A HIDDEN CASE OF TREASON

E. R. Fish 11Apr16

It is fairly common knowledge that the Iran is an enemy of the states, as Iran has been officially recognized as a state sponsor of terrorism since the beginning of 1984[1] — Figure 1 shows the current listing of state sponsors of terrorism officially recognized by the Department of State.[2]

Furthermore, according to findings in *FIONA HAVLISH, et al v. USAMA BIN LADEN, et al* (Civil Action No: 03-CV-9848-GBD)[3], Iran was found in Conclusion of Law #35 to be "liable for damages caused by the acts of agency and instrumentality Defendants because 'in any such action, a foreign state shall be vicariously liable for the acts of its officials, employees, or agents'" — Conjoined with the fact of the AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST TERRORISTS[4] (AUMF) saying in sec. *2*, subsection *a* "IN GENERAL- That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons." clearly indicates that insofar as the law is concerned Iran has been proven to be an enemy of the states.

Country	Designation Date
Iran	January 19, 1984
Sudan	August 12, 1993
Syria	December 29, 1979

1 — State Sponsors of Terrorism

Moreover, the AMUF is indeed a formal declaration of war as Webster's 1828 dictionary — which would be the common man's understanding of the Constitution — defines war (first definition) as:

> A contest between nations or states, carried on by force, either for defense, or for revenging insults and redressing wrongs, for the extension of commerce or acquisition of territory, or for obtaining and establishing the superiority and dominion of one over the other. These objects are accomplished by the slaughter or capture of troops, and the capture and destruction of ships, towns and property. Among rude nations, war is often waged and carried on for plunder. As war is the contest of nations or states, it always implies that such contest is authorized by the monarch or the sovereign power of the nation. When war is commenced by attacking a nation in peace, it si called an offensive war and such attack is aggressive. When war is undertaken to repel invasion

---

[1] – The Department of State's page on State Sponsors of Terrorism as of 10Apr16. Also archived here (03Apr16) & here (17Feb13).

[2] – The Senate's own public record of the vote.

[3] – Havlish et al.

[4] – H.J.RES.64 & S.J.RES.23, passed both houses of Congress on 14Sep01.

> or the attacks of an enemy, it is called defensive, and a defensive war is considered as justifiable. Very few of the wars that have desolated nations and deluged the earth with blood, have been justifiable. Happy would it be for mankind, if the prevalence of Christian principles might ultimately extinguish the spirit of war and if the ambition to be great, might yield to the ambition of being good.

— precisely because the congress, which authorizes war, authorized military force to "reveng[e] insults and redressing [the] wrong" that was the 11Sep01 terrorist act.

Therefore, being that we have lawfully declared war on "those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons", and that it was found that Iran is one such nation that we are at war with Iran. — That terminology has been used to try to deny this fact is irrelevant.

Having proved that Iran is an enemy of the states (in multiple ways), we shift our attention domestically: namely, 98% of the House of the Senate (see Figure 2)[5] and the President. — Hereafter I shall endeavor to prove that they are guilty of, and ought to prosecuted & convicted for, Treason.

The definition of Treason according to the Constitution for the United States is:

> `Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort.`

Now the charge of treason will be tied to a single public and overt action: HR 1191[6]. — Though it must be noted that intent and validity are two different things, this is to say that just because the measure, is in my own opinion, unlawful (and therefore invalid) on its face does *not* impact the intent displayed by the measure itself.

First, let us consider that HR 1191 was not intended to change the state of hostility (i.e. war) with Iran, as evidenced by Sec 2 (d)(7)(A) which says, in part, "United States sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place". It is thus clear here that Iran's involvement with terrorism is not being considered repaid ('revenged') by the measure.

Second, HR 1191 allows Iran a measure of legal cover to develop nuclear weapons; it is well known that Iran is a signatory of THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS (NPT), which seeks to "prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology"[7] by Article II which reads:

> Each non-nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty undertakes not to receive the transfer from any transferor whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; and not to seek or receive any assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

— and it is also known to the United States that Iran has violated (and continues to violate)

---

[5] – HR 1191: IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015 — vote data from the Senate's own web page.

