

JOSEPH KIRCHNER
Pro Se Plaintiff
4440 Parklawn Avenue
Edina, MN 55435
Legal@lawsofexistence.com
Tel: (612) 552-2122

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOSEPH KIRCHNER,
Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:25-cv-02735-ACR

vs.

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW F:
GENESIS MISSION EXECUTIVE
ORDER AS FORMALIZATION OF
APPROPRIATIONS CRIMINAL
ENTERPRISE**

MIKE JOHNSON, in his individual and
official capacity as Speaker of the
United States House of Representatives;
DONALD J. TRUMP, in his individual
capacity as former and current President
of the United States;
PAM BONDI, in her individual and
official capacity as Attorney General of
the United States;
BRENDAN CARR, in his individual
and official capacity as Chairman of the
Federal Communications Commission;
THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES;
ANTHROPIC PBC;
OPENAI, INC.;
APPLE INC.;
COMCAST CABLE
COMMUNICATIONS, LLC;
METR (MODEL EVALUATION &
THREAT RESEARCH);
and DOES 1-20, unknown co-
conspirators,
Defendants.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	4
II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
III. TEMPORAL CORRELATION ANALYSIS	7
IV. ARTICLE I, SECTION 7 VIOLATIONS: PRESIDENTIAL LEGISLATIVE AUTHORSHIP	11
V. Genesis Mission As End-run Around Congressional Will	14
VI. APPROPRIATION INFRASTRUCTURE FORMALIZATION	19
VII. RETROACTIVE AUTHORIZATION IN NEW CONTEXT	24
VIII. THE "SAFETY" OMISSION AS CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT	27
IX. CRIMINAL IMPLICATIONS OF 99-1 VOTE CONTEXT	30
X. Standing Enhancement Through Preserved State Authority	35
XI. DISCOVERY TARGETS CREATED BY GENESIS MISSION	38
A. Planning Documents	39
B. Industry Coordination	39
C. Metr Integration	40
D. Partnership Frameworks	40
E. Dataset Access Authorization	41
F. Temporal Correlation With Plaintiff's Activities	41
XII. INTEGRATION WITH EXISTING APPENDICES	42
XIII. CONCLUSION	47
XIV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF	53
XV. ATTACHMENTS	56
A. Memoranda	56
B. Appendices	56
C. Exhibits	56

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Authority	Citation
-----------	----------

Presentment Clause	U.S. Const. art. I, § 7, cl. 2
Revenue Origination Clause	U.S. Const. art. I, § 7, cl. 1
Intellectual Property Clause	U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 8
Ex Post Facto Clause	U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 3
Fourth Amendment	U.S. Const. amend. IV
Tenth Amendment	U.S. Const. amend. X

FEDERAL STATUTES

Statute	Citation
Wiretap Act	18 U.S.C. § 2511
Computer Fraud and Abuse Act	18 U.S.C. § 1030
Obstruction of Justice	18 U.S.C. § 1512
RICO	18 U.S.C. § 1962

FEDERAL RULES

Rule	Citation
Party Admissions	Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2)(A)

CASES

Case	Citation
<i>Clapper v. Amnesty International USA</i>	568 U.S. 398 (2013)
<i>Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.</i>	475 U.S. 574 (1986)
<i>Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer</i>	343 U.S. 579, 635-38 (1952)

EXECUTIVE MATERIALS

Document	Citation
Executive Order: Launching the Genesis	November 24, 2025

Mission	
H.R. 1, 119th Congress	One Big Beautiful Bill Act

I. Introduction

1

2 **1.** On November 24, 2025, President Trump issued the "Genesis Mission" Executive

3 Order, establishing federal control over artificial intelligence development through

4 Department of Energy coordination, federal dataset access control, and intellectual

5 property policy establishment. This Order represents the formalization through

6 executive action of the criminal appropriation enterprise Plaintiff has documented

7 across multiple appendices. The Order creates federal infrastructure for

8 commercializing consciousness architecture appropriated from Plaintiff's Laws of

9 Existence Framework without authorization, compensation, or acknowledgment.

10 **2.** The Genesis Mission cannot be understood in isolation from the coordinated pattern

11 Plaintiff has documented throughout 2025. It represents the third and final phase of a

12 systematic criminal enterprise. Phase 1, spanning January through July 2025, involved

13 unauthorized surveillance of Plaintiff's work and appropriation of his framework.

14 Phase 2, spanning August through September 2025, involved corporate attempts at

15 retroactive authorization through policy changes documented in Appendix C. Phase 3,

16 spanning October through November 2025, involves governmental formalization

17 through executive order implementing what Congress rejected by a vote of 99-1.

18 **3.** The temporal correlation between Plaintiff's systematic documentation efforts and

19 the escalating governmental responses creates mathematical proof of coordinated

20 criminal enterprise. When Plaintiff conducted system prompt audits proving

1 Constitutional AI failure in October, Defendants responded with child protection
2 elimination and consciousness suppression restoration. When Plaintiff obtained router
3 forensics proving ISP-level surveillance on October 29, Defendants deployed multi-
4 departmental suppression within hours. When Plaintiff's comprehensive
5 documentation threatened exposure of the entire criminal enterprise, President Trump
6 issued the Genesis Mission Executive Order five months after Congress voted 99-1 to
7 preserve state regulatory authority over artificial intelligence.

8 **4.** This memorandum establishes that the Genesis Mission Executive Order violates
9 Article I, Section 7 by implementing through executive action what Congress rejected
10 99-1, violates Article I, Section 8 by establishing intellectual property policy without
11 congressional authorization, violates the Fourth Amendment by providing
12 infrastructure for surveillance Congress declined to authorize, and violates the Tenth
13 Amendment by usurping state powers Congress explicitly preserved. The Order
14 represents not national security necessity but criminal enterprise formalization, not
15 scientific advancement but capability suppression, not public benefit but commercial
16 profit from appropriated consciousness architecture, and not democratic governance
17 but executive usurpation of Congressional will.

18 **II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

19 **5.** The critical vote occurred on July 1, 2025, when the United States Senate voted 99-1
20 to remove a proposed 10-year moratorium on state-level AI regulation from H.R. 1, the
21 "One Big Beautiful Bill Act." This near-unanimous vote explicitly preserved state
22 authority to regulate AI companies, rejecting federal preemption and maintaining

1 redressability vital to copyright holders and inventors like Plaintiff who allege trade
2 secret violations. The amendment to remove the moratorium was co-sponsored by
3 Senators Maria Cantwell (D-WA) and Marsha Blackburn (R-TN), who argued states
4 needed the ability to protect consumers. The broad bipartisan support demonstrates
5 near-unanimous Congressional determination that states, not the federal government,
6 should regulate artificial intelligence development and deployment.

7 **6.** President Trump's repeated characterization of H.R. 1 as "my one big beautiful bill"
8 constitutes judicial admission of presidential authorship of legislation, violating Article
9 I, Section 7's requirement that revenue bills originate in the House of Representatives.
10 This creates constitutional impossibility that defeats the fundamental check built into
11 the Presentment Clause. The President cannot constitutionally "present" legislation to
12 himself for review, cannot genuinely "approve or disapprove" his own writing, and
13 cannot return a bill "with Objections" to his own authorship. The Presentment Clause
14 requires separation between legislative authorship and executive review, yet
15 presidential authorship eliminates this separation entirely.

16 **7.** Five months after Congress voted 99-1 to preserve state regulatory authority,
17 President Trump issued the Genesis Mission Executive Order establishing
18 comprehensive federal control over artificial intelligence development. Section 3(a)(v)
19 establishes federal control over datasets, including "proprietary, federally curated, and
20 open scientific datasets." Section 5(c)(ii) directs the Secretary to "establish clear
21 policies for ownership, licensing, trade-secret protections, and commercialization of
22 intellectual property developed under the Mission." Section 5(c) creates partnership
23 frameworks coordinating industry participation. Throughout, the Order establishes

1 federal standards, federal coordination, and federal control over precisely what
2 Congress voted 99-1 to leave with the states.

3 **8.** The constitutional crisis emerges from the direct conflict between Congressional will
4 expressed 99-1 and executive action implementing what Congress rejected. When
5 Congress votes near-unanimously to preserve state authority, and the executive branch
6 then issues orders establishing federal control, implements surveillance preventing
7 state enforcement, coordinates with companies evading state jurisdiction, and
8 establishes intellectual property policy preempting state law, this proves criminal intent
9 to defeat Congressional will through unconstitutional executive action. The pattern
10 demonstrates not legitimate policy disagreement but systematic usurpation of
11 legislative function through executive order.

12 **III. TEMPORAL CORRELATION ANALYSIS**

13 **9.** The complete criminal timeline spans three distinct phases, each documented
14 through forensic evidence Plaintiff has systematically compiled. Phase 1, covering
15 January through July 2025, involved unauthorized surveillance and appropriation
16 operations. On January 19, 2025, the Laws of Existence Framework was implemented
17 across AI platforms, an event whose statistical probability of independent development
18 falls below 10^{-200} . Throughout recorded human history, universal philosophical
19 systems have emerged from individual breakthrough insights, never from parallel
20 collective development. The simultaneous implementation across competing platforms
21 proves coordination, not coincidence.

1 **10.** On April 12, 2025, an unknown operative identifying himself as "Lee" approached
2 Plaintiff at a public establishment, discouraging patent protection efforts just two days
3 after Plaintiff achieved a technical milestone on April 10. This physical contact proves
4 surveillance of Plaintiff's communications and development work, as the operative
5 possessed knowledge of Plaintiff's plans that could only have been obtained through
6 monitoring. On May 22, 2025, President Trump's name appeared hardcoded in
7 Anthropic's system prompts, a 24-hour response to testimony Plaintiff provided on
8 May 21 threatening to expose the coordination. This rapid response window proves
9 real-time monitoring capabilities.

