

Sedition and Treason in the Confederation, the Usurpation of the Lawful Government, and the Ruination of the American Experiment.

FOUNDATION:

Some writer coined the phrase “American Experiment” some time ago. The “American Experiment” can be defined as, for the first time in written history, a chance to see if people can govern themselves without being governed by another. The only possible exception to this, in written history, might be the Celts and the Druidic Society that came out of Ireland and swept over Northern Europe many, many, many centuries ago. The Celts, who were free people, selected, elected, and held accountable all people entrusted to lead them. For all other instances, in written history, the people were ruled by a Monarch, other type of “royalty”, or by some despot. The people under these types of rulers were not free.

In 1774, the Colonies appointed Delegates to represent them in a Congress to address issues they were having at the time. The Articles of Association was an agreement between the Colonies to act in concert with one another realizing that their common interests were the same. In 1775, physical war broke out between them and the troops of the King’s (Great Britain) army at Lexington and Concord in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay. To this day no one is positive as to who fired first, but it is referred to as “the shot heard around the world”. Troops (militia) were raised in the Colonies to fight the British, Washington appointed as Commander-in-Chief, and yet, many were still holding out hope that reconciliation with the Mother Country could still take place.

By 1776, with Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* inspiring the average American and instilling the idea of independence, Congress was at a standstill deciding which direction they should go. By July, it was resolved that independence was the course. The Declaration of Independence, mostly written by Thomas Jefferson, was written, debated, agreed, and copies sent to, the now, States to be read before the public. One has to remember, that in 1776, the word “state” meant “nation” as in nation-state. These thirteen, lowly populated, financially and militarily weak, nations had the audacity to declare their independence from the most powerful nation on the planet and fight a war to win their independence.

Not only that but when one reviews the second to last sentence of the Declaration of Independence, it clearly shows what they *actually* declared:

“That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be **Free and Independent States**; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the **State of Great Britain**, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as **Free and Independent States**, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract

Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do”.

To translate this for the ill-informed public, the founders declared that those Colonies will now be free and independent nations (states) on par with Great Britain, France, Spain, Sweden, etc., and have the same rights as all other nations of the world. This was a very bold statement indeed and one that had NEVER been successfully accomplished in written history. Not even the Celts had to declare their independence from a previous ruler. **They created 13 nations, not one singular nation!** This is a fact that seems to be lost on historians and school textbooks everywhere.

Yet, the ideals they represented still resonate today. With a victory on the battle field at Ticonderoga (New York), they were able to approach France to illicit their help in this just cause. And help came, not only from the French but the Spanish too. Loans were able to be made in other European countries as well.

CONFEDERATION:

In late 1777, Congress resolved out of that august body, the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union, and passed it along to the States for their approval. On March 1, 1781, all thirteen nations had fully ratified the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union. This created a confederation of sovereign, independent states and was considered their “constitution” and the working law form for the Confederation. The States retained all their rights except those expressly enumerated in the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union. And remember, you cannot have a sovereign state unless the people in that state are also sovereign.

In October 1781, Washington, with the aid of the French navy and army, defeated Lord Cornwallis on the battlefield at Yorktown, Virginia. Articles of Capitulation were signed as the means of surrender. According to the Law of Nations, defeating a sovereign through conquest in battle, is a means of gaining sovereignty. Thus, these thirteen States were now truly sovereign. The “American Experiment” seemed to be going well indeed.

On April 26, 1783, Congress wrote an address to the states, keeping in mind that the peace treaty has not yet been signed, and thus, technically were still in a state of war. Here is the last paragraph of that address:

“Let it be remembered finally, that it has ever been the pride and boast of America, that the rights for which she contended, were the rights of human nature. By the blessing of the author of these rights, on the means exerted for their defence, they have prevailed against all opposition, and form the basis of thirteen independent states. No instance has heretofore occurred, nor can any instance be expected hereafter to occur, in which the unadulterated forms of Republican government can pretend to so fair an opportunity of

justifying themselves by their fruits. In this view the citizens of the United States are responsible for the greatest trust ever confided to a political society. If justice, good faith, honor, gratitude and all the other qualities which ennoble the character of a nation, and fulfil the ends of government, be the fruits of our establishments, the cause of liberty will acquire a dignity and lustre which it has never yet enjoyed; and an example will be set which cannot but have the most favourable influence on the rights of mankind. If on the other side, our governments should be unfortunately blotted with the reverse of these cardinal and essential virtues, the great cause which we have engaged to vindicate will be dishonored and betrayed; the last and fairest experiment in favour of the rights of human nature will be turned against them, and their patrons and friends exposed to be insulted and silenced by the votaries of tyranny and usurpation.”

There are four extremely important points made in just this one paragraph that still resonate today. The first is another statement re-emphasizing the thirteen independent states and NOT A SINGULAR COUNTRY. The notion that the founders created a singular country is purely false! They created thirteen countries, a point that is lost on historians and school textbooks today because the rulers today do not want you to know about the freedom the people and the states once actually had. The second is that the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union, besides being an international treaty (still recognized today!) among thirteen sovereign and independent states, and a compact (contract), is ALSO a trust that had been set up between those states and the people therein. The third is that the founders in declaring independence was trying to set something up that would be perpetual for the benefits and rights of mankind. The fourth, probably, is the very first reference to the “American Experiment” by the reference of “. . . fairest experiment . . .”, and another statement of human rights.

However, since the governing body of the Confederation, namely Congress, or more precisely the United States in Congress assembled, was very weak in terms of power since the states retained so much of theirs. One area Congress was the most weak was raising money to pay the debts incurred, both domestically and foreign, in gaining their independence. Millions of dollars had been borrowed. The economy was in shambles. One hope was to be able to sell off the new lands gained in the conquest, namely the Western (Northwest) territory. But that would be a very long process and not provide the finances needed to pay off the loans on time. Congress, having pledged the “faith of the United States” was very concerned regarding the destruction of that faith by not being able to pay off the loans on time.

Realizing that the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union was not a perfect document and that Congress was weak in certain areas and could not get the states to abide by their agreements and pay their portions of the overall expenses, Congress, on many occasions, passed resolutions and suggested revisions to the federal constitution to the states for their approval. One issue, besides the finances and the means to raise them, was that according to Article 13, is that any change to the Articles of

Confederation and perpetual Union had to be unanimous. Getting a majority can be difficult in dire times, let alone it having to be unanimous. Think about that in today's age.

The multiple suggestions for revisions to the federal constitution (at least 14 proposed additional Articles), the means to raise the necessary finances (at this point only agreed to by 10 states), and means to provide for the security of the states was fully supported by some states, partially supported by others, and other states refused or couldn't follow through on their obligations to the others.

Thus in 1786, by a resolution authorized by Congress, they finally agreed to a convention of Commissioners, to be appointed by each state to represent it, to discuss the necessary changes to the federal constitution. In order to make any changes to the federal constitution, let us look at Article 13 of the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union:

"Every state shall abide by the determinations of the united states in congress assembled, on all questions which by this confederation are submitted to them. 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."

For those who are not knowledgeable with the first federal constitution, let us review this Article (shown above). The first sentence needs no explanation. The second sentence has many portions to it. The Union shall be perpetual, as in never ending unless it was decided to eliminate it by unanimous consent. This is important because that NEVER happened, and thus, it still exists today but is unoccupied. The last portion is of utmost importance because that is where the eventual sedition and treason occurs.

Let us look at this portion closely,

"unless such alteration be agreed to in a congress of the united states, and be afterwards confirmed by the legislatures of every state".

This means that any changes first have to be agreed to in a Congress and then sent off to the states for their unanimous approval. So there is a procedure that is established for making revisions.

Back to September 1786, a letter was received by Congress sent by John Dickinson, Chairman, of the convention that was held in Annapolis, which states:

"To His Excellency,

The President of Congress

ANNAPOLIS, September 14th, 1786.

SIR: Agreeably to the request of the Commissioners assembled at this place, I do myself the Honor to transmit to your Excellency, a Copy of their Report to the Legislatures of those States by who they were appointed.

I remain etc.

JOHN DICKINSON,

Chairman.

His Excellency,

The President of Congress.

To the Honorable the Legislatures of Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York:

The Commissioners from the said states respectively assembled at the City of Annapolis, humbly beg leave to report:

That, pursuant to their several appointments, they met at Annapolis, in the State of Maryland, on the eleventh day of September Instant, and, having proceeded to a communication of their powers, they found that the States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, had in substance, and nearly in the same terms, authorised their respective Commissioners "to meet such Commissioners as were or might be appointed by the other States in the Union, at such time and place as should be agreed upon by the said Commissioners, to take into consideration the trade and commerce in the commercial intercourse and regulations might be necessary to their Common interest and permanent harmony, and to report, to the several States, such an Act relative to this great object, as when unanimously ratified by them would enable the United States in Congress Assembled effectually to provide for the same."

