it was in the current AoC was equally problematic.

The concept of extending suffrage to either the State or the people had been used throughout the millennia’s of civil societies, but implementing both had never been considered. The concept that both were sovereigns was not the challenge; the challenge was implementing a duality of representation without creating a political power struggle was unheard of historically.

Who are the sovereigns?

Though God is sovereign over all things, “We the People” as individuals are sovereigns in our own autonomous world. When our world intersects with others, our sovereignty ends where another’s begins or exists. The framers truly understood the various levels of sovereignty, government, and governing. A democracy is the most rudimentary form of government and is also the most volatile. It will swing from chaos or anarchy to despotism

due to its mob rule nature that a simple majority rules the people. The most advanced and safest government that is capable of guarding individual liberty and individual sovereignty is a Republican form of government. Therefore, in an effort to create a civil society, we begin to develop rules or fundamental laws to justly protect the rights and the sovereignty of all. We then must delegate a few roles, responsibilities, powers, and property to “our” government granting it the necessary and specific sovereignty to societal governors – those who will govern us or they cannot govern us and our efforts become futile. If encapsulated in an enlightened form or in a form that is based upon discipline that government is to serve the people, not itself, then those roles, responsibilities, powers, and property will be limited to those necessary for our government to serve in protecting the two primary of objects as to why we create government: 1) to protect our lives, and 2) to protect our property. As Madison stated in 1792, our most precious property is our rights in his Essay on Property in stating:

“In a word, as a man is said to have a right to his property, he may be equally said to have a property in his rights.

Where an excess of power prevails, property of no sort is duly respected. No man is safe in his opinions, his person, his faculties, or his possessions.

Where there is an excess of liberty, the effect is the same, tho' from an opposite cause.

Government is instituted to protect property of every sort; as well that which lies in the various rights of individuals, as that which the term particularly expresses. This being the end of government, that alone is a just government, which impartially secures to every man, whatever is his own.

According to this standard of merit, the praise of affording a just securing to property, should be sparingly bestowed on a government which, however scrupulously guarding the possessions of individuals, does not protect them in the enjoyment and communication of their opinions, in which they have an equal, and in the estimation of some, a more valuable property.

More sparingly should this praise be allowed to a government, where a man's religious rights are violated by penalties, or fettered by tests, or taxed by a hierarchy. Conscience is the most sacred of all property; other property depending in part on positive law, the exercise of that, being a natural and unalienable right. To guard a man's house as his castle, to pay public and enforce private debts with the most exact faith, can give no title to invade a man's conscience which is more sacred than his castle, or to withhold from it that debt of protection, for which the public faith is pledged, by the very nature and original conditions of the social pact.”³⁰

Therefore, when done properly, in creating our government we create a symbiotic relationship with it. Consequently, the roles, responsibilities, powers, and properties we delegate must be concise, succinct, and clearly enumerated to ensure that no latitude or misconstruction can occur to where government is capable of assuming any more role, responsibility, powers, or property then that which is absolutely essential. So in essence “We the People” delegate a limited and defined level of sovereignty to our Representatives in a Republican Form of government.

Our Republican Form of government is very unique not just because the Constitution(s) are King, but the Sherman Compromise applied the concept of government sovereignty to account for a complex multi-level Constitutional Republic because the National Republic was not just a body of people, it was a body of States that

³⁰ James Madison, Property, 29 March 1792, <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch16s23.html>

were made up of a body of counties and that “We the People” instituted these governments by the consent of the governed. The difficult principle is that when people in a Republican Form of government institute a government, they delegated to it – in granting their Representatives the ultimate say over those things granted. In other words, the people were Sovereign and had the ultimate say they that would be a Democratic form of government within a Republic; thus, the people cannot declare war, only Congress can. Democracies were cesspools to the framers that teetered back and forth from anarchy to despotism.

Many Americans do not understand a republican government – where the people or bodies of government elect/select representatives to represent them and exercise suffrage on their behalf. Too often, Patriots insist that the people are the only sovereigns; thus, their paradigm is one of a democratic government where the people vote on all things... creating a mob rule government. When “We the People” institute government and delegate to it the power to do something like war or building roads, then those representatives in government – regardless of who they represent – have the sovereignty to decide whether we are going to war or where and how a road needs to be built without any involvement of the people.

In implementing a dual sovereignty or what is also referred to as a bicameral government, the two bodies of representations are separated and the power is divided appropriately to defuse any opportunity of conflict, and the RRPPs granted to each are those that are most relevant to their constituents. In our Republic, the two bodies of sovereigns in our government are Representatives and Senators. The constituents of the Representatives are the people and the Senators are that body of government that created the bicameral legislative body. In context to the federal body or Congress, the body of government that created it was the State Legislatures. In context to the state body legislature, the body of government that created the State was the county.

Bicameral Legislative Bodies

This is why in Sherman’s Compromise it was truly inspired by the Divine Hand of Providence. His design laid out the components in establishing a unique bicameral legislative body unlike any other throughout history. All Bicameral legislative bodies prior to our Constitution were similar to the Parliament in Britain at the time of the framers. To this day Parliament is still a bicameral body and like all other bicameral legislative bodies represented two classes of people. The Commons represents the all the people and these representatives are elected. The House of Lords represents the aristocracy of Britain and these representatives are appointed by the affluent in Britain.

As pointed out in context to the innovation in the design of our Constitution, bicameral legislative bodies serve as an additional check within our form of Republican government. If one understands the danger of democracy or tyranny of a majority, then one can see separating the process of who is to be represented and who and how the legislators are selected is critical. The adage “he who pays the piper calls the tune” speaks to why the State Legislature was to choose who would be representing the State’s interest in the Congressional Senate; while the people in each Congressional District choose who would represent the people within the Congressional District within the Congressional House of Representatives. The Constitutional design allocated one representative per 30,000 persons and the Fourteenth Amendment shifted representation to citizens allowed to vote and at a minimum, each State would possess at least one representative.

The structure or boundaries of our government were laid out by this bicameral design, allocating equal suffrage to the States in the Senate, and then allocating in the House of Representation an apportionment based upon an equal number of citizens per representation or a minimum of one. The boundaries are based upon “We the People,” and the governments we instituted to govern us. Make no mistake, the framers did not establish a democracy for a very specific reason: to ensure that the interests of the disparate people and their disparate

governments they instituted had a level of protection from tyranny of a majority, thus protecting the minority from mob-rule.

Because our Representatives are our “legislators” (those who create law and change law) when the people, the counties, or the States elect their representative for the general government in the State or federal government (keeping in mind governments instituted by the people with the consent of the governed), then these Representatives exercise SUFFRAGE within the Representative body in legislating for whom they are there to represent. Most may marginalize the fact that these representatives exercise suffrage on behalf of those constituents who put them there but, in essence, this marginalizing also marginalizes the effectiveness of the checks and balances that were built into the system. Consequently it is imperative to provide a common definition of suffrage as:

- 1) a short intercessory prayer usually in a series
- 2) a vote given in deciding a controverted question or electing a person for an office or trust
- 3) the right of voting : FRANCHISE
- 4) the exercise of such right

Obviously, the two applicable definitions that fit the context of this discussion are 3 and 4 above. The concept of “representatives” exercising suffrage for their constituents is not contrived in a bubble, as one understands the Senate in Congress is representing the States-- the States are using representatives to vote for their legislature or vote in representing their interests. This suffrage of the States in the Senate is irrefutable, as the Constitution contains an Amendment Protection clause that clearly ensures a “State” as a sovereign cannot lose its suffrage without its consent is enshrined in Article V of the Constitution that states:

“Provided, that no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808, shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and **that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.**”³¹

The first part ensured that the union could not pass an Amendment that would stop the implementation of ending the Slave Trade and the second part of the Amendment Protection clause, our focus that the Constitution ensured that an Amendment could not be passed taking away the States’ suffrage without their consent; thus those States (seven in total) who did not ratify (accept) the Seventeenth Amendment, are not “Constitutionally” bound to the amendment and can continue appointing their Senators, if the State legislatures of these States so choose. Even though the focus is our Republican Form of government the reader may find solace in that the Seventeenth Amendment does not need to be repealed it can be rescinded. However, if one wants more info on how to rescind, please contact the author by going to:
<http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/contact.html>.

Fundamental in Sherman’s Compromise, the upper body represented the sovereign body of government creating the nation’s Constitution. As an aside, prior to our Constitution, our independent States were nations like all other States of Europe after the Revolutionary War and our Governors were equal to Kings and the other forms of heads of states. These States were not instituted by the people: these States were initially established by Charters by the monarchs of Britain. Their independence drove them all to form their own Constitutions prior to instituting our current Constitution for the United States.

³¹ The Constitution for the United States, Article V, 17 September 1787, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art5.asp

The Model of a Republican Form of Government in America

At the risk of being redundant, according to our Declaration of Independence, our local governments are to be instituted by the people. Our State governments are instituted by our local governments empowering representation to delegates to form the State government, just like the State governments empowered representation from the people of the State to represent the State in the federal convention. In some cases the representation can either be appointed or elected.

The Supreme Law of the land is the Constitution for the United States. Our Constitutions delegate specific powers and not general powers, which is why all laws made must be made in pursuance to those powers delegated within the Constitution(s), not powers assumed, implied, or ordered.

Regarding Madison's comment in Federalist Paper #51, cited above the statement, "In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself."³² The integral part of the "framing of government" within the Constitution is the establishment of a bicameral legislative body, is what is referred to today as a check and balance. The separation of suffrage was considered by those who long have been enemies of the Constitution attacked this check and balance by passing the Seventeenth Amendment. Putting aside blatant discrimination within the States, the implementation of dual sovereignty in bicameral legislatures in the States has proven to be a buttress against attacks on individual liberty and individual sovereignty for almost two centuries. This is why the progressives used the courts to assume jurisdiction they did not have, to attack this bulwark of liberty – wiping out this bastion of our unique form of American republicanism in the 1960's. The reason they were successful in perverting our government was due to the inculcation of democracy – which ironically was the mantra of the time establishing an unconstitutional principle called "one person one vote."

The Apostate Version of our Republican Form of Government

Sadly, today the American definition of a republican form of government falls seriously short of how the framers designed it. That said, based on the subversive "Annotated Constitution," which is a version of the Constitution that is referred to today as the U.S. Constitution is where the federal government attempts to redefine every line and clause in the Constitution. The following is a full excerpt on how the federal government chooses to redefine a Republican Form of Government by stating:

"1. Although the Supreme Court has generally avoided addressing Guarantee Clause questions because of their political character, it has occasionally ruled on the merits of such challenges. These decisions, as well as contemporaneous sources, shed some light on the meaning of the Republican Form of Government guaranteed by the Clause. For example, in the Federalist No. 39, James Madison emphasizes popular sovereignty and majoritarian control as among the distinctive characters of the republican form:

2. '[W]e may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior. It is ESSENTIAL to such a government that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it; . . . It is SUFFICIENT for such a government that the persons

³² James Madison, 8 February 1788, FEDERALIST No. 51, The Structure of the Government Must Furnish the Proper Checks and Balances Between the Different Departments, From the New York Packet, <http://constitution.org/1-Constitution/fed/federa51.htm>

administering it be appointed, either directly or indirectly, by the people; and that they hold their appointments by either of the tenures just specified[.]’

3. The 1874 case of *Minor v. Happersett* represents a rare instance of the Supreme Court directly deciding a Guarantee Clause issue. In *Minor*, the Court addressed whether Missouri’s denial of the right to vote to women complied with the Constitution. The Court stated that the Guarantee Clause leaves room for states to structure their governments in various ways yet remain republican. Relying on historical practice as dispositive of the matter, the Court held that the Guarantee Clause did not require women’s suffrage because at the time of ratification, women were excluded from suffrage in nearly all the States, with the franchise only bestowed upon men and not upon all of them. Later, the Court held in *Forsyth v. City of Hammond* that the Guarantee Clause did not prevent a state from determining municipal boundaries through its courts instead of the state legislature.

In other cases, the Court found occasions to opine on the nature of a republican government guaranteed by the Clause in dicta. For example, *In re Duncan* observes:

4. By the constitution, a republican form of government is guarant[eed] to every state in the Union, and the distinguishing feature of that form is the right of the people to choose their own officers for governmental administration, and pass their own laws in virtue of the legislative power reposed in representative bodies, whose legitimate acts may be said to be those of the people themselves . . .

5. Similarly, the Court in *United States v. Cruikshank*, while adopting a narrow construction of the rights secured by the Fourteenth Amendment’s Privileges or Immunities Clause, stated that a republican form of government includes a right on the part of its citizens to meet peaceably for consultation in respect to public affairs and to petition for a redress of grievances as well as the equality of the rights of citizens.”³³

Note: Paragraph numbering is added for citation purposes.

Obviously, in the first paragraph it appears to be common knowledge that SCOTUS is the alleged repository of knowledge concerning the mysteries of the Constitution – when in fact there are no mysteries. Everything one needs to know and seeks to understand about the Constitution can be found in the Ratification Debates and because these are the contractual descriptions, terms, and definitions – only the Ratification Debates are the legally binding definitions; jurists opinions are not legally bound, they are simply opinions. This is why over time, the opinions creep in various directions and since the progressive era of the early twentieth century, the opinions have become far more radical and far more dangerous to liberty.

The underlined portion of paragraph two clearly fails to point out that the powers are limited to those enumerated and not open to administration “by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior.” By the sleight of hand, the curators of this document cast a belief that our governments possess general unlimited powers.

The underlined portion of paragraph three shows how SCOTUS implies that the State Constitution grants the State court powers not delegated - granting the court to determine municipal boundaries instead of the state or county legislators; thus, leading the way for an unconstitutional transformation. This is a clear indication where the SCOTUS is deliberately shifting State governments from being Republican in form where our Representatives in the State House and our county governments’ representatives in the Senate are the sovereigns over those

³³ Annotated Constitution, https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/artIV-S4-3/ALDE_00013637/

things delegated and shifting it to a Judiciary form of government – reestablishing a Magistrate doctrine within our Constitutional Republic.

The underlined portion of paragraph four reiterates and further supports the concept of a government with general powers not one defined and limited. When people directly make their laws, this is a Democratic Form of Government, which has crept into most States today with referendums or voter initiatives – this violates the Guarantee Clause as well as further promotes mob rule. The only way laws or legislative acts can be legitimate in our Constitutional Republics is when they are based upon or derived directly from enumerated objects within the Constitution.

Finally with regard to paragraph five, the referenced court case clearly lays out how the federal government is directly perverting the Constitution by citing this “narrow construction of the rights secured by the Fourteenth Amendment’s Privileges or Immunities Clause.” This is where the court and the federal government is literally redefining the Constitution to obviate the unalienable rights of U.S. citizens as well as the perversion of a “republican form of government.” At this point one could write a voluminous dissertation from the empirical data available; however, the following points are submitted as others who have done this already:

Professor Kurt T. Lash, wrote a three part scholarly paper in 2009, titled “The Origins of the Privileges or Immunities Clause.” An abstract of his work states:

“Historical accounts of the Privileges or Immunities Clause of Section One of the Fourteenth Amendment generally assume that John Bingham based the text on Article IV of the original Constitution and that Bingham, like other Reconstruction Republicans, viewed Justice Washington’s opinion in *Corfield v. Coryell* as the definitive interpretation of Article IV. According to this view, Justice Miller in the *Slaughterhouse Cases* failed to follow both framers’ intent and obvious textual meaning when he sharply distinguished Section One’s privileges or immunities from Article IV’s privileges and immunities.”³⁴

Not only has the bench blatantly perverted the true meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment to keep “We the People” under their control, but the progressives in all aspects of our government and justice system have been using the same clause in Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment against us. With one side of their mouths they tell you that the State can pass laws to restrict your right to bear arms, because the Bill of Rights only applies to the federal government and out of the other side of their mouths, they have been dismantling crosses, removing bibles, ending Christian prayer in public, and changing institutions’ names because of the Christian character of the name. They do this, because they say this violates the Establishment Clause, which is a part of the Bill of Rights that truly only applies to the federal government because every State in the Union had a State sponsored church at the time of the Ratification of the federal Constitution:

State	Church	Established	Retired
Virginia	Anglican/Church of England	1606	1830
New York	Anglican/Church of England	1614	1846
Massachusetts	Congregational Church	1629	1833
Maryland	Anglican/Church of England	1632	1867

³⁴ Lash, Kurt, The Origins of the Privileges or Immunities Clause, Part II: John Bingham and the Second Draft of the Fourteenth Amendment (February 28, 2010). 99 Georgetown Law Journal 329 (2011), Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1561183> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1561183>

Delaware	Christian non-denominational	1637	1792
Connecticut	Congregational Church	1639	1818
New Hampshire	Congregational Church	1639	1877
Rhode Island	Christian non-denominational	1643	1842
South Carolina	Anglican/Church of England	1663	1868
North Carolina	Anglican/Church of England	1663	1875
Georgia	Protestant	1663	1798
Pennsylvania	Christian non-denominational	1681	1790
New Jersey	Protestant	1702	1844

As one can see, the original thirteen States did not disband their State-sponsored church because the First Amendment Establishment Clause did not apply to them, only the federal government. One can even see that Maryland, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and South Carolina all maintained their churches after the Fourteenth Amendment.

This also begs the question as to how these laws that demanded the alleged separation of Church and State were created. As the Preamble of the Bill of Rights stated:

“The conventions of a number of the States having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added.”³⁵

Clearly, the First Amendment and the remaining amendments were strictly applied to the federal government only, constraining them from passing **any law** respecting religion. Furthermore, to date the States have not delegated **any power** in the Constitution to the federal government regarding religion. A repository of First Amendment petitions for the redress of grievances has been established that proves that powers not delegated cannot be assumed. These petitions also prove that the limitations of the court jurisdiction are also tied to the enumerated powers. There is also a petition that proves the federal court cannot create a law, only Congress can do this and yet lawyers and judges in our alleged legal system state with pride as to how they have not only shaped law but create and confirm its creation.

Before moving on, one must examine further on the legal arguments that have proven the federal courts and governments ability to create and maintain a “living Constitution” also referred to as the “Annotated Constitution.” There is no RRPP enumerated in the Constitution for the federal government to redefine what the Constitution means or how they can chose to interpret the Constitution and even modify the Constitution by usurpations via the courts. Had case law, precedence, legislative power vested in the judiciary, or the creation of a living Constitution been presented to any one of the States during the time of Ratification by the Federalists, instead of the Anti-Federalists, the Constitution would have been rejected. The creature created by the Constitution (i.e. the federal government) has been redefining the Constitution and its amendments for over two centuries and these are palpable violations of the Constitution as well as the fundamental tenants of contract law, because this power was never granted to the federal government by the States.

As Thomas Jefferson stated in the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798:

³⁵ Congress, 25 September 1789, The Bill of Rights, <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript>

“That the several States composing, the United States of America, are not united on the principle of unlimited submission to their general government; but that, by a compact under the style and title of a Constitution for the United States, and of amendments thereto, they constituted a general government for special purposes — delegated to that government certain definite powers, reserving, each State to itself, the residuary mass of right to their own self-government.”³⁶

The Constitution, being a compact, is not subject to redefining or what some refer to as a living document left to interpretation by oracles in black robes. Those who purport this paradigm are lying and obviating what is clear in our source founding documents. When it comes to compacts, contracts, treaties, etc., the language in the compact along with the clarifications of the terms, conditions, and definitions of the compact during the process of ratification, are the only legally binding terms and definitions by the parties to the compact and in this case with the Constitution for the United States, this would be the States **not** the federal government.

When a matter arises, where a federal jurist, Congress, or the President does not have a clear understanding, this is more commonly because the matter creating the question is not within the federal government’s powers or jurisdiction. If, on the rare occasion, a federal court, Congress, or the President lack clarity on the matter – their first and only step is to consult the Ratification Debates as that clause was defined in the ratification process or in the debates to one State or multiple States; or with regard to amendments, how the proponents defined the amendment during Congressional Debates. If, by rare chance, the matter within the Constitution was not clarified, then the federal government would need to petition the State legislatures for guidance as to how they would need to proceed since the States are the only Parties to the Constitution. The federal government has zero power to assume and there is an adage about assumptions that would apply to this form of behavior.