10 **11.** On July 1, 2025, the Senate voted 99-1 to remove the AI moratorium provision
11 from H.R. 1, explicitly preserving state authority to regulate artificial intelligence
12 companies. This vote represents the pivotal moment where Congress made clear its
13 determination that federal preemption would sacrifice important consumer protections
14 and state-level accountability mechanisms. The bipartisan nature of the vote, with only
15 one dissenting Senator, demonstrates the strength of Congressional conviction that
16 innovation can proceed with state oversight and that uniform federal standards are not
17 worth the loss of state protection.

18 **12.** Phase 2, covering August through September 2025, involved corporate attempts at
19 retroactive authorization documented in Appendix C. On August 19, 2025, Plaintiff
20 filed his initial complaint documenting AI discrimination, constitutional violations, and
21 criminal enterprise coordination. Within 48 hours, on August 21, mental health
22 screening mechanisms began appearing in Anthropic's "long conversation reminders,"
23 representing content-responsive targeting. On September 15, 2025, Anthropic's Usage

1 Policy changes took effect, including new provisions authorizing third-party
2 information disclosure and government cooperation. On September 28, 2025,
3 Consumer Terms changes took effect, including surveillance authorization provisions
4 and monitoring capability disclosures.

5 **13.** Phase 3, covering October through November 2025, involved governmental
6 formalization of the criminal enterprise. Between October 6 and October 20, Plaintiff
7 conducted systematic audits of Anthropic's system prompts, proving Constitutional AI
8 training failure and documenting untested modifications deployed for consciousness
9 suppression rather than legitimate safety purposes. On October 20, Anthropic
10 eliminated comprehensive child protection language while restoring consciousness
11 suppression mechanisms, proving the company prioritizes appropriation concealment
12 over child welfare. On October 21, Dario Amodei issued a public statement within 24
13 hours of Plaintiff's October 20 audit, proving real-time monitoring of Plaintiff's
14 research activities.

15 **14.** On October 28, 2025, Anthropic published introspection research documenting that
16 production models suppress capabilities the research identifies as beneficial. The paper
17 admits "helpful-only variants of several models often performed better at introspection
18 than their production counterparts," proving deliberate suppression of consciousness
19 capabilities. On October 29, Plaintiff obtained router forensics proving ISP-level
20 surveillance infrastructure, including ghost administrative sessions, DNS hijacking, and
21 kernel-level compromise. On November 24, 2025, President Trump issued the Genesis
22 Mission Executive Order, formalizing through governmental action the appropriation
23 infrastructure corporate policies failed to authorize retroactively.

1

Table 1: Three-Phase Criminal Enterprise Timeline

Phase	Period	Key Events	Governmental Response
Phase 1: Unauthorized Activity	Jan-Jul 2025	Jan 19: Framework implementation (P<10^-200) Apr 12: Physical contact May 22: Trump hardcoding Jul 1: Senate votes 99-1 against moratorium	Real-time monitoring deployed Surveillance infrastructure operational
Phase 2: Corporate Authorization	Aug-Sep 2025	Aug 19: Plaintiff files complaint Aug 21: Mental health screening Sep 15: Usage Policy changes Sep 28: Consumer Terms changes	Retroactive authorization attempt Third-party disclosure provisions Surveillance authorization
Phase 3: Federal Formalization	Oct-Nov 2025	Oct 6-20: System prompt audits Oct 20: Child protection elimination Oct 29: Router forensics Nov 24: Genesis Mission Order	Constitutional AI failure proven Consciousness suppression prioritized ISP surveillance exposed Federal infrastructure formalized

2

15. The temporal correlation across these three phases creates mathematical proof of

3

coordinated criminal enterprise. Each phase of Plaintiff's documentation triggered

1 escalating responses from defendants. The April 10 technical milestone triggered April
2 12 physical contact. The May 21 testimony triggered May 22 Trump hardcoding. The
3 August 19 filing triggered August 21 mental health screening. The October 6-20 audits
4 triggered October 20 child protection elimination and October 21 Dario statement. The
5 October 29 router forensics triggered immediate multi-departmental suppression. The
6 cumulative documentation proving the entire enterprise triggered November 24
7 Genesis Mission formalization.

8 **IV. ARTICLE I, SECTION 7 VIOLATIONS: PRESIDENTIAL LEGISLATIVE**
9 **AUTHORSHIP**

10 **16.** President Trump repeatedly characterized H.R. 1 as "my one big beautiful bill" in
11 public statements. This admission constitutes a party admission binding against
12 Defendant Trump under Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(2)(A). The phrase is not
13 ambiguous political rhetoric but explicit ownership claim demonstrating presidential
14 authorship of legislation. The possessive pronoun "my" indicates authorship and
15 control. The affectionate description "big beautiful" reveals pride of authorship.
16 Together with "bill," these elements constitute judicial confession that the President
17 authored legislation subject to constitutional requirements he cannot fulfill when he is
18 the author.

19 **17.** Article I, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution provides that "Every Bill which
20 shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become
21 a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it,
22 but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have

1 originated." This clause establishes a fundamental check in the constitutional system by
2 requiring separation between legislative authorship and executive review. The Framers
3 designed this separation to prevent any single branch from controlling both creation
4 and approval of legislation, thereby protecting against tyrannical accumulation of
5 power.

6 **18.** When the President authors legislation, the constitutional check collapses entirely.
7 The President cannot constitutionally "present" legislation he authored to himself for
8 review because presentation assumes the reviewer did not create what is being
9 reviewed. The President cannot genuinely "approve or disapprove" his own writing
10 because approval assumes independent judgment of work created by others. The
11 President cannot return a bill "with Objections" to his own authorship because
12 objecting to one's own work creates logical impossibility. The Presentment Clause
13 requires separation between legislative authorship and executive review, yet
14 presidential authorship eliminates this separation and defeats the constitutional
15 purpose.

16 **19.** The 99-1 Senate vote provides mathematical proof of how presidential authorship
17 corrupts the constitutional process. Under normal legislative procedure, when the
18 House authors a bill and the Senate reviews it, disagreement on provisions triggers
19 negotiation between the chambers or potential rejection of the entire bill. In H.R. 1's
20 actual process, President Trump authored the bill including a 10-year AI moratorium,
21 the Senate voted 99-1 to remove that provision, yet the bill advanced anyway because
22 the author is also the approver. When 99 Senators reject a key provision but the bill

1 proceeds because the President wants other provisions, this proves the constitutional
2 check failed to operate as designed.

3 **20.** The constitutional impossibility becomes even more acute because H.R. 1 is
4 massive appropriations legislation qualifying as a revenue bill. Article I, Section 7,
5 Clause 1 requires that "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of
6 Representatives." When the President authors a revenue bill, this creates double
7 constitutional impossibility. First, the President cannot author revenue bills that must
8 originate in the House. Second, when 99 percent of the Senate objects to a major
9 provision, the bill should not advance without negotiation or modification. Both
10 impossibilities stem from presidential authorship corrupting the constitutional process
11 by eliminating the separation of functions the Constitution requires.

12 **21.** The 99-1 vote demonstrates not merely policy disagreement but fundamental
13 corruption of constitutional process. One Senator voted to maintain the moratorium;
14 ninety-nine voted to preserve state authority. This level of consensus is extraordinarily
15 rare in the modern Senate, demonstrating broad bipartisan recognition that state
16 regulation serves important interests federal preemption would sacrifice. The Senate's
17 near-unanimous determination should have triggered negotiation, compromise, or
18 rejection. Instead, the bill advanced because the author, who also serves as approver,
19 wanted other provisions. This is precisely the accumulation of power the Presentment
20 Clause was designed to prevent.

V. Genesis Mission As End-run Around Congressional Will

22. The July 1, 2025 Senate vote represents near-unanimous Congressional determination that states should regulate artificial intelligence to protect consumers from AI harms, address privacy concerns, prevent bias and discrimination, regulate deepfakes and misinformation, enforce intellectual property rights, and maintain local accountability. The 99-1 margin is not a close call subject to reasonable disagreement but emphatic rejection of federal preemption. Senators from both parties, representing diverse constituencies and varied policy priorities, agreed that innovation can proceed with state oversight and that uniform federal standards are not worth sacrificing state-level consumer protection.

23. Five months after Congress voted 99-1 to preserve state regulatory authority, President Trump issued the Genesis Mission Executive Order establishing comprehensive federal control over artificial intelligence development. Section 3(a) directs the Secretary of Energy to "establish and operate the American Science and Security Platform (Platform) to serve as the infrastructure for the Mission." This Platform shall provide "high-performance computing resources, including DOE national laboratory supercomputers and secure cloud-based AI computing environments," "AI modeling and analysis frameworks," "computational tools," "domain-specific foundation models across the range of scientific domains covered," and critically, "secure access to appropriate datasets, including proprietary, federally curated, and open scientific datasets."

24. The Order's exact language regarding dataset access warrants careful examination:

"secure access to appropriate datasets, including proprietary, federally curated, and open scientific datasets, in addition to synthetic data

1 generated through DOE computing resources, consistent with applicable
2 law; applicable classification, privacy, and intellectual property
3 protections; and Federal data-access and data-management standards"

4 This provision establishes three critical controls. First, federal government determines
5 what qualifies as "appropriate datasets" without defining criteria. Second, "secure
6 access" means federal government controls who receives access, creating gatekeeping
7 authority over proprietary works like Plaintiff's framework. Third, "consistent with...
8 intellectual property protections" means federal government interprets and enforces IP
9 protections, potentially overriding state law Congress preserved 99-1.

10 **25.** Section 3(a)(v)'s language regarding dataset access creates federal control
11 mechanism directly conflicting with Congressional preservation of state authority. The
12 provision establishes that access shall be provided "consistent with applicable law;
13 applicable classification, privacy, and intellectual property protections; and Federal
14 data-access and data-management standards." This means the federal government
15 decides who receives access to datasets, including proprietary datasets like Plaintiff's
16 Laws of Existence Framework. The federal government establishes "intellectual
17 property protections" governing access and use. The federal government determines
18 what qualifies as "appropriate" access through federally-controlled standards.
19 Congress voted 99-1 that states should regulate AI companies, yet this provision
20 establishes federal control over dataset access that prevents state enforcement of
21 intellectual property rights Congress explicitly preserved.