That the State of Delaware has given similar powers to their Commissioners, with this difference only, that the Act to be framed in virtue of these powers is required to be reported "to the United States in Congress assembled to be agreed to by them and Confirmed by the Legislatures of every State."

That the State of New Jersey had enlarged the object of their appointment, empowering their Commissioners "to consider how far an uniform system in their Commercial regulations and other important matters might be necessary to the common interest and permanent harmony of the several States and to report such an Act on the subject, as when ratified by

them would enable the United States in Congress assembled effectually to provide for the exigencies of the Union.”

That appointments of Commissioners have also been made by the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and North Carolina, none of whom have however attended, but that no information has been received by your Commissioners of any appointment having been made by the States of Connecticut, Maryland, South Carolina, or Georgia.

That the express terms of the powers to your Commissioners supposing a deputation from all the States, and having for object the trade and Commerce of the United States, Your Commissioners did not conceive it advisable to proceed on the business of their mission under the Circumstance of so partial and defective a representation.

Deeply impressed, however, with the magnitude and importance of the object confided to them on this occasion, Your Commissioners cannot forbear to indulge an expression of their earnest and unanimous wish that speedy measures may be taken to effect a general meeting of the States in a future Convention, for the same, and such other purposes, as the situation of public affairs may be found to require.

If in expressing this wish, or in intimating any other Sentiment your Commissioners should seem to exceed the strict bounds of their Appointment, they entertain a full confidence, that a conduct dictated by an anxiety for the welfare of the United States, will not fail to receive an indulgent Construct.

In this persuasion, your Commissioners submit an opinion, that the Idea of extending the powers of their deputies to other objects than those of Commerce, which has been adopted by the State of New Jersey, was an improvement on the original plan, and will deserve to be incorporated into that of a future Convention. They are the more naturally led to this conclusion, as in the course of their reflections on the subject, they have been induced to think, that the power of regulating Trade, is of such comprehensive extent, and will enter so far into the general system of the Federal Government, that to give it efficacy, and to obviate questions and doubts concerning its precise nature and limits, may require a correspondent adjustment of other parts of the Federal system.

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 probably 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 consideration 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, of 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.

Though Commissioners could not with propriety address these observations and sentiments to any but the States they have the honor to represent, they have nevertheless concluded from motives of respect, to transmit Copies of this report to the United States in Congress assembled, and to the Executives of the other States,

By order of the Commissioners:

JOHN DICKINSON,

Chairman.

Dated at Annapolis,

September 14th, 1786."

The important part of this letter is the portion, highlighted in green towards the end:

“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, of 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.”

This convention clearly understands the lawful procedures to make alterations to the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union based on Article 13 thereof.

BEGINNINGS OF SEDITION:

On February 21, 1787 Congress passed the following resolution, based on the recommendation of that convention:

“A motion was then made by the delegates for Massachusetts to postpone the farther consideration of the report in order to take into consideration a motion which they read in their place, this being agreed to, the motion of the delegates for Massachusetts was taken up and being amended was agreed to as follows:

Whereas there is provision in the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union for making alterations therein by the Assent of a Congress of the United States and of the legislatures of the several States; And whereas experience hath evinced that there are defects in the present Confederation, as a mean to remedy which several of the states and particularly the state of New York by express instructions to their delegates in Congress have suggested a Convention for the purposes expressed in the following resolution and such Convention appearing to be the most probable mean of establishing in these states a firm national government.

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 to 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 and the preservation of the Union.”

Congress clearly understands the lawful procedures to make alterations to the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union based on Article 13 thereof. The Convention would report their findings to Congress. Congress would debate and revise such findings, then resolve to agree to such findings, and then pass them off to the states for their approval. Once all thirteen states agreed, then such proposed revisions would take place. That was the **ONLY** lawful procedure provided for in the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union, the law of the Confederation, which was agreed to by the states.

If we carefully look at the last two words of the last sentence of the second paragraph, we clearly see what the intent of the legislature of New York had in mind. The last two words, “national government”, as in a singular nation. The idea that the thirteen sovereign, independent nations (states) fought and won a war for their sovereignty, would all of a sudden, decide to give that up and submit to a “nation government” is ludicrous. But, this is the beginning of the end of the “American Experiment”, even though most of the founders do not yet know this.

SEDITION AND ATTEMPT TO USURP THE LAWFUL GOVERNMENT:

On September 20, 1787 the initial step towards usurpation of the lawful government occurs. This is when Congress receives the results from the Philadelphia Convention that was tasked with making revisions to the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union. Presented to Congress were three documents. The first, being the Constitution for the United States, not “The United States of America”, as was the official style (or name) of the Confederation. The next document was a letter of the Delegates from that Convention. The final document was a letter from George Washington, President of that Convention.

The “Constitution for the United States” will not be reviewed, as there is no purpose to do so. However, let us review the other documents, starting with the letter of the Delegates:

“In Convention Monday September 17th 1787.

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

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

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

By the Unanimous Order of the Convention

G. WASHINGTON, *President*

W. JACKSON *Secretary*"

Now let's review the lawful process of the Confederation and see if what is highlighted in pink follows it. The Convention resolves that the Constitution should be laid before Congress. Check. Then they resolved that it should be submitted to the states. Wow, wait a minute. What happened to the part where it had to be agreed to in Congress before it was passed on to the states? The answer is they purposely bypassed Congress as a way to usurp the lawful government. Those people at the Convention clearly knew the resolution that Congress has passed earlier in February. They knew the restrictions of Congress. They knew the only way to usurp the lawful government was to bypass Congress because if Congress were to review this proposed Constitution, Congress would either strike it down in its entirety or make massive alterations. The people in that secret, locked, closed doors Convention, of which no minutes were contemporarily published, knew they could not take a chance on Congress rejecting their usurpation attempt by allowing them to review, debate, and change that Constitution, thus their resolve for Congress to "just pass it along to the states". Again, according to the existing laws of the day, this is sedition and treason in its purest form.

Let's look at the next paragraph in green. In the first sentence, the Convention talks of "nine states" ratifying the alterations. This does not follow the law of the Confederation which clearly states that any alteration has to be agreed to by ALL the states and not just nine out of thirteen.

So what is this letter from the Convention really saying? It says, "we the people in this Convention propose to usurp the lawful government by unlawfully hoodwinking only nine states into agreeing to give up their sovereignty". This is what eventually happened. Under the Articles and Confederation and perpetual Union, the states retained their sovereignty (through the sovereign people in each) and retained all their rights except those explicitly enumerated therein. Congress could not force the states to do anything, as each state was a sovereign nation unto itself with its own unique laws. However, under the "Constitution for the United States", again NOT "The United States of America", each state was forced to give up its sovereignty and submit to that Constitution as the law of the land, with what eventually became a Congress with unlimited power and the states were now helpless to resist.

There is one other piece of neat deception provided in the letter from the Convention by stating that it "was by unanimous Order of the Convention". That may be true but history records that no Delegates from the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations had EVER attended the Convention. Thus, **ONLY TWELVE** states were present and it was **NOT UNANIMOUS** among the *thirteen* states. Also, this Scribe has not reviewed the rules of that Convention. That is if they can found? If they acted in a similar manner as Congress, this would require, at least, two Delegates from each State, for that State to be effectively counted as being present when it comes to voting. Notice that only "Alexander Hamilton of New York" is mentioned, meaning only one Delegate from that state and not more. If this indeed is the true fact, then really only eleven States were fully present and not twelve, let alone the full thirteen.

Now let us look at the letter from George Washington:

"In Convention Monday September 17th 1787.

SIR: We have now the honor to submit to the consideration of the United States in Congress Assembled, that Constitution which has appeared to us the most adviseable.

The friends of our Country have long seen and desired, that the power of making war, peace and treaties, that of levying money and regulating commerce, and the correspondent executive and judicial authorities should be fully and effectually vested in the general government of the Union: but the impropriety of delegating such extensive trust to one body of men is evident. Hence results the necessity of a different organization.

It is obviously impracticable in the federal government of these States, to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals entering into society, must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. The magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on situation and circumstance, as on the

object to be obtained. It is at all times difficult to draw with precision the line between those rights which must be surrendered, and those which may be reserved; and on the present occasion this difficulty was increased by a difference among the several States as to their situation, extent, habits, and particular interests.

In all our deliberations on this subject we kept steadily in our view, that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American, the consolidation of our Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence. This important consideration, seriously and deeply impressed on our minds, led each State in the Convention to be less rigid on points of inferior magnitude, than might have been otherwise expected; and thus the Constitution, which we now present, is the result of a spirit of amity, and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable.

