COMES NOW the People of the Alaska Republic, does hereby declare the Sovereignty of the People and their governing political body, the State of Alaska.

The People of Alaska, as a Republic, hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security – To prove this, let the facts be submitted to a candid world.

I

Mark I

The people of the Alaska Republic hereby proclaims that they do not recognize the existence of any Corporation that was created by the Congress of the United States after March 2, 1867, the date in which the Congress dissolved the de jure government of
the United States by unlawfully removing the Statehood status of several States of the Union and denying the People and the governments of those State Republics from having representation in the U.S. Congress. /¹ This unlawful Act was known as the Reconstruction Acts of March 2, 1867 which violated the perpetual “Compact Agreement” of the Articles of Confederation of November 15, 1778. /²

Mark II

With the U.S. Congress of 1867 claiming that it not only has the authority to propose Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, but it also had the authority to compel States with unlawful governments to ratify Amendments by force of arms of the United States military, /³ the States are no longer in a position to cast votes of ratification or rejection of choice without approval of the U.S. Congress. With the U.S. Congress using its military armed forces to compel a State Legislature to ratify Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and with the present day U.S. Congress refusing to declare such an Amendment to be a fraud, the U.S. Congress declares itself to be a defacto body of a defacto government.

Mark III

The people of the Alaska Republic declares that the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States does not exist as it was rejected by more than one-forth (¼) of the lawful legislatures of the States of the Union with the vote of rejection cast by the State of Maryland on March 23, 1867. The people of the Alaska Republic declares that they do not recognize any votes of ratification that were cast by unlawful governments as identified within the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867 /⁴ by the Congress of the United States. As the Fourteenth Amendment is a product of fraud, the People of the Alaska Republic does not recognize any Legislation of the U.S. Congress that was enacted under the purported authority of

¹/ See Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867 (THIRTY-NINTH CONGRESS, Sess. II, Ch. 153)
²/ See Articles of Confederation, Article XIII, Paragraph 2
³/ See Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867 (THIRTY-NINTH CONGRESS, Sess. II, Ch. 153)
the Fourteenth Amendment nor does the People of the Alaska Republic recognize any “Decree” or “Rulings” of the Federal Judiciary that were also founded upon the Fourteenth Amendment.

Mark IV

As the U.S. Constitution declares at Article V that it is the Legislatures of the States that have the authority to alter or change the Constitution of the United States by ratifying Amendments, it is the Legislatures of the States that have the authority to determine if an Amendment was properly adopted. The Judges and Justices of the Federal Judiciary and the U.S. Court of Claims have gone on record to declare that they have no authority to rule upon the legitimacy of adoption of Constitutional Amendments /5

The Congress of the United States has also gone on record that it has no authority to determine the legitimacy of ratification of Constitutional Amendments by refusing to give hearings or making investigations into the purported ratification of

/4/ THIRTY-NINTH CONGRESS, Sess. II, Ch. 153

/5/ Judge James A. Von Der Heydt (U.S. District Court No. J90-010CV) “The question of whether the Fourteenth Amendment was properly ratified is a political question (Coleman v. Miller, 307 U.S. 433, 450). Political Questions are those federal constitutional issues which courts do not address but leave to the legislative and executive branch of the federal government to resolve (Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186, 217).”

Judges Hug and Pool (U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, No. 91-35862) “The Epperly’s seek declaratory relief to the effect that the Fourteenth Amendment was never ratified. Such relief involves the evaluation of a political question which cannot be addressed by the courts (United States v. Stahl, 792 F.2d 1438, 1440-41; United States v. Foster, 789 F.2d 457, 462-63).”

Justice William K. Sutter (U.S. Supreme Court No. 93-170) “The petition for writ of certiorari is denied.”

Judge Reginald W. Gibson (U.S. Court of Claims No. 95-281C) “petitioner challenged the validity to the Fourteenth Amendment and in the process sought to have the court submit a report to the U.S. Congress detailing our findings in this matter, …

“It is well settled that the jurisdiction of this court extends to money damages founded upon either a contract with the United States or a source of law that “can fairly interpreted as mandating [monetary] compensation by the Federal Government for damages sustained.” United States v. Mitchell, 463 U.S. 206, 217. Absent specific authorization, the court cannot grant the relief requested.”
the Fourteenth Amendment upon Petition of several Legislatures of the States (or of the People 6) by tabling said Petitions without comment.

