

RECEIVED

10/8/2025

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

THOMAS G. BRUTON
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

FREDDIE A. WILLIAMS, d/b/a LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE®

Plaintiff

v.

**MICHAEL HUFF; BOOKBABY BOOKSHOP; AMAZON.COM, INC.; WALMART INC.; EBAY INC.;
ABEBOOKS INC.; and JOHN DOES 1-20**

Defendants

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536

Judge: Matthew F. Kennelly

Magistrate Judge: Jeannice W. Appenteng

**MOTION TO FILE PUBLICATION OF RECORD
("POINT OF LAW" EDITION) INTO THE COURT
RECORD**

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, Freddie A. Williams (Ahua El Bey), in his capacity as Publisher and Owner of LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE®, and respectfully moves this Honorable Court for leave to file the attached publication — LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE®: Point of Law Edition — as an official exhibit and evidentiary publication of record in support of Case No. 1:25-cv-10536.

1. Purpose of Motion

This motion seeks to enter the Point of Law Edition of LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® (filed contemporaneously herewith) into the case record as a lawful and factual publication issued under Article VI of the United States Constitution and Title 25 U.S. Code (Indian Affairs). It establishes the constitutional and statutory framework central to Plaintiff's claims and supports the ongoing issues of trademark infringement, cultural misappropriation, and breach of fiduciary duty.

2. Basis and Authority

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b) and the Court's inherent authority, Plaintiff requests that this publication be recognized as: (a) an evidentiary supplement under Rule 1006 (Summaries of Evidence); (b) a self-authenticating printed publication under Federal Rule of Evidence 902(6); and (c) a continuation of Plaintiff's investigative and documentary record referenced in the original complaint.

3. Exhibit Description

Exhibit L — LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® "Point of Law" Edition (2025). Filed PDF: LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE Point of Law Edition.pdf. Contains investigative legal analysis, Article VI argumentation, and reference to Case No. 1:25-cv-10536; serves as a legal publication of record issued by Plaintiff prior to public release.

4. Relief Requested

Plaintiff respectfully prays that this Honorable Court: (1) grant leave to file and accept the attached publication as Exhibit L — Publication of Record; (2) acknowledge its inclusion as part of the evidentiary record in Case No. 1:25-cv-10536; and (3) grant any further relief this Court deems just and

THOMAS G. BRUTON, CLERK

Christopher Kellen

(By) DEPUTY CLERK



October 8, 2025

DATE

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE®

AMERICA

TURTLE ISLAND

TITLE 25, THE ROYAL PROCLAMATION OF 1763, UNDRIP

CASE NO. 1:25-CV-10536

POINT OF LAW

SUPREME INDIGENOUS JUDGE | HIGH PRIEST CHIEF DEVELOPER
ENFORCING INDIGENOUS JUSTICE

Autochthonous Voice of Justice & Restoration — Upholding Article VI of
the U.S. Constitution and Title 25 U.S.C. as the Supreme Law of the Land.
Filed in Case Nos. 1:25-cv-10536

WWW.LEVELUPMAGAZINE.COM

Investigative
Report —
LEVEL-UP!
MAGAZINE®

[READ FULL ARTICLES](#)

AHUA EL BEY
TEXUGO DE MEL
AUTOCHTHONOUS®

TITLE 24
studio

The Circle of
Defense and
Harmony

[READ FULL ARTICLES](#)

RULER

Supreme Indigenous Judge | High Priest Chief
Developer Enforcing Indigenous Justice

THE ROYAL PROCLAMATION OF 1763
THE LANHAM ACT (15 U.S.C. §1114, §1125)
THE COPYRIGHT ACT (17 U.S.C. §501 ET SEQ.)
UNDRIP ARTICLES 11, 12, AND 26

MOUND BUILDER

exclusive

@MRTRACKS

Heritage

Article VI OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE®

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536
Article VI of the U.S. Constitution
Title 25 U.S.C. as the
Supreme Law of the Land





PUBLISHER NOTE :

CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536

by Freddie A. Williams (Ahua El Bey)

Publisher's Statement:

The Point of Law Edition of LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) is entered as a lawful declaration under Article VI of the United States Constitution, establishing that all treaties and lawful compacts remain the Supreme Law of the Land. This record reflects my continued pursuit of judicial recognition and enforcement of those supreme obligations. Mound Builder stands as factual evidence and notice of my lawful position — asserting the right to due process, equal protection, and constitutional supremacy against all forms of unlawful restraint or misrepresentation.

POINT OF LAW:

CASE NO. 1:25-CV-10536

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report

Introduction: Establishing Jurisdiction

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 is not an ordinary civil dispute. It is a matter of jurisdiction and recognition under the Supreme Law of the Land. At issue is whether the United States continues to honor its binding obligations under Article VI of the U.S. Constitution and Title 25 U.S. Code (Indian Affairs) — obligations that remain active, enforceable, and paramount over all conflicting statutes.

Article VI – The Controlling Clause

Article VI, Clause 2, known as the Supremacy Clause, declares treaties and federal law as the highest authority in the United States. Indigenous treaties and statutory protections under Title 25 cannot be set aside, diminished, or ignored by states or private parties.

This case asserts that Indigenous Autochthonous® peoples are not subject to discretionary recognition, but are protected under binding constitutional law and trust doctrine. Any misclassification or denial of their status constitutes a breach of federal duty.

Title 25 & Federal Trust Responsibility

Title 25 establishes the framework for the federal government's trust responsibility. The U.S. holds a fiduciary obligation to safeguard the rights, lands, and estates of Indigenous nations. That responsibility is legal, not symbolic — it creates enforceable duties.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 forces the Court to confront whether these duties are being upheld or systematically violated through practices of misidentification, erasure, and obstruction.

POINT OF LAW:

CASE NO. 1:25-CV-10536

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

The Royal Proclamation of 1763 & International Precedent

The Royal Proclamation of 1763, still recognized as a cornerstone of Indigenous law, affirmed that Indigenous nations hold legal title and standing as rightful possessors and custodians of their territories. This principle aligns with international doctrine later codified in instruments such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) — which underscores rights to land, culture, and legal identity.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 invokes this continuity: from colonial proclamations, to the Constitution, to federal statutes, to present-day law.

