

1/12/19

## **Narration for Understanding Federal Tyranny, Part One of Five Parts**

Welcome to Part One of the five-part Patriot Corps presentation, *Understanding Federal Tyranny*.

Parts One and Two of this series provide a general overview of expansive federal powers, explaining in broad terms how members of Congress and federal officials are able to extend beyond the Constitution's enumerated powers, despite being bound by their solemn oaths to support the Constitution.

After the first two presentations provide the framework necessary to explain how government servants work to become our political masters, Parts Three, Four, and Five will prove the overview true as they "follow the money"—as they examine the specific case of Congress, American Presidents and the Courts surreptitiously displacing our lawful tender money of gold and silver coin with paper currency.

Exposing to the bright light of day the constitutional loophole exploited by power-hungry politicians allows freedom-loving Americans to take the steps necessary to contain or eliminate that source of inherent discretion that allows them unbridled authority, to reclaim our rightful heritage of limited government and individual liberty.

When discussing the topic of abuse of federal authority—it is appropriate to start with the U.S. Constitution, the supreme Law of the Land, which sets the standard for allowable federal action.

However, if Patriots are being perfectly honest, they'd have to readily admit that the U.S. Constitution seemingly has little effect in the day-to-day affairs back in the District of Columbia.

Which begs the question, "How can that be?"

After all, members of Congress and supreme Court justices shall all be *bound* by oath or affirmation to "support" this Constitution.

And, American Presidents, no matter their political affiliation and irrespective of the personal views, shall also be *bound* by oath or affirmation to "preserve, protect and defend" the Constitution of the United States and also to "faithfully execute" the Office of President.

So, how then is it possible that members of Congress and federal officials who are legally bound by those oaths to support the Constitution seemingly bypass their constitutional restraints without repercussion?

Before examining that critical question of abuse of federal authority, it is important to understand how federal powers are properly obtained and exercised in the first place. After all, the concept that

federal servants may exercise discretion for the Union beyond the Constitution is antithetical to the founding principles of these United States.

Thankfully, since the delegation of authority from the States to the Congress and U.S. Government are formal transfers of governing power, they may be critically examined to understand all the ramifications and underlying principles involved.

To learn how Congress and the U.S. Government obtained their enumerated powers, one must travel back in time to the origin of our country and then examine the later delegations of federal powers by the States that make up the Union.

With their Declaration of Independence in 1776, the American colonies of Great Britain declared their independence, not only from Great Britain, but also even from one another, declaring themselves to be “Free and Independent States.”

Throwing off the British Crown did not immediately create another form of government. Thus, the governing power formerly exercised by Great Britain devolved upon the only governing bodies existing at that time, the individual States themselves.

While the States were already sending their respective delegates to meet and work together in the Second Continental Congress, this body of men had no coercive power over any State, nor any formal structure whatsoever.

The Independence Pie Chart shown here graphically represents all governing authority being exercised wholly in each State by the respective State itself, within its geographic borders.

The Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union were drafted and proposed in 1777, but they were not formally ratified by all the individual States until 1781. With the Revolutionary War officially ending in 1783, one may see that the bulk of the war effort was fought without any strict federal structure whatsoever.

Since the Articles of Confederation amounted to only a transitory government, we’re not going to examine that form of government, to instead concentrate on the U.S. Constitution which is today relevant.

In 1787, following the lead of the Virginia legislature, Congress under the Articles of Confederation called for a convention to meet in Philadelphia to revise the Articles to meet the exigencies of the Union, especially dealing with trade and the difficult problem of settling past-due war debts.

The convention immediately began to draft instead a charter for a new form of government.

In September of 1787, the delegates sent their completed draft to the States for ratification.

The last article in the proposed Constitution, Article VII, detailed the ratification process for establishing the Constitution. It reads;

“The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.”

After the ninth State ratified the U.S. Constitution in 1788, the time was established for the following spring for the ratifying States through their elected Senators and Representatives to meet in Congress and begin government under the Constitution.

The directive in Article VII specifying that the ratification of the conventions of *nine* States would be sufficient for the establishment of the Constitution “between the States so ratifying the same” acknowledged that no State would come under the Constitution except by its own accord.

When March of 1789 arrived, two more States of the Union had ratified the Constitution. Thus, on Wednesday, March 4, 1789, the 11 States that had already ratified the U.S. Constitution began to meet in New York City.

It wasn't until November of 1789 that North Carolina as the 12<sup>th</sup> State ratified the U.S. Constitution. Thereafter, North Carolina chose its U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives who could thereafter assemble in Congress.