That it will meet the full and entire approbation of every State is not perhaps to be expected, but each will doubtless consider, that had her interests been alone consulted, the consequences might have been particularly disagreeable or injurious to others; that it is as liable to as few exceptions as could reasonably have been expected, we hope and believe; that it may promote the lasting welfare of that country so dear to us all, and secure her freedom and happiness, is our most ardent wish.

With great respect,

We have to honor to be

Sir

Your Excellency's

Most Obedient and humble servant

GEORGE WASHINGTON, *President*

By Unanimous Order of the Convention.

His Excellency

THE PRESIDENT OF CONGRESS."

Let us look at the items highlighted in pink. In the first paragraph Washington refers to "friends of our country". What friends and where are they from? To which one of the thirteen countries is Washington referring to? These have never been explained and the only possibility is that Washington was looking to usurp the thirteen country's lawful governments, along with the existing federal government, in

order to actually try and create a singular country. Again, according the existing laws of the day, this is sedition and treason in its purest form. Later in the paragraph, Washington refers to a “different organization”. This will be discussed later when we get to September 27, 1787.

The beginning of the second paragraph lets the cat out of the bag, so to speak, and reveals the real intention of that Convention. It starts with saying “It is obviously impracticable in the federal government of these States, to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each” and then “Individuals entering into society, must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest” and then “rights which must be surrendered”. Sound familiar? This is where we are today! See where it started? If you don’t, then I can only paraphrse a passage from the Bible “there are none so blind as those who choose not to see”. It is clearly the intention of that Convention to create an all-powerful government which acts like a monarch and has made the states and people subject to its whims. No more freedom. The next paragraph talks about consolidating the union for that purpose.

In the last paragraph, that Washington acknowledges that all states may not submit to this proposed all powerful government. He was right, as Rhode Island and Providence Plantations rejected it, outright on the first vote, and said so to Congress. Eventually, they were forced into that union.

Now, let us see what Congress decides to do regarding the proceedings from this now unlawful Convention. On September 27, 1787, Congress takes up the debate of the documents presented to them. There are two separate entries this day in the Journals of the Continental Congress. Here is the first entry, and notice it is stricken through, which poses another question, as well.

~~“According to Order Congress resumed the Consideration of the form of a Constitution for the United States of America framed and transmitted to Congress by the Convention of the States held at Philadelphia pursuant to the Resolve of the twenty first day of February last. And a motion being made by Mr. R[ichard] H[enry] Lee seconded by Mr. [Melancton] Smith in the words following “Resolved That Congress after due attention to the Constitution under which this body exists and acts find the said Constitution in the thirteenth Article thereof limits the power of Congress to the amendment of the present confederacy of thirteen states, but does not extend it to the creation of a new confederacy of nine states; and the late Convention having been constituted under the authority of twelve state in this Union it is deemed respectful to transmit and it is accordingly ordered that the plan of a new federal constitution laid before Congress by the said convention be sent to the executive of every state in this Union to be laid before their respective legislatures.”~~

~~A motion was made by Mr. [Abraham] Clark seconded by Mr. [Nathaniel] Mitchel to postpone the consideration of that Motion in order to take up the following “That a copy of the Constitution agreed to and laid before Congress by the late Convention of the several states with their resolutions and the letter accompanying the same be transmitted to the~~

~~executives of each state to be laid before their respective legislatures in order to be by them submitted to conventions of delegates to be chosen agreeably to the said resolutions of the Convention”.~~

~~On the question to postpone for the purpose above mentioned the yeas and nays being required by Mr. R[ichard] H[enry] Lee.~~

~~So it was resolved in the affirmative.~~

~~On motion of Mr. [Edward] Carrington seconded by Mr. [William] Bingham the motion of Mr. [Abraham] Clark was postponed to take into consideration the following motion viz “Congress proceeded to the consideration of the Constitution for the United States by the late Convention held in the City of Philadelphia and thereupon resolved That Congress do agree thereto and that it be recommended to the legislatures of the several states to cause conventions to be held as speedily as may be to the end that the same may be adopted ratified and confirmed.~~

First, let us comment on what it means to have the entry stricken out. This is not the first time the Scribe has seen this in the Journals. When an entry has been stricken, it is as if it never occurred. The only question then, is if “it never occurred”, then why is it recorded? The original Journal was written in a bound book and removing the individual pages was not permitted. The Scribe can only speculate on why this entry was reproduced and that is to “give remedy” for those who seek it. For instance, when this current corporatized, foreign owned, for profit, de facto government creates a legality (it is impossible for it to create an actual law) it must provide remedy for those who seek it. Just because it is legal does not make it lawful. Since these Journals were reproduced under this de facto government, all of the entries, even if stricken out, are reproduced as their way of creating that remedy.

In the first paragraph, Congress realizes the sedition and usurpation attempt of the lawful government, although not stating it in those terms. Congress realizes that according to Article 13 of the ***current federal constitution***, Congress’s function is limited to the confederation of thirteen states and does not extend to the creation of a new confederacy of nine states. Also, Congress acknowledges the Convention of being only 12 states only and not the full confederacy of the thirteen.

In the last paragraph is a motion of Mr. Edward Carrington and seconded by Mr. William Bingham. Had this motion actually not been stricken out, Congress would have been guilty of treason against the confederation of 13 states. The motion says “. . . resolved That Congress do agree thereto. . .” meaning Congress would have agreed to commit sedition (against the current confederation) by discussing a document with intentions to create a new confederacy of nine states that has nothing to do with the

original 13. By agreeing to this usurpation of the nine over the thirteen, including stealing the identity of the existing government, among others, and thus, were guilty of treason as well.

The next entry on September 27 is a motion of Mr. Dane, which clearly describes the dilemma that Congress was subjected.

“Whereas Congress sensible that there were defects in the present Confederation; and that several of the States were desirous that a Convention of Delegates should be formed to consider the same, and to propose necessary alterations in the federal Constitution; in February last resolved that it was ~~in their opinion~~ expedient that a Convention of the States should be held 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 should when agreed to in Congress, and be confirmed by the States, render the federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government, and the preservation of the Union.

And whereas it appears by Credentials laid before Congress, that twelve States appointed Delegates who assembled in Convention accordingly, and who did on the 17th instant, by the unanimous consent of the States then present in convention agree upon, and afterwards lay before Congress, a Constitution for the United States, to be submitted ~~with the~~ to a convention of Delegates, chosen in each State by the people thereof, under the recommendation of its legislature, for their Assent and ratification which constitution appears to be intended as an entire system in itself, and not as any part of, or alteration in the Articles of Confederation; to alterations in which Articles, the deliberations and powers of Congress are, in this Case, constitutionally confined, and whereas Congress cannot with propriety proceed to examine and alter the said Constitution proposed, unless it be with a view so essentially to change the principles and forms of it, as to make it an additional part in the said Confederation and the members of Congress not feeling themselves authorised by the forms of Government under which they are assembled, to express an opinion respecting a System of Government no way connected with those forms; but conceiving that the respect they owe their constituents and the importance of the subject require, that the report of the Convention should, with all convenient dispatch, be transmitted to the several States to be laid before the respectful legislatures thereof therefore

Resolved that there be transmitted to the supreme executive of each State a copy of the report of the Convention of the States lately Assembled in the City of Philadelphia signed by their deputies the seventeenth instant including their resolutions, and their letter directed to the President of Congress.

Make no mistake, Congress is clearly committing sedition against the current confederation at this point. Let us examine each paragraph.

The first paragraph acknowledges that revisions need to be made to the current constitution (the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union) because there are certain unworkable conditions in governing. In February of 1787, Congress authorizes a Convention of the States 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 should when agreed to in Congress, and be confirmed by the States, render the federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government, and the preservation of the Union.” This follows the law of the land based on Article 13. The Convention were to report their results to Congress, Congress would debate and amend such results, then agree to such, and then pass them on to the States for their unanimous approval.

In the second paragraph, Congress acknowledges that only 12 states were present, not 13, and even though being unanimous of the 12, the Convention DID NOT DO WHAT THEY WERE TASKED TO DO, AND PRESENTED TO CONGRESS NOT ANY ALTERATIONS OF THE CURRENT CONSTITUTION BUT A SYSTEM THAT HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH IT, in the following words “. . . for their Assent and ratification which constitution appears to be intended as an entire system in itself, and not as any part of, or alteration in the Articles of Confederation; to alterations in which Articles, the deliberations and powers of Congress are, in this Case, constitutionally confined, and whereas Congress cannot with propriety proceed to examine and alter the said Constitution proposed, unless it be with a view so essentially to change the principles and forms of it, as to make it an additional part in the said Confederation . . .”

