

PETITION FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES

REGARDING THE NORTH AMERICAN UNION

WHEREAS, Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution states that the President, “Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation: ‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of the President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.’”, and

WHEREAS, Article VI of the Constitution states, “The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution;”, and

WHEREAS, Officers of the United States and of some of the several States are attempting to create a North American Union, and

WHEREAS, on August 9, 2007, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit erred, in relying on two inapposite decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States and holding that the Government does not have to listen or respond to Petitions for Redress of Grievances from the People, and

WHEREAS, on February 22, 2008, the Supreme Court of the United States committed treason to the Constitution by refusing to hear the First Amendment case, We The People v. United States (case No. 07-681), calling for a judicial declaration -- *for the first time in history* -- of the Rights of the People and the obligations of the Government under the “accountability clause” of the Constitution – that is, the last ten words of the First Amendment.

WHEREAS, all men are created equal and are endowed by their "Creator" with certain unalienable rights, and

WHEREAS, if the Creator has, in fact, gratuitously provided, equipped and enriched the People with Rights, it follows that those Rights belong to the People and to the Creator, and it follows that any affront to the Constitution (as when government violates an unalienable Right) is an affront to the Creator, and

WHEREAS, if our Rights come from the Creator, only the Creator can frustrate, deny or defeat those Rights -- that is, government cannot abridge what God alone has manifest and bestowed upon the People, and

WHEREAS, the Constitution of the United States of America is a strongly worded, Divinely inspired, set of principles expressly intended to govern the government, not the People, and

WHEREAS, by the terms and provisions of the written Constitution, the People have expressly established their government and empowered it to act in only certain ways, while purposely and patently restricting and prohibiting it in other certain ways, and

WHEREAS, the Constitution of the United States of America guarantees to every American citizen and to those lawfully on our soil, the unalienable Rights to Life, Liberty, Property, Privacy and to Due Process of Law as well as other Rights, enumerated or not, and

WHEREAS, the Constitution prohibits and restricts the federal Government from infringing upon those Rights, and

WHEREAS, each of the Constitution's prohibitions and restrictions on government's authority is, in fact, another unalienable Right enjoyed by every American citizen and to those individuals lawfully upon our soil, and

WHEREAS, the People of this nation are entitled, by unalienable Right, to enjoy the Sovereignty of the Republic they have formed via a written Constitution as well as the inherent duties, and strict limitations of authority, they have so delegated to their elected representatives and other officials for their service, as well as the protection of their other Constitutionally protected unalienable Rights,

Now, therefore:

WE THE PEOPLE hereby petition the federal Government for a Redress of Grievances relating to the unlawful attempt by the President and other Officials to create a North American Union without constitutional constraint.

WE THE PEOPLE find ourselves, once again, in the position of having to admit that in every stage of our oppression we have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms, our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury, and that a Government that ignores its People is unfit to be the ruler of a free People.

WE THE PEOPLE, by and through the unalienable Right guaranteed by First and Ninth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America, instruct the President and each member of Congress to honor their oaths of office and their constitutional obligation by responding to this Petition for Redress, providing formal, specific answers to the questions contained herein, **no later than (40) forty days reckoning from the date of service of this Petition for Redress.**

WE THE PEOPLE reaffirm the essential principle underlying our system of governance, as expressed by the Founders, "whenever the ends of government are perverted, and public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the people may, and of right ought to reform the old, or establish a new government, for the doctrine of nonresistance against arbitrary power, and oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind." See Declaration of Independence and the New Hampshire Constitution, Article 10.

WE THE PEOPLE reaffirm the essential principle underlying our system of governance, as expressed by the Founders, that “If money is wanted by Rulers who have in any manner oppressed the People, **they may retain it until their grievances are redressed**, and thus peaceably procure relief, without trusting to despised petitions or disturbing the public tranquility” and “how efficacious its [the privilege of giving or withholding our money] intercession for redress of grievances and establishment of rights, and how improvident would be the surrender of so powerful a mediator.” (*Journals of the Continental Congress*, 1:105-113 and Jefferson’s papers 1:225).

