

# Choose Who You Will Serve

by Alfred Adask

Several articles in Volume 10 No. 1 explored the concept of citizenship. This next article continues that exploration with a series of email which express common concerns about government abuse but neglect to consider the relevance of citizenship.

For example, the first segment of this article is based on an email entitled “9th Circuit Rules Murder OK If It’s Doing Your Job” from Jail4 Judges.<sup>1</sup> This email focused on the lawsuits and criminal charges that have stemmed from the 1992 standoff between federal agents and Randy Weaver’s family at the Weaver’s Ruby Ridge cabin.<sup>2</sup>

I suspect that the Weaver case may illustrate something important about the nature of citizenship. I’ve reprinted excerpts from the email below in brown and interjected my own comments in black or [bracketed] text.

**S**hould federal agents who killed a woman and child and wounded two men at Ruby Ridge be immune from prosecution or lawsuits simply because they were doing their jobs?

The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals has answered that question two different ways [criminally, he could not be prosecuted; civilly, he could] — and it’s now being asked to rule again.

“The case is highly significant, and raises issues of the greatest importance and of national concern,” said Stephen Yagman, a Los Angeles attorney who is working with Boundary County Prosecutor . . . to prosecute FBI sniper Lon Horiuchi for manslaughter. If Horiuchi can’t be charged, Yagman said, “This changes the entire law with respect to the use of force.”

Absolutely. If government agents are immune from prosecution for shooting unarmed mothers holding babies, they can get away with shooting anyone, anytime, for any reason. Of course, I don’t mean they can get away with shooting rich people, judges, lawyers or government officials. But niggers, wetbacks, and po’ white trash who (in government’s opinion) comprise about 80% of the population can surely be shot without legal repercussion.

“In its petition for rehearing, the county said it could have charged Horiuchi with second-

degree murder instead of manslaughter.”

Then why didn’t they? Professional courtesy for fellow government employees?

“When Horiuchi fired, he was ‘mindlessly shooting to kill on sight, firing blindly a 200-yard shot through a door,’ the petition states. ‘Mrs. Weaver was killed by a wild-headed government sniper in violation of our Constitution, and still is dead.’”

The allegation that Horiuchi was “mindless” and “wild-headed” justifies charging him with second-degree murder rather than first-degree murder — since first-degree requires evidence of intent. That is, to convict Horiuchi of first-degree murder, you’d have to show he *intended* to kill Vickie Weaver and did not shoot as a “mindless, wild-headed” sniper firing a random round in the general vicinity of the victims. Nevertheless, the prosecutor’s second-degree allegation is implausible. First, Horiuchi is reputed able to hit a target the size of a quarter at 100 yards. He is arguably one of the finest hit men who’s ever contracted to kill for the FBI. His reputation for accuracy belies any claim that he “accidentally” shot Vickie Weaver in the head.

The shot was almost certainly straight, true, intended and done on orders from his superiors. Further, if it were true that Horiuchi acted “mindlessly” when he “accidentally” shot Vickie Weaver, Horiuchi should’ve been relieved of duty by the FBI. Instead, Horiuchi went on to play a sniper role in the Waco siege. It’s inconceivable that the FBI, having suffered serious adverse public exposure by Horiuchi’s “mindless, wild-headedness” in Ruby Ridge would risk being badly exposed again by the same man in the super-sensitive stand-off at Waco.

“Boundary county tried to prosecute Horiuchi for manslaughter for Vickie Weaver’s death, but a three-judge panel of the 9th Circuit Court ruled 2-1 in June, 2000, that Horiuchi *couldn’t be charged*. The 9th Circuit’s Horiuchi ruling came under the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution, saying the *state* couldn’t prosecute Horiuchi for “actions taken in pursuit of his duties as a federal law enforcement officer.”

If the (corporate?) *state* can’t prosecute, what about *private* prosecution by the Weaver family?

“In that decision, dissenting Judge Alex Kozinski wrote that the decision “throws a monkey

wrench into our law governing the proper use of deadly force.” He added, “Perhaps most troubling, the opinion waters down the constitutional standard for the use of deadly force by *giving officers a license to kill* even when there is no immediate threat to human life, so long as the suspect is retreating to ‘take up a defensive position.’ This has never been the law in this circuit, or anywhere else I’m aware of, except in James Bond movies. I fear this change in our long-standing law.” [Emph. add.]

“The 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court’s ruling is being appealed. In the meantime, Harris’ \$10 million civil lawsuit against the federal *government* is also headed back to the 9th Circuit, after a U.S. district judge ruled last month that five of the eight agents Harris sued, including Horiuchi, *must stand trial*. . . .