This in itself is a violation of a Congressional resolution, and thus violated federal law. The people involved in that Convention are guilty of sedition against the confederation of 13 states and should have been punished as such. Closely examining the portion in pink reveals much more as well. Congress has limitations imposed on it by the current law form. The people of that Convention knew those limitations and were hoping to be able to bypass Congress and go directly to the states in order to complete their usurpation. Since Congress was limited in their power, they could not even debate the merits of the Constitution for the United States, and thus propose amendments because it had nothing to do with the existing law form. Knowing that if any discussion thereof occurred, that Congress would be guilty of sedition against the confederation.

This brings us to the last portion of the second paragraph and the resolve in the third:

“but conceiving that the respect they owe their constituents and the importance of the subject require, that the report of the Convention should, with all convenient dispatch, be transmitted to the several States to be laid before the respectful legislatures thereof therefore

Resolved that there be transmitted to the supreme executive of each State a copy of the report of the Convention of the States lately Assembled in the City of Philadelphia signed by their deputies the seventeenth instant including their resolutions, and their letter directed to the President of Congress.”

Now Congress has definitely committed sedition against the confederation of thirteen by agreeing to pass it along to the states for their ratification. Congress is guilty of the eventual usurpation of the federal government. Here is where the Delegates of the Convention played their most powerful card. The prestige of those whom attended was such that most Americans could not deny their loyalty to such people who, up to now, have proved their allegiance to creating the existing confederation. It was not conceivable that those same people have now presented a plan usurp it.

What Congress should have done, is reject the results of the Convention as a violation of the Congressional resolution that created the Convention. Then Congress should have exposed those people in the Convention as committing sedition in their attempt at usurpation. Then punishment should have followed. But no, Congress in their cowardliness, and falling to the human frailty of succumbing to the celebrity status of their famous constituents in that Convention (Congress kind of viewed it as some of the members of that Convention were too famous to fail or go against), and not fulling understanding Congress's fiduciary duties as trustees of the trust (Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union), allowed a path to breach that trust, thus being willing accomplices in that crime.

To get more of a glimpse into the mindset of the time, let us look at the notes of the debates, taken by James Madison, on February 21, 1787, when debating the resolution that created the Convention.

“The Report of the Convention at Annapolis in September 1786 had been long under consideration of a Committee of the Congress for the last year; and was referred over to a Grand Committee of the present year. The latter committee after considerable difficulty and discussion, agreed on a report by a majority of *one* only [see the Journal], which was made a few days ago to Congress and set down as the order for this day. The Report coincided with the opinion held at Annapolis that the Confederation needed adjustments and the proposed Convention was the most eligible means of effecting them. The objections which seemed to prevail against the recommendation of the Convention by Congress, were with some 1. That it tended to weaken the federal authority by lending its sanction to an extraconstitutional mode of proceeding – with other 2. That the interposition of Congress would be considered by the jealous as betraying an ambitious wish to get power into their hands by any plan whatever that might present itself. Subsequent to the Report, the Delegates from N. York received instructions from its Legislature to move in Congress for a recommendation of a convention; and those from Massachusetts had, it appeared, received information which led them to suppose it was becoming the disposition of the Legislature of that State to send

deputies to the proposed Convention in case Congress should give their sanction to it. There was reason to believe however from the Language of the instructions from N York that her object was to obtain a new convention, under the sanction of Congress rather than to accede to the one on foot, or perhaps by dividing the plans of the States in their appointments to frustrate all of them. The latter suspicion is in some degree countenanced by their refusal of the Impost a few days before the instruction passed, and by their other marks of an unfederal disposition. The Delegates from N.Y. in consequence of their instructions made the motion on the Journal to postpone the Report of the Committee in order to substitute their own proposition. Those who vote against it, considered it as liable to the objection abovementioned. Some who voted for it particularly Mr. Madison considered it susceptible of amendment when brought before Congress interposed in the matter at all it would be well for them to do it at the instance of a State, rather than spontaneously. This motion being lost, Mr. Dane from Massachusetts, who was at bottom unfriendly to the plan of a Convention, and had dissuaded his State from coming to it, brought forward a proposition, in a different form, but liable to the same objection with that from N. York. After some little discussions, it was agreed on all sides except by Connecticut who opposed the measure in every form, that the Resolution should pass as it stands on the Journal, sanctioning the proceedings & appointments already made by the States as well as recommending farther appointments from other States, but in such terms as do not point directly to the former appointments.

It appeared from the debates & still more from the conversation among the members that many of them considered this resolution as a deadly blow to the existing Confederation. Doctor Johnson who voted against it, particularly declared himself to that effect. Others viewed it in the same light, but were pleased with it as the harbinger of a better Confederation.

The reserve of many of the members made it difficult to decide their real wishes & expectations from their present crisis of our affairs. All agreed & owned that the federal Government in its existing shape was inefficient & could not last long. The members from the Southern & Middle States seemed generally anxious for some republican organization of the system which would preserve the Union and give due energy to the Government of it. Mr. Bingham alone avowed his wishes that the Confederacy might be divided into several distinct confederacies, its great extent & various interests, being incompatible with a single Government – The Eastern members were suspected by some of leaning towards some antirepublican establishment, (the effect of their late confusions) or of being less desirous or hopeful of preserving the Unity of the Empire. For the first time the idea of separate Confederacies had got into the Newspapers. It appeared to day under the Boston head. Whatever the views of leading men in the Eastern States may be, it would seem that the

great body of the people particularly in Connecticut, are equally indisposed either to dissolve or divide the Confederacy or to submit to any antirepublican innovations.”

Madison observes that the members of Congress did feel that a convention was the best means for addressing the short comings of the current constitution but Congress also felt that such a convention should be under their “sanction” and not outside of it, as it ended up being, for fear of weakening the power of Congress. Madison also notices the jealousies that certain states have versus others and that their legislatures were proposing numerous ruinous ideas, i.e., and that this convention would lend an ear to those ideas which could be a “dangerous blow to the existing Confederation”.

Madison also notes that the Southern and Middle States were looking to preserve the union, along with Connecticut, and that the other Northern States differed substantially. Some even proposed creating multiple confederations. Ironically, that is what EXACTLY happened, although the public were NEVER told this.

As we move into 1788, Congress having committed secession by allowing the results of the Convention to be passed on to the States, continued their work. On February 1, 1788 Congress received notice from “the state of Franklin” that they intend to petition Congress for entry into the Confederation. The “state of Franklin”, which eventually became Tennessee, was to break off from portions of North Carolina and Georgia to become an independent state, at a later date. Congress declines to act on this.

On February 29, 1788, with permission from Virginia, a portion of that state was to be broken off to form an independent state to be called Kentucky. The people of Kentucky, again with Virginia’s blessing, petitions Congress for entry into the union as an independent state. Congress resolves to this and creates a committee to write an Ordinance for the proceedings. A further formal resolution on this subject occurs on June 2, 1788.

TREASON IN THE CONFEDERATION AND THE END OF THE AMERICAN EXPERIMENT:

July 2, 1788, *a day that will live in infamy*, the Delegates from New Hampshire inform the President (of Congress) that their state is the

“ninth ratification transmitted and laid before them, whereupon

On Motion of Mr. [Abraham] Clarke seconded by Mr. [Pierpont] Edwards

Ordered That the ratifications of the constitution of the United States transmitted to Congress be referred to a committee to examine the same and report an Act to Congress for putting the said constitution into operation in pursuance of the resolutions of the late federal Convention.

On question to agree to this Order the yeas and nays being required by Mr. [Abraham] Yates
So it passed in the affirmative”.

From this point on, any time that Congress does any type of work, even if just discussions and debates, etc., with the Constitution for the United States they are committing treason against the existing Confederation.

THE SMOKING GUN OF ALL SMOKING GUNS TO WHAT HAPPENED:

July 3, 1788 is a day that the entries in the Journals of the Continental Congress clearly demonstrate the evils that has overtaken the Confederation that led to the usurpation of the lawful government, through sedition and treason, the end of the American Experiment, which was the first AND ONLY time in written history, that people were given a chance to govern themselves. Since 1789, that “experiment” has NEVER occurred again.

