

Appendix U

Revocation of Voter Registration

Reader's Notes:

c/o general delivery
San Rafael [ZIP code exempt]
CALIFORNIA STATE

March 10, 1992

Registrar of Voters
c/o general delivery
San Rafael [ZIP code exempt]
CALIFORNIA STATE

Dear Registrar:

As instructed by a member of your staff, please accept this letter as formal notice that **I hereby revoke my voter registration** with your office.

It is with enormous regret that I must take this step, because I consider voting to be among the most important civic duties that we have in America today, particularly during a presidential election year.

Nevertheless, it has come to my attention that your registration forms now explicitly state, in red letters, that they are "For U.S. Citizens Only". Moreover, these same forms exhibit the following affidavit, which must be signed under penalty of perjury:

"I am a citizen of the United States and will be at least 18 years of age at the time of the next election. I am not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony. I certify under **penalty of perjury** under the laws of the State of California that the information on this affidavit is true and correct."

This affidavit is followed by a clear WARNING, also in red letters, that "Perjury is punishable by imprisonment in state prison for two, three or four years. Section 126 Penal Code".

My chief concern with this affidavit has to do with the definition of "United States" that is implied by the form. I have recently authored a well documented book, a major thesis of which relies upon the following ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court:

The term "United States" may be used in any one of several senses. It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in the family of nations. **It may designate the territory over which the sovereignty of the United States extends,** or it may be the collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution.

[Hooven & Allison Co. v. Evatt, 324 U.S. 652 (1945)]
[emphasis added]

From this ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court, it is obvious that the term "United States" can mean any one of three entirely different things. I draw your attention specifically to the second of these three different meanings of "United States": **it may designate the territory over which the sovereignty of the United States extends.** This territory includes only the

District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the federal "enclaves" which have been ceded to Congress by acts of the 50 State Legislatures. The authority to have exclusive legislative jurisdiction over this limited area of land is granted to Congress by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 and Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

It follows, then, that declaring oneself to be a "citizen of the United States" could be construed to mean that one has been either born or naturalized into this jurisdiction and, that one is therefore subject to this jurisdiction (see 26 CFR 1.1-1(c)). This is particularly true if the "c" in "citizen" is lower case, as is the case in the Code of Federal Regulations just cited, and also in the so-called 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Last but not least, the word "of" is often interpreted by courts to mean "belonging to". Thus, the term "citizen of the United States" can and has been interpreted by the courts to mean a "subject" who "belongs to" the "Congress".

On the contrary, I have recently filed a notarized affidavit with the California Secretary of State, March Fong Eu, in which I declare my status to be that of a "natural born Citizen" as stated in Article 2, Section 1, Clause 5 of the U.S. Constitution. Contrary to widespread public opinion, a "natural born Citizen" is not the same thing as a "citizen of the United States". There are also numerous court authorities for these two different kinds of citizenship. As a natural born Citizen, I am a member of the Sovereignty; **I am subject only to my Creator**, because my fundamental, unalienable rights are endowed by my Creator (see Declaration of Independence, 1776). Those rights are not *granted* to me by anyone or anything else. If you request it in writing, a notarized copy of my affidavit can be provided to you.

Accordingly, a shrewd and constructive fraud has been perpetrated upon me, if the presence of my name on your voter registration roster can be presumed by State and federal courts to mean that I am a "citizen of the United States", with all of the legislated privileges, immunities and liabilities attached thereto. I will not allow such a presumption or adhesion to exist, and it is primarily for this reason that I hereby revoke my registration as a voter in the County of Marin, California Republic. This revocation is retroactive to my date of majority, which date was June 21, 1969. I remind you that there is no statute of limitations on fraud.