Thus, it appears possible that while Horiuchi is not personally liable for criminal prosecution (under the common law?), the *government* may be civilly liable (under the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment?).

“Its earlier decision in the Harris case dealt with “qualified immunity,” a similar concept. In the June ruling, the majority of the court argued, “The two im-

munities are not the same, nor do they serve the same purposes. Immunity under the Supremacy Clause from state *criminal* prosecution may cover instances in which qualified [civil?] immunity does not apply.”

“Judge Kozinski responded, “This might be a plausible argument but for the fact that precisely the same test applies as to both: Did the officer act constitutionally? What protects an officer from civil and criminal liability is the lawfulness of his actions.” If the officer does something unlawful, Kozinski said, states should be able to enforce their criminal laws.

*Exactly!* But while it may be civilly unlawful to damage another 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-subject, it may not be criminally unlawful to kill the very same 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-subject. However, would it be criminal to kill that same person if that individual were not a 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-subject?

“Harris’ lawsuit charges that federal agents violated his 4th Amendment right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure and excessive force. He also alleges battery and false imprisonment.

If you read the definition of “Incorporation” in the 7<sup>th</sup> Edition of Black’s Law Dictionary, you’ll discover,

In all Chicagoland . . . there’s only one

## STONEBRIDGE VILLAGE

### APARTMENTS AND PENTHOUSES

A complex of 586 large apartments . . . in a 45-acre, beautifully landscaped park-like setting. Ten minutes from convenient shopping at Woodfield Mall. Only 45 minutes from the Chicago Loop.

Luxurious and innovative living accommodations plus a full range of recreational facilities for your to enjoy.

. . . and now offering

NEW REGAL SUITES



600 Rand Rd., Arlington Heights IL 60004  
(708) 394-3434

*“Constitutional law. The process of applying the provisions of the Bill of Rights to the states by interpreting the 14th Amendment’s Due Process Clause as encompassing those provisions. In a variety of opinions since 1897, the Supreme Court has incorporated all of the Bill of Rights *except* the following provisions: (1) the Second Amendment right to bear arms, (2) the Third Amendment prohibition of quartering soldiers, (3) the Fifth Amendment right to grand-jury indictment, (4) the Seventh Amendment right to a jury trial in a civil case, and (5) the Eighth Amendment prohibition of excessive bail and fines.”* (Emph. add.)

This doctrine of “incorporation” implies that only *some* of the rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights are available under the 14th Amendment, while other rights are not. If so, it follows that citizens under the 14th Amendment do not have all of the rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Thus, there must be two fundamental classes of citizenship: (1) those Citizens who enjoy all of the unalienable Rights granted by God, declared in the Declaration of 1776, and guaranteed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights; and (2), those 14th Amendment citizens how enjoy only some of those rights.

According to Black’s 7th, the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment has been fully “incorporated” under the 14<sup>th</sup>

Amendment and therefore Keven Harris (presumably a 14th Amendment citizen) suit against the government is lawful. But note that if Mr. Harris had sued under the 2nd or 5th Amendments, his suit might’ve been summarily dismissed since 14th Amendment citizens’ claim to those rights can’t fully sustained. Point: there are two kinds of citizenship, and your rights depend on which citizenship you claim.

**O**n the face of it, it’s hard to make sense of the courts’ seemingly inconsistent verdicts: The Weaver survivors can file civil charges against the federal government for damages they’ve suffered due to Sam and Vickie Weavers’ deaths, but the state can’t file criminal charges against the federal agents for actually killing Sam and Vickie Weaver.

It’s possible that we’re just witnessing another incomprehensible judicial aberration. More likely, we’re watching the courts respond to political pressures by 1) protecting government agents at all costs from the threat of criminal liability; and 2) quieting public discontent by throwing a few civil bones to the survivors in the form of million-dollar settlements.

But what if the courts decisions were neither idiotic or political? What if it is simultaneously “legal” for federal agents

to kill civilians, and for civilian survivors to sue the federal government for abuse? Is there a hypothesis that might explain that seeming inconsistency?

Consider the farmer’s cows. The farmer can milk his cows; take the cows’ calves and sell them for veal; he can even kill his cows and butcher them into steaks and roasts.

But what happens if I were to go to the farm and try to milk the cows? What happens if I try to sell the calves or butcher the cows? The farmer will charge me with trespass or theft.

Why can the farmer milk, rob or butcher the cows but I can’t? Because they’re *his* cows.

Likewise, why can government kill Sam and Vickie Weaver? Perhaps because they were government “cows”.