WE THE PEOPLE instruct the President and each member of Congress to respond to this Petition by providing formal, specific answers to the following questions:

1. Admit or deny that the Constitution does not provide any power to the General Government, or the States, or both together, to "merge" the United States, Canada, and Mexico into a single super-national entity.
2. Admit or deny that the purpose of the Declaration of Independence was to claim and to justify Americans' national independence, as a matter of law.
3. Admit or deny that the Declaration came into being when "it [became] necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them."
4. Admit or deny that the Declaration asserts "That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES; ... 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."
5. Admit or deny that for Americans "to dissolve ... political bonds" and "to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them" were acts that invoked and relied upon the highest legal authority, and entailed profound legal consequences.
6. Admit or deny that WE THE PEOPLE who composed the "Free and Independent States" then entered into the Constitution in order "to form a more perfect Union" amongst themselves, that is, to secure the fact of independence and make the principles upon which it rested even more effective in practice than they had been theretofore.
7. Admit or deny that the legitimacy of the Constitution depends upon the Declaration of Independence; and therefore the Constitution's powers cannot contradict the Declaration's principles for, were the Declaration not an actual law both prior in time and superior in authority to the Constitution, and the source of WE THE PEOPLE'S authority to enact the Constitution, the Constitution itself would not be valid.

8. Admit or deny that before they could enact their own laws, binding on anyone, including themselves, Americans had to win legal independence from Great Britain.
9. Admit or deny that Americans secured that independence only under the aegis of the Declaration and, therefore, they could enact only such subsequent laws as were entirely consistent with the principles the Declaration set forth.
10. Admit or deny that the "more perfect Union" of the Constitution in no way rejected the sovereign status of "the several States" incorporated within the Constitution's federal system.
11. Admit or deny that the "more perfect Union" modified that status only insofar as WE THE PEOPLE, through the Constitution, explicitly limited some of the powers of the States in ways favorable to the Union. See Article I, Section 10, Clauses 1 through 3, and Article VI, Clause 2.
12. Admit or deny that out of the limitations on the sovereignties of the States, the Constitution created a sovereign status for the Union as a whole among the nations of the world. See Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3, 4, 11, 12, and 13; Article I, Section 9, Clause 8; Article I, Section 10, Clauses 1 and 3; and Article II, Section 2, Clause 2.
13. Admit or deny that the Constitution was not a repudiation of national independence, but a transferral of some of the powers of "Free and Independent States" from the individual States to the "more perfect Union" of them all, and thereby a perfection of national independence, for it enabled all of the States together to "establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty" in ways more effective than any of the States could have put into operation individually.
14. Admit or deny that under the Constitution it is not possible for the "FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES" to merge with foreign states, for by the Constitution WE THE PEOPLE have caused the States to surrender their primordial ability to do so, and have delegated no competence to the General Government in that particular.
15. Admit or deny that the most basic rule of constitutional interpretation is that the States retain all of their original sovereign powers that the Constitution does not take away from them and that, conversely, the General Government can exercise only those powers that the Constitution delegates to it, and "[p]owers not granted are prohibited." See *United States v. Butler*, 297 U.S 1, 68 (1936).
16. Admit or deny that the Constitution provides that new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress. See Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1.

17. Admit or deny or deny that the Constitution withdraws from the States the powers they originally enjoyed to divide or to consolidate themselves solely on their own initiatives, and the Constitution denies to the Union any power to split up or to merge the States, in whole or in part, solely on its own initiative.
18. Admit or deny that the Constitution provides that "[n]o State shall, without the Consent of Congress, ... enter into any Agreement or Compact ... with a foreign Power." See Article I, Section 10, Clause 3.
19. Admit or deny that, "any Agreement or Compact ... with a foreign Power" aimed specifically at creating a new super-national entity could not be constitutional, for under Article VI, Clause 2, the States are required to treat the Constitution as "the supreme Law of the Land", and under Article VI, Clause 3, State officials "shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution."
20. Admit or deny that, "[A]ny Agreement or Compact ... with a foreign Power" to form a new super-national entity would have to absolve State officers from their "Oath[s] or Affirmation[s], to support this Constitution" as "the supreme Law of Land," because the new entity would necessarily be subject to some law other than and to the exclusion of the Constitution.
21. Admit or deny that for State officials to enter into such an "Agreement or Compact" would itself violate their "Oath[s] or Affirmation[s]," and therefore be illegal from its inception.
22. Admit or deny that under Article VI, Clause 3, "all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States" become part of "the supreme Law of the Land."
23. Admit or deny that a State's "Agreement or Compact ... with a foreign Power" is not a "Treat[y]." See *The Cherokee Tobacco*, 78 U.S. (11 Wallace) 616, 620 (1871).
24. Admit or deny that even if it were, "a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of the Constitution."
25. Admit or deny that an "Agreement or Compact" of less legal status than a "treaty" cannot do so, either.
26. Admit or deny that no such "Agreement or Compact" can absolve a State, or its officials, from their "Oath[s] or Affirmation[s], to support this Constitution," and to the extent it purports to do so, it is unconstitutional, and therefore cannot be given any legal effect by any State or any State officials.
27. Admit or deny that the Constitution's authorization to Congress to give its "Consent" to a State's "Agreement or Compact ... with a foreign Power" does not change this result, for Congress's "Consent" cannot enlarge Congress's own constitutional powers, or diminish its constitutional disabilities.