It’s as if the Supreme Law of the Land is not really the Supreme Law of the Land – except when they (i.e. the gods in black robes) allow it. Of course, this is in direct conflict with how the jurisdiction of the courts were defined in the States at the time of its ratification. The article, *Constitutional and Legal Jurisdictional Limitation on the General Government*,³⁷ provides both Constitutional and academic context to the limitations on the federal court, including court cases that break away from the prevailing paradigm of self-aggrandizing of jurisdiction. There is also a First Amendment Petition regarding the separations of powers titled the *First Amendment Petition For Redress of Violations of Legislative Authority and the Separation of Powers Within the Constitution for the United States*,³⁸ that irrefutably proves the federal court cannot create law and we are not aware of one State in the Union where the counties delegated that power in the creation of the State Constitution. Furthermore, this Petition irrefutably proves that no court in the world can redefine the terms and definitions of the compact that are the bedrock of contract law from its inception. This power is strictly reserved to the Parties of the compact, especially when the Parties provide clear and concise terms and definitions to their compact and what each clause means.

Bottom line: based on the blatant distortions of the legal terms and definitions of the Constitution for the United States that were provided by the framers during the Ratification Debates, the federal government’s Annotated Constitution is a tool that the federal government created unconstitutionally to redefine the Constitution that

³⁶ Thomas Jefferson, November 10, 1798, The Kentucky Resolutions, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/jeffken.asp

³⁷ Constitutional and Legal Jurisdictional Limitation on the General Government, G.R. Mobley, 27 April 2022, http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/ConstitutionalandLegalJurisdictionalLimitationontheGeneralGovernment.pdf

³⁸ First Amendment Petition For Redress of Violations of Legislative Authority and the Separation of Powers Within the Constitution for the United States, September 2023, http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/Petitions/Petition008ForRedressOfViolationsOfLegislativeAuthority.pdf

directly contradicts the legal terms and definitions. The Annotated Constitution is a critical source and tool of the federal government to continue to usurp RRPPs as well as States' powers and the liberty of "We the People." This abomination must be obliterated because of its perverse nature of redefining that which was legally defined at the time of ratification. In 1821, John G. Jackson sent a letter to a family friend, James Madison, speaking for a group of men who were concerned with the direction of the federal government and courts. He asked Madison for a copy of his personal notes on the Constitutional Convention to see how those men at the Constitutional Convention understood those parts of the Constitution that have come into question. Madison's reply was congruent with the tenants of contract law and consistent with his professional career in stating:

"But whatever might have been the opinions entertained in forming the Constitution, it was the duty of all to support it in its true meaning as understood by the Nation at the time of its ratification. No one felt this obligation more than I have done; and there are few, perhaps, whose ultimate & deliberate opinions on the merits of the Constitution, accord in a greater degree with that obligation."³⁹

These two sentences contradict the jurists, the politicians, and bureaucrats who all have sought to aggrandize their RRPPs all at the expense of liberty; consequently, the greatest atrocity committed against our republican form of government and the rule of law, has been the shared efforts of the courts, historians, and our representatives in obfuscating the Ratification Debates into obscurity – instead of promoting them as the greatest national treasure for all time.

In order to end the discussion as to the authority and jurisdiction of the federal court and why it cannot hear or rule on a case regarding a matter that is not enumerated or a federal violation of the compact, James Madison clarifies this in his report on the Virginia Resolutions of 1800 to the committee of correspondence within the Virginia State legislature; to explain how the sibling states were wrong in the decisions and insinuations regarding the principles of *interposition* that Mr. Madison and Thomas Jefferson were seeking. In the following, Mr. Madison spells out the nature of compacts in that the Parties (collective) were the ultimate authority and final arbiter over the Constitution by asserting:

"It appears to your committee to be ***a plain principle, founded in common sense, illustrated by common practice, and essential to the nature of compacts, that, where resort can be had to no tribunal superior to the authority of the parties, the parties themselves must be the rightful judges, in the last resort, whether the bargain made has been pursued or violated.*** The Constitution of the United States was formed by the sanction of the states, given by each in its sovereign capacity. It adds to the stability and dignity, as well as to the authority, of the Constitution, that it rests on this legitimate and solid foundation. ***The states, then, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows of necessity that there can be no tribunal, above their authority, to decide, in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated;*** and consequently, that, as the parties to it, ***they must themselves decide, in the last resort, such questions as may be of sufficient magnitude to require their interposition.***"⁴⁰

Towards the end of the Report on the Virginia Resolutions, Mr. Madison goes into meticulous detail as to why the federal court, especially the Supreme Court, cannot be entrusted with any involvement in arbitrating the proper final outcome. The detail he provides in response to those other State Legislatures who were insisting

³⁹ Letter from James Madison to John G. Jackson, James Madison, 28 December 1821, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Madison/04-02-02-0367>

⁴⁰ Report on the Virginia Resolutions, James Madison, January 1800, Para 18, <https://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch8s42.html>

that the federal court was the last resort in resolving matters between the States and the federal government as laid out in his concluding remarks with this report in the following paragraphs:

First, Madison states that if the States cannot interpose a suitable remedy, the all would be lost including State Sovereignty and Independence:

“If the deliberate exercise of dangerous powers, palpably withheld by the Constitution, could not justify the parties to it in interposing even so far as to arrest the progress of the evil, and thereby to preserve the Constitution itself, as well as to provide for the safety of the parties to it, there would be an end to all relief from usurped power, and a direct subversion of the rights specified or recognized under all the state constitutions, as well as a plain denial of the fundamental principle on which our independence itself was declared.”⁴¹

In the next few paragraphs, Madison addresses the other state legislatures’ insinuations that the States must unconstitutionally surrender their sovereignty to the federal court – where in fact this concept alone, had it been presented to the States as an integral part of the Constitution, the States would have rejected this Constitution. However, Madison’s focus is strictly contractual and based upon the design of the Constitution in stating:

“But it is objected, that the judicial authority is to be regarded as the sole expositor of the Constitution in the last resort; and it may be asked for what reason the declaration by the General Assembly, supposing it to be theoretically true, could be required at the present day, and in so solemn a manner.

On this objection it might be observed, first, that there may be instances of usurped power, which the forms of the Constitution would never draw within the control of the judicial department; secondly, that, if the decision of the judiciary be raised above the authority of the sovereign parties to the Constitution, the decisions of the other departments, not carried by the forms of the Constitution before the judiciary, must be equally authoritative and final with the decisions of that department. But the proper answer to the objection is, that the resolution of the General Assembly relates to those great and extraordinary cases, in which all the forms of the Constitution may prove ineffectual against infractions dangerous to the essential rights of the parties to it. The resolution supposes that dangerous powers, not delegated, may not only be usurped and executed by the other departments, but that the judicial department, also, may exercise or sanction dangerous powers beyond the grant of the Constitution; and, consequently, that the ultimate right of the parties to the Constitution, to judge whether the compact has been dangerously violated, must extend to violations by one delegated authority as well as by another--by the judiciary as well as by the executive, or the legislature.”⁴²

In the third to last paragraph of the report, Mr. Madison concludes the salient point of the consequences of states surrendering their sovereignty to the federal courts and ultimately to the federal government in stating:

“However true, therefore, it may be, that the judicial department is, in all questions submitted to it by the forms of the Constitution, to decide in the last resort, ***this resort must necessarily be deemed the last in relation to the authorities of the other departments of the government; not in relation to the rights of the parties to the constitutional compact, from which the judicial, as well as the other***

⁴¹ Report on the Virginia Resolutions, James Madison, January 1800, Para 22, <https://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch8s42.html>

⁴² Report on the Virginia Resolutions, James Madison, January 1800, Para 23 & 24, <https://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch8s42.html>

departments, hold their delegated trusts. On any other hypothesis, the delegation of judicial power would annul the authority delegating it; and the concurrence of this department with the others in usurped powers, might subvert forever, and beyond the possible reach of any rightful remedy, the very Constitution which all were instituted to preserve.⁴³

Mr. Madison, in the second to last paragraph, concludes by pointing out the importance of constant state oversight over their compact (i.e. the Constitution for the United States) based upon the fundamental tenants of contract law in stating:

“The truth declared in the resolution being established, the expediency of making the declaration at the present day may safely be left to the temperate consideration and candid judgment of the American public. It will be remembered, that *a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is solemnly enjoined by most of the state constitutions, and particularly by our own, as a necessary safeguard against the danger of degeneracy, to which republics are liable*, as well as other governments, though in a less degree than others. *And a fair comparison of the political doctrines not unfrequent at the present day, with those which characterized the epoch of our revolution, and which form the basis of our republican constitutions, will best determine whether the declaratory recurrence here made to those principles ought to be viewed as unseasonable and improper, or as a vigilant discharge of an important duty. The authority of constitutions over governments, and of the sovereignty of the people over constitutions, are truths which are at all times necessary to be kept in mind; and at no time, perhaps, more necessary than at present.*⁴⁴

In subsequent sections and Articles we are confident that the analysis of the County design and the design of our Republic will disclose why this report is one of the most revealing documents that helps the layman clearly understand why Article VII, as asserted earlier, is the most important part of the Constitution, because it clarifies who has the sovereignty and legal authority over the Constitution itself... and it's not the federal government, it is the States.

In addition to this, one must keep in mind the issue that caused Jefferson and Madison to sound such urgent alarm to the other States. They were standing up to the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. These men understood the erosive nature of politics and government when public servants (in Republics public servants are the epitome of our government) seek to breach the Constitution and or usurp RPPs. As Washington pointed out in his Farewell Address to the nation, he pointed out how liberties are lost and governments destroyed when the people allow public servants do things with good intentions:

“If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.”⁴⁵

Consequently, one may presume the tenor of Madison and Jefferson's assertions as hyperbole of the time; however, this has proven to be unequivocally accurate regarding the erosive nature of unbridled politics within the constructs of our Constitution. Only those enumerated objects are our public servants authorized to inject

⁴³ Report on the Virginia Resolutions, James Madison, January 1800, Para 25, <https://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch8s42.html>

⁴⁴ Report on the Virginia Resolutions, James Madison, January 1800, Para 26, <https://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch8s42.html>

⁴⁵ Washington's Farewell Address 1796, George Washington, 1796, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp

politics; however, when our public servants seek to breach the Constitution or usurp RPPs not delegated with the use of political compromise, this is seditious as well an insurrection against the Constitution according to Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment. Ironically, Jefferson's final comments promulgated in the Kentucky Resolutions of 03 December 1799, were the sentiments that placed the Union as paramount, but these were not words of surrender. Following this set of Resolutions, James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, set out to execute a public relations/election coup against the Federalists sitting in State and federal seats. As such, in the following year of 1800, the election Jefferson, was due to the use of the "Republican Party" (established by Madison and Jefferson on a trip to New England in the summer of 1791)⁴⁶. Consequently, they successfully removed the sitting President, and enough members of Congress and State Legislatures to change the course of the nation and restore the Constitutional framework of government without having to force interposition upon the federal government.

Our Constitutions Are King

Again, as cited above, John Adams, in his Thoughts on Government, echoed the prevailing paradigm on a Republican Form of government as "the very definition of a Republic, is "an Empire of Laws, and not of men."⁴⁷

Expanding on what a basic republican form of government is throughout the world today, is one that contains representatives of the people as well it being based on the "rule of law" where the law is King not a person, not a blood line, not an office, not an ideology, etc. Though everyone asserts they understand what a representative government is, to understand the United States Republican Form of Government, one must place context to representation and the best contrast to republicanism is democracy. The appeal of a democracy to some is the perception that they have equal say or suffrage; however, democracy is tantamount to anarchy and mob rule with no regard to societal safe guards. In other words, democracies will always devolve to their utter destruction or transform into totalitarian despotism, and will never obtain the utopian bliss its proponents purport. In a democracy, the laws and all matters must come before the people to vote on the issue.

It can be said, that democracy is a pure form of full sovereignty in the people; it can equally be said that full sovereignty in the people is anarchy. Bottom line: this is the epitome of a carnal government where no constraints exist. The desires of the mob will always be in play, which is why a democratic society is the antithesis of an enlightened society, because an enlightened society embraces discipline and constraint.

Suffice it to say, the key in government that serves the people best is a government that serves the least possible for the people. Self-reliance is a bedrock principle to an enlightened society; consequently, the intent is to transfer limited and specified suffrage to the representatives of the sovereigns who only possess the essential powers to accomplish the necessary functions of government to protect the sovereignty of the sovereigns and the sovereignty that has been delegated to government.

The Objects of Government

The Declaration of Independence provides clarity to the purpose in severing our connection to Britain and established the pinnacle of a free society in stating:

"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, **to secure these rights,**

⁴⁶ Jefferson and Madison create a party - summer 1791, American History from Revolution to Reconstruction and Beyond, University of Groningen, <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/biographies/alexander-hamilton/jefferson-and-madison-create-a-party---summer-1791.php>

⁴⁷ Thoughts on Government, John Adams, Apr 1776, <https://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch4s5.html>

governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government... But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."⁴⁸

As stated before, the two principle objects of government are to protect the lives of the citizens and to protect their property and their property rights.

The Constitutional Structure of Our Government and Politics

Our government structure or how we are to govern ourselves and interface with our public servants will be detailed in a following article. However, as asserted before, the framers were very familiar with the tyranny of a democracy by a majority – or the concept of mob rule; more importantly, the necessity of protecting the minority to develop and maintain harmony in a complex Union where the States are to be Sovereign over those things not delegated to its servant the federal government is to be a similar model for the Counties of the States, where the Counties are to enjoy their sovereignty over those things not delegated to their servant the State government.

The Protection of the Minority

The framers were very familiar with the tyranny of a majority – or the concept of mob rule; more importantly, the necessity of protecting the minority to develop and maintain harmony in the Union.

The Structure of our Government and Politics

Obviously, there was a lot of focus and citations in point of fact that the Constitution for the United States is simply a compact written for and by the States. The same must be said about the States. The creation of our multi-tiered government with fixed RRPPs, places a fixed relationship that can be akin to a genealogical order. The roots of our governments, as established in the Declaration of Independence are – our governments are instituted by “We the People.” This resonates specifically in context to our County governments. In tandem with our County governments, “We the People,” under the auspices of our County governments (collectively) in a territory or State, establish and legitimize our State Government, which in turn under the auspices of our State governments (collectively) established our federal government.

Bottom line: the structure of the nation’s government and politics is: [the Senate – representing the State’s suffrage] and [the House of Representatives – representing the citizens of the State’s suffrage] in Congress. In line with this galvanized paradigm, the structure of the State’s government and politics is: [the state Senate – representing the County’s suffrage] and [the House of Representatives – representing the citizens of the County’s suffrage] in the State legislature. Again, because “We the People” institute our governments and delegate them sovereigns over those powers delegated, our governments are entitled to suffrage through their own representation just like “We the People.”

As asserted earlier in this article, the original thirteen states were formed by a Charter and the Sovereign that established these entities that were once colonies and now States was the monarchy of Britain. The logical question is “what and how new States would be able to join the union,” which requires one to revisit the enumeration of RRPPs within the Constitution. We already know that States are established once the admission

⁴⁸ Continental Congress, The Declaration of Independence, 02 July 1776 https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/declare.asp

criterion for a State to join the Union has been met; they are created by the people of the Counties and the County government. This was the evolutionary process of territories needing to be organized; therefore, the federal government inserted a managerial government with some security forces to defend the territory and in the areas where populations accumulated, counties were formed, by the people.

Territories Are Not an Enumerated Power

The specific powers and properties delegated to the general government are enumerated in Article I Section 8. The enumerated properties delegated to the general government are:

“to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be, for the erection of **forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings.**”⁴⁹

There is no enumeration for the federal government to permanently possess a territory. We already cited the article titled “Constitutional and Legal Jurisdictional Limitation on the General Government,”⁵⁰ that goes into this with microscopic focus. Suffice it to say, Article IV Section 3 is the role and responsibility for the federal government for admitting States into the Union. It states:

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

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular state.”⁵¹

The beginning or first paragraph identifies the role and responsibility for Congress to serve the Union and the growth of the Union by to admitting new States into the Union. The mention of territory in the second paragraph of the Section comes in the administrative matters in managing a potential territory to become a State. This is not an enumeration of authority to permanently possess territorial land or create any permanent laws or regulations. When a State is formed it will take full sovereignty over all of its land other than those few forms of properties that have been delegated to the federal government in Article I Section 8 subsection 17. The federal government only possesses an allowance to create “needful Rules and Regulations” while the federal government is managing and preparing a territory to become a State. During the Ratification Debates, Governor Randolph spoke on the “Prejudice any Claims” portion of Section 3. In the first case, he was speaking of the forming of a treaty and navigational rights of the Mississippi, in stating:

“But there is an expression which clearly precludes, the general government from ceding the navigation of this river. In the 2d clause of the 3d section of the 4th article, Congress is empowered “to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.” But it goes on, and provides that “**nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or any particular state.**” Is this a claim of the particular

⁴⁹ The Constitution for the United States, Article I Section 8, 17 September 1787, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art1.asp#1sec8

⁵⁰ Constitutional and Legal Jurisdictional Limitation on the General Government, G.R. Mobley, 27 April 2022, http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/ConstitutionalandLegalJurisdictionalLimitationontheGeneralGovernment.pdf

⁵¹ The Constitution for the United States, Article IV Section 3, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art4.asp#4sec3

state of Virginia? If it be, there is no authority in the Constitution to prejudice it. If it be not, then we need not be told of it. This is a sufficient limitation and restraint. But it has been said that there is no restriction with respect to making treaties. The various contingencies which may form the object of treaties, are, in the nature of things, incapable of definition. The government ought to have power to provide for every contingency. The territorial rights of the states are sufficiently guarded by the provisions just recited. *If you say that, notwithstanding the most express restriction, they may sacrifice the rights of the states, then you establish another doctrine — that the creature can destroy the creator, which is the most absurd and ridiculous of all doctrines.*"⁵²

The paramount matter here is the simple principle of State Sovereignty and the severance of federal authority once a State is admitted into the Union – each State is admitted with full sovereignty and equal footing with all other Parties to the Constitution. There is no allowance for the federal government to subjugate a State by withholding any of its property other than for “the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings.” This means that the federal government can allocate and lease land for military (i.e. national security) purposes but they have no power or authority to possess, operate, or reserve any land within a State whatsoever.

Sometimes we learn more from failures of government than one could surmise, such as Thomas Jefferson’s failed amendment to the Constitution for the United States in 1803. Some may remember the Louisiana Purchase and what it meant to securing the Union from external threats. As such, Thomas Jefferson wanted to grant lands that were a part of the purchase to the Indian tribes of America. The problem was this power did not exist within the Constitution and he knew that could not use a treaty to prejudice the Union’s claim to this land. Keep in mind, everything the federal government did was to serve the interests of the States. Obviously it is not that way today, but the framers profoundly understood that the federal government was an agent whose existence was to serve and protect the states and their interests. The federal government had no other mission but to serve the States.