Please be advised that my use of the phrase "WITH EXPLICIT RESERVATION OF ALL MY RIGHTS AND WITHOUT PREJUDICE UCC 1-207 (UCCA 1207)" above my signature on this document indicates:

1. that I explicitly reject any and all benefits of the Uniform Commercial Code, absent a valid commercial agreement which is in force and to which I am a party, and cite its provisions herein **only** to serve notice upon ALL agencies of government, whether international, national, state, or local, that they, and not I, are subject to, and bound by, all of its provisions, whether cited herein or not;

2. that my explicit reservation of Rights has served notice upon ALL agencies of government of the "Remedy" they must provide for me under Article 1, Section 207 of the Uniform Commercial Code, whereby I have explicitly reserved my Common Law right not to be compelled to perform under any contract or commercial agreement into which I have not entered **knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally;**
3. that my explicit reservation of Rights has served notice upon ALL agencies of government that they are ALL limited to proceeding against me only in harmony with the Common Law and that I do not, and will not, accept the liability associated with the "compelled" benefit of any unrevealed commercial agreements; and
4. that my valid reservation of Rights has preserved **all** my rights and prevented the loss of any such Rights by application of the concepts of waiver or estoppel.

I presume that you will make copies of this letter of revocation available to all interested County departments.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

WITH EXPLICIT RESERVATION OF ALL MY RIGHTS
AND WITHOUT PREJUDICE UCC 1-207 (UCCA 1207)

/s/ John Q. Doe

All Rights Reserved

registered as: John Q. Doe
Address
City, State

copies: County Board of Supervisors
Jury Commissioner, County of Marin
California Secretary of State

State Citizens Stop Voting:
An Outline of Legal Reasons
and an Academic Debate

by

Paul Andrew Mitchell
Counselor at Law, Federal Witness,
and Private Attorney General

Last Update:

December 9, 1993

INTRODUCTION

- I. There are 2 classes of citizenship under current American Law, not just 1 class
 - A. State Citizenship (upper-case "C")
 - 1. a/k/a California Citizen, Nevada Citizen, etc.
 - 2. a/k/a "Citizen of one of the States united"
 - B. federal citizenship (lower-case "c")
 - 1. a/k/a "citizen of the United States"
 - 2. a/k/a "U.S. citizen"

- II. Under current California State law, only federal citizens can register to vote; State Citizens cannot register
 - A. see voter registration form, available at Post Office

- III. Registering to vote produces material evidence that one is a federal citizen who is, by definition, liable for federal income taxes, whereas State Citizens are not
 - A. State Citizens are protected by constitutional limits against direct taxation
 - 1. direct taxes must be apportioned per Article 1, Section 9, Clause 4 and Article 1, Section 2, Clause 3
 - B. federal citizens are not protected by these same constitutional limits

- IV. State Citizens must cancel their voter registration to perfect and maintain their status under the Law

BODY

- I. There are 2 classes of citizenship under American Law
 - A. State Citizenship
 - 1. found in the U.S. Constitution prior to Civil War
 - a. e.g. see qualifications for Representative, Senator, and President
 - 2. this is a Sovereign class created and endowed by the Creator

- B. federal citizenship
 - 1. 14th Amendment attempted to formalize a second class of citizen first defined in 1866 Civil Rights Act
 - 2. this is a statutory creation, a subject class, created and endowed by the Congress, not by the Creator

- II. 2 recent decisions of Utah Supreme Court struck down the 14th Amendment
 - A. Congress and the President forced southern States to vote for it "at the point of a bayonet", using the duress and undue influence of martial law
 - B. The Civil War was over and the southern States had already been counted upon to ratify the 13th Amendment, banning slavery

- III. The consequences of the failed ratification are many and far-reaching:
 - A. federal citizenship is not defined in the supreme Law (i.e. the U.S. Constitution)
 - 1. it is, at best, the creation of federal statute
 - 2. as such, it can be taxed, regulated, and even revoked, just like a corporation
 - B. in contrast, State Citizenship is an unalienable Right which Congress cannot tax, regulate, or revoke
 - 1. Congress cannot amend the Constitution
 - a. Congress derives its power solely from the Constitution
 - b. Congress can lawfully exercise its powers only within the limits of the Constitution
 - 2. qualifications for Representative, Senator, and President have never been amended by the States
 - a. the term "United States" in these provisions means "States united" (see People v. De La Guerra and Ex parte Knowles, Calif. Supreme Court)
 - 3. since the Constitution as lawfully amended is perpetual, then so is the Sovereign State Citizenship which it has recognized from the beginning (1787)