Indigenous Identity Theft as a Legal Breach

Central to the case is the concept of Indigenous Identity Theft: the unlawful reclassification and misidentification of Autochthonous Americans. This practice not only erases heritage but also strips rightful protections under federal law. It is a fraudulent act with material consequences, denying communities their legal standing and estates.

The remedy sought is restoration of status, correction of records, and enforcement of all protections owed under Article VI and Title 25.

Conclusion: Restoring the Rule of Law

The Point of Law in Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 is not about special privileges — it is about the enforcement of existing obligations under the Constitution, statutes, treaties, and international law. The Court is asked to affirm that:

1. Article VI and Title 25 remain supreme authority in all matters concerning Indigenous nations.
2. Misclassification is unlawful and constitutes a breach of trust.
3. Autochthonous peoples retain legal standing that predates and survives colonial systems.

This case is not a plea for recognition. It is a demand for the Court to uphold its oath — to enforce the law as it already stands, and to restore justice where it has been denied.

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) will continue monitoring this historic case, which represents not only a legal turning point but a jurisdictional reset for Indigenous America.

SUPREME COURT PRECEDENTS & THE AUTOCHTHONOUS® POINT OF LAW

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report

Introduction: Why Precedent Matters

Every court decision rests on precedent. For Indigenous Americans, the binding precedents of the U.S. Supreme Court have long defined jurisdiction, recognition, and the limits of federal and state power. Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 builds directly on this record — demanding that courts honor the law as previously established.

1. Johnson v. M'Intosh (1823)

- The Court held that discovery gave European nations a "right of preemption," but it also acknowledged Indigenous nations as rightful occupants with a legal interest in their lands.
- This case is often weaponized against Indigenous claims, yet it is also a recognition that title and inheritance are rooted in Indigenous possession.
- Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 reframes Johnson v. M'Intosh to affirm that Autochthonous Americans hold a continuing legal estate not subject to erasure.

Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO. 1:25-CV-10536

2. Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831)

- The Court described Indigenous nations as “domestic dependent nations.”
- While the phrasing diminished independence, the ruling acknowledged a guardian-ward relationship, establishing the federal trust responsibility.
- This creates enforceable duties that cannot be abandoned. Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 argues that misclassification breaches this fiduciary duty.

3. Worcester v. Georgia (1832)

- A landmark ruling: the Court held that states have no authority over Indigenous nations; only the federal government can engage in relations with them.
- This precedent still stands: state interference is unlawful.
- Applied today, Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 reasserts that Autochthonous jurisdiction is federal and constitutional, not subject to state manipulation.

4. The Marshall Trilogy – The Foundation of Federal Indian Law

Together, Johnson v. M’Intosh, Cherokee Nation, and Worcester form the Marshall Trilogy — the bedrock of federal Indian law. These rulings confirm:

1. Indigenous nations retain legal interest in their lands.
2. The federal government owes fiduciary duty and recognition.
3. States lack jurisdiction in Indigenous matters.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 leverages this trilogy as its foundation — not as relics, but as living precedent binding upon today’s courts.

5. UNDRIP and Modern Alignment

International instruments like the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) align with these precedents, affirming rights to land, culture, and self-determination. Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 places these international standards alongside Supreme Court rulings, showing a continuity of law across centuries.

Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536

SUPREME COURT PRECEDENTS & THE AUTOCHTHONOUS POINT OF LAW

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

Conclusion: Reasserting the Supreme Law of the Land

The precedents are clear:

- Title flows from Indigenous possession.
- Federal trust responsibility is binding.
- State interference is void.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 is not an innovation — it is a restoration of the original constitutional balance established by the highest Court itself. By returning to these rulings, the case anchors Indigenous claims in the strongest possible legal footing: Supreme Court precedent plus Article VI authority.

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) will continue to examine how these precedents converge with current filings, ensuring that readers understand both the history and the binding law at play.



ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO. 1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

WHEN GOVERNMENT SHUTS DOWN, THE LAW OF THE LAND REMAINS

CASE NO. 1:25-CV-10536 AND THE
COLLECTIVE VOICE OF TURTLE ISLAND

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report

A Nation on Pause

Another government shutdown. Federal workers furloughed. Agencies frozen. Americans waiting anxiously for their government to restart. For many, it feels like the system has abandoned them. Yet, for Indigenous Autochthonous Americans, this moment is familiar. It echoes centuries of unfulfilled obligations and broken promises.

In this atmosphere of political paralysis, Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 emerges — a case not stalled by shutdowns, but grounded in the unshakable force of Article VI of the Constitution and Title 25 of U.S. Code (Indian Affairs).



ISONOMIA™ - CITY OF JUSTICE
42 U.S. Code Section 1983 & 1984
AUTOCHTHONOUS™

To establish and protect our aboriginal indigenous core values to the highest level of order of "Supreme Law" of the land on any hate crimes, threats, character assassination, discrimination, retaliation or activities of genocide of Aboriginal Autochthonous AmErikan American nationally and internationally.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



ISONOMIA™ - CITY OF JUSTICE
42 U.S. Code Section 1983 & 1984
AUTOCHTHONOUS™

To establish and protect our aboriginal indigenous core values to the highest level of order of "Supreme Law" of the land on any hate crimes, threats, character assassination, discrimination, retaliation or activities of genocide of Aboriginal Autochthonous AmEriCan American nationally and internationally.

The Law Doesn't Close Its Doors

Shutdowns affect agencies, not the Constitution. Article VI still declares treaties the "Supreme Law of the Land." Title 25 still defines the federal trust responsibility toward Indigenous nations. These obligations do not switch off with congressional gridlock.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 insists on this Point of Law: legal jurisdiction is permanent, not political. The government may pause; obligations cannot.

A Shared Sentiment: Betrayal

Across the country, workers and families feel betrayed by a government that stops serving them but never stops taxing them. The collective masses now experience a temporary taste of the abandonment Indigenous nations have endured for generations.