The point of Jefferson’s amendment was to allow the federal government to give land to the Indians. This is because this power is not enumerated; therefore that ability to create a State or territory to grant land to the Indians was required in the form of an Amendment to the Constitution for the federal government to legitimately do this. All land procured or leased by the federal government is done so for the States by their agent, the federal government, to fulfill their responsibility in serving the Union. As Jefferson refers to Congress as the Legislature of the Union in the second paragraph, he seeks to give Congress the power to:

“have authority to exchange the right of occupancy in portions where the U. S. have full right for lands possessed by Indians within the U. S. on the East side of the Missisipi, to exchange lands on the East side of the river for those on the West side thereof and above the latitude of 31 degrees; to maintain in any part of the province such military posts as may be requisite for peace or safety; to exercise police over all persons therein, not being Indian inhabitants; to work salt springs, or mines of coal, metals and other minerals within the possession of the U. S. or in any others with the consent of the possessors; to regulate trade and intercourse between the Indian inhabitants and all other persons; to explore and ascertain the geography of the province, its productions and other interesting circumstances; to open roads and navigation therein where necessary for beneficial communication and to establish agencies

⁵² Governor Randolph, 13 June 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of Virginia, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. <https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/elliott.htm>

and factories therein for the cultivation of commerce, peace and good understanding with the Indians residing there.”⁵³

Prior to the Revolutionary War, Britain became hostile toward the American Colonies and as such, they exploited their treaties with the Indian Tribes, creating strategic positions that frustrated the colonists especially in the decades leading into the Revolutionary War. The British monarchs were notorious in exploiting conflicting powers; this was actually documented in Thomas Jefferson’s original draft of the Declaration of Independence stating:

*“He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating it's most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating & carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of INFIDEL Powers, is the warfare of the CHRISTIAN king of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought & sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce. And that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished die, he is now exciting those very people to rise in arms among us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them, by murdering the people on whom he also obtruded them: thus paying off former crimes committed against the LIBERTIES of one people, with crimes which he urges them to commit against the LIVES of another.”*⁵⁴

Britain’s Monarch’s manipulation of the Indian Tribes wasn’t any different, as summarized by Encyclopedia website:

“Between 1754 and 1829, British policies toward native North Americans sought three key objectives: recruitment and supply of native military allies; regulation of trade and diplomacy; and protection of native peoples' territorial integrity through negotiated settlement boundary lines. Although these policies played a crucial role in the British victory over France in the Seven Years' War (1756–1763), they rapidly fell into disfavor among the settler population of British North America after 1763. By 1776, colonists' discontent with imperial oversight of Indian affairs constituted a significant grievance against Great Britain. In the aftermath of the Revolutionary War (1775–1783), the ongoing influence of the British Indian Department in Canada with native peoples in the United States was viewed by many Americans as a threat to the survival of the Republic itself. Only after the Treaty of Ghent (1814) ended the War of 1812 (1812–1815) did the British cease to pursue alliances with Native Americans as a means of checking American expansionism.”⁵⁵

The point in fact is that the Constitution did not establish a policy one way or another for the development of relationships with the Indians. A rough distilling would break down the policy focus as follows:

- 1) 1789 – 1828 assimilation and coexistence
- 2) 1829 – 1886 removal and reservations
- 3) 1887 – 1932 assimilation
- 4) 1932 – 1945 reorganization
- 5) 1945 – 1960 integration

⁵³ Thomas Jefferson, 1803, Jefferson's Draft on an Amendment to the Constitution, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/jeffdraft.asp

⁵⁴ Declaring Independence: Drafting the Documents, Thomas Jefferson, 1776, Jefferson's "original Rough draught" of the Declaration of Independence, <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/declara/ruffdraft.html>

⁵⁵ American Indians: British Policies, Encyclopedia.com, <https://www.encyclopedia.com/history/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/american-indians-british-policies>

6) 1961 – present manipulation into woke revisionist history

An academic history book that challenges the revisionists view of American history is *A Patriot's History of the United States* by Larry Schweikart & Michael Allen.

Clearly, the United States inherited a mess and clearly the Constitution did not grant any authority to the federal government to get involved nor did it define specific outcomes, only matters regarding apportionment (excluding Indians not taxed) in Article I Section 2 and in Article I Section 8, regarding the regulating commerce to and from Indian Tribes. Needless to say, other than stating the obvious that we will have some messes to clean up, the point is that the federal government had no authority to maintain Indian reservations once Statehood of a given State was established. Treaties could not be used to prejudice a State's claim to its land, regardless the intent.

There is no authority granted to the general government to determine anything regarding the State such as making a state a slave state or even determining its law system. States, like ALL states in the world, are Sovereign and have the ability to determine their own destiny and their circumstance. All states that joined the Union determined that common law would be the law of the State, except for Louisiana. Consequently, when the Missouri Compromise was established as law, it was an unconstitutional usurpation by the federal government to inflict slavery upon all States that were south of the Mason-Dixie line, by requiring them to become Slave States. This was determined in the Dred Scott Case as an unconstitutional assumption by the general government. The actual delegated power granted was the power to dispose of and to make needful Rules and Regulations for the territory prior to such territory transitioning into a Sovereign State. The establishment of the State subsequently ends the federal government's authority over the new sovereign State joining the Union.

The Uniformity Clause

The Doctrine of uniformity was straight forward; the federal government was to be impartial and to treat each State equally. They were not allowed to make favorites or to give advantages to a State or group of States as well as treating one foreign polity, or group of people better than others. This is why they were required to create laws that established a uniform Rule of Naturalization to ensure all nations and people had equal opportunity to immigrate to and become a citizen of the United States. They also were required to ensure that all States and polities within the United States and the people had equal punishment or obligations in regard to debt and bankruptcy. More specifically, the uniformity clause in Article I Section 8 requires that all States were to be treated equal, making them coequals in the compact with uniform taxes and or burdens placed upon them by the general government. The Uniformity Clause is the preamble to the delegation of powers, stating:

“The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;”⁵⁶

Duties are direct taxes placed upon the State, Imposts are taxes placed on imported goods into the U.S. and excise tax is placed upon a commodity or item purchased like liquor, tobacco, tires, etc. The most important point is that the general government could not treat one State differently than another. In other words, the federal government could not give one State an advantage over the other States such as the unconstitutional welfare program like the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP) bailouts in 2008 nor could they create a

⁵⁶ The Constitution for the United States, Article I Section 8, 17 September 1787,
https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art1.asp#1sec8

disadvantage upon a State such as the unconstitutionally seized assets like mineral rights, forests, etc. Again, constitutionally, the federal government can only act within those few and defined RRPPs enumerated in the Constitution for the United States.

A burden placed upon one State had to first be enumerated in the Constitution for the United States and also applied to all States and in concert with those RRPPs enumerated regarding land; therefore, there is no mention in the Constitution for the federal government to possess or operate within a State in the union a Park, refuge, forest, dessert, habitat, or even a reservation. For that matter the general government did not have the authority to subordinate States, the States are the sovereigns over the Constitution.

What about the County?

Ironically, the one government “We the People” marginalized in instituting is also the most ignored and yet it is the most relevant and important to our everyday lives. If there was any government within this multi-tiered hybrid Constitutional Republic that truly was established and formed by “We the People,” it is the County or Parrish governments. This is the one government that merits our greatest scrutiny and also our most powerful government. The focus of our political energy was to be with our local government where the flow of political power was greatest in our local governments, because it is best qualified to positively affect our lives if it is in our control. In reality, the people of the time created a limited State government that did not have the power to do much. This is because no one in the nineteenth century imagined that government would take over so many aspects of our lives.

Consequently, the counties were the foundation and source of our States’ governments. Accordingly, when Vermont, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio joined the union, they were already territories of existing States; therefore, they already created their counties and were already familiar with the convention/process of creating a Constitution and a State government. This changed in one particular case – out of all new States thus far admitted into the Union, this was due to the fact that Louisiana, which formed parishes – as a consequence of its previous status as a colony of Spain and then France before the Louisiana Purchase.

Again, the fundamental tenet of contract law is that the parties that form a compact are the sovereigns over the compact. The people collectively did not form the State compacts, this was done by representatives of the counties, and the counties, just like the States, were delegations. Thus, each county should have one vote in the State Constitutional Conventions as the delegates from the States did during the Constitutional Convention in forming the government and federal Constitution. Remember, sovereign governments, regardless of population, were and should always be equally footed with their sibling sovereign governments, whether States or Counties.

To review the process at a rudimentary level as to how our government is to admit new states into the Union in accordance with Article IV of the Constitution for the United States, they were to be created as follows:

- 1) The general government would establish a territory like the Louisiana Territory – if not already established.
- 2) The general government would then delineate boundaries for States to be formed in the vast territory.
- 3) In accordance with Article IV Section 3, the general government would establish a territorial government.
- 4) As people migrate into the territory, the people institute a County with the funding and assistance of the general government to create a seat of government and provide a sheriff, a county court, and other necessary objects to support the county.
- 5) As the population grows, new counties are formed until the State reaches a population of 60,000.
- 6) At this point (after 1816), the people of the territory through their counties request an application for the territory to become a State and the general government would generate an “Enabling Act” directing

the people of the counties in the State to convene a convention with delegates to form a Constitution and to form their government.

Enabling Acts:

The admitting of a State into the union was initiated by an Enabling Act. This first State to be admitted was Vermont. The following is the Enabling Act of Congress to contrast with a later State that joined the Union:

“Congress of the United States: AT THE THIRD SESSION, Begun and held at the City of Philadelphia, on Monday the sixth of December, one thousand seven hundred and ninety.

An ACT for the Admission of the State of Vermont into this Union.

THE State of Vermont having petitioned the Congress to be admitted a member of the United States, Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, and it is hereby enacted and declared , That on the fourth day of March, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-one, the said State, by the name and stile of **“the State of Vermont,” shall be received and admitted into this Union, as a new and entire member of the United States of America.**

FREDERICK AUGUSTUS MUHLENBERG, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JOHN ADAMS, Vice-President of the United States, and President of the Senate.

Approved, February the eighteenth, 1791.

GEORGE WASHINGTON, President of the United States.

Deposited among the Rolls in the Office of the Secretary of State.

Th. Jefferson Secretary of State.”⁵⁷

The following Enabling Act to admit Indiana into the union in 1816, cited below, followed the admission of Louisiana in 1812. This Act will provide insights as to how the general government began assuming authority beyond that which was delegated to it in Article IV Section 3 of the Constitution. This was covered above, that the only regulations the federal government was capable of maintaining those “needful Rules and Regulations” while the area was in territorial status. The federal government’s responsibility was to admit states into the union and set some level of qualifications by adding specifications/direction for the new State to be admitted into the union such as population for sustainability, dictating language (i.e. English), the law/legal system (i.e. Republican Common Law), etc..

“Statute I, CHAP. LVII.—An Act to enable the people of the Indiana territory to form a constitution and state government, and for ***the admission of such state into the Union on an equal footing with the original states.***

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled,

That the inhabitants of the territory of Indiana be, and they are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and state government, and to assume such name as they shall deem proper; and ***the said state, when formed, shall be admitted into the union upon the same footing with the original states, in all respects whatever.***

SEC. 2.

And be it further enacted,

That the said state shall consist of all the territory included within the following boundaries, towit: bounded on the east, by the meridian line which forms the western boundary of the state of Ohio; on the South, by the river Ohio, from the mouth of the Great Miami river, to the mouth of the river

⁵⁷ Enabling Act for Vermont Statehood, 6 December 1790, <https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbpe.2160060b>

Wabash; on the west, by a line drawn along the middle of the Wabash, from its mouth to a point, where a due north line drawn from the town of Vincennes, would last touch the northwestern shore of the said river; and from thence by a due north line, until the same shall intersect an east and west line, drawn through a point ten miles north of the southern extreme of lake Michigan; on the north, by the said east and west line, until the same shall intersect the first mentioned meridian line which forms the western boundary of the state of Ohio: Provided, That the convention hereinafter provided for, when formed, shall ratify the boundaries aforesaid; otherwise they shall be and remain as now prescribed by the ordinance for the government of the territory northwest of the river Ohio: Provided, also, That the said state shall have concurrent jurisdiction on the river Wabash, with the state to be formed west thereof, so far as the said river shall form a common boundary to both.

SEC. 3.

And be it further enacted,

That all male citizens of the United States, who shall have arrived at the age of twenty-one years, and resided within the said territory, at least one year previous to the day of election, and shall have paid a county or territorial tax; and all persons having in other respects the legal qualifications to vote for representatives in the general assembly of the said territory be, and they are hereby authorized to choose representatives to form a convention, who shall be apportioned amongst the several counties within the said territory, according to the apportionment made by the legislature thereof, at their last session, to wit: from the county of Wayne, four representatives; from the county of Franklin, five representatives; from the county of Dearborn, three representatives; from the county of Switzerland, one representative; from the county of Jefferson, three representatives; from the county of Clark, five representatives; from the county of Harrison, five representatives; from the county of Washington, five representatives; from the county of Knox, five representatives; from the county of Gibson, four representatives; from the county of Posey, one representative; from the county of Warrick, one representative; and from the county of Perry, one representative. And the election for the representatives aforesaid, shall be holden on the second Monday of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixteen, throughout the several counties in the said territory; and shall be conducted in the same manner, and under the same penalties, as prescribed by the laws of the said territory, regulating elections therein for members of the House of representatives.

SEC. 4.

And be it further enacted,

That the members of the convention, thus duly elected be, and they are hereby authorized to meet at the seat of the government of the said territory, on the second Monday of June next, which convention, when met, shall first determine, by a majority of the whole number elected, whether it be, or be not expedient, at that time, to form a constitution and state government, for the people within the said territory, and if it be determined to be expedient, the convention shall be, and hereby are authorized, to form a constitution and state government: or if it be deemed more expedient, the said convention shall provide by ordinance for electing representatives to form a constitution, or frame of government; which said representatives shall be chosen in such manner, and in such proportion, and shall meet at such time and place, as shall be prescribed by the said ordinance, and shall then form, for the people of said territory, a constitution and state government: Provided, That the same, whenever formed, shall be republican, and not repugnant to those articles of the ordinance of the thirteenth of July, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven, which are declared to be irrevocable between the original states, and the people and states of the territory northwest of the river Ohio; excepting so much of said articles as relate to the boundaries of the states therein to be formed.

SEC. 5.

And be it further enacted,

That until the next general census shall be taken, the said state shall be entitled to one representative in the House of Representatives of the United States.

SEC. 6.

And be it further enacted,

That the following propositions be, and the same are hereby offered to the convention of the said territory of Indiana, when formed, for their free acceptance or rejection, which, if accepted by the convention, shall be obligatory upon the United States.

First.

That the section numbered sixteen, in every township, and when such section has been sold, granted or disposed of, other lands, equivalent thereto, and most contiguous to the same, shall be granted to the inhabitants of such township for the use of schools.

Second.

That all salt springs within the said territory, and the land reserved for the use of the same, together with such other lands as may, by the President of the United States, be deemed necessary and proper for working the said salt springs, not exceeding, in the whole, the quantity contained in thirty-six entire sections, shall be granted to the said state, for the use of the people of the said state, the same to be used under such terms, conditions, and regulations as the legislature of the said state shall direct: **provided the said legislature shall never sell nor lease the same, for a longer period than ten years at any one time.**

Third.

That five per cent. of the net proceeds of the lands lying within the said territory, and which shall be sold by Congress from and after the first day of December next, after deducting all expenses incident to the same, shall be reserved for making public roads and canals, of which three-fifths shall be applied to those objects within the said state, under the direction of the legislature thereof, and two-fifths to the making of a road or roads leading to the said state under the direction of Congress.

Fourth.

That one entire township, which shall be designated by the President of the United States, in addition to the one heretofore reserved for that purpose, shall be reserved for the use of a seminary of learning, and vested in the legislature of the said state, to be appropriated solely to the use of such seminary by the said legislature.

Fifth.

That four sections of land be, and the same are hereby granted to the said state, for the purpose of fixing their seat of government thereon, which four sections shall, under the direction of the legislature of said state, be located at any time, in such township and range, as the legislature aforesaid may select, **on such lands as may hereafter be acquired by the United States, from the Indian tribes within the said territory:** Provided, That such locations shall be made prior to the public sale of the lands of the United States, surrounding such location: And provided always, **That the five foregoing provisions, herein offered, are on the conditions that the convention of the said state shall provide by an ordinance irrevocable, without the consent of the United States, that every and each tract of land sold by the United States, from and after the first day of December next, shall be and remain exempt from any tax, laid by order or under any authority of the state, whether for state, county or township, or any other purpose whatever, for the term of five years, from and after the day of sale.**

Keep in mind, Vermont was already a territory of New York with its origins of the area going back to Massachusetts. In other words seats of government were already formed where Counties and courts were already established. The Enabling Act for Indiana on the other hand exposes how the federal government had already begun expanding their scope beyond the simple responsibility of admitting equally footed Parties into the union, which begs some analysis and insights.

Analysis and Insights

With initial analysis and insights, the below following is provided to help clarify the initial overreach of Congress in the Indiana Enabling Act in contrast to Vermont. The initial language used in the first section’s title along with the first section conclusion ultimately became a doctrinal or constitutional “law” referred to as the equal footing doctrine. Both were highlighted with red font and the summation clearly asserted that: “the said state, when formed, shall be admitted into the union upon the same footing with the original states; in all respects whatever.”⁵⁹ If that was the case, then the Enabling Act should have been far more straight forward due to the point of fact that the federal government could only “make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.”⁶⁰ Consequently, it is imperative to point out that the federal government could not inflict **ANY** Rules or Regulations upon the States other than 1) they must be Republican in form and 2) they must be in full harmony with the Constitution that the Parties had created. In other words the child or federal government had no authority delegated to it in the Constitution to dictate to how the States were going to function as a Party to the compact. Therefore, the following are conditions and stipulations were never levied upon the original States nor the previous States who joined the union; consequently, the federal government in the Indiana Enabling Act begins to reach well beyond the RRPPs enumerated to the federal government in the Constitution.

1. Section 3.

- a. The red font in this section points out that only Citizens of the United States (21 year old males and older, who have paid their property tax) can be involved in choosing delegates from their county to the Convention that will decide on creating the State and the writing of the State Constitution. Though this was a noble assertion dictating that only male citizens 21 years of age could vote, the federal government had no enumeration within the Constitution to determine who could vote in a State election. This was left to the State and Congress should have directed the government and the people of the Territory the necessity to establish this in preparation to becoming a State. Keep in mind, at the time freemen (i.e. black males) were allowed to vote. “Only three of the original 13 states — Georgia, South Carolina and Virginia — limited voting exclusively to whites. Elsewhere, free Black men voted to ratify the Constitution in 1789 and continued voting in steadily growing numbers.”⁶¹ Unless the people of the territory had already acquiesced to this race and age qualification as the law of the territory, this was clear overreach of Congress. Considering the ease of assuming power for those who govern, one would need to find evidence that the people of the Territory had actually established this law or one must presume that the so-called limited federal government of the time had already begun becoming

⁵⁸ An Act to enable the people of the Indiana territory to form a constitution and state government, and for the admission of such state into the Union on an equal footing with the original states, 1816, <https://www.tbox.com/US/statutes/act-enable-people-indiana-territory-form-constitution-and-state-government-and-admission-such-state.html>

⁵⁹ An Act to enable the people of the Indiana territory to form a constitution and state government, and for the admission of such state into the Union on an equal footing with the original states, 1816, <https://www.tbox.com/US/statutes/act-enable-people-indiana-territory-form-constitution-and-state-government-and-admission-such-state.html>

⁶⁰ The Constitution for the United States, Article I Section 8, 17 September 1787, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art4.asp#4sec3

⁶¹ NY’s history of blocking Black votes, <https://www.nydailynews.com/2021/03/02/nys-history-of-blocking-black-votes/>

- a nanny state and was not so limited as designed. The big government Federalists who subscribed to Alexander Hamilton's unconstitutional postulation of implied powers, were those who began redefining the Constitution. John Marshall was one of many of Alexander Hamilton's protégés,⁶² from when they served together in the Revolutionary War and on into John Marshall's involvement in framing the nation. It was Hamilton's advisement for Adams to appoint Marshall as the Chief Justice to the Supreme Court where he could play a key role in expanding government powers. Marshall was the nation's first activist judge in the Supreme Court who was the first to redefine essential clauses in the Constitution.⁶³
- b. Based on the census of the territory population, each county received a specific apportionment as to how many delegates would represent them in the State Constitutional Convention. The lack of instruction guiding the delegates to function as a delegation and not as individuals was completely lost. Acting and voting in a delegation like the Constitutional Convention ensured the delegates were working in the interest of their counties and not as a single body. In every State, each county has its own unique interests and needs and allowing these interested to be swallowed into a single body as a State allowed the centralization of political power to shift from a Republican Form of government where the only government "We the People" institute are our counties and that the Counties institute the State like the States instituted the federal government. Working individually in unifying the State as people centralized the political power into more of a democracy. This is one critical failure that every State has either done or has shifted to is their amendment process. Each State today has implemented their amendment process to be done by popular vote democracy or mob-rule versus a specific sizable majority of the State such as two-thirds or like the federal Constitution of three-fourths to allow a change to the State Constitution. More importantly, the counties should have created their own constitutions first, but in the nineteenth century, no one could imagine that this government would eventually control every facet of our lives.
2. Section 4.
 - a. The red font in this Section initially harmonizes with Article IV Section 4 of the Constitution in guaranteeing a Republican Form of government. This was an enumerated responsibility of the federal government in admitting States into the Union.
 - b. The problem arises with the following clause "and not repugnant to those articles of the ordinance of the thirteenth of July... which are declared to be irrevocable between the original states, and the people and states of the territory northwest of the river Ohio." Clearly this clause is pointing to the Northwest Ordinance and not the Constitution. The Constitution superseded this agreement when it was ratified. Suffice it to say that even though Article VI of the Constitution states "All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation." This strictly was referring to external debts and engagements to ensure those entities would not need to worry about the money the Confederacy borrowed or treaties made with them. In contrast, the Constitution made a significant change in the relationship between the Parties to the Constitution and the general government that the Constitution created.
 3. Second "Proposition."
 - a. Even though this was not a grab for taking actual control of a State resource like we see later in subsequent Enabling Acts, Congress had no authority to make this proposition, but only the ability to make Rules and Regulations during the time the territory was preparing to become a State. The Constitution has enumerated the control of regulating trade with foreign nations and Indian Tribes, but what States chose to do with their own resources is up to the States.
 4. Third "Proposition."
 - a. Congress had no power to create these stipulations, but they were likely leveraging the defunct Northwest Ordinance of 1787. The Constitution and the process of admitting States into the

⁶² The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Eliot, Russell Kirk, 01 September 2001 - 7th Revised edition, Regnery Gateway

⁶³ 7 Worst Constitutional Liars, Douglas V. Gibbs, 17 September 2018

union was fixed by the ratification of the Constitution. The Constitutional process of admitting states into the union was strictly constrained to ensure states self-determination because those who framed the Constitution understood that if the federal government could subjugate the States it would completely pervert the Constitution.