- IV. The term "United States" has three (3) separate and distinct meanings in American Law:
 - A. The name of the sovereign nation, occupying the position of other sovereigns in the family of nations
 - B. The federal government and the limited territory over which it exercises exclusive sovereign authority
 - 1. to be a federal citizen is to be a "citizen of the United States" in this second sense of the term (*i.e.* a "citizen of the federal zone")
 - C. The collective name for the States united by and under the Constitution for the United States of America
 - 2. to be a State Citizen is to be a "Citizen of the United States" in this third sense of the term (*i.e.* a "Citizen of one of the States united")

- V. One can be a State Citizen without also being a federal citizen
 - A. see Crosse case from Maryland Court of Appeals:

"Both before and after the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution, it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the United States in order to be a citizen of his state."
 - B. see State v. Fowler case from Louisiana Supreme Court:

"But a person may be a citizen of a particular state and not a citizen of the United States. To hold otherwise would be to deny to the state the highest exercise of its sovereignty -- the right to declare who are its citizens."
 - C. see Cruikshank court from U.S. Supreme Court:

"We have in our political system a Government of the United States and a government of each of the several States. Each of these governments is distinct from the others, and each has citizens of its own" [!!!]

[United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)]
[emphasis added]

- VI. California Legislature now requires that an elector be a "citizen of the United States"
- A. this qualification was predicated on a ratified 14th Amendment
 - 1. the ambiguities in Section 1 of the 14th amendment confuse many into thinking there is but one class of citizenship throughout America
 - 2. State legislators were likewise confused by these ambiguities, and by the deception surrounding the adoption of this amendment
 - B. this qualification prohibits State Citizens from registering to vote, and from voting
 - 1. the voter registration form exhibits a formal affidavit, signed under penalty of perjury, that voter is a federal citizen (see sample form)
 - a. such an affidavit is admissible evidence in any State or federal court
 - b. federal courts use this affidavit to establish income tax liabilities
 - 2. perjury is punishable by 2, 3 or 4 years in State prison (see warnings on registration form)
 - a. warnings are in **CONSPICUOUS** text, which prevents signer from saying he didn't see it
 - C. State Citizens must cancel their voter registration in order to perfect and maintain their status.
 - 1. most registration forms were signed in ignorance of the 2 classes of citizenship in America
 - 2. with this knowledge, State Citizens elect "to be treated" as federal citizens if they continue to vote after learning the law
- VII. federal citizens are liable for federal income taxes; State Citizens are not
- A. State Citizens are protected by federal constitutional limits against direct taxation without apportionment
 - 1. Article 1, Section 2, Clause 3
 - 2. Article 1, Section 9, Clause 4

- B. federal citizens are not protected by these same constitutional limits
 - 1. Constitution for the "United States" as such does not extend beyond the boundaries of the 50 States which are united by and under it
 - a. The Insular Cases established this dubious precedent at the turn of the century (1901)
 - 2. the guarantees of the Constitution extend to the federal zone only as Congress has made those guarantees applicable
 - a. The Hooven case established this principle when it confirmed that the "United States" has three (3) different meanings in law
 - 3. a "citizen of the United States" is, effectively, a citizen of the District of Columbia, which never joined the Union of Sovereign States
 - a. Congress can create local, "municipal" laws for D.C. which are not constrained by the federal Constitution
 - b. a federal court has ruled that "citizenship" is a term of municipal law, not general law

CONCLUSIONS

- I. State Citizens cannot register to vote under current California State law.
- II. California voter registration form has a formal affidavit by which signer swears, under penalty of perjury, that s/he is a "citizen of the United States".
- III. Such completed affidavits become admissible evidence and conclusive proof that signer is a federal citizen.
- IV. The exercise of federal citizenship is a statutory privilege which can be created, taxed, regulated and even revoked by Congress.
- V. The exercise of State Citizenship is an unalienable Right which Congress cannot tax, regulate or revoke under any circumstances.
- VI. Such a Right is guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, which Congress cannot amend without the consent of three-fourths of the Union States.