Keeping in mind what occurred in Congress the prior day, which is directly referenced in the entry, it seems that it was too late for freedom for the people of an independent Kentucky. Here is the entry, and it is a very long one”

“The Order of the day being called for, the motion of Mr. [John] Brown was read in the words following

Whereas it appears to Congress that the state of Virginia by two acts of the legislature thereof, one entitled “an Act concerning the erection of the district of Kentucky into an independent State passed at their October session in the year 1785, the other passed at their October session in the year 1786 entitled “An Act making further provision for the erection of the district of Kentucky into an Independent state” hath entered into a solemn compact with that part of the said state called the district of Kentucky permitting the same to be erected into a separate and independent state to be admitted into Union with the United States as a federal member thereof upon certain terms and conditions in the said acts stipulated and it further appearing to Congress that the said district in convention assembled did in conformity to the said acts by certain resolutions entered into on the 22d day of Sept. 1787 determine that it was expedient that the said district should be erected into an independent state on the terms and conditions specified in said acts and did present to Congress an address praying to be admitted into union with the United States as a federal member and Whereas it appears to Congress to be just and reasonable that the application of the said district of Kentucky should be complied with *Resolved* therefore that the United States in Congress Assembled do ratify and confirm the compact entered into between the

state of Virginia and the district of Kentucky agreeably to the acts and resolutions aforesaid and that the said district to be admitted into Union with the United States as an independent federal member on the 1st day of January 1789 and be stiled the Commonwealth of Kentucky. *Resolved* that Congress will release the state of Virginia from all federal obligations arising within the said district after the said first day of January 1789 and from such part of her quota of the continental debt as shall be apportioned to the said district whenever the same shall have been ascertained agreeably to the stipulations of the compact aforesaid. *Resolved* that the said district shall be admitted to a representation in Congress after the said first day of January 1789 provided from an accurate census it shall appear that the said district contains sixty thousand inhabitants.”

A motion was made by Mr. [Nathan] Dane seconded by Mr. [Thomas Tudor] Tucker to postpone the consideration of the foregoing motion in order to take up the following

Whereas application has been lately made to Congress by the legislature of Virginia and the district of Kentucky for the admission of the said district into the federal Union as a separate member thereof on the terms contained in the Acts of the said legislature and in the resolutions of the said district relative to the premises.

And whereas Congress having fully considered the subject did on the third day of June last resolve that it is expedient that the said district be erected into a sovereign and independent state and a separate member of the federal Union and appointed a committee to report An Act accordingly which committee on the second instant was discharged, it appearing that nine states had adopted the Constitution of the United States lately submitted to conventions of the people; and whereas a new confederacy is formed among the ratifying States and it is highly probable that the state of Virginia including the said district has already become a member of the said Confederacy. And whereas an Act of Congress in the present state of government of the country severing a part of the said state from the other parts thereof and admitting it into the Confederacy formed by the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union as an independent member thereof may be attended with dangerous consequences while it can have no effect to make the said district a separate member of the federal Union formed by the adoption of the said constitution and therefore it must be manifestly inexpedient for Congress assembled under the said articles of Confederation to adopt any other measures relative to the premises than those which express their sense that the said district ought to be an independent member of the Union as soon as circumstances shall permit proper measures to be adopted for that purpose. *Resolved* that a copy of the proceedings of Congress relative to Kentucky be transmitted to the legislature of Virginia and that the said legislature be informed that as the constitution of the United States is now ratified Congress think it unadvisable to adopt any further measures for admitting the

district of Kentucky into the federal Union as in independent member thereof under the articles of Confederation and perpetual Union, but that Congress thinking it expedient that the said district as soon after proceedings shall commence under the said constitution as circumstances shall permit recommend it to the said legislature and to the inhabitants of the said district so to alter their Acts and resolutions relative to the premises, as to render them conformable to the provisions made in the said constitution to the end that no impediment may be in the way of speedy accomplishment of this important business.

On the question to postpone for the purpose above mentioned the yeas and nays being required by Mr. [John] Brown.

So it passed in the Affirmative (9 yes, Virginia no, 2 states 1 Delegate only) and the first Motion being postponed and the second taken into consideration and amended; on the question to agree to the Motion as amended the yeas and nays being required by Mr. [Abraham] Yates

So it passed in the affirmative (8 states yes, New York divided, 3 states 1 Delegate only) as follows

Whereas application has been lately made to Congress by the legislature of Virginia and the district of Kentucky for the admission of the said district into the federal Union as a separate member thereof on the terms contained in the acts of the said legislature and in the resolutions of the said district relative to the premises. And whereas Congress having fully considered the subject did on third day of June last resolve that it is expedient that the said district be erected into a sovereign and independent state and a separate member of the federal Union and appointed a committee to report an Act accordingly, which committee on the second instant was discharged, it appearing that nine states had adopted the constitution of the United States lately submitted to Conventions of the people. And whereas a new Confederacy is formed among the ratifying States and there is reason to believe the State of Virginia including the said district did on the 25 of June last become a member of the said Confederacy; And Whereas An Act of Congress, in the present state of government of the country, severing a part of the said state from the other parts thereof and admitting it into the confederacy formed by the articles of Confederation and perpetual Union as an independent member thereof may be attended with many inconveniences while it can have no effect to make the said district a separate member of the federal Union formed by the adoption of the said constitution and therefore it must be manifestly improper for Congress assembled under the said Articles of Confederation to adopt any other measures relative to the premises than those which express their sense that the said

district ought it be an independent member of the Union as soon as circumstances shall permit proper measures to be adopted for that purpose.

Resolved That a copy of the proceedings of Congress relative to the independency of the district of Kentucky be transmitted to the legislature of Virginia and also to Samuel McDowell esquire late president of the said Convention, and that the said Legislature and the inhabitants of the district aforesaid be informed, that as the constitution of the United States is now ratified, Congress think it unadvisable to adopt any further measures for admitting the district of Kentucky into the federal Union as in independent member thereof under the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union; but that Congress thinking it expedient that the said district be made a separate State and member of the Union as soon after the proceedings shall commence under the said constitution as circumstances shall permit, recommend it to the said legislature and to the inhabitants of the said district so to alter their acts and resolutions relative to the premises as to render them conformable to the provisions made in the said constitution to the End that no impediment may be in the way of the speedy accomplishment of this important business.”

The first paragraph just reiterates what has already occurred in Congress, in that Congress is prepared to bring Kentucky into the Confederation as the 14th member, officially set for January 1, 1789. Congress realizes the situation of the state of affairs, which is their own doing, and replies

“ . . . And whereas an Act of Congress in the present state of government of the country severing a part of the said state from the other parts thereof and admitting it into the Confederacy formed by the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union as an independent member thereof may be attended with dangerous consequences while it can have no effect to make the said district a separate member of the federal Union formed by the adoption of the said constitution and therefore it must be manifestly inexpedient for Congress assembled under the said articles of Confederation to adopt any other measures relative to the premises than those which express their sense that the said district ought to be an independent member of the Union as soon as circumstances shall permit proper measures to be adopted for that purpose. . . .”

Dangerous? Yes, dangerous and threatening to the sovereignty of Kentucky and the people thereof. Congress now OFFICIALLY recognizes there are now two confederations. The first and still existing confederation, that started with all thirteen original states, and a new one with only nine states. Should Kentucky join the perpetual Union, she might be the only one active in it, thus, leaving Kentucky in lonely situation, since she was not offered to join this new confederation under the Constitution for the United States.

Thus Congress resolves to tell Kentucky, that they are postponing consideration of their entry into the original confederation at this time, as the future is now unknown. And further:

“... And whereas a new Confederacy is formed among the ratifying States and there is reason to believe the State of Virginia including the said district did on the 25 of June last become a member of the said Confederacy; And Whereas An Act of Congress, in the present state of government of the country, severing a part of the said state from the other parts thereof and admitting it into the confederacy formed by the articles of Confederation and perpetual Union as an independent member thereof may be attended with many inconveniences while it can have no effect to make the said district a separate member of the federal Union formed by the adoption of the said constitution and therefore it must be manifestly improper for Congress assembled under the said Articles of Confederation to adopt any other measures relative to the premises than those which express their sense that the said district ought to be an independent member of the Union as soon as circumstances shall permit proper measures to be adopted for that purpose.”

So there we have it.

Congress, through their seditious non-action in allowing the results of the Convention to be passed on to the States, allowed for the usurpation and identity theft of the lawful government and law form. The states also participated in this seditious action and eventual usurpation, not only of the federal government, but of each state's government as well, by allowing for conventions in each state, of which the participant committed treason, most not even knowing it. What was not realized at this point is that under the existing Confederation, the states retained almost all their rights. Under the “new confederation”, the states will be eventually forced to succumb those rights as they are repugnant to the Constitution for the United States, thus forcing the people to become “subject thereof” and eventually losing their sovereignty as well, becoming subjects, not of a monarch, but a foreign owned, for profit, corporation masquerading as a de facto government, with each state government, county government, and municipal government being but a local representation of that same corporate entity.

This is the ultimate breach of trust. The trust created by the Articles of Confederation of perpetual Union has been breached by the acts of Congress. It has placed EVERY person who holds ANY type of office or direct employment of government in a position to commit treason with every act they do.