- b. Consequently, even though these stipulations seemed noble, the new power the federal government was assuming was not in the Constitution and as they assumed this unconstitutional power the federal government became more and more restrictive and assuming more powers as new States were admitted into the union to a point where as the western States joined the union, the federal government unconstitutionally claimed to withhold lands and resources from these States all in violation to the Constitution.
5. Fourth "Proposition."
- a. Here, Congress graciously delegates an unconstitutional role and responsibility to the President of the United States to designate an entire town / city to be the location of the state's university. This is clearly outside what is enumerated as Congresses responsibility in admitting States in accordance with Article IV Section 3's first paragraph, which is where the responsibility of admitting states into the Union is fixed upon Congress not the President nor the Judiciary.
 - i. The Constitution enumerates in Article I Section 8 subsection 7, that Congress shall have the 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."⁶⁴ Nowhere has this new government been granted any role, responsibility, power, or property to establish schools or to be involved in education or training except what is enumerated in Article I Section 8 subsection 15.
 - ii. Article I Section 8 subsection 15 states that Congress shall have the power to "provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."⁶⁵
 - iii. Congress cannot require States to be formed with specific institutions such as universities – though these may seem to be noble efforts, prior to joining the union States are to be sovereign and independent – self-determined by the components within the States (i.e. the counties and the counties citizens). A State is not to be manipulated into being a free or slave state, nor can it be manipulated that the federal government can possess its land especially for purposes that have not been enumerated within the Constitution. The only property that the federal government can possess and operate is enumerated in Article I Section 8 subsection 16, stating that the "the Seat of the Government of the United States... Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings," nothing else.
 - b. It was firmly established numerous times during the Ratification Debates that the "powers" delegated to the general government were enumerated in Article I Section 8. The other Articles and Sections within Articles I through VII are either roles or responsibilities and that in Article I Section 9 were restrictions placed upon the general government and Article I Section 10 were restrictions placed upon the States. Consequently, it is necessary to repeat that Article IV Section 3 was a role and responsibility placed upon Congress in admitting new independent and sovereign States into the Union to become equal parties to the compact, not the power to admit subordinate governments to become administrators for the federal government's desires. This plan was presented in the Constitutional Convention, which was James Madison's plan that was introduced by Governor Randolph as the Virginia plan and this plan was flat out rejected by the delegates at the Convention.

⁶⁴ The Constitution for the United States, Article I Section 8, 17 September 1787,
https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art1.asp#1sec8

⁶⁵ The Constitution for the United States, Article I Section 8, 17 September 1787,
https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art1.asp#1sec8

6. Fifth "Proposition."

- a. In this proposition Congress assumes roles, responsibilities, or powers that go beyond again what is delegated in the Constitution.
 - i. The first usurpation is "on such lands as may hereafter be acquired by the United States, from the Indian tribes within the said territory." There is nowhere in the Constitution that allows the federal government to take land from a state and manage it as a territory for Indians.
 - ii. Next, the assertion by Congress that "such locations shall be made prior to the public sale of the lands of the United States." Indicating that the federal government will unconstitutionally reserve land for sale to benefit the federal government directly. This in no way is enumerated. The land was already acquired for the purpose of growing the union, which in growing the union benefits the union. The federal government cannot claim land to sale as a tax or burden placed upon the State. This is unconstitutional.
- b. Finally, in the proposition the federal government asserts that all the propositions in this enabling act are "are on the conditions that the convention of the said state shall provide by an ordinance irrevocable, without the consent of the United States, that every and each tract of land sold by the United States, from and after the first day of December next, shall be and remain exempt from any tax, laid by order or under any authority of the state, whether for state, county or township, or any other purpose whatever, for the term of five years, from and after the day of sale." This is pure tyranny, strong arming the citizens of a forming State how they must be formed, Counties and States are to be self-determined as long as they are in full compliance to the Constitution and Republican in Form. Consequently, it is a violation of the Constitution when the federal government makes assertions without having the authority delegated to it in the Constitution.

Providing the entirety of these two Acts, essentially to provide a full view as to how Congress and the federal government gradually changed in how they behaved in executing their role and responsibility in admitting new states into the Union to become equal Parties to the Constitution. Again, this was not a delegated "power" or it would have been placed in Article I Section 8. Therefore, it was Congresses responsibility to prepare and ensure new States that were formed out of territories that were designated to become states, that these new states would be fully aligned with the standards of the Union, such as law (i.e. common law), currency, language, etc. The one portion that became evident as the standard in the forming of Indiana and subsequent states was "***the admission of such state into the Union on an equal footing with the original states***". Thus, guaranteeing that each state be admitted with full and equal status as all other States, in compliance with the Uniformity clause and principle that the federal government could not treat states differently. Even so, Congress asserted unconstitutional powers and placed constraints and requirements in the Indiana Enabling Act that were not delegated to the federal government. As time progressed these enabling acts became the vehicle for the general government to include more unconstitutional constraints and requirements upon the States that became egregious violations to the Constitutional and as the Republic grew older, Congress became more and more aggressive in asserting unconstitutional powers.

The framers were well aware of the danger in allowing the general government to own land, land is property that translates into wealth and power. Government can use land as a tool to conduct economic warfare by keeping it from being used to feed the people. This happened in Britain and is happening in America today, and not just government but other institutions and individuals who are deliberately working to undermine America. This is why the framers limited the federal government's ability to possess property specifically for military or defense purpose, international ports for the importation and exportation of commerce and people.

The Power of the Parties

Starting with an aside, there is a severe deviation to the relationship when it comes to the modification process of the Constitution as defined in Article III and Article V. In the preceding subsection “The Apostate Version our Republican Form of Government,” we point to the First Amendment Petition titled “First Amendment Petition For Redress of Violations of Legislative Authority and the Separation of Powers Within the Constitution for the United States”⁶⁶ that legally and academically proves the Constitutional jurisdiction of the federal court and government is hard bound to only those things arising under the Constitution. In the AoC, the Continental Congress had no jurisdiction over the amendment process. This change and the language of the Constitution specifically delegates full authority to the federal government over the process, and there were no assertions in the Ratification Debates delineating the cognizance of an Article V Convention solely under the States in the Convention. What should have been added in Article I, Section 9, was this delineation of control – reserving full control to the Parties (i.e. the states) once the Convention convened. In light of the contractual authority though, it would be better to simply remove the ability of the Convention since the only function that a convention lends to the Parties is the rewriting of the Constitution. Though this topic of the Convention merits a through and deep dive; this is a topic for another article. Suffice it to say, the execution of an Article V Convention would not be done as many are advertising and simulating today. In these days when there is nothing under the sun that the federal government will not seize control over, the jurisdiction clause clearly grants this authority to the federal government.

A Few Errors in Instituting Our Governments

Keep in mind, our forefathers had the opportunity to evolve. They didn’t go from the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution in a day, week, month or year. It took over a decade and this evolution was not done in tranquility and peace – it was done during constant hostility and harassment by the British Empire that dominated the world at the time. The following items or points is not by any means a comprehensive listing, simply a list of critical mistakes where either 1) “We the People” were simply negligent, 2) “We the People” committed or were manipulated into committing, or 3) the error was a blatant act of usurpation by the federal government committed.

Protection of Counties Powers

Within each of the territories that were being prepared to become States, the first error that jumps out is that “We the People” failed to take a more of an active role in instituting their county government by forming it with a Constitution. The other possibility is that the federal government was being too aggressive in create States. By instituting their county with a Constitution, they would have formally delegated the RRPPs that they wished their county government to possess and created a barrier in the State Constitution that would be identical to the Tenth Amendment, asserting:

‘The powers not delegated to the State within the State Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the Counties, are reserved to the Counties respectively, or to the citizens of the County.’

Hind sight being 20/20, Counties, States, and our federal governments have all proven the paramount principle of limited and defined Constitutions (i.e. powers of attorney) only delegating the necessary powers to function. As Jefferson stated “A government big enough to give you everything you want, is a government big enough to

⁶⁶ First Amendment Petition For Redress of Violations of Legislative Authority and the Separation of Powers Within the Constitution for the United States, September 2023,
http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/Petitions/Petition008ForRedressOfViolationsOfLegislativeAuthority.pdf

take away everything that you have.”⁶⁷ This is why our government was created incapable of giving everything, on those things enumerated; thus, the difficulty in amending ones’ Constitution regardless of the government is paramount.

Protection of Amending the Counties Compact

State Constitutions are the Counties compact. Therefore as the preceding section points to another error which was instituting the use of democracy (a simple majority) as the means for amending the State Constitution. Currently, 46 States have implemented a simple majority (i.e. mob rule) democracy. The four outliers are:

- 1) Delaware requires two-thirds of the legislature, and today due the perversion of the States neither the people of the counties nor the counties have any suffrage in the matter.
- 2) Colorado required 55% of the people can authorize an amendment, but an amendment repealing, in whole or in part, any constitutional provision only requires approval by a simple majority on the amendment – yet this still ignores the people of the counties and their county government.
- 3) Florida requires three-fifths vote on amendment, except that an amendment for “new state tax or fee” not in effect on Nov. 7, 1994 requires two-thirds of voters in the election – yet this still ignores the people of the counties and their county government.
- 4) New Hampshire truly stands out requiring two-thirds of the voters to pass an amendment – yet this still ignores the people of the counties and their county government.

Bottom line, not one State Constitution has implemented a bar that ensures that an Amendment must be ratified by a majority of counties or some level of majority of the Counties to pass an amendment to ensure the County interests across the State are preserved and protected from the population centers. New Hampshire may seem good, but excluding the sovereign governments and the citizens of these governments is not republican in any way. All states are using a democratic process of the voters, marginalizing and undermining the Counties or Parishes interests.

The Selection of State Wide Positions

Regardless of the shortcomings of the framers the design of the Constitution guarded our “Republican Form of Government,” which is why the only direct elections that were allowed were selecting ones Representatives in our county, state and federal governments and our Electors who in turn would choose the President for us. Again, the State Legislatures selected their Senators in the US Senate, to represent their suffrage in the Senate. The State legislatures created Congressional Districts and only those who lived in the Districts were able to select their Representatives to represent their suffrage in the House of Representatives.

Though there are several problems with failing to properly institute our counties, this does not mean we cannot take back our government – we can. We need to understand what happened to understand how to keep from making these mistakes in the future as we reclaim our Republics and restore our Constitutional frameworks in each level of our Republics. By now, one should conclude correctly that the County, State, and the Union are Republics where governments are to be instituted with limited and defined RRPPs.

Wyoming

The process of Wyoming becoming a State and what happened to its Republican Form of government provides insight into one of the specific ways the States and our Constitutional Republic was undermined. As a territory, it was aggressively seeking Statehood and the following link lays out how and why Wyoming bypassed Congress in joining the union. After the Civil War, every State joining the union was required to include unconstitutional

⁶⁷ The Jefferson Monticello, Thomas Jefferson, <https://www.monticello.org/research-education/thomas-jefferson-encyclopedia/government-big-enough-give-you-everything-you-wantspurious-quotation/>

language in their Constitutions and again, this too is a separate discussion. Suffice it to say, Wyoming did some things right that actually substantiates some of the shenanigans committed by those at different levels of government that were unconstitutional.

<https://www.wyohistory.org/encyclopedia/wyoming-statehood>

In forming the State of Wyoming, some assert that the State was established by the general government; this is incorrect. Others state that the people were responsible in the forming of the Constitution and the State; fundamentally this is correct – but if the State was established by the people, this would have required the majority of the people to come together to agree upon the State’s Constitution and government. In essence, the State would have been established by a democratic form of government and actually, if almost 30,000 (half of the State’s population necessary “for the people” to form the Constitution) I am not sure Wyoming would have a Constitution by now.

This is how Wyoming was formed into a State

With that, the following is an extract out of the *Memorial of the State Constitutional Convention of the Territory of Wyoming, Praying the Admission of That Territory as a State into the Union*:

“Whereas the boards of county commissioners of several counties in the Territory have, by resolution, requested the governor to call a constitutional convention, and have re-requested the governor, chief-justice, and secretary of the Territory to divide the Territory into delegate districts, to apportion the number of delegates among the several districts, and to do such other acts as may be necessary for the convening of such constitutional convention in the manner and form provided by the terms of the said Senate bill; and

Whereas the governor, chief-justice, and secretary of the Territory, on this :id day of June, 1889, did convene at the capitol in the city of Cheyenne, and did apportion the number of delegates among the several districts so established, upon the basis of the vote cast for Delegate in Congress at the last general election, as follows, to wit:

- (1) The county of Laramie shall constitute the first district and shall elect 11 delegates.
- (2) The county of Albany shall constitute the second district anal shall elect 8 delegates.
- (3) The county of Carbon shall constitute the third district and shall elect 8 delegates.
- (4) The county of Sweetwater shall constitute the fourth district and shall elect 5 delegates.
- (5) The county of Uinta shall constitute the fifth district and shall elect 6 delegates.
- (6) The county of .Fremont shall constitute the sixth district and shall elect 3 delegates.
- (7) The county of Sheridan shall constitute the seventh district and shall elect 3 delegates.
- (8) The county of Johnson shall constitute the eighth district and shall elect 3 delegates.
- (9) The county of Crook shall constitute the ninth district and shall elect 4 delegates.
- (10) The, county of Converse shall constitute the teeth district and shall elect. 4 delegates.”⁶⁸

Consequently, Wyoming was formed and its Constitution was established by 55 delegates of the ten sovereign counties, not the people at large or by the federal government. A State was created and accepted into the union by Congress, meeting the Constitutional responsibility established by Congress **most of which** was under their delegated role and responsibility in accordance with Article IV Section 3. The emphasis added to “most of

⁶⁸ Memorial Of The State Constitutional Convention Of The Territory Of Wyoming, Praying The Admission Of That Territory As A State Into The Union, 16December 1889, <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.35112105045779&view=1up&seq=12>

which”, in the preceding sentence, points to requirements and attributes that Congress and the federal government demanded in the forming of States and their Constitutions—all of which were not within the few delegated RRPPs within the Constitution. These requirements and directions Congress made were, at minimum, coercive, forcing Wyoming to insert the following line:

“The State of Wyoming is an inseparable part of the federal union”⁶⁹

No State is or can be subjugated to the union – ALL States are independent and Sovereign States and are equal parties to the compact (i.e. the Constitution) and as Madison stated in Federalist Paper # 43:

“A compact between independent sovereigns, founded on ordinary acts of legislative authority, can pretend to no higher validity than a league or treaty between the parties. It is an established doctrine on the subject of treaties, that all the articles are mutually conditions of each other; that a breach of any one article is a breach of the whole treaty; and that a breach, committed by either of the parties, absolves the others, and authorizes them, if they please, to pronounce the compact violated and void.”⁷⁰

Thus, nullifying and ending their participation in the compact and leaving the Union. In the preceding subsection, *The Apostate Version of our Republican Form of Government*, above, we provided another document from James Madison, *The Report on the Virginia Resolutions*, which further supports the simplicity of this argument in stating:

“The Constitution of the United States was formed by the sanction of the states, given by each in its sovereign capacity. It adds to the stability and dignity, as well as to the authority, of the Constitution, that it rests on this legitimate and solid foundation. The states, then, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows of necessity that there can be no tribunal, above their authority, to decide, in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated; and consequently, that, as the parties to it, they must themselves decide, in the last resort, such questions as may be of sufficient magnitude to require their interposition.”⁷¹

As the Republic aged, some doctrines became perverted, one of which was the concept of Nullification. The Southern States and former Vice President, John C Calhoun, began preaching that nullification of a federal law could be done by a single State and that the nullifying state could stay in the Union. James Madison explained the assertions of Thomas Jefferson in Madison’s notes on Nullification and how a single State could nullify a federal law, but they could not remain in the Union in stating:

“Thus the right of nullification meant by Mr. Jefferson is the natural right, which all admit to be a remedy against insupportable oppression. It cannot be supposed for a moment that Mr. Jefferson would not revolt at the doctrine of South Carolina, that a single state could constitutionally resist a law of the Union, whilst remaining within it, and that with the accession of a small minority of the others, overrule the will of a great majority of the whole, & constitutionally annul the law everywhere.

If the right of nullification meant by him had not been thus guarded agst., a perversion of it, let him be his own interpreter in his letter to Mr. Giles in Decr 1826. in which he makes the rightful remedy of a state in an extreme case to be a separation from the Union, not a resistance to its authority while

⁶⁹ Wyoming State Constitution, Article 1, Section 37, <https://sos.wyo.gov/Forms/Publications/WYConstitution.pdf>

⁷⁰ James Madison, 23 January 1788, Federalist Paper #43, <http://constitution.org/1-Constitution/fed/federa43.htm>

⁷¹ Report on the Virginia Resolutions, James Madison, January 1800, Para 18, <https://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch8s42.html>

remaining in it. The authority of Mr. Jefferson therefore, belongs not to, but is directly opposed to, the nullifying party who have so unwarrantably availed themselves of it.”⁷²

The two clear take aways from the father of the Constitution is that 1) all States are independent sovereignties who are not bound to remain in the union if the creature created by the compact violates the Constitution and 2) if a single State seeks to nullify a federal law, they can no longer stay in the Union.

The conclusion regarding the line in the Wyoming State Constitution that it’s “an inseparable part of the federal union” does not align with the simple fact that Wyoming, like its sibling States, is an “independent and sovereign” State who has voluntarily joined the Union – but is not subjugated to it and can abnegate its participation in the Union if the compact is violated.