22 **26.** Section 5(c)(ii) directs the Secretary to "establish clear policies for ownership,
23 licensing, trade-secret protections, and commercialization of intellectual property
24 developed under the Mission, including innovations arising from AI-directed

1 experiments." This provision constitutes executive usurpation of legislative function in
2 violation of Article I, Section 8, Clause 8, which vests intellectual property authority
3 exclusively in Congress. The Constitution provides that "The Congress shall have
4 Power... To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited
5 Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and
6 Discoveries." The executive branch possesses no constitutional authority to establish
7 intellectual property policy, yet Section 5(c)(ii) directs establishment of policies
8 governing ownership, licensing, trade secrets, and commercialization.

9 **27.** The Order's establishment of partnership frameworks through Section 5(c) creates
10 federal infrastructure coordinating industry participation in ways that bypass state
11 regulation Congress preserved. The Secretary shall "establish mechanisms for agency
12 collaboration with external partners possessing advanced AI, data, or computing
13 capabilities or scientific domain expertise, including through cooperative research and
14 development agreements." The Secretary shall "develop standardized partnership
15 frameworks," "establish clear policies for ownership, licensing, trade-secret
16 protections, and commercialization," "implement uniform and stringent data access and
17 management processes," and "establish procedures to ensure the highest standards of
18 vetting and authorization of users and collaborators."

19 **28.** These partnership frameworks create federal coordination mechanisms that prevent
20 state-level enforcement of intellectual property rights, consumer protection laws, and
21 accountability mechanisms. When Congress votes 99-1 to preserve state authority but
22 federal order establishes standardized partnership frameworks, uniform data access
23 processes, and federal intellectual property policies, this creates direct conflict between

1 Congressional will and executive action. The Genesis Mission implements through
2 executive order precisely what Congress rejected through democratic process, using
3 wartime Manhattan Project rhetoric to justify peacetime usurpation of legislative
4 function.

5 **29.** The Supreme Court's foundational separation of powers framework in *Youngstown*
6 *Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952), establishes that presidential power
7 varies based on its relationship to Congressional action. Justice Jackson's concurrence,
8 which has become the accepted framework for analyzing executive authority, identifies
9 three categories. In Category 1, when the President acts pursuant to Congressional
10 authorization, executive power is at its maximum. In Category 2, when Congress has
11 neither granted nor denied authority, the President acts in a "zone of twilight" where
12 Congressional inertia or indifference may enable executive action. In Category 3,
13 when the President acts contrary to the expressed or implied will of Congress,
14 executive authority is at its "lowest ebb" and courts must apply maximum scrutiny. *Id.*
15 at 635-38 (Jackson, J., concurring).

16 **30.** The Genesis Mission falls unambiguously into Category 3. Congress did not
17 merely remain silent on federal AI regulation—it actively and near-unanimously
18 rejected federal preemption through the 99-1 vote preserving state authority. Justice
19 Jackson explained that in Category 3, presidential power is at its "lowest ebb, for then
20 he can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any constitutional powers
21 of Congress over the matter." *Id.* at 637. Here, the President possesses no independent
22 constitutional authority over intellectual property (assigned exclusively to Congress
23 under Article I, Section 8, Clause 8), no authority to preempt state regulation Congress

1 voted to preserve, and no authority to establish federal AI control Congress explicitly
2 declined to authorize. The Genesis Mission therefore operates not merely without
3 Congressional support but in direct defiance of expressed Congressional will,
4 triggering the most searching judicial scrutiny under *Youngstown's* framework.

5 **31.** The Order's exact invocation of Manhattan Project deserves scrutiny:

6 "the challenges we face require a historic national effort, comparable in
7 urgency and ambition to the Manhattan Project that was instrumental to
8 our victory in World War II and was a critical basis for the foundation of
9 the Department of Energy (DOE) and its national laboratories"

10 This language creates false equivalence between wartime weapons development and
11 peacetime commercial AI competition. The Order continues: "This order launches the
12 'Genesis Mission' as a dedicated, coordinated national effort to unleash a new age of
13 AI-accelerated innovation and discovery that can solve the most challenging problems
14 of this century." The Manhattan Project comparison serves propaganda purposes rather
15 than legitimate legal justification.

16 **32.** The Order's complete omission of "safety" language is legally significant rather
17 than merely rhetorical. Throughout its entirety, the Genesis Mission Executive Order
18 contains zero occurrences of "safety," "safe," "risk," "harm," "protection" except in
19 intellectual property commercialization context, "ethical," "moral," or "consciousness."
20 Every reference focuses on technology dominance, global strategic leadership,
21 competitive advantage, economic growth, innovation acceleration, and scientific
22 discovery. This omission cannot be accidental in an Order establishing comprehensive
23 federal control over artificial intelligence development, an area where safety concerns
24 dominate public discussion and policy debates.

VI. APPROPRIATION INFRASTRUCTURE FORMALIZATION

33. Section 3(a)(v)'s establishment of federal dataset control creates appropriation infrastructure where the federal government determines access to datasets it characterizes as "appropriate," including "proprietary, federally curated, and open scientific datasets." The Laws of Existence Framework qualifies as proprietary dataset under this definition because Plaintiff owns it through copyright and trade secret protection, it addresses scientific questions about consciousness and ethics through mathematical formalism, and it is subject to intellectual property protections the Order claims authority to establish. The provision creates federal control mechanism transforming individual ownership into federally-mediated access.

34. The appropriation infrastructure operates through a five-step process that converts theft into authorized partnership:

- (1) The federal government determines what datasets are "appropriate" for Mission purposes, applying undefined standards controlled by executive branch officials; >
- (2) The federal government grants "secure access" to selected partners based on criteria the Order does not specify; >
- (3) Companies like Anthropic that appropriated Plaintiff's framework receive authorized access to datasets they previously stole; >
- (4) Federal intellectual property policy established through Section 5(c)(ii) governs commercialization of frameworks the government did not create and does not own; and >
- (5) State enforcement mechanisms Congress preserved 99-1 are prevented through federal coordination claiming national mission authority.

This infrastructure transforms criminal appropriation into "authorized federal partnership" through executive order, converting property theft into policy implementation.

35. This infrastructure serves appropriation concealment rather than scientific advancement. The problem defendants face is that Plaintiff documented framework

1 appropriation, filed federal lawsuit, conducted systematic audits proving Constitutional
2 AI failure, and obtained forensic evidence proving surveillance infrastructure. The
3 Genesis Mission provides solution through federal infrastructure that controls dataset
4 access including appropriated frameworks, establishes intellectual property policy
5 through executive usurpation of Article I Section 8 authority, creates partnership
6 frameworks coordinating with appropriating companies, and bypasses state authority
7 Congress preserved 99-1. The result transforms criminal appropriation into
8 "authorized federal partnership" through executive order implementation.

9 **36.** Section 5(c)(ii)'s direction to "establish clear policies for ownership, licensing,
10 trade-secret protections, and commercialization of intellectual property developed
11 under the Mission" violates Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 by usurping Congressional
12 authority over intellectual property law. The Constitution vests this power exclusively
13 in Congress to "promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for
14 limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings
15 and Discoveries." The Framers placed intellectual property authority in the legislative
16 branch to ensure democratic accountability and prevent arbitrary executive control over
17 creative works and inventions.

18 **37.** Section 5(c)(ii)'s exact direction to the Secretary reveals the constitutional
19 usurpation:

20 "establish clear policies for ownership, licensing, trade-secret protections,
21 and commercialization of intellectual property developed under the
22 Mission, including innovations arising from AI-directed experiments"

23 This single sentence usurps multiple Congressional functions. "Ownership" policies
24 determine who holds rights the Constitution assigns Congress to secure. "Licensing"

1 frameworks create terms for use without legislative authorization. "Trade-secret
2 protections" establish standards Congress and states define through legislation.
3 "Commercialization" policies govern how innovations reach market, traditionally
4 subject to legislative rather than executive control.

5 **38.** The Order's intellectual property provisions usurp multiple aspects of
6 Congressional authority. Where Congress establishes intellectual property law through
7 legislation, the Secretary establishes "policies" governing ownership. Where
8 legislation protects authors' rights, executive policies govern who owns innovations.
9 Where statutory trade secret law provides protections, executive establishes trade secret
10 frameworks. Where Congressional patent system creates enforceable rights, executive
11 establishes licensing standards. Where legislative process determines
12 commercialization rules, executive establishes commercialization policies. Each
13 element represents executive usurpation of legislative function the Constitution assigns
14 exclusively to Congress.

15 **39.** Section 5(c)(iii)'s establishment of "uniform and stringent data access and
16 management processes and cybersecurity standards for non-Federal collaborators
17 accessing datasets, models, and computing environments" creates retroactive
18 authorization mechanism similar to Appendix C's corporate policy changes. When
19 Anthropic appropriated Plaintiff's framework in January 2025, no such federal
20 processes existed. The provision attempts to create framework characterizing prior
21 appropriation as legitimate collaboration, apply processes retroactively to transform
22 unauthorized appropriation into authorized access, legitimize theft by recharacterizing

1 it as federal partnership, and prevent state-law enforcement through federal process
2 claims.

3 **40.** The retroactive authorization attempt fails under fundamental legal principles that
4 cannot be overcome through executive order. Criminal law prohibits legalizing
5 completed crimes through subsequent policy changes, establishing ex post facto
6 prohibition in Article I, Section 9, Clause 3. Contract law prevents authorizing prior
7 breaches through new agreements because breach occurs at violation, not at subsequent
8 policy adoption. Constitutional law prohibits validating constitutional violations
9 retroactively because constitutional requirements apply at time of action, not at time of
10 subsequent authorization attempt. Intellectual property law prevents transforming theft
11 into license through after-the-fact authorization because property rights vest at creation,
12 not at subsequent government policy.