The Executive Branch, in and through the U.S. Attorney General and the Archivist of the United States, stated its position that the Executive Branch of the United States government has no authority to determine what constitutes an “Official Vote” of ratification that was cast upon an Amendment to the United States Constitution The U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska declared that the U.S. Archivist has a ministerial duty to record all votes that were cast irregardless the qualifications of a State to have lawful governments. (Judge H. Russel Holland – Case No. J97-0025-CV) “Neither the Archivist nor his predecessors have had the expanded authority to determine the validity of the States' ratification. Leser v. Garnett, 258 U.S. 130, 137 (1922); Widenmann v. Colby, 265 F. 998 at 999.”

II

The people of Alaska Republic does further proclaim that they do not recognize the authority of Congress to incorporate the District of Columbia 7 for the purpose of doing business as the “United States” or to create child Corporations known as “several states.” The people of the Territory of Alaska applied for Statehood status as a Republic with Sovereign Powers under the rule of International Law with their Republic to be brought into the Union on equal footing with the original thirteen States of the Union, [not on equal footing with corporate bodies known as “several states”]. The “Constitutional Convention” of September 17, 1787 declared the creation and boundaries of the District of Columbia within the Constitution of

6) Letter from U.S. Sen. Orrin G. Hatch to U.S. Sen. Ted Stevens (August 6, 1985) “Thank you for consulting me with regard to Mr. Epperly’s letter and publication. His work is very thorough and thought provoking . Also I can understand and appreciate his concern at the apparent abuses involved in the ratification process of the Fourteenth Amendment.

“Regarding his request for Senate investigation of these historical issues, however, I doubt it would serve any meaningful purpose. Assuming a Senate investigation would substantiate Mr. Epperly’s contentions, where would we be then? ....”

7) FORTY-FIRST CONGRESS, Sess. III, Ch. 62
the United States and that designation did not authorize the U.S. Congress to change
the District of Columbia into a new foreign corporate political body of govern-

III

Mark I

The people of the Alaska Republic declares that the U.S. Congress exceeded its
Constitutional authority when it granted a selected few individuals a “Title of Nobility” /8
to create and operate a private Central Bank (Federal Reserve Bank) for the purpose of
regulating the value of the coins of the United States /9 and for profiteering from the
issuance of “Bills of Credit” (Federal Reserve Bank Notes) on the credit of the
United States. Said practices of the Federal Reserve Bank System is to hold the people
and the States of the Union in perpetual involuntary servitude to the payment of
[purported] debts owing to the Federal Reserve Bank by the United States that may not
be questioned. /10

Mark II

The U.S. Congress further exceeded its constitutional authority when it declared
that from June 5, 1933 /11 forward that it shall be against “Public Policy” for any debt to
be paid and all debts shall thereafter be “discharged” /12 dollar for dollar and applied that

8/ See U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 9, Clause 8. -- Nobility Clauses were not limited to the prohibition of
certain distinctive titles, such as “duke” or “earl,” but had a substantive content that included a prohibition on all
hereditary privileges with respect to state institutions.

9/ See U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 – Congress shall have power “to coin money and regulate the
value thereof ...” -- The “Federal Open Market Committee” of the Federal Reserve Bank System sets the value of
Federal Reserve Bank Notes and it is the value of the Bank Notes of the Federal Reserve Bank that sets the value
of the coins of the United States and the foreign coins that circulates throughout the United States.

10/ See Section 4 of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

11/ See HJR 192 of June 5, 1933

12/ In the case of Stanek v. White, 172 Minn. 390, 215 H.W. 784, the court explained the legal distinction between the
words “payment” and “discharge”: “There is a distinction between a ‘debt discharged’ and a ‘debt paid.’
When discharged the debt still exists though divested of its character as a legal obligation during the operation of
the discharge. Something of the original vitality of the debt continues to exist, which may be transferred, even
though the transferee takes it subject to its disability incident to the discharge. The fact that it carries something
decree upon the States of the Union. The U.S. Congress is without authority to instruct any State of the Union to “discharge” their debts with “Bills of Credit” (Federal Reserve Bank Notes) of a Central Bank as the U.S. Constitution at Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 mandates that the States shall make “payments” on their debts and declared the medium of exchange to be used in payment of those debts (Gold and Silver coin). Notwithstanding Section 4 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the People of the Alaska Republic does hereby declare that they do not recognize the validity of any debt of the United States that is claimed to be owing to the Federal Reserve Bank.