In May of 1790, Rhode Island ratified the U.S. Constitution and thereafter likewise joined in the measures of the Union under the Constitution as the last of the original 13 States.

If either of these latter two States had refused to ratify the Constitution, they would have remained separate nation-States, continuing to exercise all governmental powers within their State.

No State of the Union came under the U.S. Constitution until the State ratified it.

Thus, with ratification of the U.S. Constitution by each State, the governing power which was once exercised only by each State within its borders was now divided into State and federal authority.

Whereas the Independence Pie Chart showed all government power originally being exercised only within each State of the Union, with ratification of the U.S. Constitution, the Ratification Pie Chart shows a *division* of governing power, thereafter divided into *State* and *federal* authorities.

The thin blue wedge of federal authority represented in the Ratification Pie Chart shows the extent of governing power that is delineated in the U.S. Constitution. The large, yellow remainder piece of governing authority represents all the reserved powers held in each State within its respective geographic borders.

Of course, the U.S. Constitution as originally ratified contains Article V which delineates an amendment process that allows the States a process for formally changing the powers of Congress and the U.S. Government.

The pertinent words of Article V read;

“Amendments...shall be valid...as part of this Constitution, when ratified by...*three fourths* of the several States.”

Thus, once a proposed amendment is ratified by three-fourths of the then-existing States, formal changes in the division of federal and State authority takes place. Amendments may restrict or enlarge federal powers. The Amended Pie Chart shown here represents all the 27 amendments that have been ratified since the Constitution was first established, slightly enlarging the federal powers over the original determination under Article VII.

However, if one were to ask the average American on the street to graphically represent the approximate division of power as readily witnessed today in the day-to-day affairs of government, it would probably look something like what is being labelled here as the “Feral Pie Chart”, or a pie chart that shows a federal government exercising powers well-beyond those enumerated initially or as amended.

The Feral Pie Chart appears to be Pac-Man gone crazy, all but devouring up what was once within the sole domain of the several States of the Union, far beyond the normal federal powers changed only by amendment.

Thus, one begins to note disturbing evidence of a separation of current actions from underlying authority. Since the United States guarantee to every State of the Union a Republican Form of Government—representative government of delegated powers (under Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution)—it is important to examine existing evidence that separates action from underlying principles. Indeed, representative government must conform to delegated authority—the idea that those who are delegated federal powers may determine the extent of those powers mocks that delegation, and is rightfully called tyranny and absolute despotism.

Recall, that with ratification of the Constitution under the Article VII ratification process, the several States of the Union voluntarily gave to their new agent—the Congress and the U.S. Government—distinct and enumerated powers. Those powers related to matters such as dealing with foreign relations, especially with trade and matters of war and peace. Also, a few things for ensuring uniformity amongst the States were delegated, such as the coinage of money and the free flow of goods across State borders.

Of course, the Article V amendment process allows the States of the Union to give more power to the federal government, or pull it back through formal changes of authority.

The safeguard against the improper exercise of delegated federal powers, of course, is that every member of Congress and high federal official must swear an oath to support the Constitution and hold it inviolable.

Which leads patriots asserting the existence of a Feral Pie Chart to ask questions such as “Does the binding oath no longer bind” and “Have government servants become our political masters?”

That such questions may be asked today with complete sincerity is a tragic commentary of how far these United States of America have strayed from their original course.

To understand better the improper diversion of government action away from fundamental principles, it is helpful to name our current condition, for articulating what we face allows us to confront it more fully.

The Patriot Corps calls this condition “The Peculiar Conundrum”—the odd phenomenon of members of Congress and federal officials bypassing their constitutional constraints, with impunity.

The idea that members of Congress and federal officials may ignore their solemn oaths to support the Constitution must be examined, for that cannot be. Government servants may not become masters of this Union.

Thus, it is time to examine critically the Peculiar Conundrum, the odd phenomenon of members of Congress and federal officials seemingly able to do as they please without effective restraint.

To cut directly to the chase, is appropriate to boldly declare that the Feral Pie Chart doesn't exist beyond that of a mistaken and soon-to-be-discredited theory.

The Feral Pie Chart is but a figment of the collective imagination of an uninformed populace, every bit as dangerous as is a mirage is in a desert to a parched patriot thirsting for life-sustaining water.