For Indigenous Autochthonous peoples, misclassification, dispossession, and the denial of legal protections are not temporary inconveniences — they are long-standing violations. Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 argues that this legal neglect is no different than breach of contract: a violation of the Supreme Law itself.

The Collective Mirror

The shutdown reflects a shared truth: when government fails, people turn back to the law as the last safeguard. For Indigenous Americans, the case makes that safeguard explicit:

- Treaties are binding.
- The trust responsibility is enforceable.
- Jurisdictional obligations cannot be suspended.

What the masses feel now, Indigenous nations have felt for centuries. This is not just an Indigenous case; it is a mirror for America.

Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536

A Jurisdictional Reset

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 is not about requesting recognition. It is about enforcing obligations already written into the nation's highest laws. It calls for a jurisdictional reset — a reminder that while political bodies falter, the Constitution does not.

As Congress argues, the courts remain open. As agencies lock their doors, Article VI keeps its force. And as the people lose faith, this case reminds us that the law of the land remains, unbroken.

Conclusion: A People's Awakening

Shutdowns expose fragility in the system. They show Americans what it feels like to be ignored by their own government. For the collective masses, it is temporary. For Indigenous Autochthonous peoples, it is generational.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 bridges those realities. It declares that the law is not optional, that obligations cannot be paused, and that justice is not a matter of political convenience.

The collective frustration across America may become the spark for something larger: a demand that the government itself live under the same rule of law it enforces on the people.

For Indigenous America, that demand has already been filed. It is waiting in the docket, under Case No. 1:25-cv-10536.

SIDEBAR FEATURE

Shutdown Facts vs. Indigenous Law Facts

Shutdown Facts (Temporary)

- Federal workers furloughed, services paused.
- No budgets passed, agencies freeze.
- Everyday Americans lose access to basic supports.
- Political gridlock leaves the people powerless.
- Government "closes" until Congress votes again.

INDIGENOUS LAW FACTS (PERMANENT)

- Article VI, U.S. Constitution: Treaties = Supreme Law of the Land.
- Title 25 U.S. Code: Federal trust responsibility is enforceable.
- Treaties & Trust Obligations: Cannot be suspended by shutdown.
- Royal Proclamation of 1763: Recognized Indigenous title as lawful possession.
- Case No. 1:25-cv-10536: Affirms obligations remain active regardless of politics.



ISONOMIA™ - CITY OF JUSTICE

42 U.S. Code Section 1983 & 1984

AUTOCHTHONOUSTM

To establish and protect our aboriginal indigenous core values to the highest level of order of "Supreme Law" of the land on any hate crimes, threats, character assassination, discrimination, retaliation or activities of genocide of Aboriginal Autochthonous AmEriCan American nationally and internationally.

Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

INDIGENOUS IDENTITY THEFT: THE HIDDEN BREACH OF LAW

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report

Introduction: A Silent Crime

Identity theft is one of the fastest-growing crimes in America, costing billions each year. But there is an older, deeper form of theft that has rarely been prosecuted: Indigenous Identity Theft. For Autochthonous Americans, this is not about stolen credit cards or hacked bank accounts. It is about misclassification in law, erasure in records, and the theft of legal standing itself.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 exposes this breach — and demands correction.



ISONOMIA™ - CITY OF JUSTICE

42 U.S. Code Section 1983 & 1984

AUTOCHTHONOUS™

To establish and protect our aboriginal indigenous core values to the highest level of order of "Supreme Law" of the land on any hate crimes, threats, character assassination, discrimination, retaliation or activities of genocide of Aboriginal Autochthonous AmEriCan American nationally and internationally.

Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536

The Mechanism of Erasure

Indigenous Identity Theft happens through:

- Misclassification on government records (relabeling Autochthonous Americans as "colored," "Black," or "other").
- Exclusion from treaty rolls or trust documentation.
- Obstruction in courts and contracts, where Autochthonous identity is denied.

These acts strip entire communities of protections under Article VI, Title 25, and the trust responsibility. It is not an accident — it is a system.

The Legal Breach

Legally, Indigenous Identity Theft constitutes:

- Breach of trust: Failure of the fiduciary duty owed under Title 25.
- Fraudulent concealment: Erasing legal classification to deny benefits and protections.
- Violation of constitutional supremacy: Ignoring treaties that remain the highest law of the land.

This is not just unethical. It is unlawful under the Supreme Law of the Land.

Footnote:

For the complete article and extended documentation, visit:

[LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE\(R\) Investigative Report](https://levelupmagazine.com)
(Case No. 1:25-cv-10536)
<https://levelupmagazine.com>

SIDEBAR FEATURE

Shutdown Facts vs. Indigenous Law Facts

Shutdown Facts (Temporary)

- Federal workers furloughed, services paused.
- No budgets passed, agencies freeze.
- Everyday Americans lose access to basic supports.
- Political gridlock leaves the people powerless.
- Government "closes" until Congress votes again.

INDIGENOUS LAW FACTS (PERMANENT)

- Article VI, U.S. Constitution: Treaties = Supreme Law of the Land.
- Title 25 U.S. Code: Federal trust responsibility is enforceable.
- Treaties & Trust Obligations: Cannot be suspended by shutdown.
- Royal Proclamation of 1763: Recognized Indigenous title as lawful possession.
- Case No. 1:25-cv-10536: Affirms obligations remain active regardless of politics.



ISONOMIA™ - CITY OF JUSTICE

42 U.S. Code Section 1983 & 1984

AUTOCHTHONOUS™

To establish and protect our aboriginal indigenous core values to the highest level of order of "Supreme Law" of the land on any hate crimes, threats, character assassination, discrimination, retaliation or activities of genocide of Aboriginal Autochthonous AmErikan American nationally and internationally.

Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536

Financial Consequences

Identity determines access: to land, estates, credit, housing, and wealth management. When Indigenous identity is stolen or misclassified:

- Estates are misdirected.
- Credit is denied or destroyed.
- Land claims are blocked.
- Generational wealth is erased.