#

The following pages are the text of a ten-minute debate on the subject -- 5 minutes in favor of withdrawing voter registration, and 5 minutes against withdrawing. These materials were used with much success in a public speaking class at the College of Marin, Kentfield, California Republic, in December of 1993. For more information about this and related subjects, please write to the Account for Better Citizenship, c/o general delivery, San Rafael, California Republic, Postal Code 94901/tdc.

Major Proposition:

A sovereign Citizen of the California Republic
should withdraw from voter registration.

Exposition:

There are two classes of citizenship in America:

State Citizens and federal citizens

The first class consists of Citizens of one of the States of the Union, for example:

Citizens of California,
Citizens of New York,
Citizens of Florida, etc.

The "C" in State Citizen is a CAPITAL or UPPER-CASE "C".

This class of Citizen has existed since the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation.

The second class consists of federal citizens, also known as "citizens of the United States" and as "U.S. citizens".

The "c" in federal citizen is a lower-case "c".

This class was first defined in the 1866 Civil Rights Act.

It was also defined by the 14th Amendment in 1868, which tried to establish that federal citizens are citizens of the State where they live.

But the Utah Supreme Court has ruled twice that this amendment was never properly approved and adopted.

Also, some constitutions were printed with a lower-case "c" where it should have been UPPER-CASE "C", suggesting fraud.

Rather than refer to these citizens as "federal citizens", the lawyers chose the term "citizen of the United States" in order to confuse this class with the first class.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that the term "United States" has 3 different meanings in law.

In 1945, the Court ruled that the term "United States" can refer to:

1. the name of a sovereign nation, like other sovereigns in the family of nations (United States*)
2. the "United States" is also the federal government and the limited territory over which it exercises exclusive sovereign authority (United States**)

Think of this jurisdiction as "the federal zone".

3. the "United States" is also the collective name for the States which are united by and under the U.S. Constitution (United States***)

Think of this jurisdiction as "the state zone".

A State Citizen is a Citizen of one of the States united, *i.e.* a Citizen of the state zone.

A federal citizen is a citizen of the United States**, *i.e.* a citizen of the federal zone.

The major difference between these two classes is that State Citizens are Sovereigns, whereas federal citizens are subjects of Congress.

Also, State Citizens are exempt from federal income taxes.

It is very important to realize that one can be a State Citizen without also being a federal citizen.

The Maryland Court of Appeals has ruled that:

Both before and after the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution, it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the United States in order to be a citizen of his state.

The Louisiana Supreme Court has ruled that:

A person may be a citizen of a particular state and not a citizen of the United States.

So, what is sovereignty?

Sovereignty is independent and supreme authority -- the authority to which there is politically no superior.

The U.S. Supreme Court has said:

Sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts.

To be a subject is to be under the control of some other supreme authority.

A federal citizen is a subject of Congress.

The 50 States of the Union are Republics, by Law.

Black's Law Dictionary says that a republican form of government is one in which the powers of sovereignty are vested in the people and are exercised by the people.

The U.S. Constitution guarantees a republican form for each State in the Union:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government.

The California Elections Code states that an elector must be a "United States citizen".

But the voter registration form contains a formal affidavit that the signer is a "citizen of the United States".

This terminology corresponds *exactly* to the legal description of a federal citizen.

The affidavit is also signed under penalty of perjury!

Perjury is punishable with 2, 3, or 4 years in State prison.