There is no more dangerous action than to concede our Republic of enumerated powers to the unlimited action of those persons who must instead become legally bound to support the Constitution. If we foolishly allow federal servants to exercise inherent discretion for the whole Union, we surrender limited government and accept in its place absolute tyranny.

To accept that supreme Court justices may interpret the Constitution's words into the opposite meanings for the Union, then, in effect—if not in deed—we bow before these justices who have become our political masters.

Our safety will not to be found in the careful picking of these masters from those persons who have like mind as our own; instead, we must take every possible measure to remove that source of absolute authority they seek to exercise over their subjects.

To oppose absolute rule, we must first boldly assert that neither court justices, the President, nor members of Congress may ever exercise inherent discretion throughout the Union.

But, if inherent discretion for the Union doesn't exist—if that Feral Pie Chart doesn't actually exist—then what exists in its place? Obviously, something is going on beyond that which meets the eye.

To discover what exists in the place of absolute federal discretion exercised *throughout the Union*, it is important first to realize that absolute federal discretion exists instead *in a very special place*.

To learn about *that place* and to learn how it is different from other places, it is important to learn about the highly unusual exception to all the normal rules of the U.S. Constitution—Article I, Section 8, Clause 17—the clause for the District Seat of the Government of the United States.

The first portion of Clause 17 reads;

“Congress shall have Power...To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of Government of the United States...”

By these words, one discovers Clause 17 allows for the creation of a District to be used as the exclusive federal seat—what in time became the District of Columbia.

In 1791, the State of Maryland ceded (or gave up) to Congress and the U.S. Government, a specific parcel of land lying North and East of the Potomac River. With that cession of land, Maryland also transferred all of its power to govern that parcel over to Congress.

At the same time, the State of Virginia also ceded (or transferred) land South and West of the Potomac River. Combined, the two parcels of land could not exceed ten miles square, or 100 square miles.

Congress accepted those parcels of land for use as the Seat of Government of the United States.

The District of Columbia was built up and became the permanent federal seat in the year 1800. Thereafter, Congress would exercise the exclusive ability to govern that land without interference from any State of the Union, with neither State (Maryland or Virginia [or any other State, for that matter]), having any continuing State authority in those parcels. Thereafter, *only* members of Congress and federal officials could exercise governing powers there.

Since the U.S. Constitution directly empowers Congress with the enumerated power to exercise exclusive legislation “in all Cases whatsoever,” it should be noted that if members of Congress delegate some local authority over to a mayor, city council, or other local form of government, that delegation of authority always remains strictly subservient to Congress by express constitutional authority and thus any local forms of government are irrelevant to our discussion. Therefore, local D.C. government will be ignored from further consideration herein.

It should be noted that the land ceded by Virginia (Alexandria) was *retroceded* back to Virginia in 1846, as unnecessary for the government seat. Since only the former lands of Maryland today form the District of Columbia, for the remainder of the presentation, only Maryland will be discussed, but realize that Virginia was included in this discussion until 1846.

Before examining the words of Clause 17 more fully, it is proper to finish reading the remainder of the clause, which reads that Congress shall also have Power;

“to exercise *like Authority* over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings.”

Thus, beside the federal district seat, other exclusive legislative lands include many military forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards and other needful buildings.

“Other needful buildings” refers most often to U.S. Post Offices, court houses and lighthouses.

Although patriots routinely ignore this clause because they mistakenly think it only applies to the District Seat and other exclusive legislation properties, a proper examination into Clause 17 reveals otherwise, showing just how very important is this clause in understanding the extreme federal powers today, across the nation and globe.

The first matter to realize regarding Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 is that members of Congress are expressly given the power to exercise *exclusive* legislation in the District of Columbia and “like Authority” over the other exclusive federal properties. Not only is this power to be used *exclusively* by Congress in the occasional case, but “in all Cases whatsoever.” In every instance, members of Congress determine the allowable governing actions here.

Looking back to the Amended Pie Chart, one may see the *division* of governing power between federal and State authority. Since this Amended Pie Chart shows a “division” of governing authority

into federal and State authority, obviously the Amended Pie Chart is not the appropriate pie chart to represent the “exclusive” legislative jurisdiction of Congress for the District Seat and exclusive federal areas. Nor was the earlier Ratification Pie Chart applicable, for that matter.

However, even the *Feral Pie Chart* that many people assume to be the applicable pie chart representing government action today still shows a *division* of governing power between the federal and State authorities. Therefore, not even the Feral Pie Chart explains the unique situation found in the District of Columbia.