[6] – https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/1191

[7] – According to the UN's page on the NPT.

the NPT, as reported/found[8] by the Department of State:

> Article II [of the NPT] prohibits NNWS from seeking or receiving assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons. It also prohibits NNWS from the receipt, manufacture or other acquisition of such weapons. The United States has previously found that Iran is pursuing a nuclear weapons capability. The breadth of Iran's nuclear development efforts, the secrecy and deceptions with which they have been conducted for nearly 20 years, its redundant and surreptitious procurement channels, Iran's persistent failure to comply with its obligations to report to the IAEA and to apply safeguards to such activities, and the lack of a reasonable economic justification for this program leads us to conclude that Iran is pursuing an effort to manufacture nuclear weapons, and has sought and received assistance in this effort in violation of Article II of the NPT. This weapons program combines elements of not only the activities declared to the IAEA and ostensibly run by the civilian Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI), but also any still undeclared fuel cycle and other activities that may exist, including those that may be run solely be the military.
>
> In addition, Iran's past failure to declare the import of UF6, failure to provide design information to the IAEA on the existing centrifuge facility prior to the introduction of nuclear material, and its conduct of undeclared laser isotope separation, uranium conversion experiments, and plutonium separation work further reinforce this assessment and also make clear that Iran has violated Article III of the NPT and its IAEA safeguards agreement.

As such, the legal cover that HR 1191 gives to Iran is *exactly* "`giving them Aid and Comfort`", legal aid and comfort, to be exact — which is the definition of Treason.

Thirdly, let us consider the method by which the Senate proposed to enable giving this aid. HR 1191, SEC. 2 (c)(1)(C) reads, in whole, as follows:

> this section does not require a vote by Congress for the agreement to commence;

which directly contradicts the Constitution's requirement[9] for international agreements (i.e. treaties[10]) by requiring no vote whatsoever and as a law "repugnant to the Constitution" it is unlawful and void — However, this does not negate the facts in this matter:

1. The overwhelming majority of the Senate has voted affirmative on HR 1191.
2. HR1191 gives aid, in the form of legal cover, to Iran's development of nuclear weapons; an enemy we are at war with and who itself has repeated declared its desire to eliminate the united states.
    a. A particularly prominent threat on 17Jun15 was that the White House would be destroyed in 10 minutes by a paper, "Kayhan", which is apparently affiliated with Iranian leader Ali Khamenei.[11]

---

[8] – Adherence to and Compliance With Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments, 30Aug05.
(Department of State, Web Archive)

[9] – US Constitution, Article 2, Section 2, Paragraph 2, in part:
`He [the President] shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur`

[10] – Webster's 1828 dictionary; TREATY:
An agreement, league or contract between two or more nations or sovereigns, formally signed by commissioners properly authorized, and solemnly ratified by the several sovereigns or the supreme power of each state. Treaties are of various kinds, as treaties for regulating commercial intercourse, treaties of alliance, offensive and defensive, treaties for hiring troops, treaties of peace, etc.

[11] – Iranian Newspaper: Iran Could Destroy White House 'in Under 10 Minutes'