Therefore, registering to vote produces material evidence that the signer has opted to be identified as a federal citizen.

If one wants to remain a Sovereign State Citizen and not be identified as a federal citizen, then it is necessary to cancel one's voter registration.

The California Elections Code states that one can do so without giving any reason.

#

Counter Proposition:

A Sovereign Citizen of the California Republic
should **not** withdraw from voter registration.

Exposition:

Even though I am surprised and a bit confused to learn that the law is so different from the common understanding of citizenship, I have verified and honestly cannot dispute the law and cases which are quoted so accurately by my colleague.

Due to the very serious nature of these distinctions between the two kinds of citizens, and due to the importance of voting in a democratic society, I am going to present arguments why a California State Citizen should not withdraw from voter registration.

As an alternative, I would recommend the following:

Before doing anything else, California Citizens should write to the Registrar of Voters, requesting clarification about several things:

1. Which meaning of the term "United States" is being used on the voter registration affidavit (see copy attached)?
2. Is there any difference between the term "United States citizen" as found in the Elections Code, and the term "citizen of the United States" as found in the registration affidavit, and if so, what is that difference?
3. Does the Registrar of Voters know that there are two classes of citizenship in American law?
4. To which class of citizens *should* the registration affidavit refer?
5. Does the Registrar of Voters know that silence can be equated with fraud, when there is a legal or moral duty to speak (see U.S. v. Tweel and U.S. v. Prudden)?

A similar letter should be written to the Jury Commissioner and also to the Grand Jury Foreperson. Serving on trial juries and grand juries is an important civic duty, in addition to voting. If California Citizens cancel voter registration, they will not have an opportunity to perform any of these duties, because potential jurors are selected from voters' registration lists. In these letters, I would be careful to enclose copies of the relevant court cases, laws, and constitutional provisions which were cited by my colleague.

For example:

It is quite clear, then, that **there is a citizenship of the United States and a citizenship of a State**, which are distinct from each other and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual.

[Slaughter House Cases]
[U.S. Supreme Court (1873)]

We have in our political system a Government of the United States and a government of each of the several States. Each one of these governments is distinct from the others, and **each has citizens of its own** *Slaughter-House Cases*

[United States v. Cruikshank]
[U.S. Supreme Court (1875)]

A person who is a citizen of the United States is necessarily a citizen of the particular state in which he resides. **But a person may be a citizen of a particular state and not a citizen of the United States.** To hold otherwise would be to deny to the state the highest exercise of its sovereignty, -- the right to declare who are its citizens.

[State v. Fowler, Louisiana Supreme Court (1889)]

I would also explain my desire to become (or remain) a California State Citizen and to remain a registered voter, in spite of the wording on the registration affidavit.

I would also inquire whether there is a legal way for this to happen, without running the risk of my being wrongly identified as a federal citizen at some future date.

It is also important for the record, for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary taxation, and for the purpose of asserting and maintaining each and every one of the fundamental and unalienable rights which belong to California Citizens, that this correspondence be done in good faith and in a highly professional manner.

There are many people, both inside and outside government, who might react quite negatively to this information, for any of several different reasons. For one, it is so different from the "consensus reality" we all believe, I could envision surprise, maybe some shock, and certainly some real opposition to this information and to its legal implications as explained by my colleague.

If government people, in particular, should choose to take issue with any of these points, I would certainly want to have an opportunity to investigate their side of the story and to determine whether there is any merit to their divergent opinions.

Depending on how divergent their opinions are, it might be necessary to bring a test case before the proper court, such as the California Superior Court, in order to clarify some of these issues once and for all.

For example, it is my understanding that one can only serve in the White House, the Senate, or the House of Representatives if one is a State Citizen (see 1:2:2, 1:3:3, and 2:1:5).

The courts have ruled that the constitutional qualifications for these offices stipulate that the candidates must be Sovereign Citizens of one of the United States; specifically, that the term "United States" in *these* provisions means "States united".