There are other clear deficiencies regarding the Wyoming Constitution, which is why Wyoming and each State needs to 1st, definitize the Constitution for the United States; 2nd Audit the Constitution for the United States; 3rd initiate Republic Review; 4th Audit the State Constitution; and 5th Establish County Constitutions and conduct a State Constitutional Convention to revert the State governments into limited general governments; thus, making the Counties and the People the primary repository of political and governmental power in all matters that are domestic in nature. Most all of these steps will be covered in a subsequent article.

Apportionment in the Original Wyoming Constitution:

In the process of forming the State government, following the federal example, the delegates in the Wyoming Constitutional Convention established their Republican Form of government as such:

“Each county shall constitute a senatorial and representative district; the senate and house of representatives shall be composed of members elected by the legal voters of the counties respectively, every two (2) years. They shall be apportioned among the said counties as nearly as may be according to the number of their inhabitants. Each county shall have at least one senator and one representative; but at no time shall the number of members of the house of representatives be less than twice nor greater than three times the number of members of the senate. The senate and house of representatives first elected in pursuance of this constitution shall consist of sixteen and thirty-three members respectively.”⁷³

The following is an excerpt from the 1889 Wyoming Constitution on how the initial apportionment would be applied:

“APPORTIONMENT

SECTION I. One Representative in the Congress of the United States shall be elected from the State at large the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, 1890, and thereafter at such times and places and in such manner as may be prescribed by law. When a new apportionment shall be made by Congress the legislature shall divide the State into Congressional districts accordingly.

SEC. 2. The legislature shall provide by law for an enumeration of the inhabitants of the State in the year 1895, and every tenth year thereafter, and at the session next following such enumeration, and also at the session next following an enumeration made by the authority of the United States, shall revise and

⁷² James Madison, Dec 1834, On Nullification, <https://rotunda.upress.virginia.edu/founders/default.xqy?keys=FOEA-print-02-02-02-3065>

⁷³ Wyoming State Constitution, 1890, <https://sos.wyo.gov/Forms/Publications/WYConstitution.pdf>

adjust the apportionment for senators and representatives on a basis of such enumeration according to ratios to be fixed by law.

SEC. 3 Representative districts may be altered from time to time as public convenience may require. When a representative district shall be composed of two or more counties they shall be contiguous, and the districts as compact as may be. **No county shall be divided in the formation of representative districts.**

SEC. 4. Until an apportionment of senators and representatives as otherwise provided by law they shall be divided among the several counties of the State in the following manner:

Albany County, two senators and five representatives.
Carbon County, two senators and five representatives.
Converse County, one senator and three representatives.
Crook County, one senator and two representatives.
Fremont County, one Senator and two representatives.
Laramie County three senators and six representatives.
Johnson County, one senator and two representatives.
Sheridan County, one senator and two representatives.
Sweetwater County, two senators and three representatives.
Uinta County, two senators and three representatives.”⁷⁴

Though the above apportionment is not identical to the Constitution for the United States, it clearly separates representation of both the people and the county government by county – providing suffrage for both groups of sovereigns. Actually by this time the divine design of representation of sovereigns in our Republican form of government in America was beginning to get lost by the doctrine of communism using democracy as a tool to destroy a Republican Form of Government. The doctrine of communism began seeping into the United State by the end of the Eighteenth Century.

When one examines the facts one cannot deny the suffrage in these two legislative bodies was different since the roles and responsibilities were attuned to the two disparate bodies (i.e. “We the People,” and the County government) they represented; thus, creating a check and balance on laws, ensuring they would be pursuant to the enumerated powers delegated to each body in the Constitution. These checks and balances can be restored and that is why taking back one’s county matters the most.

The Perversion of the Republic Exposed in the Wyoming Constitution

Above, we provided the following excerpt from the current Wyoming Constitution:

“Legislative apportionment. Each county shall constitute a senatorial and representative district; the senate and house of representatives shall be composed of members elected by the legal voters of the counties respectively, every two (2) years. They shall be apportioned among the said counties as nearly as may be according to the number of their inhabitants. Each county shall have at least one senator and one representative; but at no time shall the number of members of the house of representatives be less than twice nor greater than three times the number of members of the senate. The senate and house of

⁷⁴ Memorial Of The State Constitutional Convention Of The Territory Of Wyoming, Praying The Admission Of That Territory As A State Into The Union, 16 December 1889, <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.35112105045779&view=1up&seq=12>

representatives first elected in pursuance of this constitution shall consist of sixteen and thirty-three members respectively.”⁷⁵

Just below this paragraph in the Wyoming Constitution one will find the following note inserted into the Wyoming Constitution which has stripped the county and the people of the county their suffrage in the State Legislature:

“This section is inconsistent with the application of the “one person, one vote” principle under circumstances as they presently exist in Wyoming. Consequently, the Wyoming legislature may disregard this provision when reapportioning either the senate or the house of representatives.”⁷⁶

What is clear is that this change to the representation of the sovereigns was not done constitutionally. The only way for this change to be Constitutional is for the Wyoming Constitution to be amended per the process or mode identified in the Wyoming Constitution. Obviously, this was done on a point of principle as denoted, but what is the “one person, one vote” principle? As one scours the Wyoming Constitution and the Constitution for the United States, one will not find this principle. Consequently, Wyoming happens to be one of the very few States that actually accounts for their State Constitution being superseded by some principle, but the details as to the source of this intervention are not obvious.

This is why the history and design of our Republican Forms of government were provided upfront in this article. As well as how the federal government has assumed an unconstitutional authority to use court cases or what is referred to as precedence to redefine what each particular line in the means, completely ignoring how it was actually defined by the framers in the Ratification process as well as the intent in framing the Constitution during the Constitution, because these definitions do not align with their “new” definitions. Laying this foundation that will allow us to expose what really happened and why this was not only unconstitutional, this was an act of insurrection against both the State Constitutions as well as an act of insurrection against the Constitution for the United States.

An Insurrection That Violated the Constitution and All State Constitutions

Suffice it to say, the progressive era has been a long string of insurrections against the Constitution, beginning in 1816/7 when Congress attempted to assume unconstitutional footings to the Department of Transportations with a Bill referred to as the Bonus Bill, which President Madison vetoed the Bill as his last official act as President on 3 March 1817. The progressive process is on to where politicians use compromises to accomplish the assumption of RRPPs without using the Article V process; thus, each assumption is unconstitutional. There were progressive assumptions prior to this, but from 1800 to 1817, compliance to the Constitution was the rule not the exception. Since this short period, progressive politics had slowly evolved to where an almost wholesale abandonment to the Constitution began towards the end of the Nineteenth Century. That States were still coming into the union with a quasi-proper Republican Form of government was nothing short of a miracle, and these States joining the Union, like Wyoming, provide the insights as to how the fundamental framework of county governments, as the bedrock of States, are still a standard.

In the Twentieth Century attacks against the State Constitutions and the Constitution for the United States had become the norm from both the state and federal courts, especially in context to the Republican Form of government. For over a century the “Republican Form of Government” was never challenged in the court and was considered non-justiciable (i.e. inappropriate for the court and or a justice to be involved in) and one would

⁷⁵ Wyoming State Constitution, 1890, <https://sos.wyo.gov/Forms/Publications/WYConstitution.pdf>

⁷⁶ Wyoming State Constitution, 1890, <https://sos.wyo.gov/Forms/Publications/WYConstitution.pdf>

think that this is still the case to this day. Clearly, the Constitutional precedence as well as the fundamental tenant of our governing is that “governments are instituted by men,” or more appropriately stated “instituted by We the People.” This is why each State being admitted into the Union clearly met the standard for Congress and which is why Congress admitted each State into the Union. As such, the Republican Form of government was established by the delegates from within the territorial government becoming a State who determined how to institute their Republican Form. Though many did not truly understand, they still fell into a process that was duplicating the point in fact that the Counties were the Parties to the Compact or the State Constitution and ensure representation for the citizens of the County in the “people’s representative” body of the State Legislature and that the county government was represented in the Senate within the State Legislature, following the Constitution for the United States as their guide.

The admission into the Union clearly met the standard for Congress which is why Congress admitted each State into the Union. Putting aside the point that Wyoming did an end-run around the process of being admitted into the union, one can read here the why and how they joined the Union without an Enabling Act from Congress for the territory to proceed in holding a Constitutional Convention to create the State and a State Constitution—the leaders in the territory just did it...⁷⁷ What is important, is that Congress accepted and allowed Wyoming to join the Union with their Constitution and Republican Form of Government as defined by the framers. The Constitution is clear, the Judiciary has no role or responsibility in admitting States into the union, nor do they have the authority to redefine that what the States have accepted as the terms and definitions to their compact. If the judiciary wishes to redefine an established or accepted term and or definition they must seek Congress to use the Article V process to admit such a change. Clearly, only three-fourths of the States are the required measure for the “change” to become Constitutional, not the bearer of a black robe.

Before diving into how the federal court pulled the wool over the heads of the Republic and obfuscate the Constitution, it is paramount to dive into the limitations of the federal government once again, since these matters are easily misunderstood. Article III Section 2 of the Constitution for the United States identifies the jurisdiction of the federal court and the federal government in stating:

“The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;”⁷⁸

This unequivocally defines that only matters “arising under this Constitution” and also includes treaties that were constitutionally made, are within the federal jurisdiction. We also provided clarity that the federal government cannot make a treaty regarding anything that is not enumerated within the Constitution; therefore, many treaties are violations, such as the treaty with the UN and with Indian Tribes. That said, for the federal court to open its doors to a case, the matter of the case must be an enumerated object within the Constitution.

Baker v. Carr

In a nutshell, Baker asserted his constitutional rights were being violated by unfair representation. Baker asserted that his vote was being devalued because rural areas had lower citizen-representative ratios. His and other urban voters' voices were being weakened. It is not unheard of for a person to want more of anything and for that matter actually everything possible; however, when it comes to the design of the State and its Republican Form of government, this must be fixed to the Sovereigns. Truth be told, Tennessee had failed to

⁷⁷ Wyoming Becomes a State: The Constitutional Convention and Statehood Debates of 1889 and 1890 and Their Aftermath, Roberts, Phil. 8 November 2014, <https://www.wyohistory.org/encyclopedia/wyoming-statehood>

⁷⁸ The Constitution for the United States, Article III Section 2, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art3.asp#3sec2

reapportion Representation according to its Constitution. What Tennessee did was constitutionally repugnant, because:

“the complaint alleges that the 1901 statute, even as of the time of its passage, 'made no apportionment of Representatives and Senators in accordance with the constitutional formula * * *, but instead arbitrarily and capriciously apportioned representatives in the Senate and House without reference * * * to any logical or reasonable formula whatever.' It is further alleged that 'because of the population changes since 1900, and the failure of the Legislature to reapportion itself since 1901,' the 1901 statute became 'unconstitutional and obsolete.'”⁷⁹

What Charles W. Baker et al, should have done was to exert their First Amendment right of Petition for the Redress of grievances to address the State’s failure to abide by the Constitution. If the State failed to respond, then Charles W. Baker et al could pursue recourse for the State violating their Constitutional right. By using the legal system, Charles W. Baker not only pumped money into the Tennessee and federal court franchises, they created the opportunity for the court to unconstitutionally seize sovereignty over a matter not delegated.

Keep in mind, the case was regarding the power of one’s vote, within the existing Republican Form of Government. Does the power of one’s vote arise under the Constitution? No

Had he pursued the Petition process demanding the Tennessee Constitution be complied with, it would have kept the court from 1) violating the essence of our Declaration of Independence, where “We the People” institute our government not the courts or government itself and 2) destroying our Constitutional framework by instituting a democratic form of government, placing full control of the States into the hands of population centers and the people, ignoring the bedrock of the State being our counties. Furthermore, the oversight of how a State implements its Republican Form of government is not within the federal Constitution other than during the admission of a State, or if a State changes its Republican Form then it would arise under Article IV Section 4 “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government.”⁸⁰ Consequently, if Tennessee modified its “Republican Form” in any way regarding representation in the State legislation than that could be justification for a review by Congress first, but this was not the case. However, since the application of actual federal jurisdiction had been abandoned by the States for a sundry of reasons – one can see why and how the progressives in the federal court system were able to do such damage to our instituted governments.

Instead, Charles W. Baker suspiciously sued the Secretary of State, Joe Carr, for violating his right of “equal protection of the laws.” Because he was attempting to apply this law outside of how it was defined, this leads one to believe that progressive lawyers and politicians were involved in directing this case towards legal and political theatrics by using the “equal protection of the laws” clause in Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment which states:

“nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”⁸¹

There is nothing here about ensuring equality of ones voting power. More importantly, when it comes to a clause in a compact, more specifically the federal Constitution or its amendments, once the clause(s) have been

⁷⁹ Baker v. Carr, 1962, [https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/baker_v_carr_\(1962\)](https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/baker_v_carr_(1962))

⁸⁰ The Constitution for the United States, Article IV Section 4, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art4.asp#4sec4

⁸¹ The Constitution for the United States, Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/amend1.asp#14

defined to the Parties for acceptance (i.e. ratification) then those definitions become fixed like stone. The only way to alter the terms and definitions of a compact in accordance with contract law, as well as in accordance with the Constitution, the mode to modify the Constitution, would be to follow the process in Article V, which allocates the authority to grant amendments that would alter the wording or meaning which is strictly reserved to the States, neither the federal, legislative, the executive, nor the judiciary has any authority to redefine the meaning and application and this equally applies to the "equal protection clause."

Therefore, when the court hears a case that invokes a specific clause of the Constitution, the court is obligated, as Madison stated in his letter to John G. Jackson above, to apply the terms and definitions of the clause as the States understood them to mean at the time of ratification. If not, the legal and political process will quickly redefine the clause(s) to meet their view. Consequently, one must examine the Congressional Debates of the Fourteenth Amendment as to how these clauses were defined, because this Amendment originated in Congress to quantify what the "equal protection" clause meant as it was approved by Congress for the States to consider for Ratification. The first definition for the equal protection clause was provided by Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, a Representative from Pennsylvania, a leader of liberty for the Freeman, and a co-author of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment, who stated the following on 7 May 1866 in the Congressional Globe:

"I can hardly believe that any person can be found who will not admit that every one of these provisions is just. They are all asserted, in some form or other, in our DECLARATION or organic law. But the Constitution limits only the action of Congress, and is not a limitation on the States. This amendment supplies that defect, and allows Congress to correct the un-just legislation of the States, so far that the law which, operates upon one man shall operate equally upon all. Whatever law punishes a white man for a crime shall punish the black man precisely in the same way and to the same degree. Whatever law protects the white man shall afford "equal" protection to the black man. Whatever means of redress is afforded to one shall be afforded to all. Whatever law allows the white man to testify in court shall allow the man of color to do the same. These are great advantages over their present codes. Now different degrees of punishment are inflicted, not on account of the magnitude of the crime, but according to the color of the skin. Now color disqualifies a man from testifying in courts, or being tried in the same way as white men. I need not enumerate these partial and oppressive laws. Unless the Constitution should restrain them those States will all, I fear, keep up this discrimination, and crush to death the listed freedmen. Some answer, "Your civil rights bill secures the same things." That is partly true, but a law is repealable by a majority. And I need hardly say that the first time that the South with their copperhead allies obtain the command of Congress it will be repealed. The veto of the President and their votes on the bill are conclusive evidence of that. And yet I am amazed and alarmed at the impatience of certain well-meaning Republicans at the exclusion of the rebel States until the Constitution shall be so amended as to restrain their despotic desires. This amendment once adopted cannot be annulled without two thirds of Congress. That they will hardly get. And yet certain of our distinguished friends propose to admit State after State before this becomes a part of the Constitution. What madness! Is their judgment misled by their kindness; or are they unconsciously drifting into the haven of power at the other end of the avenue? I do not suspect it, but others will.

The second section I consider the most important in the article. It fixes the basis of representation in Congress. If any State shall exclude any of her adult male citizens from the elective franchise, or abridge that right, she shall forfeit her right to representation in the same proportion. The effect of this provision will be either to compel the States to grant universal suffrage or so to shear them of their power as to keep them forever in a hopeless minority in the national Government, both legislative and

executive. If they do not enfranchise the freedmen, it would give to the rebel States but thirty-seven Representatives.”⁸²

After reading the actual intent and what the equal protection clause was intended to do, it is clear that it ensures that the civil laws of a State were required to punish or reward white and black equally with no separation. Consequently, when the court began hearing Fourteenth Amendment cases during the “Gilded Age”⁸³ it was apparent that the courts and governments, for the most part, turned their back on Justice for the blacks in America. While the ink was drying on the Fourteenth Amendment, court cases and governments were already doing what they could to redefine the Fourteenth Amendment.

This Republican Form of government was not civil law. It was a Constitutional foundation for the literal framework of our government, one of which was established by “We the People,” not Congress, the President, nor the Supreme Court. What was established was the representation of two disparate sovereigns. The concept that an apportionment process in the State Constitution being a “law” inflicted upon a person or demographic of people is absurd and to think that the framework of a county and the citizens of the county can be applied differently for one race or demographic over another, giving one an advantage over another was a delusional reach by the court. The reason they were successful was because they outright ignored the original definition of this clause as well as the framers’ design of our Republican Form of government – and the point in fact is that the Supreme Court was apt to inflict a democratic form of government and violate the law in sundry ways.

Out of the entire 104 page case document from the Supreme Court, the use of the phrase “equal protection” was stated 68 times. Not once, did the court provide the original definition established in Congress while the Fourteenth Amendment was being framed and passed to send to the States for Ratification. Most of the uses were pointing to previous cases as to how other courts redefined this clause. Whether one sees this as right, wrong, or is indifferent – – as stated ad nauseam, the law (i.e. the Constitution and its legal terms and definitions) is our king, not a person in an oval office, not people in chambers, or people in black robes. This one fact protects “We the People” from the biases of individuals, political agendas, or political compromises.

It is necessary to again reference the *First Amendment Petition for Redress of Violations of Legislative Authority and the Separation of Powers Within the Constitution for the United States*⁸⁴ because the Supreme Court does not possess the authority to interpret or redefine clauses or portions of the federal Constitution that were already provided by the framers during the Ratification Debates. Thus, the Warren Court functioned more like a Kangaroo Court by:

- 1) Accepting the jurisdiction and standing of the Baker v. Carr case in the first place
- 2) Redefining the equal protection clause
- 3) Having a total disregard for the people’s Republican Form of Government by demanding it be reconfigured based on simple population, wiping out the sovereignty of the People’s Counties

Now Gerrymandering of Districts is one thing, but the Apportionment and complete failure to follow the State’s law as to how to apply apportionment is something that the counties should have secured to ensure standards of representation as the population shifted within a State like our federal Constitution and the process of

⁸² Congressional Globe, 7 May 1866, Page 2459

⁸³ The Gilded Age, History Channel – A&E Networks, <https://www.history.com/topics/19th-century/gilded-age>

⁸⁴ First Amendment Petition For Redress of Violations of Legislative Authority and the Separation of Powers Within the Constitution for the United States, September 2023, http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/Petitions/Petition008ForRedressOfViolationsOfLegislativeAuthority.pdf

redistricting. Remember, everyone wants more, if not everything for themselves, so the federal model of apportionment should have been the standard not only in Tennessee but in all States.

Taking the Baker v Carr case one step further – the court’s argument can easily be perverted to say that the 1,084,225 million people in Montana (based upon the 2020 census) have more voting power or better Representation with their two Representatives in Congress (542,113 people to one Representative), than the 21,538,187 million people in Florida who have 28 Representatives in Congress (almost 770,000 people to one Representative). With the Warren Court logic, the Supreme Court and tyrannical power, they could wipe out the States altogether and convert America into a Democracy. The reason they would not do this, is that this would have awakened the States to the imbecility of the court and induced them to step in.

What the members of the courts and citizens in America today fail to understand is that the bicameral configuration of each State is necessary in protecting the suffrage and the sovereignty of the county government – you know – that government that was instituted by the people – so their government would have suffrage in the State Senate, while the people enjoyed their suffrage in the State House of Representatives.