As discussed earlier, the Feral Pie Chart which represents inherent government discretion exercised throughout the Union *does not exist*, ANYWHERE! The Feral Pie Chart finds no source of authority by the U.S. Constitution—no part of the Constitution suggests that members of Congress and federal officials may define the extent of their own powers for the Union, and increase their authority of their own accord.

Since no pie chart already covered explains the unusual situation described by the strict words of Clause 17, a *new* pie chart must be drawn up to represent the type of government authority exercised in D.C.

The Exclusive Legislation Pie Chart shown here properly represents *all* governing power being exercised in the District of Columbia only by Congress and the U.S. Government, without *any* governing powers being exercised by any State of the Union.

This *all-blue* Pie shows governing power being exercised *exclusively* by Congress and federal officials.

Discovering the existence of the Exclusive Legislation Pie Chart necessitates that Patriots interested in restoring limited government learn its unusual implications, for it references something far, far greater than the hypothetical but non-existence Feral Pie Chart could ever hope to reach.

To understand the vast reach of the Exclusive Legislative Jurisdiction Pie Chart, it is important to examine Clause 17 in greater detail, to learn more about this unique clause.

Carefully examining the phrase, “Congress shall have Power...by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress” for the area of land to become the District Seat, the word *particular* stands out as something wholly unique in the transfer of power to the Congress and U.S. Government.

Recall that in the Article VII ratification process, it took the action of *nine* States to establish the Constitution, but only in the States “so ratifying the Same.” Since every State of the Union had to ratify the U.S. Constitution before that Constitution became established therein (before the State gave up those enumerated powers), the Article VII ratification process ultimately described the individual actions of *every* State of the Union.

Under the Article V amendment process, the action of *three-fourths* of the States bound all the States of the Union to the ratified amendment.

In other words, both the Article VII ratification and Article V amendment processes looked at the *combined* actions of all the States of the Union, to transfer governing powers *from* the States *to* the Congress and U.S. Government.



Now, however, under Article I of the Constitution, Patriots discover that even a *single* State of the Union—a *particular* State—may give up power to Congress and the U.S. Government *all by itself!*

This highly unusual and wholly unique transfer of governing authority must be understood, for it references a source and extent of powers far, far different from the remainder of the Constitution.

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17—for exclusive federal purposes—*one* State merely has to offer and once Congress accepts, then the transfer of land and power is complete!

Thereafter, only members of Congress and federal officials may exercise governing power therein. No longer does any State of the Union exercise any governing power in that ceded parcel—indeed, the only State of the Union that was able to exercise local powers therein just gave them all up!

While the U.S. Constitution and all the States of the Union (by their ratification of the Constitution) have expressly allowed this unique transfer of power for allowed purposes, the fact of the matter is that the local governing power for D.C. comes *from only a single State*.

Patriots interested in Restoring Our American Republic of limited powers must understand this highly unique set of circumstances, because it lies at the common root of all federal tyranny witnessed today.

To learn more about this power, it is important to examine further this cession of land and governing authority for the District Seat.

As stated earlier, in 1791, the State of Maryland ceded a tract of land for the Seat of Government.

In order for Congress to be able to exercise “*exclusive* Legislation *in all Cases whatsoever*” over the District Seat to conform to the requirements of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, Maryland *had to give up* all its powers in this ceded tract of land.

Of course, since Maryland had *already* ratified the U.S. Constitution (in 1788)—in other words, since it had *already* transferred all the federal powers that are expressly enumerated within the original Constitution—the transfer of governing authority in 1791 had nothing to do with the powers already given up by Maryland by ratification of the Constitution years earlier.

Therefore, the U. S. Constitution can tell us *nothing more about the local powers Maryland later ceded in 1791!*

Consequently, study of the U.S. Constitution beyond Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 will not aid our understanding of the powers Maryland ceded in order for Congress to legislate *exclusively* in the District Seat.

It is important to break apart the Exclusive Legislation Pie Chart into its federal and local components, to understand more fully the highly unusual circumstances involved with the transfer of the local power by Maryland.

Exploding apart the Exclusive Legislation Pie Chart to show the separate origins of the separately-sourced powers herein combined, first notice the separate thin blue wedge of the federal authority that every State of the Union gave to Congress and the U.S. Government by the Article VII ratification and Article V amendment processes. The large, blue remainder piece of the pie



represents the local powers ceded by Maryland in 1791 (which became fully operational in 1800 when the District became the permanent federal seat).