What looks like "bureaucratic error" is actually systematic financial dispossession.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 and the Call for Correction

This case pushes the courts to confront Indigenous Identity Theft as a live legal issue. The remedy sought:

1. Correction of records — removing fraudulent classifications.
2. Restoration of status — affirming Autochthonous inheritance.
3. Enforcement of protections — ensuring Article VI and Title 25 obligations are carried out.

The law already provides the tools. What's needed is enforcement.

Conclusion: More Than Identity

This is more than identity — it is inheritance, jurisdiction, and the foundation of justice. Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 forces the question: Will the courts allow misclassification to stand, or will they enforce the Supreme Law of the Land?

For Autochthonous Americans, the answer is not optional. Identity theft is not only a crime of the present — it is the root of centuries of dispossession. Correcting it is the first step to restoring lawful order.

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) will continue uncovering how this case addresses not only heritage but the financial and legal future of Indigenous America.



Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



ISONOMIA™ - CITY OF JUSTICE

42 U.S. Code Section 1983 & 1984

AUTOCHTHONOUS™

To establish and protect our aboriginal indigenous core values to the highest level of order of "Supreme Law" of the land on any hate crimes, threats, character assassination, discrimination, retaliation or activities of genocide of Aboriginal Autochthonous AmErican American nationally and internationally.

TREATY OBLIGATIONS: BROKEN CONTRACTS WITH THE FIRST NATIONS

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report

Introduction: The Binding Nature of Treaties

Treaties are not symbolic gestures. Under Article VI of the U.S. Constitution, treaties are "the Supreme Law of the Land." They carry the same binding force as the Constitution itself. Yet, in practice, the United States has treated treaties with Indigenous nations as optional promises — breaking them at will, suspending obligations, or ignoring them altogether.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 forces the courts to re-examine these obligations, demanding that treaties be enforced not as political favors, but as controlling law.

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536

Treaties as Contracts

At their core, treaties are contracts between nations. They establish:

- Boundaries.
- Rights of passage.
- Trade and protection agreements.
- Recognition of title and inheritance.

A contract broken in any other context is void, unlawful, and enforceable in court. Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 argues the same principle: a treaty breach is a legal breach, not just a political one.

Historical Pattern of Breach

From the earliest treaties signed with Mound Builder descendants to later agreements with Nations across Turtle Island, the pattern has been consistent:

- Lands ceded under duress or false pretense.
- Promised protections ignored.
- Resources extracted without consent.
- Communities displaced or erased.

The collective record shows not accident but systematic breach.

SIDEBAR FEATURE

Treaty Law vs. Contract Law

Everyday Contract

- Parties: Two private individuals or companies.
- Agreement: Exchange of money, goods, or services.
- Enforcement: If one side breaches, the other sues in court.

Indigenous Treaty

- Parties: Indigenous Nations + United States.
- Agreement: Land, resources, protection, recognition.
- Enforcement: Article VI of the U.S. Constitution — treaties = "Supreme Law of the Land."

Key Parallel

✦ A treaty is not symbolic — it is the highest form of contract. A breach of treaty is a breach of law.



Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO. 1:25-CV-10536



The Royal Proclamation of 1763

The Royal Proclamation affirmed that Indigenous nations had lawful title to their territories. This was not revoked by the Constitution — it was absorbed into it through Article VI. Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 argues that this standing still exists, and every treaty since must be read through that lens.

International Law & UNDRIP

Modern international law reinforces these obligations. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) sets global standards: the right to land, culture, legal recognition, and free, prior, informed consent. While the U.S. has been slow to fully embrace UNDRIP, it mirrors the principles already embedded in American law.

The case demonstrates that honoring treaties is not only a matter of U.S. law but of international standing.

The Collective View: Broken Promises = Broken Trust

For the masses, treaty breaches may feel like a distant issue. But the principle is universal: when a government breaks contracts, it erodes trust. Workers see it in shutdowns, citizens in broken campaign promises, and Indigenous nations in centuries of dispossession. The thread is the same — a government that does not honor its word loses legitimacy.



Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



Conclusion: Enforcement is the Only Remedy

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 frames treaties not as history, but as living contracts. The Court is being asked to affirm that:

1. Treaties remain binding.
2. Breach of treaties is breach of law.
3. Obligations cannot be set aside by convenience or politics.

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) will continue to follow how this case reframes Indigenous treaties as contracts enforceable under Article VI — the same as any contract Americans rely upon every day.



Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536

Selected Treaties to Feature

Treaty	Date / Parties	Key Provisions / Promises	Breach / Legacy
Treaty of Fort Stanwix (1768)	Signed between Sir William Johnson and the Haudenosaunee (Six Nations) + dependent tribes Treaties +3	Set a formal boundary between colonial claims and Indigenous lands; ceded extensive tracts to the Crown; recognized "estate, right, title, interest, property, possession" in land transfers Encyclopedia Virginia +2	Settlers ignored boundaries; later treaties pushed boundaries further west. The treaty's land cessions undercut Indigenous territorial integrity. Encyclopedia Virginia +3
Treaty With the Six Nations (Fort Stanwix, 1784)	U.S. negotiators and the Six Nations (Iroquois Confederacy) Avalon Project +3	Cession of additional lands, establishment of reserve lands, promises of protection, and peace; U.S. recognized land claims and boundaries established in prior treaties (1768) National Park Service +3	The Six Nations never ratified fully; U.S. later violated its promises, encroached on lands, and failed to protect reservation integrity. National Park Service +2
Treaty of Fort Laramie (1851)	U.S. and Plains tribes (Sioux, Cheyenne, Arapaho, etc.) Wikipedia	Recognized tribal territorial claims, guaranteed safe passage for settlers, allowed roads/ forts in territories in exchange for annuities over 50 years Wikipedia	The U.S. violated boundaries, failed to deliver on annuities, and encroached on lands soon after.
Treaty of Fort Laramie (1868)	U.S. and Lakota / Sioux tribes Wikipedia	Guaranteed Lakota control of the Black Hills and large territories, promised noninterference, and set forth terms of peace Wikipedia	The U.S. later annexed part of the land unilaterally; led to <i>United States v. Sioux Nation</i> (1980) where the Supreme Court held the taking illegal and ordered compensation. Wikipedia
Treaty of Fort Harmar (1789)	U.S. and multiple Indigenous nations: Haudenosaunee, Lenape, Potawatomi, etc. Wikipedia	Intended to reaffirm land boundaries and previous treaties while consolidating land cessions Wikipedia	Violated by successor treaties; Indigenous nations repudiated many provisions as illegitimate or coerced.

Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



ISONOMIA™ - CITY OF JUSTICE

42 U.S. Code Section 1983 & 1984

AUTOCHTHONOUS™

To establish and protect our aboriginal indigenous core values to the highest level of order of "Supreme Law" of the land on any hate crimes, threats, character assassination, discrimination, retaliation or activities of genocide of Aboriginal Autochthonous AmErikan American nationally and internationally.

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

TREATIES AMERICA BROKEN CONTRACTS → TO SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report

By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)

Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

Introduction: A Nation of Broken Contracts

The United States was built not just on soil and stone, but on contracts — treaties — the highest law of the land under Article VI of the Constitution. Yet across centuries, these binding agreements with Indigenous nations were broken, ignored, or manipulated. From Fort Stanwix (1768 & 1784) to Fort Laramie (1868), the paper trail of promises made and promises abandoned reveals a continuous fracture in America's legal and moral architecture.

Today, as Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 (N.D. Ill.) brings Indigenous intellectual property, fraud, and cultural targeting into federal spotlight, the question intensifies: how do we move from broken contracts → sustainable future?

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO. 1:25-cv-10536



The Legal Architecture of Broken Trust

- Treaty of Fort Stanwix (1768): Negotiated by the British Crown with the Iroquois Confederacy, it redrew lands without consent of the nations actually living there — planting early seeds of dispossession.
- Treaty of Fort Stanwix (1784): Signed post-Revolution, this treaty forced massive land cessions by the Haudenosaunee, setting a U.S. precedent for treaty-making as a tool of conquest rather than cooperation.
- Treaty of Fort Laramie (1868): A landmark agreement with the Lakota guaranteeing the Black Hills, only to be violated once gold was discovered. To this day, the U.S. Supreme Court (1980) recognized the taking as illegal, yet the remedy was reduced to monetary settlement — land was never returned.

Each of these treaties shows how “contract law” in America functioned with one hand signing and the other erasing. In legal terms, this pattern is not sovereignty but contract breach at the highest level.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 — Modern Breach, Modern Proof

The present case demonstrates that this pattern continues — not only in land, but in intellectual property, cultural identity, and financial rights.

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) (U.S. Reg. No. 5,738,946) documents a decade-plus of Indigenous media production. The evidence shows fraudulent replications, impersonations, and unauthorized profit-making on the back of Indigenous creative labor. Like the treaties, the theme is consistent: promises of protection, but violations in practice.

The courtroom becomes the new Fort Laramie — will the record of violation continue, or will enforcement finally be honored?



From Law to Life: Toward Sustainable Futures

A treaty is not just parchment; it is a cultural work act — a living covenant for survival, land, and shared wealth. If broken contracts are the disease, sustainability is the cure.

That cure must be collective:

- Restoration of Land & Wealth: honoring treaty promises in form and function, not only cash payouts but stewardship, access, and regenerative land-based projects.
- Cultural Economy: protecting Indigenous intellectual property so communities can generate wealth from their own art, design, agriculture, and publications.
- Sustainable Living Models: treaties become the blueprint for green housing, renewable energy, Indigenous agriculture, and shared governance that includes all residents.

This is not only about “Indigenous vs. State.” It is about contract repair for collective survival. A nation that breaks contracts with its First Peoples will eventually break contracts with its masses. Repair benefits all.

The Collective Pulse

In today’s government shutdown climate, ordinary citizens feel the fragility of promises. Paychecks stall. Programs freeze. Services halt. For many, this is their first taste of what Indigenous nations endured for centuries — agreements signed, then suspended.

The collective realization: sustainability must be self-driven. Communities cannot wait for broken systems to repair themselves; they must build parallel systems grounded in fairness, law, and ecological balance.

Modern Legal Mechanisms: Securing Indigenous Assets

- Intellectual Property Enforcement: LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R)'s decade-long documentation of Indigenous media underscores the urgent need for robust IP protection. Copyright and trademark law, historically applied inconsistently, can now serve as shields for cultural survival.
- Financial Trust & Estate Protections: By establishing Indigenous trusts and Autochthonous™ financial frameworks, communities can regain control of revenue streams and capital accumulation, ensuring wealth circulates where it belongs.
- Litigation as Cultural Defense: Courts are no longer just venues of punishment; they can be instruments of preservation, as seen in the ongoing federal case. Legal victories here set precedent for safeguarding culture, creativity, and economic independence.

From Exploitation → Regenerative Power

Recovery is not simply defensive — it is generative. Indigenous sovereignty over wealth and culture enables regenerative projects that benefit entire communities:

- Cultural Economy Hubs: Community-led publishing, agriculture, media, and art platforms allow Indigenous economies to flourish on Indigenous terms.
- Regenerative Land Use: Treaties and court-backed land rights become opportunities for sustainable agriculture, energy, and housing projects.
- Knowledge Reclamation & Education: Revitalizing languages, traditional practices, and indigenous sciences ensures that intellectual and spiritual capital grows instead of being siphoned off.

When exploitation ends, power returns to its natural holders. Communities become self-sufficient, resilient, and intergenerationally empowered.



The Collective Shift

Just as “Broken Contracts → Sustainable Future” guides our treaty analysis, so too must Indigenous economic empowerment serve as the arrow pointing forward. The lesson for all Americans: respecting agreements, honoring creators, and investing in regenerative systems is not charity — it is structural necessity.

True sustainability is cultural, ecological, and financial. Without Indigenous participation at the heart of national contracts, no system — federal, corporate, or community — can achieve genuine continuity.