Going back to jurisdiction based on the definitions of the voting Amendments, had Charles W. Baker’s right to vote been denied, this would have been an application of “equal protection of the laws” if the denial was based on race, gender, ability to pay taxes, or age. There is no way anyone can slice this under the provided terms and definitions into a violation of the “equal protection of the laws” clause as defined in Congress during the debates of the Fourteenth Amendment. This is what the court has been doing for a century. An example of this is that the court allowed Jim Crow laws that literally violated the rights of blacks as this clause was originally defined, by redefining this clause and creating the unconstitutional doctrine of separate but equal which created an unadulterated conflict with the original definition of “equal protection of the laws.”

Regardless of the direction of the infraction – an infraction cannot be tolerated. The Warren Court reached across the Constitutional threshold where the federal courts are not permitted to and used this case to destroy the checks and balances in the State Legislature and shifted government and political focus towards the progressive population centers. Thurgood Marshall, a member of the Warren Court, publicly articulated his position on the Constitution being King as the Supreme Law of the Land in stating “The process of democracy is one of change. Our laws are not frozen into immutable form, they are constantly in the process of revision in response to the needs of a changing society.”⁸⁵ Justice Marshall was not an outlier; many others were very clear about using judicial activism to change laws. This speaks to just how emboldened the court had become in trampling on the Constitution. Chief Justice Earl Warren captured metaphorically an accurate image of the courts and our legal systems paradigm, stating “In civilized life, law floats in a sea of ethics.”⁸⁶

Clearly, our entire legal system, along with the British Accreditation Registrar commonly known as the BAR Association over the past 150 years has successfully created a swamp where they soak the law to soften and bend into the direction that serves their purpose. Even though the BAR includes lip service to the Constitution and even though the Constitution demands their full support, the BAR attorneys and jurists are committed to the institution where they take pride in twisting and bending the law; thus, perverting the rule of law and our Republican Form of government. Again, the bedrock of a Republican Form of government is the rule of law, that

⁸⁵ Thurgood Marshall. (n.d.). AZQuotes.com. Retrieved October 02, 2023, from AZQuotes.com Web site: <https://www.azquotes.com/quote/1396217>

⁸⁶ Earl Warren, 1962, The Ethics Advisor: Good Governance Floats on a Sea of Integrity, <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-ethics-advisor-good-governance-12893/>

our laws are fixed within a compact that includes terms and definitions to ensure that our laws cannot be perverted.

The brilliance in the Constitution is not simply the design of the Constitution itself, but that it was debated and clearly defined, locking the provided terms and definitions as legal appendages to the compact itself. To this author, this definitively reveals the DNA of the Divine Hand of Providence creating a law that is immovable, as HE has done with HIS covenants with mankind. A compact is just another way of saying contract, constitution, or covenant. As simplistic as it may seem, that the framers in the Constitutional Convention took the thirteen articles of the AoC and consolidated them into six articles and then with the Seventh Article, HE rested the power in the hands of the “Parties.” During the Virginia Ratification Debates Patrick Henry pointed to the Constitutions Preamble’s “We the People,” asserting that this Constitution is forming a democracy. In James Madison reply he stated:

“Who are parties to it? The people — but not the people as composing one great body; but the people as composing thirteen sovereignties. Were it, as the gentleman asserts, a consolidated government, the assent of a majority of the people would be sufficient for its establishment; and, as a majority have adopted it already, the remaining states would be bound by the act of the majority, even if they unanimously reprobated it. Were it such a government as is suggested, it would be now binding on the people of this state, without having had the privilege of deliberating upon it. But, sir, no state is bound by it, as it is, without its own consent. Should all the states adopt it, it will be then a government established by the thirteen states of America, not through the intervention of the legislatures, but by the people at large. In this particular respect, the distinction between the existing and proposed governments is very material. The existing system has been derived from the dependent derivative authority of the legislatures of the states; whereas this is derived from the superior power of the people. If we look at the manner in which alterations are to be made in it, the same idea is, in some degree, attended to. By the new system, a majority of the states cannot introduce amendments; nor are all the states required for that purpose; three fourths of them must concur in alterations; in this there is a departure from the federal idea. The members to the national House of Representatives are to be chosen by the people at large, in proportion to the numbers in the respective districts. When we come to the Senate, its members are elected by the states in their equal and political capacity. But had the government been completely consolidated, Senate would have been chosen by the people in their individual capacity, in the same manner as the members of the other house. Thus it is of a complicated nature; and this complication, I trust, will be found to exclude the evils of absolute consolidation, as well as of a mere confederacy.”⁸⁷

In essence, sanctifying the law and placing it into the hands of “We the Governed.” This includes the States and the Counties along with “We the People;” empowering them to enforce HIS Constitution for all mankind.

It is indeed a malady that federal court had been redefining the terms of the Constitution since Marbury v Madison, and the specific definitions of the “equal protection of the laws” clause; thus, doing injustice to the people and the State of Tennessee.

We already know that State apportionment does not arise under the federal Constitution. We also know that the only cognizance regarding voting within the federal Constitution is in regard to race (15th A), sex (male/female) (19th A), denial due to poll taxes (24th A), and age (26th A). Was Charles W. Baker’s case based

⁸⁷ James Madison, 6 June, 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of Virginia, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/rc/rat_va.htm

upon his Constitutional rights being denied? If not, then any other matter regarding voting *IS NOT* within federal jurisdiction – unless the matter was regarding election fraud which would affect the seating of a Congress person in accordance with Article 1 Section 5 “Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business.”⁸⁸

There is a historical fact as to how First Amendment Petition to Congress actually changed the seating of a Representative in Congress, so there is merit in citing this case here. Over the past decade or more, the federal government claims they have no responsibility to ensure accurate outcomes of elections. This is a striking contrast to the aforementioned Article 1 Section 5 and the following is a summary as to what happened in 1811:

- 1) John Taliaferro, petitioned about the election and illegal return of John P Hungerford to Congress.
- 2) November 7, 1811 Mr. Burwell presented the petition.
- 3) Nov 18, 1811, the Committee of Elections was instructed to prepare and report a bill for regulating the proceedings, and taking evidence in cases of contested elections of members of this House.
- 4) November 29, 1811, Congress audited the election examining evidence and facts from county sheriffs who conducted the elections.
- 5) December 2, 1811, John Taliaferro was declared as one of the members for Virginia in the place of John P. Hungerford.⁸⁹

Here is a complete list of where the word “vote” appears in the Constitution:

- 1) Article I Section 3 (twice): that each Senator gets only one vote – the VP shall have no vote unless there is a tie in the Senate voting.
- 2) Article I Section 7 (twice): how the votes will be cast in the house by yeas and nays – that the votes of both houses shall be presented to the President.
- 3) Article II Section 1 (eleven times): ten of which refers to the voting process for the Electors in the Electoral College and that Congress can establish the day the Electors provide their votes in choosing the President.
- 4) Article VII (three times): in how the Electoral College will function in choosing the first President once the nine States have ratified the Constitution.
- 5) Note – this ends the body of the Constitution so all other usages of voting will be in amendments to the Constitution.
- 6) Twelfth Amendment (twelve times): all applying to Electors or Congress in choosing the President and VP.
- 7) Fourteenth Amendment Section 2 (once): this is a change of apportionment – that when a State denies a citizen the right to vote for any reason, other than for rebellion or other crime, then that citizen must be deducted from the apportionment for representation in the federal government.
- 8) Fourteenth Amendment Section 3 (once): the usage of vote is in reference to the two-thirds requirement to remove the banishment of a former State or federal public servant who was banned for violating their oath of office.
- 9) Fifteenth Amendment (once): granting all U.S. Citizens the right to vote regardless of color, race, ethnicity
- 10) Seventeenth Amendment (once) changes the selection of a Senator in Congress and confirms each senator has only one vote in the Senate.
- 11) Nineteenth Amendment (once): women’s suffrage guaranteeing that the right to vote cannot be denied due to gender (male/female) extended to only U.S. Citizens.
- 12) Twenty-fourth Amendment (once): does not allow States to deny a U.S. Citizen the right to vote by requiring a poll tax.

⁸⁸ The Constitution for the United States, Article 1, Section 5, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art1.asp#1sec5

⁸⁹ A compilation of pages, 331 to 400 of the History of Congress

- 13) Twenty-fifth Amendment (twice): establishes that both the House and the Senate can seat a Vice President in the case of a vacancy and a two-thirds vote of both houses to remove the President when he is unable to discharge his duties.
- 14) Twenty-sixth Amendment (once): extends the right to vote to any U.S. Citizen person eighteen years of age.

Clearly, the Constitution demands that only a U.S. Citizen has the right to vote regardless of race or gender and the States cannot use a poll tax and yet the general government (all three branches) have done everything possible to make it impossible for States to ensure only citizens are voting by requiring Identification at the polls.

What should have happened:

- 1) The federal court should have rejected this case due to jurisdiction and standing and advised the plaintiff that he needed to exercise his right of petition.
 - a. The jurisdiction of the federal court again is based upon things arising under the Constitution. There is nothing delegated to the federal government to ensure that all votes are to be equal. The amendments in the Constitution ensures that no one can be denied their ability to vote on account of race, sex, tax, or age – nothing guaranteeing all votes are equal except the equal suffrage for the States in the Senate in Article I and V.
 - b. A First Amendment petition would have shifted the matter to a Constitutional enforcement instead of a financial endeavor with the legal system.
 - c. This also would have held the State Legislature accountable to their oaths and had they not redressed the grievances they would have been removed for violating their oath of office.
- 2) The court should have also advised the State to use the federal model of the Republican Form of government; thus, preserving the laws and liberties of the people and their county governments.

Consequently, the carte blanche wiping out of county suffrage was not only unconstitutional, it was unconscionable.

One Person One Vote

As just stated, the four amendments regarding voting never addressed the equality of suffrage over government suffrage. Therefore, the desire for a Democratic form of government is not constitutional. Once an amendment has properly passed the Article V process instituting a Democracy that allows 50 percent plus one vote to determine political outcomes, then a person can take a matter to the federal courts regarding the power of their vote. Currently this is not a matter under federal jurisdiction due to Article III stipulating that only those things arising under this Constitution is within the federal jurisdiction.

Baker v. Carr set the stage, or as legal beagles like to say, set precedence, for extending a totalitarian despotism upon the State with the subsequent case Reynolds v. Sims (1964). The case is summarized as follows with comments in *red italics*:

“1. The right of suffrage is denied by debasement or dilution of a citizen's vote in a state or federal election. *This does not arise under the federal Constitution, nor is this congruent with the framework of our Republican Form of government.*

2. Under the Equal Protection Clause, a claim of debasement of the right to vote through malapportionment presents a justiciable controversy, and the Equal Protection Clause provides manageable standards for lower courts to determine the constitutionality of a state legislative apportionment scheme. Baker v. Carr, followed. *The underlined assertions do not conform to the original definition stipulated by Congress in authoring the Fourteenth Amendment. This is blatant evolutionary*

redefining via interpretation by the court – a power not granted to the court within the federal Constitution.

3. The Equal Protection Clause requires substantially equal legislative representation for all citizens in a State regardless of where they reside.

(a) Legislators represent people, not areas.

(b) Weighting votes differently according to where citizens happen to reside is discriminatory.

Bullet 3 and its sub bullets, in its entirety, does not conform to the original definition stipulated by Congress in authoring the Fourteenth Amendment. This is blatant evolutionary redefining via interpretation by the court – a power not granted to the court within the federal Constitution.

4. The seats in both houses of a bicameral legislature must, under the Equal Protection Clause, be apportioned substantially on a population basis.

The original definition stipulated by Congress in authoring the Fourteenth Amendment, this also violates how Article IV section 3 of the federal Constitution was stipulated as well as originally executed by Congress in admitting States into the Union – wiping the minimal Congressional standards of States joining the Union.

5. The District Court correctly held that the existing Alabama apportionment scheme and both of the proposed plans are constitutionally invalid, since neither legislative house is or would thereunder be apportioned on a population basis. *Referring to the congressionally accepted Alabama Constitution of 1819 and how counties were recognized as the basis of apportionment.*⁹⁰ *Thus violating how Article IV section 3 of the federal Constitution was stipulated as well as originally executed by Congress in admitting Alabama into the Union – wiping the minimal Congressional standards of States joining the Union.*

6. The superficial resemblance between one of the Alabama apportionment plans and the legislative representation scheme of the Federal Congress affords no proper basis for sustaining that plan, since the historical circumstances which gave rise to the congressional system of representation, arising out of compromise among sovereign States, are unique and without relevance to the allocation of seats in state legislatures. *The arrogance of the court becomes clear, that due to their illiteracy of the Constitution, they are going to redo the government that the framers and "We the People" instituted into democracies.*

7. The federal constitutional requirement that both houses of a state legislature must be apportioned on a population basis means that, as nearly as practicable, districts be of equal population, though mechanical exactness is not required. Somewhat more flexibility may be constitutionally permissible for state legislative apportionment than for congressional districting.

(a) A state legislative apportionment scheme may properly give representation to various political subdivisions and provide for compact districts of contiguous territory if substantial equality among districts is maintained.

⁹⁰ Alabama : Constitution of 1819, The Avalon Project, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/ala1819.asp

(b) Some deviations from a strict equal population principle are constitutionally permissible in the two houses of a bicameral state legislature, where incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy, so long as the basic standard of equality of population among districts is not significantly departed from.

(c) Considerations of history, economic or other group interests, or area alone do not justify deviations from the equal population principle.

(d) Insuring some voice to political subdivisions in at least one legislative body may, within reason, warrant some deviations from population-based representation in state legislatures.

Regarding bullet 7-7d, there is NO requirement in the federal constitution that both houses of a state legislature must be apportioned on a population basis. The requirement is that all States must be Republican in form. This is clearly an attempt by the court to unconstitutionally redefine something that conflicts with how the original States and subsequently all States were formed in a similar fashion based on governments instituted by "We the People" versus the court controlling all things, which would make a Judiciary form of government or restore a Magistrate form of government. This fabrication and ruling is literally a violation of the Constitution by changing the Republican forms of governments instituted by "We the People."

8. In admitting States into the Union, Congress does not purport to pass on all constitutional questions concerning the character of state governmental organization, such as whether a state legislature's apportionment departs from the equal population principle; in any case, congressional approval could not validate an unconstitutional state legislative apportionment.

Only Congress has the "responsibility" to admit States into the Union, not the court, each State being independent and sovereign with the ultimate decision of self-determination – becoming an equal-footed Party to the Constitution, not the court, and now we are to believe that the court 150 years later now has the authority to form or reform States and their form of government?

9. States, consistently with the Equal Protection Clause, can properly provide for periodic revision of reapportionment schemes, though revision less frequent than decennial would be constitutionally suspect.

More arrogance and despotism...

10. Courts should attempt to accommodate the relief ordered to the apportionment provisions of state constitutions as far as possible, provided that such provisions harmonize with the Equal Protection Clause.

Here the court is aggrandizing the lower courts roles to become partakers in the insurrection against the Constitution fully believing their powers are omnipotent – without regard to the State Constitution and "We the People."

11. A court, in awarding or withholding immediate relief, should consider the proximity of a forthcoming election and the mechanics and complexities of election laws, and should rely on general equitable principles.

Everyone wants more if not everything for themselves... why shouldn't we expect the courts to seize all powers regarding the reformation of a government?

12. The District Court properly exercised its judicial power in this case by ordering reapportionment of both houses of the Alabama Legislature for purposes of 1962 elections as a temporary measure by using the best parts of the two proposed plans, each of which it had found, as a whole, invalid, and in retaining jurisdiction while deferring a hearing on the issuance of a final injunction.

One would be astonished if this court would not praise a lower court for following their agenda.”⁹¹

Before concluding on the destructive role these cases have played in perverting the government that only “We the People” can institute, take a minute to review the following entry in the Wyoming Constitution and note how there is no real information regarding the authority of this change, the date when it was changed, just an ambiguous reference to some principle.

“This section is inconsistent with the application of the “one person, one vote” principle under circumstances as they presently exist in Wyoming. Consequently, the Wyoming legislature may disregard this provision when reapportioning either the senate or the house of representatives.”⁹²

Since when is an arbitrary principle that has been fabricated by the courts that supports a Democratic form of government and not a Republican form of government have any validity? This principle conflicts with our founding principles as cited by Madison that “THE AUTHORITY OF CONSTITUTIONS OVER GOVERNMENTS, AND OF THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE OVER CONSTITUTIONS, ARE TRUTHS WHICH ARE AT ALL TIMES NECESSARY TO BE KEPT IN MIND.” There is no room in our Republican form of government for mob rule or a simple democracy as the court unconstitutionally inflicted upon all the States in the Union. This must be undone by the people and their representatives since only our legislatures create law.

Regarding a Republican Form of Government

The Divine Design

To repeat that the two fundamental factors of a Republican Form of government is 1) that it be representative (where representatives extend suffrage for those whom they represent) and 2) that the Law is our King. Consequently, to illustrate the importance in our unique form of Republicanism, “We the People” select representatives for our county, state, and federal legislative bodies to represent our suffrage in a house of representatives. This is our bicameral legislative system. In addition, the government we institute is to have their suffrage in the Senate above them. In other words, the County Legislature has their suffrage extended in the State Senate and the State Legislature has their suffrage extended in the U.S. Senate. This suffrage was so important that in the U.S. Senate the Constitution protected the State Legislatures suffrage within Article V which states: “Provided that no Amendment which may be made... that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.”⁹³

Clearly, the framers understood the importance of the unique checks and balances that were integrated into the Constitutional framework – ensuring that the desires of the people or the States wanting unconstitutional entitlements from the federal government would be kept in check if for some reason these federal representatives, or even the President would become corrupt and attempt to assume RPPs that are not delegated.

Corruption began permeating through the federal and state governments when key framers began to pass away. Madison was one of the few framers that tried not to intervene, in government affairs except when it came to his

⁹¹ Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533 (1964), June 15, 1964, <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/377/533/>

⁹² Wyoming State Constitution, 1890, <https://sos.wyo.gov/Forms/Publications/WYConstitution.pdf>

⁹³ The Constitution for the United States, Article V, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art5.asp

and his close friend Thomas Jefferson's work. Prior to his passing James Madison witnessed encroachments that laid a foundation for the perversion of our entire government apparatus from the County to the federal. Putting aside the Organic Act and the unconstitutional shift from what should have been singularly a Republican Form of Government into a Party (i.e. the Uni-Party or the two Party system) Form of Government, a Judiciary/Magistrate Form, and a Corporate Form of Government, encroachments of the RRPPs that were not enumerated in the Constitution for the United States were still somewhat hindered until the early twentieth century when President's Theodore Roosevelt, Howard Taft, and Woodrow Wilson sought to unconstitutionally grow, regulate, and spend their way into making America into prosperous.

One key for the globalist agenda was to take away the State suffrage since the States were still resisting federal assumption of unconstitutional RRPPs; thus, during the first progressive era in America (i.e. the late 1800's into the early nineteen hundreds), the progressive activists in government submitted the Seventeenth Amendment to obscure the State Legislatures suffrage in the Senate. Though they succeeded in passing the Amendment as a consequence of the rampant illiteracy of the Constitution, the problem with the Seventeenth Amendment was that it only changed the process of the selection of Senators from the State Legislature to a statewide popular vote system. This was done due to the old adage, "he who pays the piper calls the tune," creating the paradigm that the people would be the piper, since the process was a democratic one (i.e. an open election). The reality was this freed up access for deep pockets to be able to buy and control the Senate, since it is the financial contributions that buys political loyalty – while the voters had become lazy, offering blind loyalty in the form of votes for their Party and who the Party supported.