When Maryland ceded its lands for the District Seat, it did *not* give Congress and the U.S. Government the specific powers it exercised under its State Constitution, but the ability to govern, going back to a base, sovereign nature.

When a new government begins exercising governing authority, the guiding principles of the earlier form of government *do not bind the second*.

For instance, members of Congress today are not limited by Maryland's State Constitution any more than the States are today bound by the former British laws of their colonial era.

Maryland gave up its ability to govern its respective tract of land ceded to Congress for the District Seat. Thereafter, members of Congress and federal officials govern in that locality within new parameters.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution provides the parameters, explicitly stating that;

“Congress shall have Power...To exercise exclusive Legislation *in all Cases whatsoever*.”

The ability for members of Congress to exercise exclusive legislation *in all cases whatsoever* must be understood, for this unique four-word phrase references unbounded power, power perhaps beyond the comprehension of today's mortal man.

A look to our Declaration of Independence helps today's patriots to get a peek.

Much of the Declaration is a listing of the numerous “injuries and usurpations” practiced by the King of Great Britain and Parliament against the American colonies.

The specific injuries listed in various paragraphs in the Declaration begin with the phrase “He has...”

The thirteenth of these “He has” paragraphs, which discusses the king giving his “Assent to...Acts of pretended Legislation,” is in turn broken up into nine sub-paragraphs that begin with the word “For...”

The last of those nine sub-paragraphs which discusses historical “Acts of pretended Legislation” is worded;

“For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with Power to legislate *in all cases whatsoever*.”

Here one sees the same four-word phrase “in all Cases whatsoever” that was mentioned in the U.S. Constitution.

That repetition should strike Patriots as rather odd, since these words in the Declaration are listing the despicable actions of a tyrant who was trying to reduce the colonists “under absolute Despotism”, while the U.S. Constitution was ratified to establish limited government throughout the land of free people.

South Carolina's 1776 State Constitution use of this same four-word phrase is even more enlightening, where its opening line reads;

“Whereas the British Parliament, claiming of late years a right to bind the North American colonies by law *in all cases whatsoever*...without the consent and against the will of the colonists.”

Here, in the South Carolina Constitution, one sees that this British claim of being able to “bind” the colonies by law “in all cases whatsoever” extended to *binding* the colonists “without (their) consent” and even “against (their) will.”

Both of these historical references in the Declaration of Independence and the South Carolina Constitution point to an explicit British assertion—Great Britain's 1766 “Declaratory Act,” also known as “The American Colonies Act.”

This 1766 Act was enacted on the same day that Great Britain repealed the dreaded Stamp Act of 1765, that had been imposed upon American legal documents, newspapers, magazines and even playing cards.

In response to the Stamp Act, the American colonies banded together through Committees of Correspondence and successfully executed non-importation agreements with one another to refuse to land or buy the British goods shipped to American soil.

Without eventual purchase of shipped goods, wealthy British exporters saw their revenues plummet and complained bitterly to Parliament (note that the American colonists had no representation in British Parliament).

Finally, due to the success of the non-importation agreements, on March 18, 1766, Britain repealed the Stamp Act, but nevertheless on the same day enacted their Declaratory Act, which, in part, read;

“The King's majesty...had, hath, and of right ought to have, full power and authority to make laws...of sufficient force and validity to bind the colonies and people of America, subjects of the crown of Great Britain, *in all cases whatsoever*.”

Here, one sees the ruthless origin of the despotic four-word phrase, “in all cases whatsoever,” which is the claim of absolute dominion over people who may be bound not only without their consent, but even against their will.

Understanding the full implications of the British Act, one may realize that it was actually the single cause of our American revolution, after a full decade of issuing pleas to a deaf king and Parliament who refused to back away from their stance of absolute power.

Indeed, all of the various injuries and usurpations listed in the Declaration of Independence, broken down to their common denominator, are all but different manifestations of this ultimate power to bind the colonies by law “in all cases whatsoever” played out over a decade of absolute tyranny.

The look back in history shows the extreme source of power referenced by the phrase “in all Cases whatsoever” that Congress may exercise in the District Seat.

But, the present day and our future is what really concerns us. How does that power affect those of us who do not live and work in the District of Columbia?

Looking at matters from their broadest-possible application is helpful to convey the big-ticket principles.

A compare and contrast is therefore helpful to understand the implications of this power today.

Recall that for the whole Union of States—throughout all the States of the Union—the small blue wedge of federal authority transferred under the Article VII ratification and Article V amendment processes delineates the powers allotted to Congress and the U.S. Government.

