

Supreme Court of the United States
One 1st Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

April 27,2005

Terril L. Graham
No. 03-5849
Onesufi@yahoo.com
www.awritofhabeascorpus.com

To the honorable Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist, and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court John Paul Stevens, Sandra Day O'Connor, Antonin Scalia, Anthony M. Kennedy, David Souter, Clarence Thomas, Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Stephen G. Breyer:

Terril L. Graham, plaintiff and appellant, respectfully petitions for an Order for Writs of Prohibition and Mandamus upon President George Bush for violating the Constitution of the United States, Article I.8.11, as provided for by rules of denial, 20 and 44.

This is a direct appeal to the highest court of original jurisdiction, 'in Cases of Impeachment '...'based on questions 'providing for class actions', (EW IV Jurisdictional Statement, 4).

Having already extinguished my arguments to the ICC, lobbied the Arab League of States in Cairo along with Al Jazerra, Al Ahram Foundation, Syria, Iran embassies, Fidel Castro's attorney in Cuba, and several weeks in Beirut meeting with Hezbollah, Walid Joumblatt and other important figures in the Lebanon, the final argument was "go home and make your government handle this problem without our help". The same answer Bush got about financing his mistake. Dynamic majoritarianism.

The responsibility lies with this court, to execute a lawful order, as provided for by our federal system . Kofi Annan, Amir Moussa, Osama Bin Laden, and most of the rest of the world just want us to go home. The execution of the order should be sent as an appeal to the ICC as a responsible party, when legislation in the form of UN Charters, and Rome Statutes exist which cover an appeal by a state party. Our responsibility is to present the argument to the court at The Hague as a State Party, which through the interpretation of the Prosecutors Office cannot be initiated by myself, even though I presented the arguments that the citizen is the most sovereign entity in our philosophy, and explained the role of a plaintiff as outlined above (Make your boast in His Holy name" EW VI.E.37). They are now further obligated as a peacekeeping party, to intervene when the eventual civil war manifests itself. Oregon's Portland mayor has fired the first round in disengaging his law enforcement units from cooperation with the federal protective services Act. Our Constitution has been revived by one of the most progressive states in the union, Oregon. I feel deep remorse that I cannot say, 'California,' since I am sitting in the zone that the United Nations and ACLU were given birth, but as native Oregonians know, our liberal masses have been migrating in droves. Our borders must be reopened. Trade barriers can't exist to promote preferential commerce for cartels (federal intervention on marijuana distribution).

Now that the full effect of President Bush's decision to ignore the separation of powers provisions of the Constitution, the ICC can clearly apply the 'unable to execute' rule (awritofhabeascorpus.com., ltr to Cathala). Despite Annan's persistent rejection of my own arguments (ltrs to Kofi), this court can exercise its authority by letting the chips fall where they may. You cannot remain silent any longer. In the interests of preserving the peace, intended upon by the proper interpretation of our Constitution, and by making the transcendental leap from self to universe, your own declaration of acceptance will become manifest. That acknowledgment, as a state party, is the declaration that the ICC needs in order to proceed.

Since this has never happened before, I have taken the liberty of following the same form I used to address everyone else. In a clear letter of prayer.

This Court is well served by declaring these values, beyond our national borders, in order to give international law credibility. Still, this is not a political decision that should be left to the executive or legislative branches. 'It is the responsibility of the judiciary... granted by the judiciary act of 1789, Kendall v. US, 12 Pet. 524 (1838)), (EW IV.5).

'To justify the granting of a writ...petitioner must show that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers (SCR 20.4.(a))'(EW V.6), when denial did not include an explanation, and no other court remains available for appeal' (28 USC 1651 (a)).

'When the legislature may rightfully command an act to be done by a public officer, they may confer upon the judiciary the power to enforce its performance, (9 Wheat 866, 573), (EW V.5).'

You all well know that the legislature did act, and put a leash on the dogs of war. This court has made significant appearance in recent weeks addressing the necessity for a Constitutional interpretation to take place, including the New Yorker article on Justice Scalia, which made me ecstatic all day and night, and its remembrance still does, making it difficult to continue. I wanted to believe the vote was 8:0:1 because the justice recused himself; but it is now affirmed that His heart was there. These people are amazing though. With all of the paperwork I've been carrying to substantiate my claims, as I was directed to do, the arguments have either proven too preposterous to be heard, 'he slapped his knee in derision, and walked away arrogantly with anger' (Mahabarata, C. Rajagopalachari, former president of India);

"Yudhishtira will never give up the path of righteousness for love or fear. (he said)' Truth is greater than power or prosperity and has to be guarded at all costs, and not the kingdom'....Yudhishtira would firmly reply that they should abide by the promise they made and that forbearance was the highest virtue of all"(op cit 95-103).

Then we return to the argument of 'when does the exertion of executive pressure arrive at the point of preemptive actions, in self defense, which fall within dicta/stare decise, law

that determines what is right and wrong and that has power or is valid by nature, inherently, hence everywhere and always (EW VIII RELIEF SOUGHT).

In the case of potentially destroying one branch of our federal system, nameably the judiciary, by not taking action in a timely fashion, the interpretation of man's role in establishing natural law is violated. When it becomes evident that the only way of delivering justice is through an artistic representation created virtually by the imagination of man, and the principles are clearly demonstrated to be universally accepted, we should do what you yourselves proposed last week at the Tim Russert interview. We do, Justice O'Connor, need to look to other nations .

The commentaries of Jefferson, at the back of my newest copy of Jesus of Nazareth summarize my arguments:

“This is a summary view of the religious slavery under which a people have been willing to remain...for the establishment of their civil freedom....Our rulers can have no authority over such natural rights,...We are answerable for them to our God. It is error alone which needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself. Difference of opinion...perform the office of a censor morum over each other...the earth is inhabited by people ...these profess different systems of religion...if there be but one right, we should wish to see the sects gathered into the fold of truth...we cannot effect this by force. Reason and persuasion are the only practicable instruments. To make way for these, free inquiry must be indulged; and how can we wish others to indulge it while we refuse it ourselves.”(?) (Foote, Harrington, Roche, “The Jefferson Bible”, 1964).

Once again, we affirm human frailty and the preeminence of natural law.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Terril L. Graham'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Terril L. Graham

Service: Solicitor General
Kofi Annan