Under the purported authority of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution; the U.S. Congress may emit “Bills of Credit” on the credit of the United States known as “United States Notes,” /13 but does the U.S. Congress have constitutional authority to compel any State Republic of the Union to accept its “Bills of Credit” for payment of their debts? The question was answered by the United States Supreme Court of March 3, 1884 in the Legal Tender Case of Julliard v. Greenman, 110 U.S. 421 (1884):

“Congress has the constitutional power to make the Treasury notes of the United States a legal tender in payment of private debts, in time of peace as well as in time of war.” [Empasis added]

At no time in the history of the United States has the U.S. Congress ever been given the authority to make “Bills of Credit” of the United States a “Legal Tender” in payment of public debts of a State, especially if the “Bills of Credit” are without redemption qualities. The present day “Federal Reserve Bank Note” is not “legal tender for payment of debts” and that term no longer appears on the Notes. /14

---

/13/ See U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 2. The last “United States Notes” to be issued was in the year of 1963 by “Executive Order” of the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. It is believed that it was this act of shutting down the Federal Reserve Banks that got John F. Kennedy assassinated. See also Legal Tender Cases, 110 U.S. 421 (1884).

/14/ The “Federal Reserve Bank Notes” were never classified as “Legal Tender” until the Congress declared on March 5, 1933 that it shall be against “Public Policy” for anyone to pay their debts. At that time,
A *defacto* government is a government wherein all the attributes of sovereignty have, by usurpation, been transferred from those who had been legally invested with them to others, who, sustained by a power above the forms of law, claim to act and do really act in their stead.\(^{15}\) Notwithstanding the Tenth Amendment to the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution, the sovereign powers of the Republic States of the united States of America and the People have been unlawfully transferred to the District of Columbia (dba “*United States*”). This transfer of sovereign powers comes with the purported ratification of the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Seventeenth, and Nineteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

“The proposal of these amendments (14\(^{th}\) and 15\(^{th}\)) is the assumption of powers in the Federal government not conferred by any line or word in the Constitution or by any fair construction or implication. It is the assumption of all power in the Federal Government; it is the creation of citizens of the government of the United States, and it is a total overthrow of State supremacy. If triumphant, it works a consolidation of government, and it will result in a consolidation of an empire. … Now we create citizens of the Government of the United States of those who are residents in, but not citizens of the States.”

*Congressional Globe – H.p. 1066*

40\(^{th}\) Congress 2d. Sess. [Feb. 8-9, 1868]

**Mark I**

The complete transfer of sovereign Powers of the Republic States of the united States of America to the District of Columbia was the day when the States were denied their political rights to be represented in the Senate of the U.S. Congress under the purported ratification of the Seventeenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

---

Looking at Article V of the U.S. Constitution we see that no State may be denied its suffrage to vote in the U.S. Senate without its consent. There were no unanimous votes taken by the U.S. Senators in adopting the Resolution to surrender their States Congressional political suffrage rights of voting nor did the proposed Seventeenth Amendment receive an unanimous vote of ratification of the Republic States in the Union as required by Article V of the U.S. Constitution. For the Republic States of the united States of America to consent in the surrender of their political rights of suffrage to vote in the U.S. Senate, every Legislature of the Republic States would have had to be in agreement and would have had to cast an unanimous vote of ratification. Today, the governments of the Republic States of the united States of America are no longer represented in the Congress of the United States. As both the House and the Senate of the United States are now controlled by political Corporations (Democrat and/or Republican Parties), the U.S. Congress operates as a “defacto” governmental body.