The large yellow remainder piece of the government authority pie is then the amount of powers each State exercises within its respective borders.

The U.S. Constitution details the extent of allowable powers for the federal government represented by the narrow, blue wedge of federal authority. The respective State Constitutions detail the primary extent of allowable State powers represented by the remainder of the yellow pie. Of course, the U.S. Constitution also has a number of express prohibitions against the States of the Union, such as that no State shall coin money, emit bills of credit, or make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts.

But, as seen in this presentation thus far, the District Seat is different. In the District of Columbia, members of Congress still have the thin blue wedge of federal authority ceded by every State of the Union for exercise throughout the States united, powers that are detailed in the original Constitution as amended. Thus, Congress may still exercise those federal powers in the District Seat that all the States of the Union allowed them under the Article VII ratification and Article V amendment processes.

However, in the District Seat, members of Congress may also exercise the local, State-like powers in the place of Maryland which had previously exercised them.

Importantly, however, the only clause of *any Constitution* discussing the extent of allowable powers in the District of Columbia is Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution and it specifically details that members of Congress may exercise exclusive legislation *in all cases whatsoever*.

This fount of inherent discretion allows members of Congress to do as they see fit, without meeting any other parameters found in any Constitution which is binding upon them, beyond a small list of prohibitions on Congress found in the U.S. Constitution.

For example, the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, among other things, expressly prohibits Congress from making any law “respecting an establishment of religion.” Because this express prohibition on Congress is not limited by place, then this prohibition also keeps Congress from establishing a State religion in the District Seat.

Other than the few express prohibitions such as those found in the Bill of Rights, however, members of Congress have inherent discretion to do as they see fit. No State-like Constitution restricts the powers of Congress in the District Seat.

Since the U.S. Constitution does not outline any other parameters for the District Seat beyond Clause 17, and since no State-like Constitution exists to bind Congress, the President or the Courts for the District Seat, these government servants may in the District Seat become political masters.

Indeed, imagine a State where its legislature was not bound by a State Constitution—where no State Constitution even existed. Just think of all the things which that legislature could and would do if it had no standard set for its allowable action, other than its own inherent discretion. Well, that is *precisely* the situation for members of Congress in the Government Seat. No local State-like Constitution restricts their actions in this place!

Only “States” are guaranteed a Republican Form of Government—Legislative Representation — under Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution, and the District of Columbia is not a “State.”

Indeed, while Legislative Representation is the fundamental building block of our nation, in the District of Columbia, there is none! Only “States” of the Union elect Senators and (voting) Representatives in Congress.

Thus, in the District of Columbia, there is no prohibition keeping members of Congress from “sharing” their legislative responsibilities with the supreme Court, the President, department heads, or agency bureaucrats of the alphabet agencies. Nor is there even any any prohibition from members of Congress sharing their powers for the District Seat with foreign dignitaries, such as with the United Nations! Nothing is beyond their inherent power!

Members of Congress and federal officials must make up all the rules for the District of Columbia as they go along.

What is occurring is this all-encompassing power for D.C. is somehow “leaking out” of the District of Columbia and spilling over into the States. It is up to us to discover that “somehow” process so we may shut off the spigot.

The source of unlimited federal action has been found. Strict construction of the U.S. Constitution expressly details *a special place* where members of Congress are fully empowered to define the extent of their own powers—where they may and must make up all their allowable rules of their own accord as they go along!

The only thing that remains is to discover how the scoundrels exercising this enumerated power have taken that authorized power far, far beyond its proper geographic constraints.

Note that no longer is the claim that Congress and the U.S. Government may *never* do a particular action which seems forever beyond their reach, but simply that they cannot do those actions *where they do*. That is a completely different argument.

Clearly, the claims of patriots that Congress and federal officials act “unconstitutionally” have been sadly mistaken, for *one* clause of the Constitution does reach to all possible actions except the precious few that are actually prohibited them.

Please turn to Part 2 of *Understanding Federal Tyranny* to continue this important look into the abuse of federal authority from a broad perspective, to first learn the Big Idea before getting into the finer details in a specific case.

In the meantime, at least until the other presentations are completed, please see any of Matt Erickson's nine public domain books found at the [www.PatriotCorps.org](http://www.PatriotCorps.org) website, available in online viewers, downloadable pdf, epub or mobi formats, or royalty-free paperback copies available directly from one-off printers.

God bless these United States of America and the Republic they founded.