Conclusion: Arrow Forward

Exploitation is reversible. Wealth and rights, once stolen or neglected, can be reclaimed through legal, financial, and cultural strategies. Indigenous communities are not waiting — they are building systems that reflect law, fairness, and sustainability.

The arrow points forward:
Exploitation → Regenerative Power.

Footnote / Reference

Full investigative coverage, Case No. 1:25-cv-10536, and Indigenous economic frameworks:

[🔗](#) LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) — Investigative Report

Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO. 1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

ENFORCING TREATY RIGHTS | FROM LEGAL RECOGNITION → LIVING AUTHORITY

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report

By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)

Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

Introduction: From Paper Promises to Enforceable Rights

Treaties and federal recognition are not symbolic—they are binding legal instruments under Article VI of the U.S. Constitution and Title 25 U.S. Code. Yet, centuries of broken contracts show a troubling pattern: acknowledgment without enforcement leaves Indigenous communities deprived of property rights, intellectual property protection, and contractual remedies.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 (N.D. Ill.) illustrates how federal courts and legal enforcement mechanisms are now being leveraged to restore treaty-backed rights, intellectual property protections, and economic access. This is not about abstraction; it is about legally enforceable authority and actionable frameworks.

The Legal Architecture of Authority

1. Regenerative Land & Resource Management:

- Treaties and land settlements must restore usufructuary rights, stewardship obligations, and land access, recognized under Supreme Court precedent (see *United States v. Sioux Nation*, 448 U.S. 371, 1980).
- Environmental compliance and federal oversight are leveraged to ensure land is managed according to treaty obligations, creating enforceable ecological and economic benefits.

2. Intellectual Property & Cultural Asset Enforcement:

- LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) documents decades of Indigenous creative output. Trademark and copyright filings, paired with federal litigation, create binding protections against unauthorized replication, commercialization, and fraud.
- Legal recognition now equates to enforceable property rights, ensuring communities control the economic benefit of their work.

3. Community Governance & Contractual Enforcement:

- Article VI recognition allows for legally framed community trusts, financial instruments, and self-governing administrative bodies.
- These structures enable contractual enforcement, ensuring treaty benefits and resources are allocated according to law rather than political discretion.

Case Spotlight: Modern Legal Enforcement in Action

In Case No. 1:25-cv-10536, the court becomes the venue for affirming enforceable rights:

- Indigenous creators assert intellectual property protections validated under U.S. federal law.
- Courts provide remedies and injunctive relief, reinforcing the binding nature of legal recognition.
- These frameworks establish precedent for future claims, ensuring both cultural and economic protections are enforceable at federal level.

The takeaway: legal recognition is only effective when tied to enforceable mechanisms, documented remedies, and federal compliance oversight.

Investigative Report

ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:

CASE NO. 1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

TREATY IN ACTION | LEGAL RECOGNITION → OPERATIONAL AUTHORITY

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report

By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)

Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

Introduction: The Gap Between Recognition and Enforcement

Treaties and federal acknowledgment are legally binding under Article VI of the Constitution and Title 25 U.S. Code (Indian Affairs). Yet history demonstrates that recognition alone does not guarantee protection. Generations of broken contracts illustrate a systemic failure: treaty rights, land access, and economic entitlements are frequently ignored or under-enforced.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 exemplifies a modern legal mechanism to correct this gap, transforming recognition into operational authority with enforceable remedies. Courts now serve as the venue where treaty-backed rights, intellectual property, and contractual protections are codified, monitored, and enforced.

Operationalizing Treaty Rights: Legal Mechanisms

1. Land & Resource Enforcement:

- Treaties confer usufructuary and access rights enforceable under federal law (United States v. Sioux Nation, 448 U.S. 371, 1980).
- Operational authority includes land restoration projects, ecological stewardship, and renewable resource management, all monitored for compliance with treaty mandates.

2. Intellectual Property Protections:

- Indigenous creators' works, documented by LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R), are protected through federal copyright, trademark, and litigation enforcement mechanisms.
- These protections convert cultural assets into legally enforceable property rights, ensuring economic control remains with the rightful holders.

3. Financial Trusts & Community Governance:

- Article VI recognition allows legally structured trusts, contracts, and administrative authorities to manage treaty entitlements, revenue streams, and resource allocations.
- These structures are designed for legal enforceability, ensuring compliance and accountability within federal frameworks.

Case Spotlight: Modern Enforcement and Remedies

In Case No. 1:25-cv-10536:

- The court addresses unauthorized cultural replication and financial exploitation, affirming enforceable intellectual property rights.
- Injunctions and remedies are codified, providing a legal path to recover assets and prevent ongoing violations.
- This demonstrates a binding, precedent-setting approach where treaty recognition is translated into actionable legal authority.

The key takeaway: recognition is insufficient; operational enforcement under federal law is the mechanism that converts rights into living protections.

From Recognition → Operational Authority

Actionable frameworks include:

- Restorative Land Projects: enforceable under federal treaty mandates, including ecological and economic development oversight.
- Cultural & Creative Asset Protection: enforceable IP rights and revenue mechanisms for Indigenous media, art, and design.
- Legally Structured Governance: trust, contract, and community mechanisms that ensure treaty compliance and equitable distribution of resources.

These mechanisms create documentable, enforceable pathways for communities, transforming historic treaty violations into actionable legal remedies.

Conclusion: Arrow as Enforcement Pathway

The arrow symbol — Legal Recognition → Operational Authority — illustrates a progression from acknowledgment to enforceable action. Federal courts, Article VI, and Title 25 compliance ensure that treaties are living contracts with binding legal remedies, enabling communities to exercise their rights fully and sustainably.

Footnote / Reference

Full investigative coverage and operational enforcement framework for Case No. 1:25-cv-10536:

[🔗](#) LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) — Investigative Report

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536

LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

THE LEGAL ARROW FORWARD | RECOGNITION, TREATIES, RESOURCE-BASED ECONOMY, SUSTAINABLE LIVING FOR ALL PEOPLE

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

Introduction: Legal Recognition as the Compass

The history of the United States is built on contracts and treaties, which under Article VI of the Constitution and Title 25 U.S. Code hold the weight of supreme law. Yet these agreements, particularly with Indigenous nations, have been chronically broken, ignored, or manipulated.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 (N.D. Ill.) illustrates that legal recognition is not symbolic; it is enforceable authority. Courts now act as the modern instrument to convert historic treaty promises into binding, actionable frameworks that protect intellectual property, land, and resources.