**C**itizenship is very similar to ownership. One of the citizenship articles in AntiShyster Volume 10 No. 1 provided a complex diagram for citizenship that essentially that essentially boiled down to the following “creator-creation hierarchy”:

- #1. God
- #2. Man (State Citizens) (1776)
- #3. Federal Government (1789)
- #4. 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens (1868)

A creator/creation relationship exists between each of those adjacent classifications that’s somewhat like an Army “chain of command”. The higher classification is always regarded as the creator of the immediately lower classification. The immediately lower classification is the creation, property and servant of the immediately higher classification.

Simply, #1 God created #2 Man (Citizens); #2 Man created the #3 government; which, in turn, created the #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens. In

## **Eliminate All Debts LEGALLY!**

**Guaranteed Process \* Money Back Guarantee**

For Information send (Postage & Copy Costs Donation) \$10 to:

**No Tax Academy**

1624 Savannah Road AS Lewes, Delaware (19958) - 9999

[www.peoples-rights.com](http://www.peoples-rights.com) or call toll-free (877) 544-4718

every case, the creation is not only bound to serve its creator, it is its creator's property. I.e, #2 Man is obligated to serve his Creator, #1 God; the #3 government is obligated to serve its creator #2 Man; #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens are obligated to serve their creator, #3 Congress.

Similarly, #1 God owns his creations, including #2 Man. And #2 Man owns his creations, including #3 government. And #3 government (Congress) owns its creations including #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens.

If #1 God wants to strike one of his #2 creations with a bolt of lightning, God has every right to do so. If #2 man wants to eliminate elements of his #3 government in order to make that government better serve him, he has every right to do so. Similarly, if #3 government wants to strike its #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens with fines, jail time - or bullets - it has every right to do so.

Just like the farmer can butcher his cows, but I can't, the government has the right to "butcher" its 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-cows.

Of course, no lower creation owns (and can therefore kill) its higher creator. #2 Man must simply accept and obey #1 God. #3 government must similarly accept and obey #2 Man (State Citizens). And #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens must similarly accept and obey #3 government.

I suspect that we are confused and even angry over the government's apparent abuse of our "rights" because we don't understand that some men are State Citizens (government's creators) while others are 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens (government's creations). Each class of citizenship carries different rights and duties. Some things that government is absolutely forbidden to do to one class, can be done with impunity to the

**Erwin Rommel School of Law**  
**2000 "Bivens" & R.I.C.O. Seminar**

Learn to sue Federal Actors – U.S. Attorneys, "Alphabet Soup Agency" workers, even Federal judges – Under "Bivens" & R.I.C.O. when they violate the law and your rights.

***Two Day, 12-hour Seminar***

**All videos, audios & copies of the course workbook =**  
**\$400.00 PPD.**

**Free Info-Pak**

Erwin Rommel School of Law  
Peter Jon Simpson  
c/o P.O. Box 211 Atwater, Minnesota 56209-0211

**320-857-2400**      **fax: -2401**

<http://members.aol.com/rommellaw>      [rommlaw@aol.com](mailto:rommlaw@aol.com)

other.

Americans are deceived into thinking we are still #2 (State) Citizens who created #3 government and that government is therefore obligated to serve (not kill) us. But #3 government regards us as #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens which it created and who are therefore obligated to serve government and, if necessary, die without recourse or complaint.

Based on the public's belief that we are #2 Citizens and #3 government is our creation and servant, it is absolutely criminal for #3 government agents to kill members of the #2 creator-public. But based on government's understanding of the law and presumption that virtually all of us are 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens, it is absolutely lawful for government agents to butcher 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment "cows" whenever it likes.

If farmers could talk to their cows, would they tell their cows that the nice barn and the fenced-in pasture were not designed to protect the cows but

to enslave them? Would farmers tell the cows that they're being kept so the farmer can steal their calves and milk and ultimately butcher them? Of course not.

If the cows understood what was really going on, they'd riot and that's bad for business. The farmer knows that he gets the most milk and best steaks from fat, contented cows. The farmer also knows the cows are big enough to stomp him flat if they ever realized what was really going on. Therefore, the clever farmer deceives his cows with a little corn, a few lies, and a friendly pat on the rump. As a result, the cows love their farmer. He's here to help them.

Similarly, should farmers butcher their cows right out in the pasture where all the other cows can see? Probably not. That would only stress the dumb beasts and reduce milk production or, worse, precipitate a riot in which the farmer might get stomped. So sensible farmers have learned to separate the cows due for slaughter, move 'em up a ramp into a truck that hauls 'em off to the meat pack-



# Your Ad Here!

\$75 for 5,000 downloads

\$200 for 20,000 downloads (1 cent/ download)

Current ad sizes & prices at <http://www.antishyster.com>  
under the "advertising" link

Send ad and check to: AntiShyster POB 540786 Dallas,  
Texas 75354-0786 The United States of America  
or email to: [adask@gte.net](mailto:adask@gte.net)

MC, Visa, & Amex call: 972-418-8993

ing plant. It's called "due process".