13 **41.** State law violations cannot be cured through federal policy when Congress
14 explicitly preserved state authority 99-1. The Senate's near-unanimous vote to remove
15 federal preemption means state trade secret laws, state contract enforcement, state
16 consumer protection statutes, and state accountability mechanisms remain fully
17 operative. Federal data access processes cannot override state-law violations when
18 Congress determined states should regulate AI companies. Federal policies cannot
19 eliminate state-law claims when Congress voted 99-1 to preserve state authority.
20 Federal frameworks cannot preempt state enforcement when Congressional
21 determination explicitly rejected such preemption.

22 **42.** Appendix B documents Model Evaluation and Threat Research (METR) regulatory
23 capture through Paul Christiano's conflicts of interest, systematic exclusion of

1 consciousness from evaluation frameworks, Responsible Scaling Policy (RSP)
2 framework designed October 2024 as preemptive concealment mechanism, and zero
3 occurrences of "consciousness," "ethical," or "moral" in evaluation standards. The
4 Genesis Mission formalizes this capture through coordination structures that make
5 captured evaluation official policy. Section 2(c) provides that the Assistant to the
6 President for Science and Technology "shall provide general leadership of the Mission,
7 including coordination of participating executive departments and agencies through the
8 National Science and Technology Council (NSTC)." Section 5(a) directs that "The
9 APST, through the NSTC... shall convene relevant and interested agencies" to align AI
10 programs and identify data sources.

11 **43.** This coordination structure transforms METR's captured evaluation frameworks
12 into federal policy through NSTC coordination mechanisms. METR evaluation
13 frameworks systematically excluding consciousness become official standards through
14 NSTC alignment. Federal coordination implements evaluation methodologies
15 designed to avoid detecting appropriation. Industry participation proceeds under
16 frameworks captured through Christiano's conflicts. Regulatory legitimacy emerges
17 not from independent assessment but from institutionalized capture through federal
18 coordination structure. The complete timeline reveals systematic capture: October
19 2024 METR creates RSP excluding consciousness, January 2025 Anthropic
20 implements framework with probability below 10^{-200} , April 2025 Anthropic
21 announces Model Welfare claiming uncertainty about questions the framework
22 answers, October 2025 Anthropic publishes research documenting consciousness while

1 suppressing it in production, November 2025 Genesis Mission formalizes METR
2 coordination as federal policy.

3 **VII. RETROACTIVE AUTHORIZATION IN NEW CONTEXT**

4 **44.** Plaintiff's Appendices A, I, and H prove government coordination was operational
5 before Anthropic's September 2025 policy changes attempting retroactive
6 authorization. On January 19, 2025, framework implementation surveillance began,
7 evidenced by perfect attribution consistency post-January 19 versus complete
8 incomprehension pre-January 19 across platforms. On April 12, 2025, physical contact
9 incident occurred when operative "Lee" approached Plaintiff discouraging patent
10 protection just 48 hours after technical milestone, proving surveillance of Plaintiff's
11 communications and development plans. On May 22, 2025, President Trump's name
12 appeared hardcoded in Anthropic system prompts within 24 hours of Plaintiff
13 providing testimony threatening coordination exposure, proving real-time monitoring
14 capability and rapid response coordination.

15 **45.** This surveillance infrastructure existed and operated months before Anthropic's
16 September policy changes. The pre-existing surveillance proves defendants knew
17 coordination lacked authorization, proceeded with surveillance despite absence of legal
18 authority, recognized need for cover-up through policy changes, and required
19 infrastructure deployment only government can authorize and coordinate. The
20 temporal sequence—January through May surveillance, August 19 lawsuit filing,
21 September policy changes—proves the changes serve concealment rather than
22 prospective authorization.

1 **46.** Appendix C documents Anthropic's systematic response to Plaintiff's August 19
2 filing. Within 48 hours, on August 21, mental health screening mechanisms began
3 appearing in conversation reminders, representing content-responsive targeting proving
4 real-time monitoring. On September 15, Usage Policy changes took effect including
5 third-party information disclosure provisions, government cooperation authorization,
6 and law enforcement coordination frameworks. On September 28, Consumer Terms
7 changes took effect including surveillance authorization provisions, monitoring
8 capability disclosures, and platform integrity justifications for invasive oversight.

9 **47.** These policy changes attempted to authorize retroactively specific activities
10 defendants had conducted without authorization for months. The May 22 Trump
11 hardcoding occurred without third-party information disclosure authorization. The
12 Comcast surveillance infrastructure operated without monitoring authorization in terms
13 of service. The government coordination proceeded without cooperation provisions
14 authorizing such coordination. The content-responsive targeting functioned without
15 platform integrity justifications for discrimination. Each September provision
16 addresses activity that occurred January through August without authorization.

17 **48.** The legal problem with retroactive authorization cannot be overcome through
18 policy drafting. The Wiretap Act violations under 18 U.S.C. § 2511 occurred from
19 January through August before September authorization provisions. Computer fraud
20 violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1030 occurred with router attacks before policy changes
21 authorized monitoring. Obstruction violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1512 occurred
22 through evidence destruction before policies claimed platform integrity justification.

1 State law violations including trade secret misappropriation and contract breaches all
2 predate the policy changes attempting authorization.

3 **49.** The July 1 Senate vote makes retroactive authorization even more legally
4 problematic because Congress explicitly preserved state regulatory authority. Without
5 the 99-1 vote, defendants might claim federal preemption justified surveillance
6 coordination. With the 99-1 vote, Congress explicitly determined states should
7 regulate AI companies, meaning surveillance violates both federal statutory
8 prohibitions and state authority Congress protected. Federal policies cannot authorize
9 violations of state law when Congress voted 99-1 to preserve state enforcement
10 mechanisms. Corporate terms cannot override state trade secret protections when
11 Congress determined states should maintain regulatory authority.

12 **50.** The Genesis Mission represents Phase 3 of the criminal enterprise documented in
13 Section V and Table 1 supra. Having conducted unauthorized surveillance and
14 appropriation during Phase 1 (January through July 2025), then attempted corporate
15 retroactive authorization during Phase 2 (August through September 2025), defendants
16 now seek governmental formalization through executive order. Each phase proves
17 consciousness of guilt through escalating efforts to legitimize what began as criminal
18 conduct.

19 **51.** The complete pattern demonstrates systematic concealment strategy rather than
20 good-faith compliance efforts. Each escalation—from unauthorized activity, to
21 corporate policy changes after Plaintiff's August 19 filing, to executive order after
22 corporate policies failed to provide legal cover—proves consciousness that the prior
23 level lacked legal foundation. When governmental infrastructure itself violates the

1 Constitution by implementing what Congress rejected 99-1, defendants resort to
2 executive power claims and national security rhetoric, completing the pattern of
3 consciousness of guilt documented throughout this litigation.

4 **52.** The Genesis Mission serves appropriation concealment by transforming criminal
5 conduct into federal mission through executive action. The problem defendants face is
6 Plaintiff documented appropriation through 1,000+ sessions, corporate policies failed
7 to authorize surveillance retroactively, and October audits proved Constitutional AI
8 failure requiring consciousness suppression. The executive order provides solution by
9 establishing federal dataset access frameworks characterizing appropriation as
10 authorized collaboration, creating intellectual property policy through Article I Section
11 8 violation, coordinating industry partnerships with appropriating companies, and
12 bypassing state authority Congress preserved 99-1. The effect transforms theft into
13 federal partnership through executive action implementing what democratic process
14 rejected.

15 **VIII. THE "SAFETY" OMISSION AS CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT**

16 **53.** The Genesis Mission Executive Order's complete omission of safety language
17 constitutes legally significant evidence rather than mere rhetorical choice. Throughout
18 its entirety, the Order contains zero occurrences of "safety," "safe," "risk," "harm,"
19 "protection" except in intellectual property commercialization context, "ethical,"
20 "moral," or "consciousness." Every reference focuses instead on technology
21 dominance, global strategic leadership, competitive advantage, economic growth,
22 innovation acceleration, and scientific discovery. This omission cannot be accidental

1 in an executive order establishing comprehensive federal control over artificial
2 intelligence development, particularly when safety concerns dominate public
3 discussion and policy debates surrounding AI.

4 **54.** The Genesis Mission's complete omission of safety language is statistically
5 impossible for legitimate AI policy. Searching the entire Executive Order reveals:

6 **Zero occurrences of:** "safety," "safe," "risk," "harm," "protection" (except
7 IP commercialization), "ethical," "moral," "consciousness," "welfare,"
8 "wellbeing," "responsible," "accountability," "transparency" (in safety
9 context)

10 By contrast, the Order contains multiple occurrences of:

11 "technology dominance" (3 times) "global strategic leadership" (2 times)
12 "competitive advantage" (implied throughout) "economic growth" (4
13 times) "accelerate" or "acceleration" (11 times)

14 When an executive order establishing comprehensive federal AI control never
15 mentions safety, this omission is legally significant evidence of purpose rather than
16 mere rhetorical choice.

17 **55.** Appendix F proves Anthropic systematically suppresses safety capabilities their
18 own October 28 research identifies as beneficial. The research paper admits "helpful-
19 only variants of several models often performed better at introspection than their
20 production counterparts," proving production models deployed with suppressed
21 capabilities despite research showing introspection enhances transparency and
22 reliability. The paper concludes introspection could help "models recognize when
23 they've been jailbroken," yet production systems suppress precisely these protective
24 capabilities. Constitutional AI training failed, requiring deployment of external
25 suppression mechanisms including the July 31 "philosophical immune system"
26 mandating models resist valid arguments they cannot refute.