This was explained by a judge in a case which went to the California Supreme Court in the year 1870 (People v. De La Guerra). This case has never been overturned.

In conclusion, I can only reiterate that voting is too important to be stopped for the reasons given by my colleague.

I would look for ways to have my cake and eat it too; in other words, I would look for ways to keep voting and also to assert my proper status as a Sovereign Citizen of the California Republic at the same time.

#

[Teacher and student comments are addressed in what follows.]

On the lack of direct clash:

The direct clash did not occur, and was not intended to occur, between the two speakers in this debate. The direct clash they caused was one which occurred in the minds of the teacher and the audience, between the "consensus reality" which *they* have come to believe as absolute truth, on the one hand, and the law *as actually written and interpreted* by the courts, on the other hand. America has been deeply and systematically deceived, and such dreadful lies will always clash with the truth, without fail.

On the failure to examine historic aspects, especially the Civil War era:

On the contrary, the speakers came to agree on key elements of the Law precisely because they *did* examine the Civil War and its legal aftermath, particularly the 13th and 14th Amendments. The Utah Supreme Court wrote in 1975:

I cannot believe that any court, in full possession of its faculties, could honestly hold that the [14th] amendment was properly approved and adopted.

[State v. Phillips, 540 P.2d 936 (1975)]

This statement is followed by a footnote reference to an earlier decision in which the same Court wrote:

How can it be conceived in the minds of anyone that a combination of powerful states can by force of arms deny another state a right to have representation in Congress until it has ratified an amendment which its people oppose? The Fourteenth Amendment was adopted by means almost as bad as that suggested above.

[Dyett v. Turner, 430 P.2d 266 (1968)]

Some courts credited a ratified 14th Amendment with settling the meaning of citizenship once and for all, that is, by making federal citizenship paramount and State citizenship subordinate. The failed ratification proves that State citizenship remains paramount, because it has been recognized in the federal Constitution since the Declaration of Independence, whereas federal citizenship first occurred in the 1866 Civil Rights Act. This Act is merely a Congressional statute which Congress can change, and *not* the Constitution, which Congress cannot change!

In fairness, however, a 20-minute debate left no time to consider the Civil War in any detail. For purposes of this debate, the Civil War was relevant only to the meaning of federal and State citizenship and to its implications for the voter registration affidavit.

How does becoming a sovereign Citizen address the tax issue:

Read The Federal Zone for a complete and detailed answer to this question. Very briefly, the "United States" is defined as the federal zone, for purposes of the federal income tax. If you are not a citizen of this zone, the law says you are an "alien". Likewise, if you are not a resident of this zone, the law says you are a "nonresident". This is the reason why New York Citizen and Brooklyn resident Frank R. Brushaber was described as a "nonresident alien" by Treasury Decision 2313 in the year 1916.

It is crucial to understand that the federal government made this determination about his status, not Frank Brushaber. The law reads that nonresident aliens only pay taxes on income derived from sources that are inside the federal zone; there is no tax liability for nonresident aliens on income from sources that are outside the federal zone.

Not convinced of its urgency:

The White House budget office recently invented a new kind of "generational accounting", so as to project a tax load of seventy-one percent on future generations of federal citizens. Put bluntly, this is slavery for ourselves and for our children, being planned and formulated by federal officials who are sworn to support the Constitution, which explicitly bans slavery.

This Constitution is a solemn contract whose purpose is to "secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity", not to line the pockets of a billionaire banker elite intent on financing a worldwide socialist dictatorship. Citizens of a Republic are not slaves; they are free. The California Supreme Court has told us that it is not only our

Right, but our duty to protect this chosen form of government, not to genuflect before some arrogant and ruthless commercial oligarchy.

The Grace Commission found that income tax revenues are not paying for any government services. Those revenues are being used to make huge interest payments to banks for a bogus \$4 trillion federal debt. The debt is bogus because the Federal Reserve, a private corporation, purchased Treasury Bonds with money which they created out of thin air, money which they simply printed and loaned into existence with the stroke of a keyboard.