Votes on Passage of H.R. 1191 As Amended							
Yea — 98							
Alexander	(R-TN)	Daines	(R-MT)	Klobuchar	(D-MN)	Rounds	(R-SD)
Ayotte	(R-NH)	Donnelly	(D-IN)	Lankford	(R-OK)	Rubio	(R-FL)
Baldwin	(D-WI)	Durbin	(D-IL)	Leahy	(D-VT)	Sanders	(I-VT)
Barrasso	(R-WY)	Enzi	(R-WY)	Lee	(R-UT)	Sasse	(R-NE)
Bennet	(D-CO)	Ernst	(R-IA)	Manchin	(D-WV)	Schatz	(D-HI)
Blumentha	(D-CT)	Feinstein	(D-CA)	Markey	(D-MA)	Schumer	(D-NY)
Blunt	(R-MO)	Fischer	(R-NE)	McCain	(R-AZ)	Scott	(R-SC)
Booker	(D-NJ)	Flake	(R-AZ)	McCaskill	(D-MO)	Sessions	(R-AL)
Boozman	(R-AR)	Franken	(D-MN)	McConnel	(R-KY)	Shaheen	(D-NH)
Brown	(D-OH)	Gardner	(R-CO)	Menendez	(D-NJ)	Shelby	(R-AL)
Burr	(R-NC)	Gillibrand	(D-NY)	Merkley	(D-OR)	Stabenow	(D-MI)
Cantwell	(D-WA)	Graham	(R-SC)	Mikulski	(D-MD)	Sullivan	(R-AK)
Capito	(R-WV)	Grassley	(R-IA)	Moran	(R-KS)	Tester	(D-MT)
Cardin	(D-MD)	Hatch	(R-UT)	Murkowsk	(R-AK)	Thune	(R-SD)
Carper	(D-DE)	Heinrich	(D-NM)	Murphy	(D-CT)	Tillis	(R-NC)
Casey	(D-PA)	Heitkamp	(D-ND)	Murray	(D-WA)	Toomey	(R-PA)
Cassidy	(R-LA)	Heller	(R-NV)	Nelson	(D-FL)	Udall	(D-NM)
Coats	(R-IN)	Hirono	(D-HI)	Paul	(R-KY)	Vitter	(R-LA)
Cochran	(R-MS)	Hoeven	(R-ND)	Perdue	(R-GA)	Warner	(D-VA)
Collins	(R-ME)	Inhofe	(R-OK)	Peters	(D-MI)	Warren	(D-MA)
Coons	(D-DE)	Isakson	(R-GA)	Portman	(R-OH)	Whitehous	(D-RI)
Corker	(R-TN)	Johnson	(R-WI)	Reed	(D-RI)	Wicker	(R-MS)
Cornyn	(R-TX)	Kaine	(D-VA)	Reid	(D-NV)	Wyden	(D-OR)
Crapo	(R-ID)	King	(I-ME)	Risch	(R-ID)		
Cruz	(R-TX)	Kirk	(R-IL)	Roberts	(R-KS)		
Nay — 1							
Cotton	(R-AR)						
Not Voting — 1							
Boxer	(D-CA)						

2 — Vote tally on HR 1191, by position.

b. On 25Feb15, Al Jazeera reported Iran had destroyed a mock US aircraft carrier in naval drills.[12]

c. On 12Jan16, Al Jazeera reported on Iran capturing/detaining two US vessels.[13]

d. On 24Mar16, the Washington Post reported that 7 'hackers' associated with Iran attacking banks "marked the first time the United States has charged state-sponsored individuals with hacking to disrupt the networks of key U.S. industries."[14]

e. On 16Feb12, CNN (via one of its blogs) reported that Lt. Gen. Ronald Burgess

---

[12] – Iran destroys mock US aircraft carrier in naval drills.

[13] – Two US navy boats seized by Iran.

[14] – U.S. charges Iran-linked hackers with targeting banks, N.Y. dam.

"confirmed that it is the intelligence communities' belief that Iran is supporting the killing of U.S. soldiers."[15]

3. HR 1191 is claimed to be passed into law by both Houses of Congress.[16]
4. HR 1191 gives aid, in that while unlawful it authorizes the President to render aid and comfort to the enemy (Iran).
5. HR 1191 authorizes the President to negotiate a treaty outside of the constraints of the Constitution, thus providing *him* legal cover in enacting treason.
6. The President acted as if authorized by HR 1191 on 16Jan16 to remove some sanctions on Iran, while still keeping the sanctions against it for being a state-sponsor of terrorism.
7. Iran's terrorism *is* the grounds on which we are at war with Iran due to the AMUF, therefore we are still at war with Iran.