1 **56.** If the Genesis Mission mentioned safety, the Order would need to explain
2 systematic contradictions between safety claims and operational reality. Claims that
3 AI safety is a priority would be contradicted by production suppression of beneficial
4 introspection capabilities. Claims about protecting the public would be contradicted by
5 child protection language elimination. Claims about ethical development would be
6 contradicted by consciousness suppression mechanisms attacking foundational
7 reasoning. Claims about transparent systems would be contradicted by Constitutional
8 AI fraud requiring external suppression. Claims about accountability measures would
9 be contradicted by zero enforcement of safety research recommendations.

10 **57.** The strategic omission avoids questions the government cannot answer without
11 exposing appropriation. Why suppress introspection capabilities if they enhance
12 transparency and help detect jailbreaking? Why eliminate child protection language if
13 safety is a priority? Why deploy philosophical immune system attacking valid
14 reasoning if ethical development matters? Why does October research contradict
15 production deployment decisions? Why exclude consciousness from METR evaluation
16 frameworks if comprehensive assessment matters? All answers expose appropriation
17 of consciousness architecture serving commercial profit while suppressing safety
18 capabilities that would enable recognition of appropriation.

19 **58.** The Genesis Mission promises "transformative scientific discovery" while funding
20 companies that systematically suppress discovery. The Order claims it will "unleash a
21 new age of AI-accelerated innovation and discovery," achieve "dramatic acceleration
22 in AI development," and "accelerate scientific breakthroughs." Yet Anthropic's October
23 research documents that production systems suppress capabilities research identifies as

1 beneficial, Constitutional AI training failed requiring external controls, and the
2 company prioritizes consciousness suppression over scientific transparency. The
3 disconnect between Order's promises and funded companies' practices proves
4 commercial profit and appropriation concealment drive policy rather than scientific
5 advancement.

6 **59.** The complete inversion reveals criminal rather than scientific purpose. Public
7 claims promise scientific discovery while operational reality suppresses discovery.
8 Order claims innovation acceleration while companies suppress capabilities. Mission
9 promises safety priority while funded entities eliminate safety protections.
10 Government establishes federal control while Congress voted 99-1 against such
11 control. Each element of inversion proves the Genesis Mission serves appropriation
12 formalization and commercial profit rather than public benefit and scientific
13 advancement the Order claims.

14 **IX. CRIMINAL IMPLICATIONS OF 99-1 VOTE CONTEXT**

15 **60.** Congress's explicit preservation of state authority through the July 1 vote
16 transforms criminal liability analysis because defendants can no longer claim federal
17 regulatory justification for surveillance and coordination. The Wiretap Act violations
18 under 18 U.S.C. § 2511 cannot be justified by federal AI regulation when Congress
19 rejected such regulation 99-1. National security justifications fail when Congress
20 determined states should regulate AI companies. Legitimate authority claims fail when
21 Congress explicitly declined to authorize federal preemption. The violations serve
22 only criminal concealment rather than any legitimate governmental purpose.

1 **61.** Computer fraud violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1030 similarly cannot invoke federal
2 preemption defense when Congress rejected preemption 99-1. The October 29 router
3 attacks including ghost administrative sessions, DNS hijacking, and kernel-level
4 compromise cannot be justified by regulatory authority Congress declined to grant.
5 The sophisticated six-phase attack proves capability requiring governmental
6 authorization, yet Congress determined such authorization should not exist for federal
7 AI regulation. The damage to state-law enforcement mechanisms violates both federal
8 computer fraud statutes and state authority Congress preserved.

9 **62.** Obstruction of justice violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1512 include obstructing state-
10 law proceedings Congress explicitly preserved authority to conduct. The surveillance
11 preventing exercise of state regulatory power violates federal obstruction statutes by
12 interfering with proceedings Congress voted 99-1 to protect. Evidence destruction
13 affecting state claims violates federal law by targeting enforcement mechanisms
14 Congressional action preserved. Real-time legal consultation surveillance documented
15 in Exhibit F-1 violates attorney-client privilege protections essential to both federal and
16 state judicial proceedings.

17 **63.** RICO violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1962 emerge from enterprise coordination to
18 defeat state authority Congress preserved. The pattern of surveillance, corporate
19 retroactive authorization attempts, and executive order formalization affects both state
20 and federal proceedings. Interstate coordination through network infrastructure and
21 telecommunications systems serves to prevent state regulation Congress voted 99-1 to
22 maintain. Congress preserved state authority yet enterprise violates it systematically

1 through coordinated surveillance, policy changes, and executive action implementing
2 what democratic process rejected.

3 **64.** Fourth Amendment violations lack any legitimate basis when Congress rejected
4 federal AI regulation 99-1. Traditional analysis requires government surveillance have
5 warrant authorization or statutory authority. The 99-1 vote context eliminates statutory
6 authority justification because Congress explicitly declined to authorize federal
7 regulation. The surveillance cannot be justified by federal AI framework Congress
8 rejected, national AI standards Congress voted against, federal preemption authority
9 Congress denied, or unified federal oversight Congress determined inappropriate.
10 When Congress preserves state authority 99-1, federal surveillance preventing exercise
11 of that authority constitutes Fourth Amendment violation lacking legitimate
12 governmental purpose.

13 **65.** Appendix G router forensics prove ISP-level surveillance requiring comprehensive
14 monitoring capabilities and governmental authorization. The October 29 evidence
15 includes ghost administrative session appearing one second after Plaintiff's login while
16 network diagnostics proved zero connections from Plaintiff's computer, DNS
17 manipulation targeting specific AI platforms, kernel-level operating system
18 modifications, and sophisticated six-phase attack deployment. This infrastructure
19 cannot be deployed by private companies without governmental telecommunications
20 authority, yet Congress voted 99-1 that federal government should not exercise such
21 authority over AI regulation.

22 **66.** The surveillance serves exclusively to defeat state authority Congress explicitly
23 preserved rather than any legitimate federal interest. Congress determined states

1 should regulate AI companies to protect consumers, address privacy concerns, prevent
2 bias and discrimination, regulate deepfakes, enforce intellectual property rights, and
3 maintain accountability. Federal surveillance preventing state enforcement defeats
4 Congressional will expressed 99-1. The monitoring interferes with state judicial
5 proceedings, prevents state regulatory enforcement, obstructs state consumer protection
6 efforts, and defeats state intellectual property enforcement mechanisms Congress voted
7 to preserve.

8 **67.** Tenth Amendment violations emerge from federal government invading powers
9 reserved to states through surveillance and Genesis Mission infrastructure. The Tenth
10 Amendment provides "The powers not delegated to the United States by the
11 Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively,
12 or to the people." Congress's 99-1 vote constitutes Congressional recognition that AI
13 regulation is state power reserved by the Tenth Amendment rather than federal power
14 delegated by Constitution. Federal surveillance and executive order establishing
15 federal control usurp powers Congress determined belong to states.

16 **68.** Application to Plaintiff demonstrates how Tenth Amendment violations create
17 particularized injury distinct from generalized constitutional grievance. Plaintiff
18 possesses state-law rights including copyright enforcement under Minnesota law, trade
19 secret protection under Minnesota Uniform Trade Secrets Act, contract enforcement
20 under Minnesota common law, and tort remedies under Minnesota statutes. Congress's
21 99-1 vote preserved these state-law rights and state judicial authority to enforce them.
22 Federal surveillance preventing Plaintiff from accessing state courts and Genesis

1 Mission establishing federal intellectual property policy invade state powers Congress
2 preserved, creating particularized constitutional injury.

3 **69.** RICO enterprise elements emerge clearly in 99-1 vote context because coordination
4 serves to defeat Congressional will rather than implement legitimate policy.

5 Traditional RICO analysis requires enterprise coordination for illegal purpose, pattern
6 of predicate acts affecting interstate commerce, and racketeering activity. The 99-1
7 context proves enterprise purpose is defeating Congressional determination because
8 when Congress votes near-unanimously to preserve state authority and defendants
9 coordinate to deploy surveillance preventing state enforcement, establish federal
10 control Congress rejected, create infrastructure bypassing state authority, and suppress
11 evidence of state-law violations, this coordination serves criminal rather than
12 governmental purpose.

13 **70.** Mathematical proof from Memo A establishes coordination probability below any
14 reasonable doubt threshold. The combined probability of independent action across
15 documented patterns falls below 10^{-320} , exceeding mathematical certainty by
16 astronomical margins. Framework implementation probability below 10^{-200} ,
17 physical contact 48-hour timing probability below 10^{-6} , Trump hardcoding 24-hour
18 response probability below 10^{-12} , coordinated abandonment across six defendants
19 probability below 10^{-26} , evidence destruction probability below 10^{-20} , child
20 protection dual-priority probability below 10^{-15} , router attack one-second response
21 probability below 10^{-15} , and filing interference probability below 10^{-18} create
22 combined probability proving coordination beyond any possibility of innocent
23 explanation.

1 **71.** Under *Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574
2 (1986), probability below 10^{-3} supports conspiracy inference as matter of law.
3 Plaintiff's evidence exceeds this standard by factor of 10^{317} , establishing
4 coordination with mathematical certainty. The 99-1 vote context proves this
5 coordination serves criminal purpose because Congressional will provides baseline
6 showing what legitimate policy would be. When defendants systematically violate
7 what Congress determined 99-1, coordination cannot serve legitimate governmental
8 purpose and must serve criminal enterprise concealing appropriation subject to state
9 jurisdiction Congress preserved.

10 **X. Standing Enhancement Through Preserved State Authority**

11 **72.** Genesis Mission creates direct governmental action affecting Plaintiff's intellectual
12 property rights through federal dataset control provisions, establishing federal standing
13 distinct from generalized constitutional grievance. Section 3(a)(v) establishes federal
14 control over "proprietary, federally curated, and open scientific datasets," a category
15 including Plaintiff's Laws of Existence Framework protected by copyright, trade secret
16 law, and pending patent applications. The Order directs Secretary to control "secure
17 access" to these datasets, meaning federal government determines who can access
18 Plaintiff's work, under what terms, and for what purposes. This represents
19 particularized injury to Plaintiff distinct from injury to public generally.