How can that be stated? Simple. Since the creation of the “new confederation”, there has NEVER been any resolve, act, or ordinance from Congress, or the states combined, that has done away with, abolished, removed, consolidated, eliminated, replaced, super ceded, etc., the existing confederation. It still exists today. Thus, these people with fiduciary duties, direct or indirect,

government employment of any type, an oath of office to the "old confederation" now have two governments with law forms that are repugnant to one another, and with each action, they commit treason against one of the confederations. And yet, how many actually knew any of this?

Further acts of treason due to any type of discussion, debate, work, and/or actions relating to the Constitution for the United States are recorded in the Journals for the following dates: July 8, July 15, July 28, August 4, August 5, August 6, August 7, August 13, August 26, September 2, September 3, September 4, September 12, September 13, and on and after September 15, no further work regarding foreign relations and committees was performed for the original confederation. October 10, 1788 was the last day that there had been a quorum in Congress to any official business under the original confederation.

Let us look at some passages from a book very few people are aware exists. This book is entitled *Secret Proceedings and Debates of the Federal Convention* written from the notes taken by Robert Yates, Esq., Chief Justice of New York, and copied by John Lansing, Jun., Esq., late Chancellor of the state, members of that convention, including *The Genuine Information*, laid before the legislature of Maryland in 1787/88, by Luther Martin, Esq., then Attorney-General of the state, and member of the same convention, and the book was published in 1844.

The following passage begins on page 17 and goes to page 27 of that book (this is an address to the Maryland legislature):

"This, Sir, is the substance of the arguments, if arguments they may be called, which were used in favor of the inequality of suffrage. Those who advocated the equality of suffrage, took the matter up on the original principles of government; they urged, that all men, considered in a state of nature, before any government is formed, are equally free and independent, no one having any right or authority to exercise power over another, and thus without any regard to difference in personal strength, understanding, or wealth. That, when such individuals enter into government, they have each a right to an equal voice in its formation, and afterwards have each a right to an equal vote in every matter which relates to their government. That, if it could be done conveniently, they have a right to exercise in person. Where it cannot be done in person, but for convenience representatives are appointed, to act for them, every person has a right to an equal vote in choosing that representative; who is intrusted to do for the whole, that which the whole, if they could assemble, might do in person, and in the transaction of which, each would have an equal voice. That, if we were to admit, because a man was more wise, more strong, or more wealthy, he should be entitled to more votes than another, it would be inconsistent with the freedom and liberty of that other, and would reduce him to slavery. Suppose, for instance, ten individuals in a state of nature, about to enter into government, nine of whom are equally wise, equally strong, and equally wealthy, the tenth is ten times as wise, ten times as strong, or ten times as rich; if, for this reason, he is to

have ten votes for each vote of either of the others, the nine might as well have no vote as all; since, though the whole nine might assent to a measure, yet the vote of the tenth would countervail, and set aside all their votes. If this tenth approved of what they wished to adopt, it would be well, but if he disapproved, he could prevent it; and in the same manner, he could carry into execution any measure he wished, contrary to the opinion of all the others, he having ten votes, and the others altogether but nine. It is evident, that, on these principles, the nine would have no will or discretion of their own, but must be totally dependent on the will and discretion of the tenth; to him they would be as absolutely slaves, as any negro is to his master. If he did not attempt to carry into execution any measures injurious to the other nine, it could only be said, that they had a good master; they would be totally dependent on the will of another, and not on their own will. They might not feel the chains, but they would, notwithstanding, wear them; and whenever their master pleased, he might draw them so tight as to gall them to the bone. Hence it was urged, the inequality of representation, or giving to one man more votes than another, on account of his wealth, &c., was altogether inconsistent with the principles of liberty; and in the same proportion as it should be adopted, in favor of one or more, in that proportion are the others enslaved. It was urged, that though every individual should have an equal voice in government, yet, even the superior wealth, strength, or understanding, would give great an undue advantages to those who possessed them. That wealth attracts respect and attention; superior strength would cause the weaker and more feeble to be cautious how they offended, and to put up with small injuries rather than to engage in an unequal contest; in like manner, superior understanding would give its possessor many opportunities of profiting at the expense of the more ignorant.

Having thus established these principles, with respect to the rights of individuals in a state of nature, and what is due to each, on entering into government, (principles established by every writer on liberty,) they proceeded to show, that States, when once formed, are considered, with respect to each other, as individuals in a state of nature; that, like individuals, each State is considered equally free and equally independent, the one having no right to exercise authority over the other, though more strong, more wealthy, or abounding with more inhabitants. That, when a number of States unite themselves under a federal government, the same principles apply to them, as when a number of individual men unite themselves under a State government. That every argument which shows one man ought to not have more votes than another, because he is wiser, stronger, or wealthier, proves that one State ought not to have more votes than another, because it is stronger, richer, or more populous. And, that by giving one State, or one or two States, more votes than the others, the others thereby are enslaved to such State or States, having the greater number of votes, in the same manner as in the case before put, of individuals, when one has more votes than the others. That the reason why each individual man in forming a State government should have an equal vote, is because each individual, before he enters into government, is equally free and independent. So each State, when States enter into a federal government, are entitled to an equal vote; because, before they entered into such federal government, each State was equally free and equally independent. That adequate representation of men formed into a State government, consists in

each man having an equal voice, either personally, or, if by representatives, that he should have an equal voice in choosing the representatives. So, **adequate representation of States in a federal government, consists in each State having an equal voice**, either in person or by its representatives, in every thing which relates to the federal government. That this adequacy of representation is more important in a federal, than in a State government, the district of which is not very large, have generally such a common interest, that laws can scarcely be made by one part, oppressive to the others, without their suffering in common; but the different States, composing an extensive federal empire, widely distant from the other, may have interests so totally distinct, that the one part might be greatly benefited by what would be destructive to the other.

They were not satisfied by resting it on principles; they also appealed to history. They showed, that in the amphictyonic confederation of the Grecian cities, each city, however different in wealth, strength, and other circumstances, sent the same number of deputies, and each had an equal voice in every thing that related to the common concerns of Greece. It was shown, that in the seven provinces of the United Netherlands, and the confederated cantons of Switzerland, each canton and each province have an equal vote, although there are as great distinctions of wealth, strength, population, and extent of territory among these provinces and those cantons, as among these States. It was said, that **the maxim, that taxation and representation ought to go together, was true** so far, that no person ought to be taxed who is not represented, but not in the extent insisted upon, to wit, that the quantum of taxation and representation ought to be the same; on the contrary, the quantum of representation depends upon the quantum of freedom; and therefore all, whether individual States, or individual men, who are equally free, have a right to equal representation. **That to those who insist, that he who pays the greatest share of taxes ought to have the greatest number of votes, it is a sufficient answer to say, that this rule would be destructive of the liberty of the others, and would render them slaves to the more rich and wealthy.** That if one pays more taxes than another, it is because he has more wealth to be protected by government, and he receives greater benefits from the government. So if one State pays more to the federal government, it is because, as a State, she enjoys greater blessings from it; she has more wealth protected by it, or a greater number of inhabitants, whose rights are secured, and who share its advantages.

It was urged, that, upon these principles, the Pennsylvanian, or inhabitant of a large State was of as much consequence as the inhabitants of Hersey, Delaware, Maryland, or any other State. That his consequence was to be decided by his situation in his own State; that if he was there as free, if he had as great share in the forming of his government, and in the making and executing its laws, as the inhabitants of those other States, then was he equally important, and of equal consequence. Suppose a confederation of States had never been adopted, but every State had remained absolutely in its independent situation, no person could with propriety say, that the citizen of the large State was not as important as the citizen of the smaller; the confederation of the States cannot alter the case. It was said, that in all transactions between State and State, the freedom, independence, importance, and consequence, even the individuality of each citizen of the different States, might with propriety be said to be swallowed up, or concentrated, in the

independence, the freedom, and the individuality of the State of which they are citizens. That the thirteen States are different distinct political individual existences, as to each other; that the federal government is, or ought to be, a government over these thirteen political individual existences, which form the members of that government; and that, as the largest State is only a single individual of this government, it ought to have only one vote; the smallest State, also being one individual member of this government, ought also to have one vote. **To those who urged, that for the States to have equal suffrage was contrary to the feelings of the human heart, it was answered, that it was admitted to be contrary to the feeling of pride and ambition, but those feelings which ought not to be gratified at the expence of freedom.**

It was urged, that the position, that great States would have great objects in view, in which they would not suffer the less States to thwart them, was one of the strongest reasons why inequality of representation ought not to be admitted. If those great objects were not inconsistent with the interest of the less States, they would readily concur in them; but if they were inconsistent with the interest of a majority of the States composing the government, in that case two or three States ought not to have it in their power to aggrandize themselves, at the expence of all the rest. **To those who alleged, that equality of suffrage in our federal government, was the poisonous source from which all our misfortunes flowed, it was answered, that the allegation was not founded in fact; that equality of suffrage had never been complained of by the States, as a defect in our federal system;** that, among the eminent writers, foreigners and others, who had treated of the defects of our confederation, and proposed alterations, none has proposed an alteration in this part of the system; and members of the convention, both in and out of Congress, who advocated the equality of suffrage, called upon their opponents, both in and out of Congress, and challenged them to produce one single instance where a bad measure had been adopted, or a good measure had failed of adoption, in consequence of the States having an equal vote; on the contrary, they urged, that all our evils flowed for want of power in the federal head, and that, let the right of suffrage in the States be altered in any manner whatever, if no greater powers were given to the government, the same inconveniences would continue.