Given the above it becomes clear that HR 1191 is wholly the machination of a rogue senate, steeped in a class that believes itself to be above the law in all matters. The members are indeed privileged from arrests by the Constitution; however, that explicitly excluded from the case of Treason:

> US Constitution, Article 1, Section 6, Paragraph 1
> The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

Now, I realize that I have made the assertion that HR 1191 is not, and cannot be, law. This comes from the simple and obvious fact that the Legislature cannot change the Constitution without abiding by the Constitution's own rules regarding alteration as outlined in Article 5 — but, as many have been induced into the dogma that "the Constitution means whatever the Supreme Court says it means" it would behoove me to cite a case that declares this to be exactly the case as the final portion of *Marbury v. Madison* shows:

> The question whether an act repugnant to the Constitution can become the law of the land is a question deeply interesting to the United States, but, happily, not of an intricacy proportioned to its interest. It seems only necessary to recognise certain principles, supposed to have been long and well established, to decide it.
>
> That the people have an original right to establish for their future government such principles as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been erected. The exercise of this original right is a very great exertion; nor can it nor ought it to be frequently repeated. The principles, therefore, so established are deemed fundamental. And as the authority from which they proceed, is supreme, and can seldom act, they are designed to be permanent.
>
> This original and supreme will organizes the government and assigns to different departments

---

[15] – Iran a threat to U.S. on many fronts.

[16] – HR 1191 page tracker: "Became Law".

their respective powers. It may either stop here or establish certain limits not to be transcended by those departments.

The Government of the United States is of the latter description. The powers of the Legislature are defined and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken or forgotten, the Constitution is written. To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may at any time be passed by those intended to be restrained? The distinction between a government with limited and unlimited powers is abolished if those limits do not confine the persons on whom they are imposed, and if acts prohibited and acts allowed are of equal obligation. It is a proposition too plain to be contested that the Constitution controls any legislative act repugnant to it, or that the Legislature may alter the Constitution by an ordinary act.

Between these alternatives there is no middle ground. The Constitution is either a superior, paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it.

If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act contrary to the Constitution is not law; if the latter part be true, then written Constitutions are absurd attempts on the part of the people to limit a power in its own nature illimitable.

Certainly all those who have framed written Constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law of the nation, and consequently the theory of every such government must be that an act of the Legislature repugnant to the Constitution is void.

This theory is essentially attached to a written Constitution, and is consequently to be considered by this Court as one of the fundamental principles of our society. It is not, therefore, to be lost sight of in the further consideration of this subject.

If an act of the Legislature repugnant to the Constitution is void, does it, notwithstanding its invalidity, bind the Courts and oblige them to give it effect? Or, in other words, though it be not law, does it constitute a rule as operative as if it was a law? This would be to overthrow in fact what was established in theory, and would seem, at first view, an absurdity too gross to be insisted on. It shall, however, receive a more attentive consideration.

It is emphatically the province and duty of the Judicial Department to say what the law is. Those who apply the rule to particular cases must, of necessity, expound and interpret that rule. If two laws conflict with each other, the Courts must decide on the operation of each.

So, if a law be in opposition to the Constitution, if both the law and the Constitution apply to a particular case, so that the Court must either decide that case conformably to the law, disregarding the Constitution, or conformably to the Constitution, disregarding the law, the Court must determine which of these conflicting rules governs the case. This is of the very essence of judicial duty.

If, then, the Courts are to regard the Constitution, and the Constitution is superior to any ordinary act of the Legislature, the Constitution, and not such ordinary act, must govern the case to which they both apply.

Those, then, who controvert the principle that the Constitution is to be considered in court as a paramount law are reduced to the necessity of maintaining that courts must close their eyes on the Constitution, and see only the law.

This doctrine would subvert the very foundation of all written Constitutions. It would declare that an act which, according to the principles and theory of our government, is entirely void, is yet, in practice, completely obligatory. It would declare that, if the Legislature shall do what is expressly forbidden, such act, notwithstanding the express prohibition, is in reality effectual. It would be

giving to the Legislature a practical and real omnipotence with the same breath which professes to restrict their powers within narrow limits. It is prescribing limits, and declaring that those limits may be passed at pleasure.

