If there ever has been a departure from the original intent of the Constitution, no greater departure has ever occurred than that involving Article I, Section 8, Clause 17.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, reads:

The Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District as may, by cession on particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings.

Originally, this clause was understood to incorporate four very important principles.

First, it was understood that the federal government could not hold land within an incorporated State except by purchase; and second, that such a holding of land could not occur except by consent of the legislature of the State involved.

And third, that such a holding of land was to include every species of power and jurisdiction which the state had possessed, exclusive of any state authority or jurisdiction.

And forth, the federal government could not hold the land for any purpose, other than those purposes which were enumerated within the clause itself.

As it stands today, the Supreme Court has set aside every principle of importance which was incorporated into the enclave clause - which leaves the States wide open to complete dominance by the federal government. No longer does the federal government seek consent before purchasing land within a State. No longer do they bother to seek consent for the exercise of jurisdiction over any lands claimed or purchased. The feds now buy any amount of land they wish within a State at any time they wish, and they exercises complete and absolute jurisdiction over it to the complete exclusion, if they so chose, of the State, the State Constitution, and the federal Constitution. Under such authority as the Supreme Court has now allowed Congress, State law only applies to the extent that feds or Congress allow it to apply.

The original intent of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17

While the Continental Congress was meeting in Philadelphia on June 20, 1783, soldiers from Lancaster, Pennsylvania, arrived "to obtain a settlement of accounts, which they supposed they had a better chance for at Philadelphia than at Lancaster."

The mutinous soldiers presented themselves, drawn up in the street before the state-house, where Congress had assembled. The executive council of the state, sitting under their same roof, was called on for the proper interposition. President Dickinson [of Pennsylvania] came in and explained the difficulty, under actual circumstances, of bringing out the militia of the place for the suppression of the mutiny. He thought that without some outrages on persons or property, the militia could not be relied on...

In the mean time, the soldiers remained in their position, without offering any violence, individuals only, occasionally, uttering offensive words, and, wantonly pointing their muskets to the windows of the hall of Congress. No danger from premeditated violence was apprehended, but it was observed that spirituous drink, from the tippling-houses adjoining, began to be liberally served out to the soldiers, and might lead to hasty excesses...

The harassment by the soldiers which began on June 20, 1783, continued through June 24, 1783. On the latter date, the members of Congress abandoned hope that the State authorities would disperse the soldiers, and the Congress removed itself from Philadelphia...

The Congress then met in Princeton, and thereafter in Trenton, New Jersey, Annapolis, Maryland, and New York City. There was apparently no repetition of the experience which led to Congress' removal from Philadelphia. However, the members of the Continental Congress did not lightly dismiss the Philadelphia incident from their minds. On October 7, 1783, the Congress, while meeting in Princeton, New Jersey, adopted the following resolution:

That buildings for the use of Congress be erected in or near the banks of the Delaware, provided a suitable district can be procured on or near the banks of the said river, for a federal town; and that the right of soil, and an exclusive or such other jurisdiction as Congress may direct, shall be vested in the United States...

In the intervening period, a variety of considerations were advanced in the Constitutional Convention affecting the establishment of the seat of the new government, and a number of them were concerned with the problem of assuring the security and integrity of the new government against interference by any of the States...

The following record of Constitutional Convention's proceedings can be found in the Report Of The Interdepartmental Committee For The Study Of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within The States, Part II, June 1957, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, DC.

The genesis of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, of the Constitution, is to be found in proposals made by Madison and Pinchney on August 18, 1787... On September 5, 1787, the committee of eleven, to whom the proposals of Madison and Pinchney had been referred, proposed that the following power be granted to Congress:

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular states and the acceptance of the legislature, become the seat of government for the United States; and to exercise like authority over all places purchased for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings.

... The debate concerning the proposal of the committee of eleven was brief, and agreement concerning it was reached quickly, on the day of the submission of the proposal to the Convention. The substance of the debate concerning this provision was reported by Madison as follows:

So much of the fourth clause as related to the seat of government was agreed to, nem. con.

On the residue, to wit, "to exercise like authority over all places purchased for forts, &c."

MR. GERRY contended that this power might be made use of to enslave any particular state by buying up its territory, and that the strongholds proposed would be a means of awing the state into an undue obedience to the general government.

MR. KING thought himself the provision unnecessary, the power being already involved; but would move to insert, after the word "purchased," the words, "by the consent of the legislature of the state." This would certainly make the power safe.

MR. GOUVERNEUR MORRIS seconded the motion, which was agreed to, nem. con.; as was then the residue of the clause, as amended.

The report goes on to state, "There appears to be no question but that the requirement was added simply to foreclose the possibility that a State might be destroyed by the purchase by the Federal Government of all of the property within the State."

awe; power to inspire dread or fear.