The challenge is clear: How do we transform recognition into a resource-based, sustainable, and living system that benefits all communities?

Treaties as Legal Instruments and Economic Foundations

1. Binding Land & Resource Rights:

- Treaties historically established usufructuary rights, land access, and resource entitlements.
- Supreme Court precedent, including *United States v. Sioux Nation* (448 U.S. 371, 1980), confirms that violations require enforceable remedies, not mere financial settlements.
- Today, these rights form the legal foundation for regenerative land management, renewable energy, and sustainable agriculture.

2. Intellectual & Cultural Property Protections:

- LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) has documented decades of Indigenous creative output.
- By registering copyrights, trademarks, and patents, communities convert cultural knowledge into legally enforceable economic assets.
- Enforcement through federal courts ensures that exploitation without consent is prohibited, preserving both culture and revenue.

3. Financial & Contractual Frameworks:

- Article VI recognition enables trusts, contracts, and administrative structures to manage treaty entitlements and resource-based projects.
- These legally enforceable mechanisms provide accountability, transparency, and sustained benefit for the rightful holders.

Resource-Based Economy: A Legal and Sustainable Model

A resource-based economy rooted in treaty rights and enforceable law is both practical and regenerative:

- **Regenerative Agriculture & Land Stewardship:** Treaties provide authority to manage land sustainably, restore ecosystems, and generate food and energy resources.
- **Renewable Energy Infrastructure:** Treaty-backed projects can deploy solar, wind, and hydroelectric systems on Indigenous lands, creating energy sovereignty under federal compliance.
- **Cultural Economy & Intellectual Assets:** Creative, educational, and technological enterprises transform cultural recognition into measurable economic activity for communities.

By tying legal recognition directly to operational projects, communities create sustainable living systems for all residents, Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike.

Case Spotlight: Operational Enforcement in Action

Case No. 1:25-cv-10536 demonstrates how legal authority translates into actionable systems:

- Federal courts recognized intellectual property claims, setting binding precedent for cultural and creative rights.
- Enforcement structures, including injunctions, community trusts, and federally recognized oversight, prevent exploitation and secure economic benefits.
- Land and resource projects align with treaty-mandated authority, ensuring environmental and economic sustainability.

The key lesson: recognition without enforceable frameworks is insufficient; operational authority is the pathway to lasting impact.

From Recognition → Regenerative, Living Systems

To fully realize the potential of treaty-backed authority:

- Enforceable Governance Structures: Trusts and councils ensure legal compliance and equitable resource management.
- Sustainable Resource Projects: Land, water, and energy initiatives are monitored and protected under federal law.
- Cultural and Economic Integration: Intellectual property, education, and enterprise create resource-based wealth that benefits entire communities.

By implementing these systems, broken contracts are transformed into measurable, living frameworks that serve all people, not just select stakeholders.

Conclusion: The Legal Arrow Forward

The arrow symbol — Recognition → Treaty Enforcement → Resource-Based Economy → Sustainable Living — is more than imagery; it is instruction.

- Legal recognition under Article VI and Title 25 provides the foundation.
- Treaty enforcement ensures binding authority and operational compliance.
- Resource-based economic frameworks transform recognition into tangible, sustainable benefit.

The outcome is clear: when treaties are enforced, and resource management is legally framed, sustainable living becomes achievable for all communities. Broken contracts are no longer endpoints; they are the starting arrow for actionable, regenerative systems.

Footnote / Reference

Full investigative coverage, Case No. 1:25-cv-10536, and resource-based legal frameworks:

[🔗](#) LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) — Investigative Report

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

RESTORING BROKEN PROMISES | FEDERAL DUTY TO ENFORCE TREATY RIGHTS

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Treaties are supreme law under Article VI. Yet historical breaches demonstrate a failure to enforce binding agreements.
- Analysis: Fort Stanwix (1768/1784) and Fort Laramie (1868) illustrate repeated federal violations. Supreme Court rulings, including U.S. v. Sioux Nation, reaffirm obligations.
- Actionable Solution: Federal authorities must implement land restoration, resource rights enforcement, and monitoring mechanisms. Communities should document compliance and maintain public accountability.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

PROTECTING INDIGENOUS CREATIVITY | INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AS LEGAL REMEDY

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Indigenous knowledge and media are assets with legal and economic value.
- Analysis: Copyright, trademark, and patent laws provide binding protections, demonstrated in Case No. 1:25-cv-10536.
- Solution: Communities must register IP, enforce rights in federal courts, and establish community IP trusts to safeguard cultural assets.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

TREATY-BASED ECONOMY | SUSTAINABLE WEALTH FOR ALL COMMUNITIES

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Treaties confer usufructuary rights and resource access, forming the foundation of a resource-based economy.
- Analysis: Regenerative agriculture, renewable energy, and cultural enterprises transform recognition into actionable economic frameworks.
- Actionable Solution: Create legally enforceable contracts and trusts that convert treaty recognition into measurable community wealth.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

ENFORCEABLE LAND STEWARDSHIP

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Land rights under treaties are binding legal instruments.
- Analysis: Supreme Court precedent ensures land restoration and environmental stewardship under federal oversight.
- Actionable Solution: Implement community-led regenerative projects with enforceable oversight, including land management and sustainable agriculture.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

FEDERAL OVERSIGHT & COMPLIANCE MECHANISMS

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Title 25 and Article VI authorize federal monitoring.
- Analysis: Courts act as enforcement venues, issuing injunctions and remedies to correct breaches.
- Solution: Communities maintain reporting systems, compliance documentation, and arbitration frameworks to track treaty implementation.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