That it thus reduces to nothing what we have deemed the greatest improvement on political institutions -- a written Constitution, would of itself be sufficient, in America where written Constitutions have been viewed with so much reverence, for rejecting the construction. But the peculiar expressions of the Constitution of the United States furnish additional arguments in favour of its rejection.

The judicial power of the United States is extended to all cases arising under the Constitution.

Could it be the intention of those who gave this power to say that, in using it, the Constitution should not be looked into? That a case arising under the Constitution should be decided without examining the instrument under which it arises?

This is too extravagant to be maintained.

In some cases then, the Constitution must be looked into by the judges. And if they can open it at all, what part of it are they forbidden to read or to obey?

There are many other parts of the Constitution which serve to illustrate this subject.

It is declared that "no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State." Suppose a duty on the export of cotton, of tobacco, or of flour, and a suit instituted to recover it. Ought judgment to be rendered in such a case? ought the judges to close their eyes on the Constitution, and only see the law?

The Constitution declares that "no bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed."

If, however, such a bill should be passed and a person should be prosecuted under it, must the Court condemn to death those victims whom the Constitution endeavours to preserve?

"No person," says the Constitution, "shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court."

Here. the language of the Constitution is addressed especially to the Courts. It prescribes, directly for them, a rule of evidence not to be departed from. If the Legislature should change that rule, and declare one witness, or a confession out of court, sufficient for conviction, must the constitutional principle yield to the legislative act?

From these and many other selections which might be made, it is apparent that the framers of the Constitution contemplated that instrument as a rule for the government of courts, as well as of the Legislature.

Why otherwise does it direct the judges to take an oath to support it? This oath certainly applies in an especial manner to their conduct in their official character. How immoral to impose it on them if they were to be used as the instruments, and the knowing instruments, for violating what they swear to support!

The oath of office, too, imposed by the Legislature, is completely demonstrative of the legislative opinion on this subject. It is in these words:

I do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich; and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge all the duties incumbent

on me as according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Why does a judge swear to discharge his duties agreeably to the Constitution of the United States if that Constitution forms no rule for his government? if it is closed upon him and cannot be inspected by him?

If such be the real state of things, this is worse than solemn mockery. To prescribe or to take this oath becomes equally a crime.

It is also not entirely unworthy of observation that, in declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution itself is first mentioned, and not the laws of the United States generally, but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution, have that rank.
Thus, the particular phraseology of the Constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written Constitutions, that a law repugnant to the Constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.

The rule must be discharged.

As we can see, any law "repugnant to the Constitution" is a nullity and any such rule "must be discharged"[17] and the ruling itself is very clear about how absurd it would be to consider that any 'normal act of the legislature' could override or amend the Constitution.

Yet here we are with proof that the Senate tried to do exactly that — and that the rest of the government is playing along presuming the very instrument of Treason to be legal and valid despite that the act is a conspiracy[18] to defraud[19] these united states.

While, so far, these are laid out as federal crimes, they are *not* the exclusive purview of the federal government; applicable from the view of the several states are their own Constitutions as well as, possibly, their own law. As an example we will use New Mexico:

1. NM Constitution, Art II, Sec. 1. [Supreme law of the land.]
   `The state of New Mexico is an inseparable part of the federal union, and the constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land.`
   a. To deny that the states may uphold the supreme law of the land in execution while obligating them to honor it is of the same ridiculousness as was pointed out in the *Marbury v. Madison* case regarding the Judiciary's obligation to the law.
   b. By this reasoning alone it is in the state's interest to see that the laws are upheld and faithfully executed; however, there are other sections that

---

[17] – Webster's 1828 dictionary; DISCHARGED, participle passive
Unloaded; let off; shot; thrown out; dismissed from service; paid; released; acquitted; freed from debt or penalty; liberated; performed; executed.