28. Admit or deny that the only power of Congress relevant to a possible "merger" of foreign nations with the United States is the power to admit new States to the Union under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1.
29. Admit or deny that the Constitution delegates no power to Congress to license any State—let alone all of them—to leave the Union and be incorporated into some other super-national entity.
30. Admit or deny that "[p]owers not granted are prohibited."
31. Admit or deny that Congress cannot extend its "Consent" to a violation of the Constitution by the States or their officials, so Congress cannot give its "Consent" to any purported "Agreement or Compact" for a State to merge "with a foreign Power," because that would amount to "Consent" for that State to set aside the Constitution and for her officials to violate their "Oath[s] or Affirmation[s], to support this Constitution."
32. Admit or deny that Members of Congress themselves must respect the Constitution as "the supreme Law of the Land," and are "bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution." See Article VI, Clauses 2 and 3.
33. Admit or deny that Congressmen cannot possibly give "Consent" to any purported "Agreement or Compact" for a State to merge "with a foreign Power," because that would contradict "the supreme Law of Land" by enabling them to subject part or even all of the United States to the laws of some new super-national entity, to the exclusion of the Constitution.
34. Admit or deny that on its own initiative, Congress could "merge" Canada, Mexico, and the United States by admitting Canada and Mexico as two or more new States pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 of the Constitution.
35. Admit or deny that that is not what is being proposed for the North American Union.
36. Admit or deny that under the plan now being stealthily put into operation, Canada and Mexico are not to be incorporated as new States within the United States, subject to her Constitution, but along with the United States are to be restructured into some new Northern-Hemispheric super state subject to some supra-constitutional legal system.
37. Admit or deny that the Constitution delegates no such power to Congress, and "[p]owers not granted are prohibited."
38. Admit or deny that under Article II, Section 2, Clause 2, the President does have the "Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur."
39. Admit or deny that a treaty is, in its nature, a contract between two nations, or a compact between independent nations. See *Foster v. Neilson*, 27 U.S. (2 Peters) 253, 314 (1829); *Head Money Cases*, 112 U.S. 580, 598 (1884).

40. Admit or deny that a mere "treaty" cannot merge two or more independent nations into one, because that would be to dissolve the independence of at least one of them.

41. Admit or deny that even if a "treaty" could in some sense "merge" the United States, Canada, and Mexico, Congress always could override and nullify it by subsequent legislation. See *La Abra Silver Mining Co. V. United States*, 175 U.S. 423, 460 (1899).

42. Admit or deny that if the "treaty" purported to deny Congress this constitutional authority (or any other authority, for that matter), it would be unconstitutional, for a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of the Constitution. See *The Cherokee Tobacco*, 78 U.S. (11 Wallace) 616, 620 (1871).

43. Admit or deny, therefore, that the purported "merger" would constitute, not a true "union" at all, but at most some sort of loose association for mutual cooperation, with inherent impermanence because of the possibility of its dissolution by Congress at any time.

44. Admit or deny that the foundations of the North American Union are now being poured out of various international trade deals, economic arrangements, agreements among regulatory bureaucrats, and faits accomplis (such as the superhighway being constructed from Mexico through the very center of America's heartland, and eventually to continue into Canada), all of them with "commercial" character (as befits a scheme designed by, and intended to serve the special interests of, international big business and high finance).

45. Admit or deny that although these machinations are taking place primarily among executive officials in the United States, Canada, and Mexico, at some point the North American Union will need at least colorable support from Congressional legislation.

