Exhibit 212

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 reprints of the:

The Relationship of The State to the Federal Power - commentary, as given to us by a Republic of Texas Citizen.

This attestation is made on August 18, 1998.

Attest: Ed. Brannum

D. A. Hoot

Witness to source and above signature

Jo Helen Brannum

Witness to above signatures

the North:

> Before the Revolution (the South) was the seat of wealth, as well as hospitality....Wealth has fled from the South, and settled in regions north of the Potomac: and this in the face of the fact, that the South, in four staples alone, has exported produce, since the Revolution, to the value of eight hundred millions of dollars; and the North exported comparatively nothing. Such an export would indicate unparalleled wealth, but what is the fact?...**Under Federal legislation, the exports of the South have been the basis of the Federal revenue**....Virginia, the two Carolinas, and Georgia, may be said to defray three-fourths of the annual expense of supporting the Federal Government; and of this great sum, annually furnished by them, nothing or next to nothing is returned to them, in the shape of Government expenditures. That expenditure flows in an opposite direction — it flows northwardly, in one uniform, uninterrupted, and perennial stream. ... **Federal legislation does all this.**[90]

Before 1833 secession from the union was a well recognized Right that applied to all States. After 1861 it suddenly become 'illegal' — though not un-Lawful — for a State to secede:

> The attempted secession of eleven of the states from the Union...gave rise to many important decisions affecting the mutual relations of the national and state governments, and the rights of citizens under contracts made before and during the war.
>
> William Rawle,[91] in treating the guarantee of the constitution to every state in the Union of a republican form of government, expressed the opinion that a state had the right to withdraw from the Union. He said:
>
> "If a faction should attempt to subvert the government of a state for the purpose of destroying its republican form, the paternal power of the Union could thus be called forth to subdue it. Yet it is not to be understood that its interposition would be justifiable, if the people of a state should determine to retire from the Union, whether they adopted another or retained the same form of government."[92]
>
> "The states, then, may wholly withdraw from the Union, but while they continue, they must retain the character of representative republics."[93]
>
> The secession of a state from the Union depends on the will of the people of such state.[94]
>
> The editor of this Revision of Bouvier (1914 revision) found among the papers of William Rawle, some years ago his 'Notes on the Constitution' evidently intended to be used in the preparation of a third edition. Apparently they were prepared during the Nullification excitement; President Jackson's Nullification Proclamation was issued December 10, 1832. [Rawle] died in 1836 without completing the third edition. He says in these notes:
>
> "The distressing agitation of the public mind now prevailing in two of the Southern States (S. Carolina and Georgia) has induced the author carefully to review this chapter with much anxiety to discover whether his opinions on this important subject are correct and with a full determination candidly to avow any error which he should find in them. The exact question is whether the people of one state may withdraw that state from the Union without the consent of the other states, or the rest of the People of the Union." And he concludes: "Very gratifying would it have been to the author of this work had his reconsideration of this most interesting question terminated in a different conviction, but he cannot retract in this edition what he continues to think nor expunge what has already been laid before the public."

---

[90] Senator Thomas H. Benton, cited in Memoirs of Service Afloat, p. 60. [Emphasis added.]

[91] View of the Constitution, (Philadelphia, 1825, 2d Ed.1829)

[92] Bouvier's Law Dictionary (1914), pp. 3029 3030. The reader is referred to Charles F. Adams', 'Studies Military and Diplomatic,' and 'Trans Atlantic Historical Solidarity,' for his consideration of this subject.

[93] Ibid., p. 297.

[94] Ibid. p. 302.

Story[97] and Webster favored a national union even with considerable history against them down to 1861. The issue directly affects the State and Federal relationship, which, as a 'national' government, rather than a federation of states, makes the 'national' government superior to States, rather than a creation of the states. These ideas would not agree with Isaiah 9:6, and would be a fundamental flaw in early American thought. because the national government could never show that it had a lineage traceable to the Tree of Life. Again, the Source, Cause, and Origin of Law come into play.

In 1861, Attorney General John Black wrote:

> Whether Congress has the constitutional right to make war against one or more States, and require the Executive of the Federal Government to carry it on by means of force to be drawn from the other States, is a question for Congress itself to consider. **It must be admitted that no such power is expressly given; nor are there any words in the Constitution which imply it.** Among the powers enumerated in Article I., section 8, is that, "to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and to make rules concerning captures on land and water." This certainly means nothing more than the power to commence and carry on hostilities against the foreign enemies of the nation. Another clause in the same section gives Congress the power "to provide for calling forth the militia," and to use them within the limits of a State. But this power is so restricted by the words which immediately follow, that it can be exercised only for one of the following purposes: 1. To execute the laws of the Union, that is, to aid the Federal officers in the performance of their regular duties. 2. To suppress insurrections against the States; but this is confined by Article IV., section 4, to cases in which the State herself shall apply for assistance against her own people. 3. To repel the invasion of a State by enemies who come from abroad to assail her in her own territory. All these provisions are to protect the States, not to authorize an attack by one part of the country upon another; to preserve their peace, and not lunge them into civil war. Our forefathers do not seem to have thought that war was calculated to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.' There was undoubtedly a strong and universal conviction among the men who framed and ratified the Constitution that military force would not only be useless but pernicious as a means of holding the States (Union) together.
>
> If it be true that war cannot be declared, nor a system of general hostilities carried on by the Central Government against a State, then it seems to follow that an attempt to do so would be ipso facto an expulsion of such State from the Union. And if Congress shall break up the Union by unconstitutionally putting strife and enmity and armed hostility between different sections of the country, instead of the domestic tranquility' which the Constitution was meant to insure, will not all the States be absolved from their Federal obligations? Is any portion of the people bound to contribute their money or their blood to carry on a contest like that?
>
> The right of the Central Government to preserve itself in its whole constitutional vigor by repelling a direct and positive aggression upon its property or its officers cannot be denied. But this is a totally different thing from an offensive war to punish the people for the political misdeeds of their State government, or to prevent a threatened violation of the Constitution, or to enforce an acknowledgment that the Government of the United States is supreme. The States are colleagues of one another, and if some of them shall conquer the rest and hold them as subjugated provinces, it would totally destroy the whole theory upon which they are now connected.[98]

This opinion by Black immediately cost him his job under Lincoln. Thus, from the founding era to 1861 States had the right to secede, and if Congress or anyone else tried to stop them, by force or otherwise, it would radically change the relationship of the states to each other and to the Federal government. This last

---

[97] See, Charles Warren, The Supreme Court and Sovereign States, Appendix One. At the time Story wrote his commentaries, and Webster debated Hayne, Madison's Notes on the Federal Convention had not yet been published. Thus both were unaware of the true meaning of 'We the People.' *See also David Hawke, The Colonial Experience (1966, The Bobbs–Merrill Co.), p. 673.

[98] Attorney-General John Black, in an opinion quoted in the Annual Cyclopedia (1861), p. 698. [**Emphasis** added]

relationship was purportedly settled solely by A. Lincoln out of the barrel of a gun.

In further consideration of this proposition, we note later that this war never ended; but is continued this day with the Reconstruction Acts under various and sundry titles. These are evidence of the change relationship as well as of religion. We would also add that there never was a treaty of peace signed by between the belligerent parties.

Before Lincoln's War, the consensus on the relationship of the state to the federal power was:

> ...the state governments are ... essential constituent parts of the general government. **They can exist without the latter, but the latter cannot exist without the former.** Without the intervention of the state legislatures; the president of the United States cannot be elected at all; and the senate is exclusively and absolutely under the choice of the state legislatures. The representatives are chosen by the people of the states. Every where the state sovereignties are represented; and **the national sovereignty**, as such, **has no representation.** How is it possible, under such circumstances, that the national government can be dangerous to the liberties of the people, unless the states, and the people of the states, **conspire together for their overthrow?** If there should be such a conspiracy, is not this more justly deemed an act of the states through their own agents, ... rather than a corrupt usurpation by the general government?"[99]

After Lincoln's War, however, the whole issue was turned on its head..

> All these challenges from various parts of the country were disposed of peaceably, except for the slavery controversy. Over that issue and secession the North, behind Lincoln's leadership, **finally settled by force the ultimate issue of National supremacy** (under the person posing as president). **After the war it could no longer be maintained that the Union was only a creature of the States, or a compact between them, liable to be thwarted or dissolved at the will of any of them. From then on, the interpretation of National powers was to be determined, in the main, by some National authority."**[100]

And, further:

> The adoption of the first eleven amendments to the Constitution so soon after the original instrument was accepted, shows a prevailing sense of danger at that time from the Federal power. And it cannot be denied that such a jealousy continued to exist with many patriotic men until the breakout of the late civil war. **It was then discovered that the true danger to the perpetuity of the Union was in the capacity of the State organizations to combine and concentrate all the powers of the State, and of contiguous States, for a determined resistance to the General Government.**[101]

The implications then, are clear:

> Unquestionably this has given great force to the argument, and added largely to the number of those who believe in the necessity of a strong National government."[102]

Thus, *commercial* nationalism, a heresy in respect to Christianity, triumphs by force of arms at th

---

[99] Joseph Story's Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States (1833), §510, Vol. 1, p. 488. For further evidence on this, see The Charge to the Grand Jury, Fed.Cas.No. 18,274, 30 Fed.Cas. 1042, 1045, 2 Spr. 292. **[Emphasis** added

[100] Report of the Commission of Intergovernmental Relations (1955), p. 22. Formed by Public Law 109, 83rd Cong **[Emphasis** added]

[101] Slaughterhouse Cases (1873), 16 Wall. 36, p. 82. **[Emphasis** added]

[102] Ibid.