**Mark II**

Further evidence that the Republic States of the united States of America have lost their sovereign powers to the incorporated United States is found in the seating of unqualified Members of the U.S. Congress and in the Office of the President of the United States. From the day the U.S. Constitution was amended with the Fifteenth and Nineteenth Amendments to grant all male races of people and women citizens the Political Right of Voting, the domestic enemies of the United States have taken upon themselves the liberty to enlarge the two Amendments by implication to include the “Political Rights” of being Candidates and of holding Political Offices of the United States. There are no provisions in the Constitution of the United States that authorizes any non-white male citizen or any women citizen to hold Public Offices of the United States and no such intent may be found in the U.S. Constitution or any of its Amendments. Nowhere within the Constitution of the United States or any of its Amendments will the word “Suffrage” be found that would give the implication of
authority for non-white male citizens or women to hold Public Offices of the United States.

Mark III

In regard to the Office of the President of the United States, no women nor any non-white male citizens are “natural born” citizens of the United States [a qualification requirement for the Office of the President] for want of having constitutional granted Political Rights to hold Public Offices of the United States. It may be true that the purported Fourteenth Amendment is a grant of citizenship, but it is not a citizenship of unlimited “Rights” that are “Political,” “Natural,” or “Civil.” As the Congress of the United States has been empowered by Section Five of the Amendment to enforce the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment by legislation, the Congress has been empowered with the authority to grant or deny “Privileges” or “Immunities” to those who are Fourteenth Amendment citizens of the United States. “Civil Rights” are not “Rights,” but are “Privileges” or “Immunities” as stated within the Fourteenth Amendment. “Rights” are God created and as such, they may not be altered or destroyed by any governmental body whereas “Privileges” and “Immunities” are creations of the government and anything the government may create, the government may alter or destroy. The Fourteenth Amendment was adopted for the expressed purpose of legitimizing the Civil Rights Act of 1866:

“Why sir, the proposed amendment of the Constitution (14th Amendment) which has just been discussed in this House and postponed till April next, was offered by the learned gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bingham] for the very purpose of avoiding the difficulty which we are now meeting in the attempt to pass this bill [Civil Rights Act of 1866] now under consideration. Because the amendment which he reported from the committee of fifteen was intended to confer upon Congress the power “to make laws which shall be necessary and proper to secure to the citizens of each State all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States, and to all persons in the several States the equal protection in the right to life, liberty, and property.” There is no protection or law provided for in that constitutional amendment which Congress is authorized to pass by virtue of that constitutional amendment that is not contained in this proposed act of Congress that is now before us. Therefore we have the
opinion of the majority of the committee of fifteen, and the opinion of the learned gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Bingham,] that in order to do what this bill proposes, Congress must be empowered by an amendment to the organic law.” [Emphasis added]

Representative Rogers
Congressional Debates on the Fourteenth Amendment
The Congressional Globe
39th Cong., 1st Sess.
H.p. 1120
March 1, 1866

With the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, the Congress of the United States made a statement that the citizens of the Fourteenth Amendment are not “natural born” citizens, but are statutorily created “native born” citizens. To emphasize this point of law, the term: “born or naturalized within the United States” as found in Section One of the Fourteenth Amendment is understood to include not only the Fifty (50) States of the Union, but all Territories and Possessions that fall under U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. For example:

The following Sections that declare those who are citizens of the United States are found in Title 8 of the United States Code:

§ 1402. Persons born in Puerto Rico on or after April 11, 1899

§ 1403. Persons born in the Canal Zone or Republic of Panama on or after February 26, 1904

§ 1404. Persons born in Alaska on or after March 30, 1867

A person born in Alaska on or after March 30, 1867, except a noncitizen Indian, is a citizen of the United States at birth. A noncitizen Indian born in Alaska on or after March 30, 1867, and prior to June 2, 1924, is declared to be a citizen of the United States as of June 2, 1924. An Indian born in Alaska on or after June 2, 1924, is a citizen of the United States at birth.

§ 1405. Persons born in Hawaii

A person born in Hawaii on or after August 12, 1898, and before April 30, 1900, is declared to be a citizen of the United States as of April 30, 1900. A person born in Hawaii on or after April 30, 1900, is a citizen of the United States at birth.
A person who was a citizen of the Republic of Hawaii on August 12, 1898, is declared to be a citizen of the United States as of April 30, 1900.

§ 1406. Persons living in and born in the Virgin Islands

§ 1407. Persons living in and born in Guam

Do you not now understand the statement made by Barack Obama Jr. during his Presidential Campaign that the United States has more than fifty (50) States? It was not a slip of the tongue. Barack Obama Jr. was informing everyone that he was not a “natural” born citizen, but a statutory “native” born citizen of the United States.