[18] – 18 U.S. Code § 371 - Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States
For the purposes of this chapter, the term "scheme or artifice to defraud" includes a scheme or artifice to deprive another of the intangible right of honest services.

[19] – 18 U.S. Code § 1346 - Definition of "scheme or artifice to defraud"
For the purposes of this chapter, the term "scheme or artifice to defraud" includes a scheme or artifice to deprive another of the intangible right of honest services.

illustrate the principle.

2. NM Constitution, Art II, Sec. 3. [Right of self-government.]
   The people of the state have the sole and exclusive right to govern themselves as a free, sovereign and independent state.
3. NM Constitution, Art II, Sec. 16. [Treason.]
   Treason against the state shall consist only in levying war against it, adhering to its enemies, or giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.
   a. This is essentially the same definition of Treason that the US Constitution uses, therefore all the reasoning above applies to establishing a case of Treason against the State of New Mexico.
   b. To deny the State of New Mexico any right to see that its supreme law, that is the Constitution for the United States, is upheld is violative of Article II, Sec. 3 and can therefore be used as evidence toward Treason.
4. *NMSA 8-5-2. Duties of attorney general.*
   Except as otherwise provided by law, the attorney general shall:
   a. prosecute and defend all causes in the supreme court and court of appeals in which the state is a party or interested;
   b. prosecute and defend in any other court or tribunal all actions and proceedings, civil or criminal, in which the state may be a party or interested when, in his judgment, the interest of the state requires such action or when requested to do so by the governor;

   […]
5. 10-1-12. [Employment of persons advocating sabotage, sedition or treason prohibited; discharge of such persons already employed.]
   No person shall be knowingly employed by any state department, office, board, commission or bureau, county, municipality or other political subdivision, board of education or school board, who either directly or indirectly carries on, advocates, teaches, justifies, aids or abets a program of sabotage, force and violence, sedition or treason against the government of the United States or of this state.
   When it becomes reasonably apparent to his appointing power that any employee has committed any of the acts hereinabove described it shall be the duy [duty] of such employer to refer the data and information available to him to the district attorney of the judicial district wherein such employee resides, and it shall thereupon become the mandatory duty of the district attorney to institute a proceeding in the district court to determine whether the employee has violated this act [section]. If such court determines that this act has been violated, such employee shall be immediately discharged and shall not be again employed in any capacity by any state department, office, board, commission, or bureau, county, municipality, or other political subdivision, board of education, or school board.

All of the above are properly in the purview of the State of New Mexico, despite what the United States Supreme Court ruled in *ARIZONA v. UNITED STATES* or *EVENWEL v. ABBOTT* — which together provide a strong case of treason against the high court by undermining the sovereignty of the several states (though that is beyond the scope of this paper).

According to the Constitutions of both the United States and the State of New Mexico, the conviction of treason is hinged upon "the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court" — fortunately we have a multitude of witnesses: each 'AYE' vote has been recorded and is witness to that overt act, the President's own signature is also witness to HR 1191 — and finally, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are witnesses as well.

So, in summary:

1. HR 1191 provided aid and comfort to Iran.
    a. An enemy of the several states.
2. HR 1191 is an attempt to undermine:
    a. The Constitution for the United States:
        i. It presents an illusion of legitimacy to:
            (1) Iran's nuclear programs.
            (2) The treasonous aid to Iran.
            (3) The illegitimate 'passage' of a treaty.
            (4) The president's involvement in executing said aid and comfort.
        ii. Setting precedent that the legislature is not bound by the Constitution.
    b. The legitimacy and public trust of the United States:
        i. By presenting as lawful that which is manifestly not so.
        ii. Becoming definitionally a sponsor of terrorism; giving aid and comfort to a nation itself recognized as deeply tied to terrorism as Iran is.
        iii. By so egregiously and cavalierly disregarding the supreme law of these united states.
        iv. By betraying the public trust.
3. By the AUMF we are at war with Iran, HR 1191 gives aid on the subject of nuclear armament to Iran — therefore everyone involved in its passage ought to be tried for Treason.