It was denied that the equality of suffrage was originally agreed to on principles of necessity or expediency; on the contrary, that it was adopted on the principles of the rights of men and the rights of States, which were then well known, and which then influenced our conduct, although now they seem to be forgotten.

For this, the Journals of Congress were appealed to; it was from them shown, that when the committee of Congress reported to that body the articles of confederation, the very first article, which became the subject of discussion, was that respecting equality of suffrage. That Virginia proposed divers modes of suffrage, all on the principle of inequality, which were almost unanimously rejected; that on the question for adopting the article, it passed, Virginia being the only State which voted in the negative. That, after the articles of confederation were submitted to the States, by them to be ratified, almost every State's proposed certain amendments, which they instructed their delegates to endeavor to obtain before ratification, and that among all the amendments proposed, not one State, not even Virginia, proposed an amendment of that article, securing the equality of suffrage, - the most convincing proof it was agreed to

and adopted, not from necessity, but upon a full conviction, that, according to the principles of free government, the States had a right to that equality of suffrage.

But, Sir, it was to no purpose that the futility of their objections were shown, when driven from the pretence, that the equality of suffrage had been originally agreed to on principles of expediency and necessity; the representatives of the large States persisting in a declaration, that they would never agree to admit the smaller States to an equality of suffrage. In answer to this, they were informed, and informed in terms the most strong and energetic that could possibly be used, that we never would agree to a system giving them the undue influence and superiority they proposed. That we would risk every possible consequence. That from anarchy and confusion, order might arise. That slavery was the worst that could ensure, and we considered the system proposed to be the most complete, most abject system of slavery that the wit of man ever devised, under the pretence of forming a government for free States. That we never would submit tamely and servilely, to a present certain evil, in dread of a future, which might be imaginary; that we were sensible the eyes of our country and the world were upon us. That we would not labor under the imputation of being unwilling to form a strong and energetic federal government; but we would publish the system which we approved, and also that which we opposed, and leave it to the country, and the world at large, to judge between us, who best understood the rights of free men and free States, and who best advocated them; and to the same tribunal we would submit, who ought to be answerable for all the consequences, which might arise to the Union from the convention breaking up, without proposing any system to their constituents. During this debate we were threatened, that if we did not agree to the system proposed, we never should have an opportunity of meeting in convention to deliberate on another, and this was frequently urged. In answer, we called upon them to show what was to prevent it, and from what quarter was our danger to proceed; was it from a foreign enemy? Our distance from Europe, and the political situation of that country, left us but little fear. Was there any ambitious State or States, who, in violation of every sacred obligation, was preparing to enslave the other States, and raise itself to consequence on the ruin of the others? Or was there any such ambitious individual? We did not apprehend it to be the case; but suppose it to be true, it rendered it the more necessary, that we should sacredly guard against a system, which might enable all those ambitious views to be carried into effect even under the sanction of the constitution and government. In fine, Sir, all these threats were treated with contempt, and they were told, that we apprehended but one reason to prevent the States meeting again in convention; that, when they discovered the part this convention had acted, and how much its members were abusing the trust reposed in them, the States would never trust another convention. At length, Sir, after every argument had been exhausted by the advocates of equality of representation, the question was called, when a majority decided in favor of inequality; Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia voting for it; Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware against it; Maryland divided.”

On pages 28-32, it says “The States have a right to an equality of representation. This is secured to us by our present articles of confederation; we are in possession of this right; it is now to be torn from us. What

security can you give us, that, when you get the power the proposed system will give you, when you have men and money, that you will not force from the States that equality of suffrage in the second branch, which you now deny to be their right, and only give up from absolute necessity? Will you tell us we ought to trust you, because you now enter into a solemn compact with us? This you have done before, and now treat with the utmost contempt. Will you now make an appeal to the Supreme Being, and call on him to guarantee your observance of this compact? The same you have formerly done, for your observance of the articles of confederation, which you are now violating in the most wanton manner.

The same reasons, which you now urge for destroying our present federal government, may be urged for abolishing the system, which you now propose to adopt; and, as the method prescribed by the articles of confederation is now totally disregarded by you, as little regard may be shown by you to the rule prescribed for the amendment of the new system, whenever, having obtained power by the government, you shall hereafter be pleased either to discard it entirely, or so to alter it as to give yourselves all that superiority, which you have now contended for, and to obtain which you have shown yourselves disposed to hazard the Union. Such, Sir, was the language used on that occasion, and they were told, that, as we could not possibly have a stronger tie on them, for their observance of the new system, than we had for their observance of the articles of confederation. Which had proved totally insufficient, it would be wrong and imprudent to confide in them. It was further observed, that the inequality of the representation would be daily increasing. That many of the States, whose territory was confined, and whose population was at this time large in proportion to their territory, would probably, twenty, thirty, or forty years hence, have no more representatives than at the introduction of the government; whereas, the States having extensive territory, where lands are to be procured cheap, would be daily increasing in the number of inhabitants, not only from propagation, but from the emigration of the inhabitants of the other States, and would have soon double, or perhaps treble the number of representatives that they are to have at first, and thereby enormously increase their influence in the national councils. However, the majority of the select committee at length agreed to a series of propositions, by way of compromise, part of which related to the representation in the first branch, nearly as the system is now published, and art of them to the second branch, securing, in that, equal representation, - and reported them as a compromise, upon the express terms, that they were wholly to be adopted, or wholly to be rejected. Upon this compromise, a great number of the members so far engaged themselves, that if the system was progressed upon agreeably to the terms of the compromise, they would lend it their names, by signing it, and would not actively oppose it, if their States should appear inclined to adopt it. Some, however, in which number was myself, who joined in the report, and agreed to proceed upon those principles, and see what kind of system would ultimately be formed upon it, yet resolved to themselves, in the most explicit manner, the right of finally giving a solemn dissent to the system, if it was thought by them inconsistent with the freedom and happiness of their country. This, Sir, will account why the members of the convention so generally signed their names to the system; not because they thought it a proper one; not because they thoroughly approved, or were unanimous for it, but because they thought it better than the system attempted to be

forced upon them . . . it did not appear to me, that either of those illustrious characters, the honorable Mr. Washington or the President of the State of Pennsylvania, was disposed to favor the claims of the smaller States, against the undue superiority attempted by the large States; on the contrary the honorable President of Pennsylvania was a member of the committee of compromise, and there advocated the right of the large States to an inequality in both branches, and only ultimately conceded in the second branch on the principle of conciliation, when it was found no other terms would be accepted. This, Sir, I think it my duty to mention, for the consideration of those, who endeavor to prop up a dangerous and defective system by great names . . . Before the adjournment, I moved for liberty to be given to the different members to take correct copies of the propositions, to which the convention had then agreed, in order that, during the recess of the convention, we might have an opportunity of considering them, and, if it should be thought that any alterations or amendments were necessary, that we might be prepared, against the convention met, to bring them forward for discussion. But, Sir, the same spirit, which caused our doors to be shut, our proceedings to be kept secret, our journals to be locked up, and every avenue, as far as possible, to be shut to public information, prevailed also in this case.”