The U.S. Congress first defined who is a “natural born citizen” at FIRST CONGRESS, Sess II. Ch 4:

CHAP. 4.—An Act to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any alien, being a free white person, Alien whites may become citizens, and how. Who shall have resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States for the term of two years, may be admitted to become a citizen thereof, on application to any common law court of record, in any one of the states wherein he shall have resided for the term of one year at least, and making proof to the satisfaction of such court, that he is a person of good character, and taking the oath or affirmation prescribed by law, to support the constitution of the United States, which oath or affirmation such court shall administer; and the clerk of such court shall record such application, and the proceedings thereon; and thereupon such person shall be considered as a citizen of the United States. And the children of such persons so naturalized, dwelling within the United States, being under the age of twenty-one years at the time of such naturalization, Their children residing here, deemed citizens, shall also be considered as citizens of the United States. And the children of citizens of the United States, that may be born beyond sea, Also, children of citizens born beyond sea, &c. or out of the limits of the United States, shall be considered as natural born citizens: Provided, That the right of citizenship shall not descend to persons whose fathers have never been resident in the United States: Exceptions. Provided also, That no person heretofore proscribed by any state, shall be admitted a citizen as aforesaid, except by an act of the legislature of the state in which such person was proscribed. [Emphasis added]

APPROVED, March 26, 1790.
Under this Act of Congress, both parents must be citizens of the United States at the time of their child’s birth for the child to be classified as a “natural born citizen.” This understanding of “natural born” citizenship by the U.S. Congress has never changed over the years.

The Obama Campaign admitted that Barack Obama Jr. was subject to British Law at the time of his birth. Barack Obama Jr’s father, Barack Obama, Sr., was a Luo from Nyang’oma Kogelo, Nyanza Province, Kenya. Obama’s parents met in 1960 in a Russian language class at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa, where his father was a foreign student on scholarship. The couple married on February 2, 1961, separated when Obama Sr. went to Harvard University on scholarship, and divorced in 1964. Obama Sr. remarried and returned to Kenya, visiting Barack in Hawaii only once, in 1971. He died in an automobile accident in 1982.

When Barack Obama Jr. was born on Aug. 4, 1961, in Honolulu, Hawaii; Kenya was a British Colony, still part of the United Kingdom’s dwindling empire. As a Kenyan native, Barack Obama Sr. was a British subject whose citizenship status was governed by The British Nationality Act of 1948. That same Act governed the status of Obama Sr’s children. Since Barack Obama Jr. has neither renounced his U.S. citizenship nor sworn an “Oath of Allegiance” to Kenya, his Kenyan citizenship automatically expired on Aug. 4, 1982.

The British Nationality Act of 1948 (Part II, Section 5) states:

“Subject to the provisions of this section, a person born after the commencement of this Act shall be a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies by descent if his father is a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies at the time of the birth.” [Emphasis added]

We have an occurrence of children born of two nationalities within, or outside the jurisdiction of the United States. These are not ‘natural born’ children, but children naturalized at birth. For one to be a “natural born citizen,” a child must be born to a father and a mother of which both were citizens of the United States at the time of
the child’s birth. Barack Obama Jr’s father was never a citizen of the United States, naturalized or otherwise. Although the term “natural born citizen” is not defined in the U.S. Constitution, it was defined throughout history of the United States as found within Congressional debates and the laws of the United States.

We have Representative John Bingham of Ohio, considered by many the “Father of the Fourteenth Amendment,” saying the following:

“[I] find no fault with the introductory clause [S 61 Bill], which is simply declaratory of what is written in the Constitution, that every human being born within the jurisdiction of the United States of parents not owing allegiance to any foreign sovereignty is, in the language of your Constitution itself, a natural born citizen…” [Emphasis added]

As the allegiance of Barack Obama Jr’s father was owing to the United Kingdom by virtue of his foreign birth citizenship, his allegiance was not to the United States and thus Barack Obama Jr. is not a natural born citizen of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson had this to say about who is or who is not a natural born citizen.