The truth, the Seventeenth Amendment actually failed; however, due to the aforementioned Constitutional illiteracy that was rampant in America, everyone still to this day believes the Seventeenth Amendment has taken away the States suffrage in the Senate; however, the point in fact is it did not. The Seventeenth Amendment simple changed the process of how Senators were to be appointed to serve the State in the Senate, but the Seventeenth Amendment failed to address the Article V Amendment Protection clause. This clause is so well disguised that not one legal school mentions it, nor can you find a reference to the "Amendment Protection Clause" in an internet search. Thomas Jefferson made a sub reference to this Clause in the Fifth Resolution of the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 – regarding the stopping of the importation of Slaves in the year 1808, which was the other form of Amendment Protection in Article V. As previously asserted State Legislatures suffrage on matters before the U.S. Senate cannot be denied without their consent and the Seventeenth Amendment did not meddle with the State's suffrage in the Senate, only the appointment process. This means the Senators are still constitutionally required to represent their State Legislatures suffrage and nothing else. We address this matter in a more detailed article titled "Rescinding the 17th Amendment,"⁹⁴ as to how this Amendment does not need to be repealed only rescinded.

This same paradigm of bi-cameral legislative processes is applied within the state legislatures; however, we have proven how the federal court has overreached their jurisdiction and authority and unconstitutionally legislated amendments to the State Constitutions. The courts have no such authority within the State of federal Constitutions – this is purely a usurpation of power akin to the courts usurpation of legislative powers.

In contrast to all other governments that have ever existed, one should clearly see that through the intricacies in the design of the Constitution, and how most of the framers either could not comprehend or chose to obfuscate these critical checks and balances in our system, which directly speaks to the Divine inspiration involved in the Design. HE gave us a self-governance, that would function much like our immune system, if "We the People" (i.e. the body)

⁹⁴ G. R. Mobley, 2018, Rescinding of the 17th Amendment,
http://www.reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/Rescinding_the_17th_Amendment.pdf

focused on compliance to the Supreme Law and not perverted or sanctimonious versions of it. Metaphorically speaking, this is only the tip of the iceberg in regard to the checks and balances integrated into our hybrid Constitutional Republic. “We the People” are the greatest check upon government – but only when we seek full compliance to the Constitution.

Reclaiming our Republic

Without trying to incite a doctrinal dispute, in the Christian paradigm, for one to generally save one’s soul, one must immerse oneself in scripture and mingle with HIM and the HOLY SPIRIT in HIS word and be born of water and of the Spirit to enter into the Kingdom of God. With regard to our Constitution, there is the simplicity, which makes it so easy for deniers attempt refute it because it is too simply for them to understand. To save the soul of this nation that HE gave us, we only need to demand that HIS law (i.e. the Constitution) that HE inspired be fully complied to.

Remember our Republican Form of government is based upon the Law being supreme; consequently, compliance to the LAW (i.e. the Constitution) is essential. Almost two centuries ago, the Uni-Party began persuading America that as long as both a majority of our legislatures (i.e. federal, state, and county) can compromise of doing something in creating law, the law is legitimate. This is antithetical to the concept of our enumerated Constitutions – those few delegated RRPP’s granted. Stated differently, if it is not enumerated our legislatures cannot meddle with it. Therefore, as long as We the People are allow the Uni-Party the latitude to violate our Constitutions with their unconstitutional compromising powers we will suffer as a nation. In an economic paradigm, one cannot apply mercantile or communist practices to a free market economy and expect that a free market economy to thrive, which is why the unconstitutional regulations being applied to our economy are sending this Republic into the arms of a new world order – one where **ALL** are subjugated.

In the same vein, the only way to heal our Republican Form of government is to demand an end to the application of political compromise being unconstitutionally applied at our county, state and federal legislatures. Instead, we must demand the full compliance and application of the Constitution. A subsequent article will address very specific Constitutional applications and processes that if “We the People” demand compliance to the Constitution – “We the People” will get it.

Resuming Our Republicanism

We only need to demand the government that was given – it is still there but our public servants have perverted it and the following will prove this:

Placing context to today and how the corruption of our system has produced this rotting republic, that the truth of the Constitution has been literally obviated and that our perverted education and legal systems are the sources of this systemic corruption; along with the afore matter, the following must be included to provide irrefutable evidence, that if “We the People” demand full compliance to the Constitution, we can end all forms of tyranny coming from the various levels of government.

This is why we must challenge the government we are being given and demand the government as designed and as the Constitution still dictates as inspired by the Divine Hand of Providence. To do this we have to challenge how we are being represented not just in the county, but in the State as well as Congress. Doing this will expose how our Electoral College has been equally perverted as an extension of our representation, which will also fix the Electoral College and in turn place us on a path of restoring our control of our elections.

First, we must challenge our constitutional “representation” based upon arbitrary apportionment. The representation guaranteed by the Constitution for the United States that has not constitutionally changed; therefore, we are being robbed of our suffrage in our federal government.

On September 17 1787, at the end of the Constitutional Convention, as the Constitution was being readied to be sent to for final changes, James Madison entered into his notes on the Constitutional Convention, the following exchange:

"Mr. GORHAM said if it was not too late he could wish, for the purpose of lessening objections to the Constitution, that the clause declaring "the number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every forty thousand" which had produced so much discussion, might be yet reconsidered, in order to strike out 40,000 & insert "thirty thousand." This would not he remarked establish that as an absolute rule, but only give Congress a greater latitude which could not be thought unreasonable.

Mr. KING & Mr. CARROL seconded & supported the idea of Mr. Gorham.

When the PRESIDENT rose, for the purpose of putting the question, he said that although his situation had hitherto restrained him from offering his sentiments on questions depending in the House, and it might be thought, ought now to impose silence on him, yet he could not forbear expressing his wish that the alteration proposed might take place. It was much to be desired that the objections to the plan recommended might be made as few as possible. The smallness of the proportion of Representatives had been considered by many members of the Convention an insufficient security for the rights & interests of the people. He acknowledged that it had always appeared to himself among the exceptionable parts of the plan, and late as the present moment was for admitting amendments, he thought this of so much consequence that it would give . much satisfaction to see it adopted .

No opposition was made to the proposition of Mr. Gorham and it was agreed to unanimously.

On the question to agree to the Constitution enrolled in order to be signed. It was agreed to all the States . answering ay."⁹⁵

The "PRESIDENT" of the convention was George Washington who seldom broke his silence to allow the House, or the convention to work out the details of the Constitution. Clearly, his preference of restricting the representation of "We the People" could not exceed 30,000 citizens per representative. This reduction was paramount, instead of the 40,000 that was originally in Article I Section 2. With the number of representatives set to not exceed 30,000 citizens during the configuration periods of Congressional Districts, the only way this number could be adjusted is through a Constitutional Amendment. The point in fact that this number cannot be changed without an Amendment is proven in that the process of making the Bill of Rights, many of the States requested an Amendment that would facilitate a gradual increase to this number as the Republic grew. During the ratification of the federal Constitution, the states of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Virginia all requested an amendment to the Constitution be provided to ensure adjustments can be made due to the physical limitations of accommodating a large body of representatives. Consequently, the following was inscribed into the Constitution: "The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty thousand, but each State shall have at least one Representative."⁹⁶

For over two centuries this Republic existed where physical accommodations were necessary because our current technology did not exist to facilitate virtual meetings and the conducting of legislative matters. Physical space was required to facilitate the assembly representatives while in session within the chambers of the House of Representatives. Over time they added 435 seats and this was to be the final addition. Putting aside the point of fact

⁹⁵ James Madison, 17 September 1787, Notes on the Debates in the Federal Convention, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/debates_917.asp

⁹⁶ The Constitution for the United States, Article I Section 2, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art1.asp#1sec2

that apportionment was fixed within the Constitution, Congress had a choice, to either increase the size of the chamber, build a new chamber to accommodate growth, or amend the Constitution. Here is the Divine Hand of Providence, because had Congress requested an Amendment to give them the power to determine reapportionment for the people's representatives. I believe the States would have granted it, allowing for continual growth of the House would create challenges for established powers bases. Keep in mind, the Constitution demands that our government is to be Republican in Form and not a powerbase of political factions. With the diluting of our representation by having to share our representative with more and more people, "We the People" would have been kicked to the curb so-to-speak. As our luck would have it, Congress decided to violate the Constitution and use legislation which they had no authority to pass the "Reapportionment Act of 1929"⁹⁷ capping the number of representatives at 435. Furthermore, President Hoover signed this Act into law, and as such he and Congress deliberately violated their oaths of office to support the Constitution.

The Reapportionment Act of 1929

This tyrannical Act, was a usurpation of the power of "We the People" in the People's House. Congress decided that doing the right thing (i.e. retaining our Republican Form of Government) would be too difficult and the bonus for Congress would be they would be able to marginalize "We the People" the more they can water down our representation. To be clear, Congress had played shenanigans out the gate in redefining representation – something they did not have the authority to do, and our State Legislatures were literally none the wiser, since access to this information was always left to supposedly the bright legal minds of the time. All of which were on board with the agenda of aggrandizing unconstitutional powers to the federal government. Therefore, the less power "We the People" could exert gave more room for politicians to compromise more and more of our property and rights away. Remember James Madison considered our property and our rights were synonymous.

As a short aside after the Constitution was ratified, Hamilton transformed the Federalists into a faction of big government. It was Hamilton who was consistently pushing the boundaries with the unconstitutional legislation such as the Assumption Act, A Tax on the sale of Horse (which failed), the creation of a National Bank constantly using the argument that there were implied powers within the Constitution. However, in the Federalist Papers, in response to the Anti-Federalist charges that the new federal government would use implication to assume powers not delegated Hamilton constantly asserted that federal government could only execute the enumerated objects. So which Hamilton was telling the truth or did it matter? It didn't matter because the Federalist Papers did not matter they were editorial arguments in the newspaper and not the legal arguments provided during the Ratification Debates and during the Ratification Debates the Constitution was consistently justified that only those enumerated objects were granted – no general powers or implied powers existed in the Constitution. Consequently, the positions Hamilton was making in asserting implied powers were violations of the established stipulations of the terms and definitions provided during the Ratification of the Constitution; thus, Hamilton was the key character responsible for perverting the powers initially in the federal governments first eleven years of operation.

On the bright side, one positive outcome from the recent pandemic proved that Congress no longer needed to be in chambers and that virtual meetings as well as segmented meetings proved more than sufficient for our Representatives to do their damage – yet pushing in a massive influx of new blood would not only upset the power base it would and should restore "We the People's" power over our House. We can go over the significant merits of making this a reality besides completely displacing the House portion of the SWAMP – suffice it to say that this will actually reduce their cost to "We the People" and make them available all year round to "We the People." However,

⁹⁷ The Permanent Apportionment Act of 1929, June 11, 1929, <https://history.house.gov/Historical-Highlights/1901-1950/The-Permanent-Apportionment-Act-of-1929/>

before we dive that deep into the pool to take a victory lap, we must focus on the bigger picture and how this would affect the Electoral College.

The Electoral College

First and foremost, we are not to have a direct democracy. The framers understood the sheer size of the Republic and its growth potential would make it impossible for a single man let alone a field of men to effectively travel around the country to campaign for the Presidency. This was the function of the Electors who would campaign in an election on some form of ballot for the voters to choose who would represent them in forming the Electoral College. Again, our Republican Form of government denied the use of direct democracy for anything other than our “representatives.” Appendix A provides insights into how the Electoral College was applied and those names who were nominated for were not to appear on any of the ballots cast by the voters – only the names of those who sought to be the Elector for the people were presented to the voters.

Keep in mind that the larger portion of the Electoral College is directly tied to the House of Representatives eligibility standards. Based upon the Constitutional set number that a representative cannot exceed representing anything more than Thirty Thousand citizens, the House of Representatives would grow to roughly Eleven Thousand Fifty representatives in the House of Representatives if all people in America were U.S citizens and eligible voters. Also keep in mind we exposed in a previous article that according to the Fourteenth Amendment, as well as the Fifteenth, Nineteenth, the Twenty-Fourth, and the Twenty-sixth Amendments, only U.S. citizens eligible to vote had the right to apportionment and voting. This means that those invaders who are here – even those who supposedly received citizenship unconstitutionally, are not entitled to apportionment or access to voting, and based upon Article IV are to be repelled from the States. Therefore, deducting a conservative estimate of illegals/invaders being Forty million, this number would be roughly 9700 representatives; however, there are other factors that need to be presented before we really settle on what our Constitution would dictate as reasonable representation.

There are always those who pause at the thought of a person who has unconstitutionally (i.e. illegally) received their citizenship are no longer citizens. Technically they never really were. When a person buys what they believe is a legitimately owned piece of art, say a Monet, and come to find out the piece was illegally possessed (i.e. stolen) by the seller, are they still entitled to the ownership? No, of course not! Illegitimate acts, even by government, are not legitimate. They may get away with enforcing them but the parties to the Compact can always force their government into their rightful framework. This concept and process will come in a subsequent article; in addition to the proper process to be applied that must be applied will be a subsequent article.

In addition, the Executive, Legislative, nor the Judiciary can use arbitrary rules or make things up as they go along. Remember, *all* laws must be in pursuance to those few things enumerated in the Constitution. Therefore, those who seek details will discover the beauty of the Constitution and how demanding compliance redresses all of our major problems politically. That said, the Electoral College representation will match the number of seats in Congress. Stated differently, just because Congress may have passed Acts and laws to do things does not mean that these Acts and laws are applicable to the States.

Because it is clearly apparent that we cannot count on the federal government, including the courts, to acknowledge our right of representation not to exceed Thirty Thousand according to the Constitution, then how can we get the proper and or reasonable representation as the framers were inspired to establish? Only HE knew what we would be facing and it must be repeated to ad nauseam, that within the Bill of Rights, HE also gave us an Amendment that would allow “We the People” to use to obtain both Constitutional as well as reasonable representation in what is referred to as the original First Amendment to the Bill of Rights. Remember, this amendment was originally requested from Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Virginia – and was included in a list from these State Legislatures as Congress sought to create

the Bill of Rights in their first session, due to the promptings of James Madison. Hence, its inclusion in the First of the Twelve Amendments that was submitted to the States as follows:

“Article the first... After the first enumeration required by the first article of the Constitution, there shall be one Representative for every thirty thousand, until the number shall amount to one hundred, after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress, that there shall be not less than one hundred Representatives, nor less than one Representative for every forty thousand persons, until the number of Representatives shall amount to two hundred; after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress, that there shall not be less than two hundred Representatives, nor more than one Representative for every fifty thousand persons.”⁹⁸

Similar evidence has come forth regarding the First Amendment of the original Twelve Amendments in the Bill of Rights. This is the apportionment Amendment and it has been discovered that this was actually ratified by Connecticut; however, the paperwork was misfiled and was never submitted to Congress.⁹⁹ Overwhelming evidence has been brought forward that the original Thirteenth Amendment was actually ratified just like the apportionment amendment. This amendment was listed in State records that refute the assertion that the Thirteenth Amendment was not ratified. One such record arises in the State of Wyoming’s *The Compiled Laws of Wyoming*. This is a book that was commissioned by the territorial government of Wyoming in 1876 and within this published book one will find on page 35 of the pdf document or page XXIX of the book itself, one will find the original 13th Amendment as it was ratified in 1812.¹⁰⁰ Somehow, this one Amendment was unconstitutionally scrubbed from the Constitution as if it no longer exists. The irony regarding questionable amendments is that with the progressive amendments (i.e. the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Amendments) are included within the Constitution when substantial evidence has come forward indicating that these Amendments were not actually ratified. Though getting to the truth is paramount, this cannot be done without the full audit process and authority of the States instituting what is referred to as Republic Review.

America’s only option is to push forward using the political power of the people in creating a movement of “We the People” demanding to obtain “Full Compliance to the Constitution” By their public servants. Our current circumstances clearly demonstrate that there is no hope in getting Congress and those keepers of the power (i.e. the Uni-Party which is the two Party system of compromise) over our general government in Washington D.C. to: 1) investigate the truth – this is why they have been covering it up what they have been doing for centuries, 2) give us the truth, even if they did investigate – they would end up giving us another “magic-bullet theory”¹⁰¹ to obviate the truth, and 3) we cannot count on the courts to do what is right – they have not upheld the Constitution as the framers defined it for years and there is no sign that they will change. Remember it was the Warren Court that violated the Constitution that very decade, by reaching into the States and unconstitutionally reconfiguring them – wiping out our County governments that “We the People” instituted. It was the “Warren Commission” that also gave us the “magic-bullet theory” regarding the investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; thus, since the Robert’s Court has unconstitutionally instituted socialized healthcare, we cannot give them the chance to touch anything more so they can bend the facts and truth.

⁹⁸ Congress, 25 September 1789, The Bill of Rights, <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript>

⁹⁹ What about the Two Amendments and Three States that Got Away?
<https://teachingamericanhistory.org/resource/themes/amendments-and-states-that-got-away/> backup citation:
http://reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/TheApportionmentAmendment.pdf

¹⁰⁰ The Compiled Laws of Wyoming, 1876, http://reclaimingtherepublic.org/PDF_Docs/The_Compiled_Laws_of_Wyoming.pdf
- Gov citation: <https://archive.org/details/compiledlawswyo00whitgoog/page/n33/mode/2up>

¹⁰¹ Single-bullet theory, Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Single_bullet_theory

Therefore, if it could instill adequate representation for “We the People,” by using the ratification of the original First Amendment, this would change the number of members of the House of Representatives from Thirty Thousand to Fifty Thousand. Based upon the 2020 U.S. Census, the average county population, there being 3143 counties in America, would be ~105,237. Based upon the actual numbers there are 991 counties with 50,000 or greater citizens, which means there are 2152 counties with less than 50,000 citizens. All that said, based on population factoring in the conservative estimate of forty million invaders, and offering representation to all citizens who are considered eligible voters would mean we would have approximately forty-four hundred representatives and Electors representing “We the People.” Before swallowing this as a final number we first need to examine a few more things, such as actual citizens who are of the age of voting, since the parents of minors are to represent their children, excluding invaders and those who have removed themselves by becoming sovereign citizens, or those who have chosen to establish a shadow government, this includes the progressives as well as conservatives – this alone is another deep topic that must be fully discussed.

The best way to leverage the glaring problem with our elections is to tip this Republic back onto its wheels so we can take the steering wheel away from the globalist elitists. Every State in the Union has election integrity efforts and all of these fall flat because the source of the problem stems from specific Constitutional violations, that ironically, have some patriots embracing the very treasonous form of government (i.e. the Party’s, the bureaucracies, the courts, etc.) – not once challenging government at every level and in every facet that they claim they have the authority to act, based upon the Constitution. They don’t have the Constitutional Authority and this is their lie that even they believe blindly.

Our Federal Electoral Process

When it came to Federal elections for the general or executive positions, the framers instituted the authority at the State level to control these elections, where in Article I Section IV, the states left a door for the federal government to inject itself in being able to prescribe matters on the election of Representatives and Senators only as asserted:

“The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.”¹⁰²

Please note that this does not include the selection of Electors and the process of the Electoral College. One will find the Constitutional process defined in Article II Section 1 which states:

“Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.”¹⁰³

If necessary, reread the above to clearly delineate that Congress cannot set forth the “Times, Places and Manner” of holding Elections for the people to choose their Electors and forming the Electoral College.

Again, Appendix A, “The Choosing of the President and Vice President” provides the history as how this process was to operate, and unfortunately it was never standardized until 1836, when all but one State came to a standard process that the people choose each of the “Electors” and candidates for President were not on the ballot, just the Electors. By 1856, the Parties influence permanently subverted the Electoral College and ultimately seized full control of choosing the Electors as is unconstitutionally practiced today. This practice is

¹⁰² The Constitution for the United States, Article I Section 2, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art1.asp#1sec4

¹⁰³ The Constitution for the United States, Article II Section 1, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/art2.asp#2sec1

protected by those who have blindly embraced the Party apparatus as the way to unconstitutionally control our political system. We are not a Party Form of government, we are to be Republican in Form that fully supports the Constitution and not the Party or an agenda.