46. Admit or deny that Congress does have the power "[t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." See Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

47. Admit or deny that the power "[t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations," however, self-evidently presumes the permanent existences as independent nations of the entities involved in the "Commerce."

48. Admit or deny that any North American Union could never be the result of "regulat[ing] Commerce with foreign Nations," because a "merger" of the United States, Canada, and Mexico into one super-national entity would destroy and thereafter render impossible "Commerce with foreign Nations" between the United States and those two "foreign Nations," which with respect to the United States would no longer be "foreign Nations" at all.

49. Admit or deny that if, pursuant to the "merger," Canada and Mexico were not constitutionally transformed into States within the United States, or somehow fancifully

equated with "Indian Tribes," no rational basis could possibly exist for saying that the North American Union was justified under the Commerce Power.

50. Admit or deny that although the Constitution can be amended, it is difficult to imagine how any amendment could provide for the "more perfect Union" to "merge" into some other, super-national entity. After all, a new super-national entity distinct from the United States (that is, where Canada and Mexico were not simply admitted as one or more new States) would have to operate under a charter of government decidedly different from the Constitution.

51. Admit or deny that the putative "amendment" would actually have to supersede the Constitution in its entirety, in the same way that the Constitution superseded the Articles of Confederation.

52. Admit or deny that even if such an "amendment" could be drafted, it would nevertheless have to satisfy the standards of the Declaration of Independence, because the power of amendment is a constitutional power and therefore subject to the selfsame principles of the "higher law" that governs all constitutional powers.

53. Admit or deny that among those principles are the following:

- That the positive laws of any government are always subject and subordinate to the Natural Law—"the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God."
- That all men are equally entitled to "certain unalienable Rights"—whether or not that is convenient to public officials or special-interest groups, domestic or foreign.
- That "Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"—and therefore can never claim any unjust powers whatsoever, or impose any powers "from the top down."
- That "whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter and abolish it, and to institute new Government"—"the People" being always morally, politically, and legally superior to "any Form of Government." And,
- That "when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce the[People] 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." For the fulfillment of which "right" and "duty" the People must be organized, armed, and disciplined in the "well regulated Militia" the Second Amendment declares to be "necessary to the security of a free State."

54. Admit or deny that the insurmountable practical problem for any "merger" of the United States, Canada, and Mexico into a North American Union by means of a putative "amendment" of the Constitution is that neither Canada nor Mexico satisfies the standards of the Declaration of Independence, by a long shot.

55. Admit or deny, therefore, that no North American Union that simply incorporated those two countries, fundamentally unchanged, could meet the Declaration's standards, either.

56. Admit or deny, therefore, that the only way to create a North American Union that could absorb Canada and Mexico without radically reforming their regimes would be to repeal the Declaration of Independence, repudiate the principles on which it stands, and replace them with some new set of contradictory principles consistent with the way political business is carried on in Canada and Mexico.

57. Admit or deny that this could not be accomplished simply by an "amendment" of the Constitution, because the power of amendment in Article V is to "propose Amendments to this Constitution," not amendments to or replacements for the Declaration of Independence.

58. Admit or deny that, it would be necessary to adopt a new Northern-Hemispheric "Declaration of Interdependence" that reduced the United States morally, as well as politically, to the level of Canada and Mexico.

59. Admit or deny that the noxious principles of such a "Declaration of Interdependence" would have to be:

- "[T]he Laws of Nature and of Nature's God" would be replaced with purely "positive law"—that is, "law" would become whatever the political Establishment said it was, with no right of appeal to any "higher law."
- "[C]ertain unalienable rights" would be replaced with entirely "alienable rights"—that is, with no real "rights" at all, because such "rights" as the Establishment permitted under its "laws" could be set aside whenever it served the Establishment's purposes.
- The idea that "Governments * * * deriv[e] their just powers from the consent of the governed" would be replaced by the claim that governments determine their own powers, which common people must accept as being "just."
- "[T]he Right of the People to alter and abolish [any Form of Government], and to institute new Government," would be replaced with an unconditional duty to obey "the authorities" in everything, no matter how tyrannous they became. And,
- The People's "right" and "duty" "to throw off [an abusive] Government" would be abolished through pervasive "gun control" and other police-state measures, leaving common Americans (and Canadians and Mexicans, too) at the mercy of "the authorities," who could Waco-ize them without fear of resistance.