“Therefore, we can say with confidence that a natural-born citizen of the United States means those persons born whose father the United States already has an established jurisdiction over, i.e., born to father’s who are themselves citizens of the United States.” [Emphasis added]

At no time did the United States have jurisdiction over Barack Obama Sr. and at no time was Barack Obama Sr. a citizen of the United States. Barack Obama Jr. has no relationship to a father that would grant him the status of being a “natural born citizen” of the United States at the time of his birth.

Mark III

The Congress of 1866 further declared that the Civil Rights Act of 1866 (14 Stat. 27) did not include “Political Rights” of Suffrage:
“Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I move to add the following as a new section:

“And it be further amended, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to effect the laws of any State concerning the right of suffrage.

“Mr. Speaker, I wish to say one word. That section will not change any construction of the bill. I do not believe the term civil rights includes the right of suffrage. Some gentlemen seem to have some fear on that point.

“The Amendment was agreed to.” [Emphasis added]

Congressional Debates on the Civil Rights Act of 1866
The Congressional Globe
H.p. 1162
39th Cong., 1st Sess.
March 2, 1866

As the Fourteenth Amendment did not expand the Civil Rights Act of 1866 to include the Political Rights of Suffrage, the Congress of 1867 found the need to adopt another Constitutional Amendment, the Fifteenth Amendment. The Fifteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution was adopted to grant the male citizens of the Fourteenth Amendment the right to “vote” irregardless of their race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Fifteenth Amendment did not include women citizens of the United States. It was later that the U.S. Congress adopted the Nineteenth Amendment that granted women citizens the right to vote. Neither of these two (2) Constitutional Amendments expanded the Fourteenth Amendment to include the Political Rights of Candidacy or the Right to hold Public Offices of the United States. The U.S. Congress is without authority to grant such Political Rights by legislation or by implication without an Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Barack Obama Jr. is of Negro descent as his father was a full blooded Negro while his mother was a Caucasian. The mixing of blood by marriage of parents who one is Black to one who is White makes Barack Obama Jr. a “Mulatto.” As Barack Obama Jr. is a Mulatto, his citizenship is founded upon the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. /16 As the Fourteenth Amendment is

16/ See the U.S. Supreme Court case: Dred Scott v. Sanford, 60 U.S. 393.
not a grant of “Political Rights,” Barack Obama Jr. must look to another Constitutional Amendment for any authority for him to be a Candidate for or an Office holder of the President of the United States. The only Amendment that he could have turned to is the Fifteenth Amendment and the Fifteenth Amendment grants only the Political Right of Suffrage to cast Votes. The Fifteenth Amendment was never expanded by the U.S. Congress to include the Political Right of being Federal Office Candidates or the holding of Political Offices of the United States. For want of a Constitutional Amendment, Barack Obama Jr. is without authority to hold the Office of President of the United States of America.

As we now have women and non-white male citizens holding Public Offices of the United States (Congressmen, President of the United States, Cabinet Offices of the Executive Branch, and Judges and Justices of the Federal Courts), the government of the United States is no longer a “dejure” government to which the people or the Republic States of the united States of America owe any allegiance, but a “defacto” government to which the people are under a mandate of the Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776 to remove themselves from.

V

The people of the Alaska Republic does not recognize any purported authority of the U.S. Congress to create a Corporation known as the “United Nations” and declaring that the “Charter” of the United Nations has supremacy over the Constitution of the United States. As the U.S. Congress exceeded its Constitutional authority in creating the United Nations, we, the people of the Alaska Republic and its political corporation, the State of Alaska hereby declares that all Agreements the United States entered into with the United Nations are declared to be null and void.

Mark I

The people of Alaska Republic does not recognize any purported authority that the U.S. Congress exercised in creating “Regions” by the combining of boundaries of
two or more Republic States of the Union. There are no provisions in the U.S Constitution that grants the Congress of the United States the authority to divide the united States of America into “Regions” by changing the boundaries of existing State Republics after those States were admitted into the Union. The newly formed “Regions” are “States” of the United States by virtue of the term: “in the United States” that is found in Section One of the U.S. Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment. /17 As the term: “in the United States” includes all properties and territories of the United States, /18 the U.S. Congress has now placed the People of the Alaska Republic and their body politic, the State of Alaska, into their newly formed “Region X” which is governed and regulated by their created “Federal Regional Councils.” /19 And as these “Federal Regional Councils” do not answer to the People of the Alaska Republic or to their governmental body, the State of Alaska, the People do not recognize the existence of Federal Regions or the pretended authority that may be exercise by “Federal Regional Councils” within the boundaries of the Alaska Republic.