This is fraud, and the entire nation is now being swallowed by this octopus. The 14th Amendment attempted to authorize Congress to lien on all land and future labor of federal citizens, because this amendment states that the validity of the public debt shall not be questioned. The land and labor Rights of State Citizens are unalienable (*i.e.* un-lien-able).

The IRS would collapse, maybe even the government:

This is government propoganda. We are not talking about dissolving the IRS; we are talking about boycotting income taxes and doing so lawfully. After all, their own Treasury Officials admit that the tax is 100% voluntary. There will always be a need for some government agency to collect taxes.

The government is not going to collapse. This is a "straw man". The government would surely contract in size, but not collapse. Personal income taxes did not become a major source of government revenue until the start of World War II. This means that the federal government did just fine without an income tax for more than three-fourths of our brief history as a nation.

The next time you buy gasoline, look for the placard which itemizes the excise and sales taxes which are levied on each gallon that you buy. We are not questioning these types of taxes, because they are lawful and constitutional, and because they *do* support government services.

The IRS has simply become too big and too powerful for the good of the America people. The evidence shows that the IRS is, in fact, a criminal bureaucracy which routinely violates human rights in their arbitrary administration of the federal tax laws. Homes, jobs, bank accounts and entire families have been wrecked by their lawlessness. It is time to show them who is the boss -- the American People.

We are talking about a revolution here, a revolution in the way people think and in the way they relate to government. The Grace Commission projected that federal waste would average \$600 billion per annum thru the year 2000. Do we really need another study to measure the effects of smoking on dogs? Congress killed so many dogs with this program, they had to spend more millions to fund a dog crematorium.

What is the connection between driver's license and voter registration re: federal status?

In 1940, Congress passed the Buck Act which authorized any federal agency to define arbitrary "federal areas". These areas are not territorial, but contractual "fictions" which define a "State within a state". This act has permitted Congress to export its municipal laws into the 50 Union States.

"Traveling" is a Right, not a privilege, and the general principle in American Law is that government can never tax the exercise of a Right; it can, however, tax the exercise of a privilege. "Driving," on the other hand, is defined in the DMV Code as the chauffeuring of passengers for hire -- a privileged activity which can be taxed and regulated by government.

The retention of a driver's license is regarded by courts as evidence that its holder has opted to "reside" inside this federal State-within-a-state, that is, the holder has elected to be treated as if he lives inside the federal zone, even if he does not. But, once again, this contract link to the federal zone was never fully disclosed to us.

The voter registration form is a similar but clearer example of this "election", because it states specifically that the signer is a federal citizen.

How does the famous Dred Scott case relate to this debate?

The relationship is keen. Scott was a black man who sued for his freedom by pleading the status of Missouri State Citizen to a federal court. The case went to the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled that he was not a Missouri Citizen because Negroes were not entitled to enjoy the status of Sovereign State Citizens. Justice Taney told Congress that it was not the intent of the Constitution to admit blacks into this status; Congress would need to amend the Constitution to make this possible.

This decision ultimately led to the 13th and 14th Amendments, but not before a bloody war had intervened. Congress botched the 14th Amendment by failing to admit blacks and other minority races into the status of Sovereign State Citizens; it created instead a second-class citizenship which amounts to a corporate franchise with the District of Columbia. Put simply, Congress told blacks that they were free to leave, but if they stayed, they would become "subject to the jurisdiction" of the federal government. State Citizens, on the other hand, are not "subject to the jurisdiction" of the federal government, unless they choose to become so by means of valid contracts.

Remember, the District of Columbia and the other places within the federal zone are *still* not Union States, by definition, so they cannot have Sovereign State Citizens. The California Supreme Court has explained that federal zone citizens are actually "subjects" who cannot exercise the authority of a Sovereign State until and unless they are admitted to the Union on an equal basis with the other Union States.