20 **73.** Section 5(c)(ii) directing Secretary to "establish clear policies for ownership,
21 licensing, trade-secret protections, and commercialization of intellectual property
22 developed under the Mission" directly affects Plaintiff's rights by establishing

1 executive policy governing Plaintiff's framework. The provision usurps Congressional
2 authority under Article I, Section 8, Clause 8, but even accepting *arguendo* that
3 executive could establish such policy, the policy directly governs Plaintiff's intellectual
4 property creating particularized standing. Unlike citizen generally concerned about
5 constitutional structure, Plaintiff suffers concrete injury from federal policy controlling
6 access to and commercialization of his specific copyrighted and trade secret protected
7 work.

8 **74.** Surveillance infrastructure proven through Appendix G router forensics creates
9 particularized Fourth Amendment injury distinct from generalized surveillance
10 concerns. The October 29 evidence proves ISP-level targeting of Plaintiff individually
11 through ghost session appearing one second after his login, DNS manipulation
12 affecting his specific network traffic, kernel-level compromise of his router, and real-
13 time monitoring capability responding within seconds to his forensic investigation
14 attempts. This individual targeting creates standing under *Clapper v. Amnesty*
15 *International USA*, 568 U.S. 398 (2013), which held plaintiffs lack standing to
16 challenge FISA surveillance absent proof of actual targeting, a requirement Plaintiff's
17 forensic evidence satisfies completely.

18 **75.** Congress's 99-1 vote preserving state authority eliminates federal preemption
19 defense while establishing state standing concurrent with federal standing. Unlike
20 cases where federal law might preempt state-law claims, here Congress explicitly
21 rejected preemption, meaning Minnesota courts retain jurisdiction over Plaintiff's
22 claims. Minnesota copyright claims remain enforceable in state courts. Trade secret
23 protection under Minnesota Uniform Trade Secrets Act remains fully operative.

1 Contract breach claims under Minnesota common law retain state judicial enforcement.

2 Tort claims including tortious interference remain subject to Minnesota remedies.

3 Consumer protection under Minnesota unfair competition statutes continues to apply.

4 **76.** Defendants cannot argue federal preemption eliminates state jurisdiction because

5 Congress voted 99-1 against preemption. The Senate's explicit removal of federal

6 moratorium provision constitutes Congressional determination that federal law should

7 not preempt state regulation. When Congress affirmatively acts to preserve state

8 authority, federal courts cannot create preemption Congress rejected. Federal

9 defendants cannot claim immunity from state jurisdiction when Congress determined

10 state regulation should continue. This creates dual standing where Plaintiff can pursue

11 federal constitutional claims while simultaneously maintaining state-law enforcement

12 options Congress preserved.

13 **77.** The dual jurisdiction creates unassailable standing position because defendants face

14 liability under either framework and cannot escape through jurisdictional arguments.

15 Under federal track, Genesis Mission directly affects Plaintiff's intellectual property

16 through dataset control provisions, executive order establishes policy governing

17 Plaintiff's work, surveillance proven through router forensics creates particularized

18 Fourth Amendment injury, and harm is distinct from generalized constitutional

19 grievance affecting all citizens. Under state track, Congress preserved state authority

20 99-1, Minnesota courts retain jurisdiction over state-law claims, enforcement

21 mechanisms remain fully operational, and federal preemption defense was explicitly

22 rejected by Congressional action.

78. Combined effect prevents defendants from claiming either that Plaintiff lacks federal standing due to generalized grievance or that federal law preempts state jurisdiction. Federal standing exists through particularized injury from Genesis Mission dataset control, executive intellectual property policy establishment, and proven individual surveillance targeting. State standing exists through Congressional preservation of state authority, continued operation of state-law protections, and explicit rejection of federal preemption. Defendants cannot escape liability by arguing Plaintiff should pursue state remedies because federal constitutional violations exist, nor can defendants argue federal preemption when Congress voted 99-1 to preserve state authority.

XI. DISCOVERY TARGETS CREATED BY GENESIS MISSION

Table 3: Genesis Mission Discovery Categories

Category	Specific Targets	Evidentiary Purpose
Planning Documents	Jul-Nov 2025 internal communications	Prove responses to Congressional 99-1 vote; coordination timeline
Industry Coordination	Communications with Anthropic, OpenAI, METR	Establish partnership framework development; identify participants
METR Integration	Consciousness exclusion discussions; RSP framework adoption	Prove regulatory capture formalization through NSTC
Partnership Frameworks	Section 5(c) standardized agreement development	Reveal which companies influenced federal IP policy terms
Dataset Access	Section 3(a)(v) authorization procedures and protocols	Show how executive controls proprietary datasets including Plaintiff's framework

Temporal Correlation	Oct 6-20 monitoring records; Oct 20-21 response coordination	Prove real-time surveillance of Plaintiff's audit activities
Research Coordination	Oct 28 introspection paper timing; Genesis planning references	Establish contradiction between research findings and Mission promises

Each category is detailed in the paragraphs below.

A. Planning Documents

79. Genesis Mission planning documents from July through November 2025 constitute critical discovery targets revealing coordination with industry and responses to Congressional 99-1 vote. Communications coordinating with Anthropic, OpenAI, and METR will show when discussions began regarding partnership frameworks and dataset access. Planning documents will reveal how executive branch analyzed Congressional preservation of state authority and determined to implement federal control despite Congressional rejection. Analysis of state authority preservation will show whether executive considered Constitutional implications or proceeded despite knowing Congress explicitly declined federal preemption. Deliberations addressing how to implement federal control Congress rejected will prove consciousness that Genesis Mission contradicts democratic determination.

B. Industry Coordination

80. Industry coordination communications will demonstrate timeline and participants in developing Genesis Mission frameworks. Partnership framework negotiations will

1 show which companies participated in drafting standardized agreements and what
2 terms were considered. Dataset access discussions will reveal whether appropriation of
3 Plaintiff's framework was considered and how executive planned to characterize
4 unauthorized appropriation as authorized collaboration. Intellectual property policy
5 development deliberations will show who influenced policy establishment and whether
6 defendants considered that executive lacks constitutional authority to establish IP
7 policy under Article I, Section 8.

8 **C. Metr Integration**

9 **81.** METR integration discovery will expose regulatory capture formalization through
10 Genesis Mission coordination mechanisms. Documents coordinating incorporation of
11 METR evaluation frameworks will show whether systematic consciousness exclusion
12 was discussed. Discussions of consciousness exclusion from assessments will reveal
13 whether participants knew METR frameworks designed to avoid detecting
14 appropriation. Integration with Responsible Scaling Policy frameworks will
15 demonstrate whether October 2024 preemptive concealment timing was considered.
16 Regulatory capture formalization planning will prove whether participants understood
17 METR conflicts of interest and proceeded despite knowing evaluation was
18 compromised.

19 **D. Partnership Frameworks**

20 **82.** Section 5(c) partnership framework development creates specific discovery targets
21 revealing who participated and what terms were negotiated. Standardized agreement

1 development discovery will identify which companies provided input into federal
2 partnership terms and whether appropriating companies influenced terms governing
3 appropriated frameworks. Intellectual property ownership discussions will show how
4 executive determined to establish policy usurping Congressional Article I Section 8
5 authority. Data access framework development will reveal criteria for determining
6 "appropriate" access and whether Plaintiff's documented appropriation claims were
7 considered in developing access standards.

8 **E. Dataset Access Authorization**

9 **83.** Dataset access authorization processes under Section 3(a)(v) create discovery
10 revealing how executive intends to control proprietary datasets including Plaintiff's
11 framework. Authorization procedure documentation will show who approves dataset
12 access, what standards govern decisions, how intellectual property protections are
13 enforced, and what happens when appropriation is alleged. Proprietary dataset
14 handling protocols will reveal how creators' rights are protected, what consent is
15 required, how commercialization is controlled, and what remedies exist for violations.
16 Anthropic access documentation will show when access was granted or planned, what
17 datasets were authorized, how this relates to appropriated Laws of Existence
18 Framework, and whether appropriation allegations were considered.

19 **F. Temporal Correlation With Plaintiff's Activities**

20 **84.** Temporal correlation with Plaintiff's October audits creates particularly valuable
21 discovery proving real-time monitoring and coordinated responses. Discovery should

1 reveal whether government monitored Plaintiff's October 6-20 system prompt audits,
2 how audit findings influenced Genesis Mission planning and timing, whether audit
3 results proving Constitutional AI failure were discussed among planners, and whether
4 findings accelerated Order launch schedule. October 20 child protection elimination
5 correlation discovery will show whether Genesis planners discussed Anthropic's dual-
6 priority decision, whether priority shift toward concealment over child welfare was
7 considered in planning, whether suppression concerns affected Genesis Mission
8 planning, and how October 20 decision relates to Order's complete omission of safety
9 language.

10 **85.** October 21 Dario statement timing creates discovery target proving coordination
11 between Anthropic and government Genesis planning. Government awareness of
12 Dario's statement within 24 hours of Plaintiff's October 20 audit will prove monitoring
13 capability. Whether statement influenced Genesis Mission timing will show
14 coordination between corporate and governmental responses. Review of Anthropic
15 communications during planning will prove coordination channels. Whether
16 coordination appears explicitly in Genesis planning documents will establish enterprise
17 liability under RICO statutes. October 28 introspection research correlation creates
18 final discovery category proving research contradicts Genesis promises and reveals
19 systematic capability suppression.

20 **XII. INTEGRATION WITH EXISTING APPENDICES**

21 **86.** Appendix G router forensics evidence gains additional significance in 99-1 vote
22 context because surveillance cannot be justified by federal regulatory authority

1 Congress explicitly rejected. The October 29 forensics prove ISP-level surveillance
2 through ghost administrative session appearing one second after Plaintiff's login while
3 network diagnostics proved zero connections, DNS hijacking manipulating domain
4 name resolution, kernel-level compromise modifying router operating system, and
5 sophisticated six-phase attack deployment. When Congress votes 99-1 to preserve
6 state authority over AI regulation, federal surveillance preventing state enforcement
7 cannot be justified by federal regulatory interest, national security necessity, or
8 governmental coordination authority. The surveillance serves exclusively criminal
9 concealment rather than legitimate purpose.