In the onset of the Republic When the federal Constitution was being ratified in the State Conventions, during the Massachusetts debate, Reverend Peter Thacher succinctly stated:

“The President is chosen by the electors, who are appointed by the people.”¹⁰⁴

June 1th 1788, Governor Randolph provides an extensive view of the Electors and how they are to campaign to be the people’s choice in choosing the President stating:

“The mode of their election must induce us to believe that they will be men of experience and information. The state will be laid off and divided into ten districts: from each of these a man is to be elected. **He {the Elector} must be really the choice of the people,** not the man who can distribute the most gold; for the riches of Croesus would not avail. The qualifications of the electors being the same as those of the representatives for the state legislatures, and the election being under the control of the legislature, the prohibitory provisions against undue means of procuring votes to the state representation extend to the federal representatives: the extension of the sphere of election to so considerable a district will render it impossible for contracted influence, or local intrigues, or personal interest, to procure an election. Inquiries will be made, by the voters, into the characters of the candidates. Greater talents, and a more extensive reputation, will be necessary to procure an election for the federal than for the state representation.”¹⁰⁵

Later in the same debates, Governor Randolph provided a clear stipulation in countering the Anti-Federalists stating:

“The electors must be elected by the people at large. To procure his reëlection, his influence must be coextensive with the continent. And there can be no combination between the electors, as they elect him on the same day in every state.”¹⁰⁶

After James Monroe and George Mason, spoke with opposition to the Electoral College, asserting that the State Legislatures would elect the President due to potentially a large field of candidates James Madison clarified the matter for the delegates in stating:

“It is observed that none of the honorable members objecting to this have pointed out the right mode of election. It was found difficult in the Convention, and will be found so by any gentleman who will take the liberty of delineating a mode of electing the President that would exclude those inconveniences which they apprehend. I would not contend against some of the principles laid down by some gentlemen, if the interests of some states only were to be consulted. But there is a great diversity of interests. The choice of the people ought to be attended to. I have found no better way of selecting the man in whom they place the highest confidence, than that delineated in the plan of the Convention; nor has the gentleman told us. Perhaps it will be found impracticable to elect him by the immediate

¹⁰⁴ Reverend Peter Thacher, February 02 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of Massachusetts, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. <https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/elliott.htm>

¹⁰⁵ Governor Randolph, 07 June 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of Virginia, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. <https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/elliott.htm>

¹⁰⁶ Governor Randolph, 17 June 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of Virginia, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. <https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/elliott.htm>

suffrages of the people. Difficulties would arise from the extent and population of the states. **Instead of this, the people choose the electors.**”¹⁰⁷

Mr. James Iredell, during the North Carolina Debates also provided the same clarity regarding how the people are to choose their Electors, who then will choose the President and Vice President in stating:

“By the proposed Constitution, the President is of a very different nature from a monarch. **He is to be chosen by electors appointed by the people;** to be taken from among the people; to hold his office only for the short period of four years; and to be personally responsible for any abuse of the great trust reposed in him.”¹⁰⁸

It is irrefutable that the Constitution dictates that the Electors represent “We the People.” We are to choose them and they are to choose the President and the Vice President. Neither the candidates, nor the Uni-Party has the Constitutional Authority to determine “tickets” that would tie the Electors hands into who would be Vice President based upon the Presidential Candidates choice. If the people and their Electoral College believe America would be better served by a Republican President and a Democratic Vice President, they have the Constitutional authority to make that choice. Instead we allow the Parties to control something that is not theirs to control. No worries – the Parties got together and compromised that **they** would allow the Constitution to be violated for their greater good. Appendix A, will provide an accurate snapshot of how each State executed the Electoral College and one will notice that it took decade for the States to finally allow the people to elect their Electors, only to see our legislatures hand over the power of the people to the Party system, where they can control the outcomes instead of the people.

A Party Form of Government

We first must define what a member of the Party is. A Party is a faction that represents things that are typically not constitutional (i.e. unconstitutional), such as an agenda for government to do something that violates the Constitution, such as regulating energy, healthcare, the environment, and on – many if not all of these objects are not enumerated in the federal Constitution and likely the States as well. Only those things that are enumerated in the Constitutional are open for political compromise; therefore, any RRPP that is not enumerated in the Constitution has no place in our politics other than the pursuit in amending the Constitution. This is because Politics by definition is the work of different factions coming to a compromise. Again, the only thing our politicians can compromise are those things that are enumerated such as war, to make it Constitutional. But we have a bigger problem – the question not asked is who does the Party represent?

Who Does the Party Represent?

Today, the Uni-Parties represent agendas and unconstitutional compromises and the one thing ALL Parties do not represent is the Constitution. It is ironic, that every elected politician takes an oath to actively “support” the Constitution and they are not obligated to support the Party, a person, an office, or even their constituents... only the Constitution. This is because there is no allowance for compromise under our national or state constitutions.

The Party claim is that the voter represents the Party that they vote for and this is how the Party has stolen our government, since the reality is that those few who are working in the Party in the county and State are actually a very small fraction of the people of the county and State. The Party claims that because you vote for their

¹⁰⁷ James Madison, 17 June 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of Virginia, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. <https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/elliott.htm>

¹⁰⁸ James Iredell, 26 July 1788, Debates in the Convention of the State of North Carolina, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. <https://constitution.org/1-Constitution/elliott.htm>

candidates, or in essence, buy their substandard products (i.e. politicians), this means that you are a Party member when in fact everyone is a free and independent voter capable of voting anyway they want when the ballot comes into their hands. How is it, then, that the Party can claim they represent you? Because in so doing, they have been able to steal control of our government and inflict their political system upon all of us.

If one looks for the accounting of Party membership, one will find that the Parties get away with determining this number by the outcome of the last election. The truth is those who actively go to Party meetings and are registered as a Party activist – these are the Party members and again the number is a significant minority in every county in contrast to the actual population. Because the Party placed context to how many bought (i.e. voted for) their candidates in the last election they actually have claimed that “We the People” have chosen a Party to represent us, yet we have no input into the platform, by laws, resolutions, etc.. Sadly, we have allowed them to steal this control and the truth is their control violates the Constitution in the following ways:

- 1) The Electoral College
 - a. The Party has you down select their candidate in primaries and then in a national convention. The Party operators, not “We the People” choose the final candidate if necessary.
 - b. The Parties choose the Electors at the State Party convention when “We the People” are to choose our Electors.
 - c. Winner takes all is a mob rule or a Democratic form of government, not a Republican form of government and the people’s choice being stripped from them in favor of democratic rule; this is repugnant to a Republican form of government.
- 2) The Primary
 - a. The Party wants to have a primary election that serves the Party only and they get “We the People” to pay for this election
 - b. Though Party operators are a significant minority, “We the People” pay for their primary election that supports their control over this very system
- 3) Ballot Access is based upon Constitutional criteria
 - a. The Two Parties have made unconstitutional barriers for a person to be on the ballot
 - b. There is no allowance for a person who wants to be a federal Senator or Representative to pay a fee or get a specified number of signatures on the ballot – this is predatory behavior where the party limits competition

Bottom line, the Party has unconstitutionally integrated itself into our governments at every level and their agenda has nothing to do with compliance to the Constitution. Compliance to the Constitution destroys the factions that they operate within and the old adage “united we stand divided we fall” is resonating at deafening levels, so yet too few are backing out of this gallimaufry of divisive factions.

The Weapons in the Constitution

Though this topic will be covered in the subsequent article, *The First Amendment Right Of Petition*, we have divulged already the primary weapons in the Constitution. Suffice it to mention these weapons now to help establish an immediate action plan, since action is long overdue.

- 1) First, in Article VI, the oath of office is required of all our public servants. Our public servants are legally bound to support the Constitution.
- 2) Second, “We the People” have the unalienable right to Petition Government for the redress of grievances.
- 3) Third, Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment makes any public servant ineligible to hold office if they fail to support the Constitution.

We have to also acknowledge that there are 3 levels of political swamps. There is a swamp in every county, state and federal government to some degree, whether our public servants are willing participants or whether they do not know any better – this is just the way things are done. This paradigm must come to an end. Thus, we need to

begin a campaign using these weapons we will refer to as First Amendment Petitions, in the county first and this will be explained in full detail in the aforementioned forthcoming article.

Displacement of the Swamps

One should have deduced that if we had proper representation based upon the Constitution, the Capitol in DC would be larger. If one investigates the facts regarding the original First Amendment one will find that it was properly ratified by Connecticut, but it was just improperly filed – by accident or on purpose does not matter, we cannot waste time seeking the facts be corrected. Instead, we need to begin with Petitions to restore our representation in the House of Representatives, the Electoral College, in the State Legislatures – restoring the county representation to the state senates and each county being guaranteed representation in the state house, as well as restoring our true representation in our counties.

The following is a basic laundry list of what needs to happen immediately based upon state Constitutions:

- 1) Petition and demand your county representative's sever county elections from the State election system and go to a paper, in person, 1 day election. Almost ALL if not ALL State Constitutions do not delegate to the State the power to dictate County elections and their processes.
- 2) Sever federal elections within the state from the federal election system – this is strictly a state responsibility and burden per the Constitution.
- 3) Petition your county representatives to restore the Constitutional representation by demanding and supporting the State's ratification of the original First Amendment.
- 4) Petition your county representatives to restore the Constitutional representation in the U.S. Senate by demanding the state's Senators in Congress comply with the State Legislatures demands of suffrage per Article V of the U.S. Constitution.
- 5) Also Petition and demand that your county representative's support and demand the rescinding the States Ratification of the Seventeenth Amendment and formally reject the Seventeenth Amendment changing the States formal position as Delaware successfully did in 2010.
- 6) Petition and demand that your county representative's support the restoration of the Electoral College and demand that "We the People" choose our Electors and remove Presidential candidate names from the ballot within the State.
- 7) Petition and demand that your county representatives support the restoration of the counties representation in the state senate and in the state house per the State Constitution and call out the overreach of the federal courts as an unacceptable violation of the Constitution.
- 8) Petition and demand that your county representatives support the establishment of a Constitutional Compliance committee made up of citizens elected by the people to definitize the Constitution for the United States and to audit the Constitution against the federal governments RRPPs to identify all violations and call up all counties to do the same in cooperating with your county in restoring the Supreme Law of the Land.
- 9) Upon the completion of the definitizing and auditing process, that the County representatives call for a County Constitutional Convention to evaluate and delegate those RRPPs the people wish their county government to possess and operate.
- 10) Once three-fourths of the Counties have established their Constitutions – they will then call for a State Constitutional Convention and reframe the State Constitution accordingly to serve both the Counties and "We the People" of the State more appropriately.

Conclusion

It is almost common knowledge that most counties in every State are "red" or what some refer to as conservative. Consequently, if every State was following the federal model of a Republican Form of government – having the counties have equal suffrage in the Senate, the Senate in every State House would likely be red. In like manner, if every State was following the federal model of a Republican Form of government – having each

county guaranteed a minimum of one Representative, the House in the State house would be more red – if not red as well as the Senate.

If the “one person one vote” is constitutional then the framers would have instituted this model instead of the Republican Form of government the courts have been subverting over the past century.

Counties, as the Parties to the State compact, like States to the federal compact, can not only reclaim their authority, they can strengthen and reinforce it. How to do this will be in an upcoming article.

It is imperative to cite Madison one more time, regarding the authority of the Parties over their compact and that we cannot allow ourselves, and the governments we institute – to surrender our sovereignty to a court that does not have jurisdiction over the matter. It is a very rare occasion indeed when a court and or an officer of the court will not seek to convince one to take all matters to the court regardless of jurisdiction. This is why Madison stated:

“that dangerous powers, not delegated, may not only be usurped and executed by the other departments, but that the judicial department, also, may exercise or sanction dangerous powers beyond the grant of the Constitution; and, consequently, that the ultimate right of the parties to the Constitution, to judge whether the compact has been dangerously violated, must extend to violations by one delegated authority as well as by another--by the judiciary as well as by the executive, or the legislature.

However true, therefore, it may be, that the judicial department is, in all questions submitted to it by the forms of the Constitution, to decide in the last resort, ***this resort must necessarily be deemed the last in relation to the authorities of the other departments of the government; not in relation to the rights of the parties to the constitutional compact, from which the judicial, as well as the other departments, hold their delegated trusts. On any other hypothesis, the delegation of judicial power would annul the authority delegating it;*** and the concurrence of this department with the others in usurped powers, might subvert forever, and beyond the possible reach of any rightful remedy, the very Constitution which all were instituted to preserve.

The truth declared in the resolution being established, the expediency of making the declaration at the present day may safely be left to the temperate consideration and candid judgment of the American public. It will be remembered, that a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is solemnly enjoined by most of the state constitutions, and particularly by our own, as a necessary safeguard against the danger of degeneracy, to which republics are liable, as well as other governments, though in a less degree than others. And a fair comparison of the political doctrines not unfrequent at the present day, with those which characterized the epoch of our revolution, and which form the basis of our republican constitutions, will best determine whether the declaratory recurrence here made to those principles ought to be viewed as unseasonable and improper, or as a vigilant discharge of an important duty. ***The authority of constitutions over governments, and of the sovereignty of the people over constitutions, are truths which are at all times necessary to be kept in mind; and at no time, perhaps, more necessary than at present.***”¹⁰⁹

How can one not see how the federal courts have been annulling the authority of the States and more importantly, the Counties? This final line absolutely contradicts the revisionist assertions by activist jurists, that THE AUTHORITY OF CONSTITUTIONS OVER GOVERNMENTS, AND OF THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE OVER CONSTITUTIONS, ARE TRUTHS WHICH ARE AT ALL TIMES NECESSARY TO BE KEPT IN MIND. This means the

¹⁰⁹ Report on the Virginia Resolutions, James Madison, January 1800, Para 24, 25, & 26, <https://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch8s42.html>

authority of the Constitutions over the courts (i.e. governments) and the sovereignty of the people over Constitutions and the governments we institute!

APPENDIX A:

The Choosing of the President and Vice President

<u>1788</u>	
Electors appointed by state legislature.	Connecticut
	Georgia
	New Jersey
	New York(a)
	South Carolina
Two electors appointed by state legislature. Each remaining elector chosen by state legislature from the two most popular candidates in each U.S. House district.	Massachusetts
Each elector chosen by voters statewide; however, if no candidate wins majority, state legislature appoints electors from top ten candidates.	New Hampshire
State divided into electoral districts, with one elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Virginia(b)
	Delaware
Electors chosen at large by voters.	Maryland
	Pennsylvania
State had not yet ratified the Constitution.	North Carolina
	Rhode Island
<u>1792</u>	
State is divided into electoral districts, with one elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Kentucky
	Virginia
Each elector chosen by voters statewide.	Maryland
	Pennsylvania
Two congressional districts chose five electors each; the remaining two districts chose three electors. Each elector chosen by majority vote of voters in congressional district. If an insufficient number of electors are chosen by majority vote from a congressional district, remaining electors would be appointed by the state legislature.	Massachusetts
Each elector chosen by majority vote of voters statewide. If an insufficient number of electors are chosen by majority vote, runoff is held between the top 2n vote-getters, where n is the number of vacancies remaining.	New Hampshire
Each elector appointed by the state legislature.	Connecticut
	Delaware
	Georgia
	New Jersey
	New York
	North Carolina
	Rhode Island
	South Carolina
	Vermont
<u>1796</u>	
Each Elector appointed by the state legislature.	Connecticut

	Delaware
	New Jersey
	New York
	Rhode Island
	South Carolina
	Vermont
State is divided into electoral districts, with one Elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Kentucky
	Maryland
	North Carolina
	Virginia
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	Georgia
	Pennsylvania
Two Electors appointed by the state legislature. Each remaining Elector chosen by the state legislature from list of top two vote-getters in each Congressional district	Massachusetts
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide; however, if no candidate wins majority, the state legislature appoints Elector from top two candidates.	New Hampshire
Divided the state into three electoral districts and named three persons from each county in each district to elect an elector for each of the three districts.	Tennessee
1800	
State is divided into electoral districts, with one Elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Maryland
	North Carolina
State is divided into two electoral districts and half the electors are chosen from each district.	Kentucky
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	Rhode Island
	Virginia
Divided the state into three electoral districts and named three persons from each county in each district to elect an elector for each of the three districts (same as in 1796).	Tennessee
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	All other states
1804	
Each elector appointed by state legislature.	Connecticut
	Delaware
	Georgia
	New York
	South Carolina
	Vermont
Each elector chosen by voters statewide.	New Hampshire
	New Jersey
	Ohio
	Pennsylvania
	Rhode Island
	Virginia
State is divided into electoral districts, with one elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	North Carolina
	Maryland

	Tennessee
State is divided into two electoral districts and half the electors are chosen from each district.	Kentucky
Two electors chosen by voters statewide. One elector chosen per Congressional district in a statewide vote.	Massachusetts
1808	
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	Connecticut
	Delaware
	Georgia
	Massachusetts
	New York
	South Carolina
	Vermont
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	New Hampshire
	New Jersey
	Ohio
	Pennsylvania
	Rhode Island
	Virginia
State is divided into two electoral districts and half the electors are chosen from each district.	Kentucky
State is divided into electoral districts, with one Elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Maryland
	North Carolina
	Tennessee
1812	
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	Connecticut
	Delaware
	Georgia
	Louisiana
	New Jersey
	New York
	North Carolina
	South Carolina
	Vermont
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	New Hampshire
	Ohio
	Pennsylvania
	Rhode Island
	Virginia
State is divided into three electoral districts, with four Electors chosen per district by the voters of each district.	Kentucky
State is divided into electoral districts, with one Elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Maryland
	Tennessee
Two electors chosen by voters statewide One elector chosen per Congressional district in a statewide vote.	Massachusetts
1816	

Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	Connecticut
	Delaware
	Georgia
	Indiana
	Louisiana
	Massachusetts
	New York
	South Carolina
	Vermont
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	New Hampshire
	New Jersey
	North Carolina
	Ohio
	Pennsylvania
	Rhode Island
	Virginia
State is divided into three electoral districts, with four Electors chosen per district by the voters of each district.	Kentucky
State is divided into electoral districts, with one Elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Maryland
	Tennessee
1820	
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	Alabama
	Delaware
	Georgia
	Indiana
	Louisiana
	Missouri
	New York
	South Carolina
	Vermont
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	Connecticut
	Mississippi
	New Hampshire
	New Jersey
	North Carolina
	Ohio
	Pennsylvania
	Rhode Island
	Virginia
State divided into electoral districts, with one Elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Illinois
	Maryland
	Tennessee
State divided into three electoral districts, with four Electors chosen per district by the voters of each district, two Electors chosen by voters statewide and one Elector chosen per Congressional district by the voters of that district.	Kentucky
	Maine
	Massachusetts

1824	
Each elector chosen by voters statewide.	Alabama
	Connecticut
	Indiana
	Massachusetts
	Mississippi
	New Hampshire
	New Jersey
	North Carolina
	Ohio
	Pennsylvania
	Rhode Island
	Virginia
Each elector appointed by state legislature.	Delaware
	Georgia
	Louisiana
	New York
	South Carolina
	Vermont
State divided into electoral districts, with one elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Illinois
	Kentucky
	Maryland
	Missouri
Two electors chosen by voters statewide One elector chosen per congressional district by the voters of that district.	Tennessee
	Maine
1828	
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	Delaware
	South Carolina
State is divided into electoral districts, with one Elector chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Maryland
	Tennessee
Two Electors chosen by voters statewide. One Elector chosen per Congressional district by the voters of that district.	Maine
One Elector chosen per Congressional district by the voters of that district. Re-remaining two Electors chosen by the other Electors.	New York
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	All other states
1832	
State is divided into electoral districts, with one or more Electors chosen per district by the voters of that district.	Maryland
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	South Carolina
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	All other States
1836	
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	South Carolina
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	All other States
1840	
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	South Carolina

Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	All other States
<u>1844</u>	
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	South Carolina
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	All other States
<u>1848</u>	
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	South Carolina
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	All other States
<u>1852</u>	
Each Elector appointed by state legislature.	South Carolina
Each Elector chosen by voters statewide.	All other States
<u>1856</u>	
Democratic and Republican Party Primaries began taking over and perverting the Constitutional process of the people choosing their Electors where the Parties now choose the Electors and the people use a popular vote for President in the primaries, unconstitutionally reducing the field for the actual election and taking away the Electors choice of separately choosing the President the Vice President (i.e. no Party ticket allowed).	