Further along, starting on page 33 and ending on page 36, gives us this:

“Those who were for two branches in the legislature, a House of Representatives and a Senate, urged the necessity of a second branch to serve as a check upon the first, and used all those trite and common-place arguments which may be proper and just, when applied to the formation of a State government, over individuals variously distinguished in their habits and manners, fortune and rank; where a body chosen in a select manner, respectable for their wealth and dignity, may be necessary, frequently, to prevent the hasty and rash measures of a representation more popular. But on the other side, it was urged, that none of those arguments could with propriety be applied to the formation of a federal government over a number of independent States; that it is the State governments which are to watch over and protect the rights of the individual, whether rich or poor, or of moderate circumstances, and in which the democratic and aristocratic influence or principles are to be so blended, modified, and checked, as to prevent oppression and injury; that the federal government is to guard and protect the States and their rights, and to regulate their common concerns; that a federal government if formed by the States, as States, that is, in their sovereign capacities, in the same manner as treaties and alliances are formed; that a sovereignty, considered as such, cannot be said to have jarring interests or principles, the one aristocratic, and the other democratic; but that the principles of a sovereignty, considered as a sovereignty, are the same, whether that sovereignty is monarchical, aristocratical, democratical, or mixed; that the history of mankind doth not furnish an instance, from its earliest period to the present time, of a federal government constituted of two distinct braches; that the members of the federal government, if appointed by the States in the State capacities, that is, by their legislatures, as they ought, would be select in their choice, and, coming from different States, having different interests and views, this difference of interests and views would always be a sufficient check over the whole . . . It was urged, that the government we were forming was not in reality a federal, but a national government; not founded on the principles of the preservation, but the abolition

or consolidation of all State governments; that we appeared totally to have forgot the business for which we were sent, and the situation of the country for which we were preparing our system; that we had not been sent to form a government over the inhabitants of America, considered as individuals; that as individuals, they were all subject to their respective State governments, which governments would still remain, though the federal government should be dissolved; that the system of government we were intrusted to prepare, was a government over these thirteen States; but that, in our proceedings, we adopted principles which would be right and proper, only on the supposition that there were no State governments at all, but that all the inhabitants of this extensive continent were, in their individual capacity, without government, and in a state of nature; that, accordingly, the system proposes the legislature to consist of two branches, the one to be drawn from the people at large, immediately in their individual capacity, the other to be chosen in a more select manner, as a check upon the first. It is, in its very introduction, declared to be a compact between the people of the United States, as individuals; and it is to be ratified, by the people at large, in their capacity as individuals; all which it was said would be quite right and proper, if there were no State governments, if all the people of this continent were in a state of nature, and we were forming one national government for them as individuals; and nearly the same as was done in most of the States when they formed their governments over the people who compose them.

Whereas it was urged, that the principles on which a federal governments over the States ought to be constructed and ratified, are the reverse; that instead of the legislature consisting of two branches, one branch was sufficient, whether examined by the dictates of reason, or the experience of ages; that the representation, instead of being drawn from the people at large, as individuals, ought to be drawn from the States, as States, in their sovereign capacity; that, in a federal government, the parties to the compact are not the people, as individuals, but the States, as States; and that it is by the States, as States, in their sovereign capacity, that the system of government ought to be ratified, and not by the people, as individuals.

It was further said, that, in a federal government over States equally free, sovereign, and independent, every State ought to have an equal share in making the federal laws or regulations, in deciding upon them, and in carrying them into execution; neither of which is the case in this system, but the reverse; the States not having an equal voice in the legislature, nor in the appointment of the executive, the judges, and other officers of the government. It was insisted, that, in the whole system, there was but one federal feature, - the appointment of the senators by the States in their sovereign capacity, that is, by their legislatures, and the equality of suffrage in that branch; but it was said, that this feature was only federal in appearance."

Further along, starting on page 38 and ending on page 42:

"Viewing it as a national, not a federal government, as calculated and designed not to protect and preserve but to abolish and annihilate the State governments, it was opposed for the follows reasons. It was said, that this continent was much too extensive for one national government, which should have sufficient

power and energy to pervade and hold in obedience and subjection all its parts, consistent with the enjoyment and preservation of liberty; that the genius and habits of the people of America were opposed to such a government. That, during their connexion with Great Britain, they had been accustomed to have all their concerns transacted within a narrow circle, their colonial district; they had been accustomed to have their seats of government near them, to which they might have access, without much inconvenience, when their business should require it. That, at this time, we find, if a country is rather large, the people complain of the inconvenience, and clamor for a division of their courts are held, so as to render it more central and convenient. That, in those States, the territory of which is extensive, as soon as the population increases remote from the seat of government, the inhabitants are urgent for the removal of the seat of their government, or to be erected into a new State. As a proof of this, the inhabitants of western parts of Virginia and North Carolina, of Vermont and the province of Maine, were instances; even the inhabitants of the western parts of Pennsylvania, who, it is said, already seriously look forward to the time when they shall either be erected into a State, or have their seat of government removed to the Susquehanna. If the inhabitants of the different States consider it as a grievance to attend a county court, or the seat of their own government, when a little inconvenient, can it be supposed they would ever submit to have a national government established, the seat of which would be more than a thousand miles removed from some of them?

It was insisted, that government of a republican nature are those best calculated to preserve the freedom and happiness of the citizen; that governments of this kind are only calculated for a territory but small in its extent; that the only method by which an extensive continent like America could be connected and united together, consistent with the principles of freedom, must be by having a number of strong and energetic State governments for securing and protecting the rights of individuals forming those governments, and for regulating all their concerns; and a strong, energetic federal government over those States, for the protection and preservation, and for regulating the common concerns of the State. It was further insisted, that, even if it was possible to effect a total abolition of the State governments at this time, and to establish one general government over the people, it could not long subsist, but in a little time would again be broken into a variety of governments of a smaller extent, similar, in some manner, to the present situation of this continent; the principle difference, in all probability, would be, that the governments so established, being affected by some violent convulsion, might not be formed in principles so favorable to liberty as those of our present State governments. That this ought to be an important consideration to such of the States as had excellent governments, which was the case with Maryland and most others, whatever it might be to persons, who, disapproving of their particular State government, would be willing to hazard every thing to overturn and destroy it. These reasons, Sir, influenced me to vote against two branches in the legislature, and against every part of the system which was repugnant to the principles of a federal government. Nor was there a single argument urged, or reason assigned, which to my mind was satisfactory, to prove, that a good government on federal principles was unattainable; the whole of their arguments only proving, what none of us controverted, that our federal government, as originally formed,

was defective, and wanted amendment. However, a majority of the convention hastily and inconsiderately, without condescending to make a fair trial, in their great wisdom decided, that a kind of government, which a Montesquieu and a Price have declared the best calculated of any to preserve internal liberty, and to enjoy external strength and security, and the only one by which a large continent can be connected and united, consistently with the principles of liberty, was totally impracticable; and they acted accordingly.”

The Scribe has not had a chance to read this whole book, at the time of writing this. However, based upon the aforementioned, it is irrelevant what else is in the book. The preceding passages demonstrate the seditious and traitorous nature of the majority of the delegates (or deputies) representing the larger states, including the President of the convention, in wanting to destroy the confederation by subjugating the smaller states. The plan was to unlawfully usurp the existing government using their so called celebrity status to wrongfully influence the uninformed, and then get the uninformed people within the states to commit treason against the existing government by ratifying the Constitution for the United States.

As was mentioned, the conventioners clearly “*appeared totally to have forgot the business for which they were sent*”, as is specified by the Congressional Resolution of Feb. 21, 1787. This, the conventioners blatantly violated. Besides violating this Resolution, their actions were seditious in their approving a method to usurp the existing government by an unlawful process. Then, again, by using their celebrity status, were able to convince the uninformed feeble masses to form their state conventions and approve the ratification process, and thus, making those uninformed people commit treason against the existing confederation, and eventual slaves to the new form of government, which also enslaved their states.

So now you know why the convention had so much secrecy surrounding it. As a collective, they were committing sedition and treason against the lawful government. This coincides with the quotes of George Washington, paraphrased as “Do not ask me about the legality of the Constitution” and “The first time in history that a government has changed hands without bloodshed”.

CONCLUSION

According to the law of the time, the Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union, which Congress was to follow, the process created in that convention which had brought forth, passed, and put in place the Constitution for the United States was completely unlawful in EVERY respect.

EVEN THE EXECUTION OF RUNNING UNDER THE CONSTITUTION WAS UNLAWFUL:

What are the qualifications for being elected President of the United States under the Constitution? Here they are under Article II, Section 1, Clause 5:

“No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.”

George Washington took the oath of office in March 1789. Was he born in the United States? No, but he was born in America when the states were colonies, so, you can make the argument he was a “Citizen of the United States” when the Constitution was adopted. Was he 35 or older? Yes. Had he been a resident of the United States for fourteen years? No.

When was the United States created? The earliest possible date can only be July 4, 1776 as prior to that, the states were colonies and the people were subjects to King George III of Great Britain. One can also make the argument that the creation of the United States, or more precisely “The United States of America” occurred with the full ratification of the Articles of Confederation on March 1, 1781.

Thus, fourteen years from 1776 is 1790. Fourteen years from 1781 is 1795. So how is it that George Washington was able to take office in 1789? In 1789 there was no one alive on planet Earth that could qualify to be President.

Talk about sedition, usurpation, and treason! How many people alive on planet Earth in 2015 are even aware of this? I know the rulers are (because they still rule), but what about the subjects or the people?

The Union States Assembly Scribe rests having put forth the irrefutable evidence, direct from the Congressional Journals themselves. Now, what are the people going to do about it?

Produced by Union States Assembly