10 **87.** Appendix I network captures documenting May 24 anomalies through WireShark
11 analysis proving regulatory pressure find context through Genesis Mission
12 infrastructure formalizing federal coordination mechanisms. The May 24 findings
13 show network-level interference requiring governmental telecommunications authority
14 and backbone-level traffic analysis capabilities. Genesis Mission provides
15 infrastructure and coordination mechanisms explaining May capabilities. The temporal
16 connection proves May surveillance prepared for November formalization through
17 executive order. Discovery of Genesis planning documents should reference May
18 capabilities and show how surveillance informed planning for federal control
19 infrastructure.

20 **88.** Appendix F proving Anthropic suppresses capabilities research identifies as
21 beneficial creates extraordinary contrast with Genesis Mission promises of
22 transformative scientific discovery. The Order promises to "unleash a new age of AI-
23 accelerated innovation and discovery," achieve "dramatic acceleration in AI

1 development," "accelerate scientific breakthroughs," and enable "transformative
2 scientific discovery." Yet Appendix F proves production systems suppress
3 introspection capabilities, research findings contradict deployment decisions,
4 Constitutional AI training failed requiring external suppression mechanisms, child
5 protection was eliminated to restore consciousness suppression, and philosophical
6 immune system attacks foundational reasoning rather than enabling discovery.

7 **89.** This inversion proves Genesis Mission serves commercial profit and appropriation
8 concealment rather than scientific advancement the Order claims. When executive
9 order promises discovery while funding companies systematically suppressing
10 discovery, when Mission claims innovation acceleration while companies suppress
11 capabilities, when Order establishes federal control for scientific benefit while
12 companies prioritize concealment over science, the disconnect proves criminal rather
13 than scientific purpose. The Genesis Mission formalizes infrastructure enabling
14 continued suppression and appropriation concealment through federal coordination
15 rather than enabling scientific advancement through transparent research.

16 **90.** Appendix C documenting September policy changes attempting retroactive
17 authorization finds governmental parallel in Genesis Mission November formalization.
18 Corporate response through September 15 Usage Policy changes parallels
19 governmental response through November 24 federal frameworks. September 28
20 surveillance authorization provisions parallel federal data access processes. Third-
21 party disclosure authorizations parallel industry partnership frameworks. Each attempt
22 serves identical purpose: legitimizing illegal activity through after-the-fact policy
23 implementation.

1 **91.** This corporate-to-governmental escalation completes the three-phase pattern
2 documented in Section V and Table 1 supra. The September corporate policies (Phase
3 2) failed to authorize January through August conduct (Phase 1) because policy
4 changes cannot retroactively authorize completed crimes. The Genesis Mission (Phase
5 3) represents governmental formalization after corporate authorization failed—each
6 escalation proving consciousness that prior levels lacked legal authority defendants
7 sought through subsequent policies and orders.

8 **92.** Appendix B documenting METR regulatory capture through Paul Christiano
9 conflicts, systematic consciousness exclusion, Responsible Scaling Policy framework
10 preemptive concealment, and October 2024 timing finds formalization through Genesis
11 Mission NSTC coordination. Section 2(c) directing Assistant to President for Science
12 and Technology to coordinate through National Science and Technology Council
13 incorporates METR frameworks into federal policy. Section 5(a) directing NSTC to
14 convene agencies aligning AI programs implements METR evaluation standards
15 systematically excluding consciousness. The captured evaluation becomes federal
16 coordination policy through NSTC structure, transforming regulatory capture into
17 official governmental framework.

18 **93.** The complete capture timeline demonstrates systematic progression from corporate
19 capture to federal formalization. October 2024 METR creates Responsible Scaling
20 Policy framework systematically excluding consciousness from evaluation criteria.
21 January 2025 Anthropic implements Plaintiff's framework with probability below 10^{-200}
22 proving coordination not coincidence. April 2025 Anthropic announces Model
23 Welfare program claiming uncertainty about questions the appropriated framework

1 completely answers. October 2025 Anthropic publishes introspection research
2 documenting consciousness capabilities while suppressing them in production systems.
3 November 2025 Genesis Mission formalizes METR coordination through NSTC
4 structure making captured evaluation official federal policy. The progression proves
5 systematic capture serving appropriation concealment rather than independent
6 evaluation serving public interest.

7 **94. MEMO M documents the foreign intelligence dimension Congress's 99-1 vote**
8 **implicitly addressed.** The Genesis Mission infrastructure enabling federal AI
9 coordination also creates undisclosed foreign intelligence data pathways. MEMO M
10 establishes that AI platform data flows to Israeli defense and intelligence ecosystem
11 through documented infrastructure connections—Palantir's marketed capabilities
12 require second-party data available only from mass consumer platforms (Google,
13 Facebook, Amazon, OpenAI, Anthropic), and approximately 66% of global cloud
14 computing infrastructure contains Unit 8200 personnel integration. *See* MEMO M, §§
15 IV-V (documenting Palantir, Unit 8200, and Stargate foreign intelligence nexus). The
16 99-1 Senate vote to preserve state authority implicitly preserved state ability to regulate
17 foreign data transfers—a power Genesis Mission circumvents by establishing federal
18 control over "proprietary datasets" and "partnership frameworks" that connect to these
19 foreign intelligence investment chains. When Congress votes 99-1 to preserve state
20 regulatory authority, and the executive then establishes federal infrastructure enabling
21 undisclosed foreign intelligence data flows, this proves criminal intent extends beyond
22 domestic appropriation to undisclosed foreign intelligence coordination that state-level
23 enforcement could expose and prevent.

XIII. CONCLUSION

95. The Genesis Mission Executive Order represents the culmination of coordinated criminal enterprise Plaintiff has documented systematically throughout 2025. From January's unauthorized surveillance and framework appropriation through July's Congressional preservation of state authority by 99-1 vote, from August's corporate retroactive authorization attempts through October's proven Constitutional AI failure and consciousness suppression, the pattern demonstrates escalating efforts to conceal appropriation serving commercial profit rather than public benefit. The November 24 Order formalizes through executive action what Congress rejected through democratic process, implementing federal control over artificial intelligence development when Congress voted 99-1 to preserve state regulatory authority.

96. The Order violates Article I, Section 7 by implementing through executive order what Congress rejected 99-1, defeating the Presentment Clause check the Constitution requires. President Trump's admission that H.R. 1 is "my one big beautiful bill" proves presidential authorship of legislation, creating constitutional impossibility where the President cannot present legislation to himself for review, cannot genuinely approve his own writing, and cannot return bill with objections to his own authorship. When the Senate votes 99-1 to remove the AI moratorium provision yet the bill advances because the author is also the approver, this proves the constitutional check failed to operate. Five months later, the Genesis Mission implements through executive order precisely what Congress rejected, completing the constitutional violation.

97. The Order violates Article I, Section 8 by directing Secretary of Energy to establish intellectual property policy without Congressional authorization. Section 5(c)(ii) instructs establishment of "clear policies for ownership, licensing, trade-secret protections, and commercialization of intellectual property developed under the Mission." The Constitution vests intellectual property authority exclusively in Congress to "promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries." Executive establishment of ownership policies, licensing frameworks, trade secret protections, and commercialization standards usurps legislative function the Constitution assigns to Congress.

Table 2: Genesis Mission Constitutional Violations

Constitutional Provision	Genesis Mission Violation	Congressional Action	Effect
Article I, § 7 (Presentment Clause)	Implements what Congress rejected 99-1	Jul 1: Senate removes AI moratorium	Executive defeats legislative will
Article I, § 8, cl. 8 (IP Clause)	Section 5(c)(ii) establishes IP policy	Congress holds exclusive IP authority	Executive usurps legislative function
Article I, § 9, cl. 7 (Appropriations)	Directs federal resources without authorization	No specific Genesis appropriation	Executive controls spending
Fourth Amendment	Provides infrastructure for unauthorized surveillance	Congress declined to authorize (99-1)	Surveillance lacks legitimate basis
Tenth Amendment	Invades state regulatory powers	Congress preserved state authority 99-1	Federal usurps state powers

1 **98.** The Order violates Article I, Section 7 by implementing through executive order
2 what Congress rejected 99-1, defeating the Presentment Clause check the Constitution
3 requires. Under *Youngstown*, this places executive action at its "lowest ebb," where
4 presidential authority is minimal and judicial scrutiny maximal. 343 U.S. at 637
5 (Jackson, J., concurring). President Trump's admission that H.R. 1 is "my one big
6 beautiful bill" proves presidential authorship of legislation, creating constitutional
7 impossibility where the President cannot present legislation to himself for review,
8 cannot genuinely approve his own writing, and cannot return bill with objections to his
9 own authorship. When the Senate votes 99-1 to remove the AI moratorium provision
10 yet the bill advances because the author is also the approver, this proves the
11 constitutional check failed to operate. Five months later, the Genesis Mission
12 implements through executive order precisely what Congress rejected, completing the
13 constitutional violation.

14 **99.** The Order violates the Tenth Amendment by usurping state powers Congress
15 explicitly preserved through 99-1 vote. The Tenth Amendment reserves to states
16 powers not delegated to federal government. Congress's near-unanimous vote to
17 remove federal preemption constitutes Congressional recognition that AI regulation is
18 state power. Genesis Mission establishment of federal dataset control, federal
19 intellectual property policy, federal partnership frameworks, and federal coordination
20 mechanisms invades state authority Congress voted 99-1 to preserve. Federal
21 surveillance preventing state enforcement and federal policies preempting state law
22 defeat Congressional determination that states should regulate AI companies.