VI

Conclusion

There appears to be no peaceful means or procedures available by which the People or the governments of the Republic States of the united States of America may use to protect their Constitution. The People cannot take questions of usurpation of Office to the Federal Courts without the Federal Judges dismissing the cases for want of “Standing” or for being “Political Questions” to the Court. The governments of the Republic States of the Union cannot protect the U.S. Constitution for they have no dejure Congress to Petition. The U.S. Attorney General (Eric Holder) will not commence “quo warranto” proceedings before the U.S. District Court for the

17/ See U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1: “… nor any state be formed by the junction of two or more states, or parts of states, without the consent of the legislatures of the states concerned as well as Congress.”

18/ See U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 3, Clause 2.

19/ See Presidential Order No. 12314 of July 22, 1981.
District of Columbia for he himself is an usurper of Office. No Member of
the U.S. Congress will begin an investigation that will lead to the removal of those who
are usurping the Offices of the United States for several Members of Congress are
themselves usurpers of Office.

There appears to be no peaceful means or procedures available by
which the People or the governments of the Republic States may use to compel
the Public Officers of the United States to do their duty of “Oath of Office” to protect
the U.S. Constitution. The Congress, the President, and the U.S. Supreme Court seems
to take delight in telling the People and the governments of the Republic States of
the Union: “go to hell” and keeping them all in a status of involuntary servitude to the
demands of a defacto government.

The people of the Alaska Republic holds John G. Roberts, Jr., as Chief Justice
of the United States Supreme Court responsible for several usurpations of
governmental Offices of the United States of America. This deed of usurpations was
done when he administered the Presidential “Oath of Office” to Barack Obama Jr. when
he had knowledge that Barack Obama Jr. was not qualified for Office under the
provisions of the U.S. Constitution. If the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court has
the implied authority to administer an “Oath of Office” to Presidents elect then
the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court has also the implied authority to rescind
unlawful “Oaths of Office.” The administration of Presidential “Oaths of Office”
by Chief Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court is a matter of “Tradition,” not by an Act
of Law.

The removal of an usurper from Office of the President of the United States is not
a matter for Congressional Impeachment as an usurper is not an Office Holder.
The President of the United States may be Impeached for, and convicted of, treason,
bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. The U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice
has a duty to protect the U.S. Constitution by rescinding the “Oath of Office”
of Barack Obama Jr. and declare that all Papers that are under the Seal
of Barack Obama’s Signature, as President of the United States, are null and void.
This procedure of removal of an “Oath of Office” from a Presidential usurper does not fall under the jurisdiction of Article III of the U.S. Constitution as the removal of an “Oath of Office” is not an issue of a “Case” or “Controversy” that can be ruled upon by the Courts and as such, the doctrines of “Standing” and “Political Questions” do not come into play. Barack Obama Jr. is not the President of the United States and he never was.

Those who conspired to deceive the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court into administering an “Oath of Office” to a Presidential Candidate that was not qualified for Office by falsely swearing out an “Official Certification of Nomination” were: [1] Barack Obama Jr. as Candidate for President of the United States, [2] Nancy Pelosi as Chair of the Democratic National Convention, and [3] Alice Travis Germond as Secretary of the Democratic National Convention. As they “vetted” Barack Obama Jr. for the Office of President of the United States, they all had full knowledge that Barack Obama Jr’s father was never a citizen of the United States. As Barack Obama Jr’s father was an “Alien” to the government of the United States, Barack Obama Jr. was in want of qualifications to be a natural born citizen of the United States. These three named individuals also had knowledge that Barack Obama Jr. was a “Mulatto” that placed his status of citizenship under the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The above named individuals having “vetted” Barak Obama Jr. for the Office of the President of the United States had the knowledge that citizens of the Fourteenth Amendment have no standing of being “natural born” citizens of the United States. The above named individuals have willfully committed numerous crimes against the United States and the crime of “sedition.”
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