Exhibit 115

in the case of:

People of the Republic of Texas
and the
Sovereign Nation of the Republic of Texas

v.

UNITED NATIONS
(and all it's Political Subdivisions)
and
UNITED STATES
(and all it's Political Subdivisions)

Under Pains and Penalties of perjury and the laws of the Almighty, and being sworn under a vow and oath, I attest that the attached pages are true and correct representations of:

Constitutional Law, from the Encyclopedia of the Confederacy, Vol. 4, Simon & Schuster.

This attestation is made on August 14, 1998.

Attest: E. P. Brannon

D. A. Hest

Witness to source and above signature

Jo Helen Brannon

Witness to above signatures

Encyclopedi of the Confederac

RRENT ★ Encyclopedia of the Confederacy ★

4

SHIN

ZOLL

§ 72. —Supremacy as to states in rebellion and under martial law.

As to the status of the constitutions and government of the southern states during the period of the Civil War, it is now recognized that at no time were these states out of the pale of the Federal Union and that their rights under the Federal Constitution were suspended, but not destroyed. Their constitutional duties and obligations were unaffected and remained the same as theretofore.[41] The state governments did not cease to exist, and their legislation in the exercise of such powers as were theirs under the Federal Constitution was valid;[42] but all such acts on their part as were in hostility to the United States or in disregard of or in conflict with its Constitution, or were intended directly or indirectly to aid the rebellion, were absolute nullities and could not be invoked in support of any rights or for the protection of any persons acting under them.[43]

The Federal Constitution has not inhibited military government in the theater of warfare in which the military power of the federal government is engaged, and therefore such government apparently should not be regarded as a violation of the Federal Constitution. Public danger may warrant the substitution of executive process for judicial process, and a state may use its military power to put down an armed insurrection too strong to be controlled by the civil authority.[44] The guaranties of supremacy of the civil law, trial by the civil courts, and the operation of the writ of habeas corpus should be read and interpreted so as to harmonize with the retention in the executive and legislative departments of power necessary to maintain the existence of such guaranties themselves. The fact that a military occupation of a territory, in a state of peace and order, differs radically from the prosecution of a war in the same territory, is well established. Martial law is operative only in such portions of the country as are actually in a state of war and continues only

(DC Dist Col) 429 F Supp 703; Veix v Sixth Ward Bldg. & Loan Asso., 310 US 32, 84 L Ed 1061, 60 S Ct 792; Home Bldg. & Loan Asso. v Blaisdell, 290 US 398, 78 L Ed 413, 54 S Ct 231, 88 ALR 1481.

The Constitution was adopted in a period of grave emergency and its grants of power to the federal government and its limitations of the power of the states were determined in the light of emergency, and are not altered by emergency. First Trust Co. v Smith, 134 Neb 84, 277 NW 762.

As to emergency police legislation, see § 371, infra.

41. Gunn v Barry, 82 US 610, 21 L Ed 212; Hall v Hall, 43 Ala 488; Homestead Cases, 63 Va 265.

Even a state of war and the declaration of secession by the people cannot suspend the Constitution or remove its protection. Houston County v Martin, 232 Ala 511, 169 So 13.

As to continuation of constitutional guaranties during war generally, see 78 Am Jur 2d, WAR § 20.

42. Horn v Lockhart, 84 US 570, 21 L Ed 657; Luter v Hunter, 30 Tex 688.

43. Hall v Hall, 43 Ala 488; Ray v Thompson, 43 Ala 434; Houston v Deloach, 43 Ala 364; Thomas v Taylor, 42 Miss 651, affd 89 US 479, 22 L Ed 789; Luter v Hunter, 30 Tex 688.

The mandates of the Federal Constitution continued in full force and effect in the southern states during the period of the secession; these states during that period and before their representation was restored had no more power to pass bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts, or to do anything else prohibited by the Constitution of the United States, than they had before the rebellion began or after the restoration of their normal position in the Union. White v Hart, 80 US 646, 20 L Ed 685.

An ordinance of a convention of a seceding state to raise means for defense of the state was void as in direct aid of those seeking to destroy the Union. State v McGinty, 41 Miss 435; Luter v Hunter, 30 Tex 688.

As to inferiority of state laws to the Federal Constitution and federal laws passed in pursuance thereof generally, see §§ 79, 80, infra.

44. Luther v Borden, 48 US 1, 12 L Ed 581; Ex parte Jones, 71 W Va 567, 77 SE 1029.

until pacification. Ordinarily, the entire country is in a state of peace, and on extraordinary occasions calling for military operations, only small portions thereof become theaters of actual war. In these disturbed areas the paralyzed civil authority can neither enforce nor suspend the writ of habeas corpus, and it is powerless to try citizens for offenses or to sustain a relation of either supremacy or subordination to the military power, for in a practical sense it has ceased. But in all the undisturbed, peaceable, and orderly sections, the constitutional guaranties are in actual operation and cannot be set aside.[45]

§ 73. Supremacy of amendments to Constitution.

Since any constitutional amendment, upon adoption, becomes a part of the constitution as much as if it had been originally incorporated therein, so that it is equal in dignity to an original provision of the constitution,[46] it necessarily follows that amendments to the United States Constitution are part of the supreme law of the land within the meaning of Article VI § 2, of the Constitution.[47] All states are bound by such amendments, including states which refused to ratify them,[48] at least to the extent that they are made applicable to the states by the Fourteenth Amendment.[49] And amendments to the United States Constitution render unenforceable all state laws, whether organic or statutory, that conflict therewith,[50] to the extent of the repugnancy.[51]

All courts, federal and state alike, take judicial notice of amendments to the United States Constitution, and the ratification thereof.[52]

§ 74. Supremacy of acts of Congress.

Since the Constitution provides that the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof shall be the supreme law of the land, anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding,[53] an act of Congress constitutionally passed within the limits of its authority[54] becomes a

45. United States v L. Cohen Grocery Co., 255 US 81, 65 L Ed 516, 41 S Ct 298, 14 ALR 1045; Ex parte Milligan, 71 US 2, 18 L Ed 281; Ex parte Jones, 71 W Va 567, 77 SE 1029; State ex rel. Mays v Brown, 71 W Va 519, 77 SE 243.

War does not of itself suspend at once and everywhere constitutional guaranties of liberty and property. Martial law cannot be resorted to in that part of the country where the civil courts, in the midst of loyal communities, are exercising their ordinary jurisdiction, even though the government may be prosecuting a war for the suppression of a rebellion in other parts of the country; and if a person is arrested in such a loyal community and deprived of his liberty by order of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief and as incident to a state of war, without legal process, for alleged disloyal practices therein, such arrest will be unlawful and the parties making it will be liable to an action therefor. Johnson v Jones, 44 Ill 142.

46. § 64, supra.

47. § 70, supra.

48. § 19, supra.

49. § 455, infra.

50. Johnson v State, 81 Fla 783, 89 So 114.

51. Hall v Moran, 81 Fla 706, 89 So 104.

52. See 29 Am Jur 2d, Evidence § 32.

53. US Const Art VI § 2.

54. No act of Congress is of any validity which does not rest on authority conferred by Constitution. United States v Germaine, 99 US 508, 25 L Ed 482.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and all legislation must conform to its principles; when an act of Congress is appropriately challenged, the judicial branch has the duty of determining whether such act conforms to such principles. United States v Butler, 297 US 1, 80 L Ed 477, 56 S Ct 312, 4 Ohio Ops 401, 102 ALR 914.

When Congress acts pursuant to § 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment, which empowers Congress "to enforce, by appropriate legislation,