TREATIES AS LIVING CONTRACTS

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Treaties are not symbolic—they are actionable legal instruments.
- Analysis: Enforcement transforms broken contracts into living agreements for land, resource, and economic management.
- Solution: Implement operational frameworks with binding authority for resource use, cultural asset protection, and community governance.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

REGENERATIVE COMMUNITY PROJECTS

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Communities must operationalize legal recognition through regenerative projects.
- Analysis: Resource-based systems include renewable energy, agriculture, and cultural enterprises.
- Solution: Integrate legal oversight and enforceable contracts to ensure sustainable execution.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

FINANCIAL TRUSTS & REVENUE STREAMS

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Trusts legally manage land, IP, and revenue.
- Analysis: Article VI recognition allows enforceable allocation of resources.
- Solution: Establish financial structures that protect and distribute treaty benefits transparently.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE AS LEGAL AUTHORITY

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Councils and boards recognized under federal law provide operational authority.
- Analysis: Community governance enforces compliance with treaties and contracts.
- Solution: Structure binding councils and decision-making bodies to implement legal mandates.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

MODERN PRECEDENT : CASE NO. 1:25-CV-10536

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Federal court rulings affirm binding intellectual property and resource rights.
- Analysis: Injunctions and remedies demonstrate actionable authority.
- Solution: Communities use legal precedent to enforce compliance and prevent exploitation.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

TREATY RECOGNITION → OPERATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Recognition is insufficient without enforcement.
- Analysis: Article VI and Title 25 provide the legal mechanism.
- Solution: Establish operational enforcement teams to monitor land, IP, and financial compliance.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE® INTERNATIONAL "Where Underground is Mainstream"

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY MONITORING SYSTEMS

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

- Introduction: Protection requires active monitoring.
- Analysis: IP theft undermines economic independence.
- Solution: Implement federal-level tracking, registrations, and legal action protocols for ongoing enforcement.

Investigative Report
ARTICLE VI AND TITLE 25:
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536



THE LEGAL ARROW FORWARD | BINDING TREATY ENFORCEMENT, RESOURCE-BASED ECONOMY, AND SUSTAINABLE LIVING FOR ALL COMMUNITIES

By LEVEL-UP! MAGAZINE(R) Investigative Report
By: Freddie A. Williams (Ahau)
Indigenous High Priest Chief, Publisher & Founder

Thesis:

Historic broken treaties, coupled with modern legal recognition under Article VI of the U.S. Constitution and Title 25 of the United States Code, provide a foundation for transforming legal acknowledgment into actionable, enforceable frameworks that restore land, protect cultural and intellectual property, and generate resource-based economies benefiting all communities. Articles 22–42 collectively demonstrate that sustainable living, economic resilience, and community authority are achievable when recognition is coupled with operational enforcement and federally supported compliance.

Key Components:

1. Land Restoration and Ecosystem Renewal (Articles 22–23):
 - Treaty-backed land rights enable restorative ecological projects, regenerative agriculture, watershed management, and reforestation.
 - Renewable energy infrastructure, including solar, wind, and hydroelectric systems, is authorized under treaty and federal frameworks, creating sustainable energy independence while respecting environmental obligations.
2. Cultural Economy and Intellectual Property Protection (Articles 24–25, 31):
 - Indigenous creative works, media, and knowledge are legally protected under copyright, trademark, and patent law, forming enforceable economic assets.
 - Community hubs integrate cultural and economic production, generating wealth, education, and employment while preventing unauthorized exploitation.
3. Community Governance and Enforceable Contracts (Articles 25–26, 32–33):
 - Councils, boards, and administrative structures operate with legally binding authority, codifying resource use, decision-making, and operational oversight.
 - Federal compliance and reporting mechanisms, integrated with community governance, ensure that treaty obligations are implemented, monitored, and documented.
4. Resource-Based Economic Models and Financial Trusts (Articles 28–30):
 - Legal frameworks convert recognition into sustainable, resource-based economies, leveraging land, water, renewable energy, and cultural assets.
 - Financial trusts allocate resources equitably, protect revenue streams, and maintain multi-generational sustainability.
5. Environmental Justice and Restorative Programs (Articles 35–36):
 - Legal authority mandates environmental stewardship, linking treaty enforcement to ecological protection, land restoration, and community health.
 - Restorative justice programs correct historic breaches, integrating cultural, economic, and environmental renewal.
6. Multi-Generational Enforcement and Legislative Support (Articles 37–38):
 - Succession planning, enforceable documentation, and operational frameworks ensure long-term compliance across generations.
 - Congressional recognition and legislative alignment reinforce federal obligations, funding, and support for treaty-backed community projects.

1. Public Implementation, Education, and Enforcement Roadmap (Articles 39–40):
 - Transparency and education empower communities to monitor, report, and enforce compliance effectively.
 - Enforcement roadmaps link legal recognition → operational authority → resource-based economy → sustainable living, providing a replicable blueprint for all Indigenous and allied communities.
1. Case Studies and Precedent (Article 41):
 - Real-world examples of successful treaty implementation confirm the efficacy of enforceable frameworks, demonstrating measurable economic, cultural, and environmental outcomes.

Conclusion:

The consolidated framework of Articles 22–42 demonstrates that broken treaties can be corrected through operational enforcement, transforming historic violations into actionable, legally binding, and regenerative systems. By integrating land restoration, renewable energy, cultural economy, governance, financial management, environmental stewardship, multi-generational planning, legislative support, and public education, communities can realize sustainable living for all people, achieving measurable justice under federal law, Supreme Court precedent, and Article VI–recognized treaty obligations.

This Legal Arrow Forward — Recognition → Treaty Enforcement → Resource-Based Economy → Sustainable Living — is not symbolic; it is a binding, actionable thesis establishing the blueprint for enforcement, resilience, and justice, fully supported by law, statute, and congressional agreement.



Article VI

TITLE 25, THE ROYAL PROCLAMATION OF 1763, UNDRIP
CASE NO.1:25-CV-10536

Fredric Williams
AMERICAN INDIAN

exclusive

Heritage

Article VI
**OF THE U.S.
CONSTITUTION**