60. Admit or deny that the Establishment could not convince Americans to repudiate the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and to substitute for them the grotesque counter-principles of a Northern-Hemispheric totalitarian state, if the matter were openly and honestly presented in that way.

61. Admit or deny that the Executive and Legislative departments and their minions intend to simply skirt the question entirely, claiming that some combination of "statutes," "treaties," "executive orders," and "executive agreements" will suffice to create the North American Union.
62. Admit or deny that NO constitutional grounds for a North American Union exist and that, indeed, the whole project is patently illegal.
63. Admit or deny that this fact will, however, prove to be of merely theoretical significance unless WE THE PEOPLE oppose the creation of a North American Union with every form of exposure, denunciation, protest, obstruction, and resistance that the Constitution permits, and as soon as possible.
64. Admit or deny that the Establishment considers the North American Union a top priority, its foundations at the least to be poured into place with the next few years.
65. Admit or deny that on March 23, 2005, officers of the Executive branch of the federal Government, including the United States Departments of State, Commerce, and Homeland Security, participated in the formation of the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP), an agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico designed, among other things, to facilitate common regulatory schemes between these countries in furtherance of a North American Union.
66. Admit or deny that reports issued by the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) indicate that it has implemented regulatory changes among the three countries that circumvent United States trade, transportation, homeland security, and border security functions **as prescribed by law**.
67. Admit or deny that construction of a NAFTA Superhighway System from the west coast of Mexico, through the United States and north up into Canada has been suggested as part of a North American Union to facilitate trade between the SPP countries.
68. Admit or deny that this proposed Superhighway would allow virtually unfettered movement of goods and individuals between the partner nations of Mexico, Canada and the United States.
69. Admit or deny that the State of Texas has already begun planning of the Trans-Texas Corridor, a major multi-modal transportation project beginning at the United States-Mexico border, which would serve as an initial section of a NAFTA Superhighway System.
70. Admit or deny that a NAFTA Superhighway System would likely be funded and largely controlled by foreign investors and managers, directly threatening the sovereign interests of the United States.

71. Admit or deny that the Superhighway system and its physical structures would be a privately owned, politically unresponsive, toll-based transportation corridor controlled by foreign investors.

72. Admit or deny that the Superhighway system would require the condemnation and seizure for “public use” the lands and homes of untold Americans for the private benefit of foreign investors.

73. Admit or deny that the full implementation of the SPP/NAFTA plans would serve to effectively amalgamate the United States, Mexico and Canada into a single political and economic federation similar to the European Union.

74. Admit or deny that in January 2007, the Australian toll-road financing giant Macquarie corporation agreed to purchase for eighty million dollars, forty local newspapers, primarily in Texas and Oklahoma, which had been vocal in opposing the first planned stages of the NAFTA Superhighway.

75. Admit or deny that Macquarie and Cintra Concesiones de Infraestructuras de Transporte S.A. of Spain are leasing partners currently operating the Indiana Toll Road in the state of Indiana.

76. Admit or deny that Cintra and Macquarie currently operate the Chicago Skyway in Illinois and the 407 Express Toll Route in Ontario, Canada.

77. Admit or deny that the Macquarie Infrastructure Group operates the privately built South Bay Expressway in San Diego and the Dulles Greenway in Virginia near Washington, DC.

78. Admit or deny that a North American Union, like the European Union, would likely adopt a common currency and regulate all monetary policy through a common central bank scheme (an expanded, privately-owned Federal Reserve) resulting in the *de facto* loss of the monetary and banking controls of the member nations and which are necessary to the existence and Sovereignty of those states.

79. Admit or deny that the Founders, in the 1774 Journals of the Continental Congress, expressly articulated the following:

“If money is wanted by Rulers who have in any manner oppressed the People, they may retain it until their grievances are redressed, and thus peaceably procure relief, without trusting to despised petitions or disturbing the public tranquility.”

1774, *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1:105-113* [emphasis added]

80. Admit or deny that one of the most precious Rights the People enjoy is a government strictly limited by written Laws and that where Law is found to be wanting, no man can be Free.

Respectfully submitted this _____ day of _____, 200__ by:

First Name

Last Name

City

State