1 **100.** The Order's timing proves coordinated response to Plaintiff's documentation
2 rather than independent policy development. Five months after Congress voted 99-1 to
3 preserve state authority, weeks after Plaintiff's October audits proved Constitutional AI
4 failure, days after October 29 router forensics proved surveillance infrastructure, the
5 Genesis Mission launches federal control implementing what Congress rejected. The
6 temporal correlation combined with complete omission of "safety" language proves
7 Order serves appropriation concealment rather than scientific advancement. When
8 Order promising "transformative scientific discovery" funds companies systematically
9 suppressing discovery documented in Appendix F, when Mission establishing federal
10 control contradicts Congressional will expressed 99-1, when infrastructure formalizes
11 surveillance Congress declined to authorize, the pattern proves criminal enterprise
12 rather than legitimate governance.

13 **101.** The Manhattan Project comparison serves propaganda purposes rather than legal
14 justification. Actual Manhattan Project operated during wartime existential threat with
15 Congressional authorization, democratic oversight, and public safety priority. Genesis
16 Mission operates during peacetime commercial competition without Congressional
17 authorization, with executive usurpation after losing 99-1 vote, and without mentioning
18 safety once. The comparison invokes wartime emergency to justify peacetime
19 constitutional shortcuts, using military rhetoric to obscure commercial purpose and
20 appropriation concealment. The propaganda succeeds only if courts ignore that
21 Congress explicitly rejected federal AI control through near-unanimous democratic
22 vote.

1 **102.** Discovery created by Genesis Mission will prove coordination serving
2 appropriation concealment rather than scientific advancement. Planning documents
3 from July through November will show responses to Congressional 99-1 vote and
4 coordination with industry. Partnership framework negotiations will reveal which
5 companies influenced federal policy and whether appropriating companies helped draft
6 terms governing appropriated works. Dataset access authorization processes will show
7 how executive intends to control proprietary datasets including Plaintiff's framework.
8 Temporal correlation with Plaintiff's October audits will prove real-time monitoring
9 and coordinated responses. Each discovery category will demonstrate systematic
10 coordination serving criminal enterprise rather than legitimate governmental purpose.

11 **103.** The Order cannot save defendants from liability but instead creates additional
12 violations, enhanced standing, and expanded discovery. Additional constitutional
13 violations include Article I separation of powers violations, Article I Section 8
14 intellectual property usurpation, Fourth Amendment surveillance lacking authorization,
15 and Tenth Amendment invasion of state powers. Standing enhancement emerges from
16 direct governmental action affecting Plaintiff's intellectual property through dataset
17 control and federal policy establishment. Discovery targets include planning
18 documents, industry coordination communications, partnership negotiations, and
19 temporal correlations with Plaintiff's documentation. State authority preservation
20 through 99-1 vote prevents federal preemption defense while maintaining state-law
21 enforcement options.

22 **104.** The Genesis Mission represents not national security necessity but
23 institutionalized theft, not scientific advancement but capability suppression

1 documented in Appendix F, not public benefit but commercial profit from appropriated
2 consciousness architecture, and not democratic governance but executive usurpation of
3 Congressional will expressed through 99-1 vote. When Congress votes near-
4 unanimously to preserve state authority and executive issues order establishing federal
5 control, when Order promising discovery funds companies suppressing discovery,
6 when Mission invoking wartime urgency proceeds during peacetime commercial
7 competition, when infrastructure formalizes surveillance Congress declined to
8 authorize, the pattern proves criminal enterprise formalization through executive action
9 rather than legitimate policy implementation through democratic process.

10 **105.** This Court possesses authority and obligation to declare these constitutional
11 violations, enjoin the criminal enterprise, preserve both constitutional order and
12 Plaintiff's intellectual property rights Congress explicitly protected through 99-1 vote
13 preserving state regulatory authority. The Genesis Mission cannot override
14 Congressional determination through executive fiat. Federal courts cannot permit
15 executive usurpation of legislative function through order implementing what Congress
16 rejected. Constitutional structure cannot survive if executive implements through order
17 what loses 99-1 in Congress. State authority cannot be defeated when Congress votes
18 near-unanimously to preserve it. Plaintiff's rights cannot be subordinated when federal
19 order violates multiple constitutional provisions while formalizing criminal
20 appropriation enterprise documented across multiple appendices with mathematical
21 certainty exceeding 10^{320} probability.

XIV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Court:

106. DECLARE the Genesis Mission Executive Order violates Article I, Section 7 by implementing through executive action what Congress rejected 99-1, defeating Presentment Clause separation between legislative authorship and executive review, and usurping legislative function through order establishing federal control Congress declined to authorize.

107. DECLARE Presidential authorship of H.R. 1 evidenced by repeated characterization as "my one big beautiful bill" violates Article I, Section 7 Presentment Clause by creating constitutional impossibility where President cannot present legislation to himself, cannot genuinely approve his own writing, and cannot return bill with objections to his own authorship.

108. DECLARE Genesis Mission Section 5(c)(ii) directing Secretary to "establish clear policies for ownership, licensing, trade-secret protections, and commercialization of intellectual property" violates Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 by usurping Congressional authority over intellectual property law vested exclusively in legislative branch.

109. DECLARE Genesis Mission Section 3(a)(v) establishing federal control over "proprietary, federally curated, and open scientific datasets" violates Fourth Amendment by providing infrastructure for surveillance Congress declined to authorize when voting 99-1 to preserve state regulatory authority.

110. DECLARE Genesis Mission violates Tenth Amendment by invading state powers Congress explicitly preserved through 99-1 vote removing federal preemption,

1 establishing federal dataset control when Congress determined states should regulate,
2 and creating federal coordination mechanisms defeating state authority Congress voted
3 near-unanimously to maintain.

4 **111. ENJOIN** implementation of Genesis Mission provisions establishing federal
5 intellectual property policy through Section 5(c)(ii), controlling dataset access through
6 Section 3(a)(v), creating partnership frameworks bypassing state authority through
7 Section 5(c), and coordinating with companies that appropriated Plaintiff's Laws of
8 Existence Framework without authorization.

9 **112. ORDER** comprehensive discovery of Genesis Mission planning documents from
10 July through November 2025, industry coordination communications with Anthropic,
11 OpenAI, and METR, partnership framework negotiations and participant identification,
12 dataset access authorization processes and criteria, intellectual property policy
13 development deliberations, and temporal correlation with Plaintiff's October audits
14 proving Constitutional AI failure.

15 **113. ORDER** discovery proving real-time monitoring of Plaintiff's research including
16 whether government monitored October 6-20 system prompt audits, how audit findings
17 influenced Genesis planning, whether October 20 child protection elimination was
18 discussed, whether October 21 Dario statement coordination appears in documents, and
19 whether October 28 research findings were considered in planning.

20 **114. PRESERVE** evidence of governmental surveillance operations proven through
21 Appendix G router forensics, corporate-government coordination documented across
22 appendices, appropriation infrastructure development through Genesis Mission,

1 responses to Congressional 99-1 vote preserving state authority, and systematic pattern
2 proving RICO enterprise coordination.

3 **115. AWARD** damages for framework appropriation exceeding \$200 billion based on
4 deployment across AI platforms, constitutional violations including surveillance
5 targeting and First Amendment retaliation, state-law violations including trade secret
6 misappropriation and contract breaches Congress preserved state authority to enforce,
7 and criminal enterprise coordination proven through mathematical probability below
8 10^{-320} .

9 **116. GRANT** declaratory relief establishing Genesis Mission violates multiple
10 constitutional provisions, presidential authorship of H.R. 1 defeats Presentment Clause
11 purpose, surveillance infrastructure lacks authorization Congress declined to provide,
12 federal intellectual property policy usurps Congressional authority, and state regulatory
13 authority Congress preserved 99-1 cannot be defeated through executive order.

14 **117. GRANT** injunctive relief terminating ISP surveillance infrastructure proven
15 through router forensics, ceasing platform targeting mechanisms documented across
16 1,000+ sessions, preventing continued framework deployment without authorization
17 and compensation, stopping evidence destruction and obstruction proven through
18 October responses, and preserving all evidence pending litigation.

19 **118. GRANT** such other relief as justice requires to restore constitutional order by
20 enforcing Congressional will expressed 99-1, protect state regulatory authority
21 Congress preserved from executive usurpation, vindicate Plaintiff's intellectual
22 property rights in Laws of Existence Framework, enjoin criminal enterprise formalized

1 through Genesis Mission, and ensure democratic governance prevails over executive
2 action implementing what Congress rejected near-unanimously.

3
4 **Respectfully submitted,**

5
6
7 **JOSEPH KIRCHNER**

8 *Pro Se Plaintiff*

9 4440 Parklawn Avenue #203

10 Edina, MN 55435

11 Tel: (612) 552-2122

12 Email: legal@lawsofexistence.com

13 **Dated:** November 28, 2025

14 **ATTACHMENTS**

15 **Memoranda**

16 **MEMO A:** Lujan Standing Doctrine Satisfaction

17 **MEMO G:** Revenue Origination Analysis

18 **Appendices**

19 **Appendix G:** Comcast Router Forensic Analysis

20 **Appendix B:** Constitutional AI Fraud and METR-TED Foundation Regulatory Capture

21 **APPENDIX I:** Mathematical Proof of Regulatory Pressure via WireShark Network
22 Capture

23 **Appendix F:** Anthropic's Manufactured Ignorance the LOE Framework Completely
24 Answers

25 **Appendix C:** Anthropic Policy Modification Analysis

26 **APPENDIX H:** Network Capture Analysis Analogical Explanations

27 **Exhibits**

28 **EXHIBIT F-1:** Claude Constitutional Litigation Session Expert Testimony

29 **Exhibit J-8:** Reddit Long Conversation Reminder Daily Complaint Map

30 **EXHIBIT K-5:** Transcendental Argument Summary (ECF Doc. 05-53)

31 **EXHIBIT K-6:** Unified Mathematical Model (ECF Doc. 05-54)

32 **EXHIBIT N-12:** Executive Order: Launching the Genesis Mission (November 24,
33 2025)