The problem with the Weaver case is that the farmers butchered a couple of cows right out in public where the rest of the dumb critters could see. As a result, some of the cows are beginning to understand what "human agriculture" is all about.

As a result, the "friendly farmers" have Public Relations problem since some of the surviving cows are scared, some are kicking, some are threatening to jump the fence. The cows must be calmed, assured that it was quite legal to butcher Sam and Vickie, and the beloved farmer was not responsible (please don't stomp the farmer!).

Fortunately, the cows aren't very bright, they have a short memory, and if the farmer takes a little extra corn from the rest of the herd and gives it to the cows most traumatized by seeing Sam and Vickie killed, they'll stop mooing and milk production will be back to normal in no time.

As for farmer Horiuchi, the government will not indict him criminally since doing so would "chill" all human agriculture by making all farmers afraid to butcher cows too uppity to surrender their calves and milk. It's simply inconceivable that farmers be prohibited from butchering cows, and therefore no such prohibition will be enforced.

But farmer Horiuchi is not yet

off the hook. Although there's nothing wrong with farmers killing their cows, it was bad business for farmer Horiuchi to butcher cow in public. He could therefore be penalized for a "due process" violation of failing to push the damn cow up the ramp and into the truck that hauls 'em off to the meat packing plant.

OK, I've pounded the cow analogy into hamburger, but here's the real point. The reason it's OK for Lon Horiuchi to kill Sam and Vickie Weaver is because the criminal indictment was based on the presumption that "SAMUEL" and "VICKIE WEAVER" were government-owned #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-cows while Lon Horiuchi was a #3 government agent. Based on their birth certificates, Social Security Numbers, voters registrations or some similar documents, Sam and Vickie were presumed to be SAM and VICKIE (government creations) and it's virtually impossible to charge government criminally for killing it's own cows.

However, if it had been made clear during their lives (or at least before trial) that Sam and Vickie Weaver were State or natural born Citizens of the class that created government, Lon Horiuchi (the agent of #3 government) would've been virtually defenseless to charges of first-degree murder and almost certainly would've been convicted,

imprisoned and possibly executed. As an agent for the #3 government-creation, it is blasphemy to kill members of the #2 Citizen-creators. In such circumstances, Horiuchi's only defense might be a claim that he acted as a #2 Citizen rather than a #3 government agent. But, so long as Vickie and Sam Weaver were deemed to be #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens, agent Horiuchi's superior #3 government status should be sufficient to beat the rap.

I suspect the determining factor in the Horiuchi criminal indictment was that FBI agent Horiuchi killed someone, but rather *who* he killed. Because a creation has virtually no rights against its creator, it's generally legal for #3 government agents to kill #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens (government's creations). Of course, it's still illegal for government agents to kill #2 Citizens (government's creators) who were created by (and property of) God. But during their lives and especially after they died, Sam and Vickie Weaver were deemed to be 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens. As a result, criminal charges against agent Horiuchi were almost as inconceivable as filing criminal charges against a farmer for butchering one of his cows.

## Health Care for the Pee-Pull!

Here's an excerpt from another email from [Demastus@aol.com](mailto:Demastus@aol.com) entitled "Oh, Those Poor, Poor People":

"The Consumers Union is out to rewrite our Constitution. They seem upset over the amount of money paid by poor folks for medical care. They've released a study called 'The Health Care Divide' that shows families with annual incomes of less than \$10,000 spend 17% of their income on health care (insurance premiums and out-of-pocket ex-

penses), those with \$45,000 annual income spend 6% on health care and those with more than \$100,000 spend 3% on health care. The study also found that one in six households headed by a person less than age 65 spends 10% or more of its income on health care.

**“The Consumers Union wants Congress to ‘establish, as a matter of law, that all people in this country have a right to comprehensive, affordable, quality health care coverage.’”**

The article’s author is critical of this claim to a health care “right”. His fundamental argument is that, “you can’t have a ‘right’ to health care without having a ‘right’ to a portion of some other person’s life or property.”

In other words, my “right” to health care necessarily imposes a duty on someone else to pay for my “free” pills and doctor services. At first glance, that means subjecting the pharmaceutical industry and doctors to involuntary servitude (prohibited by the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment). Even if we argue that the pill manufacturers and doctors will be paid for their work, that payment will be taken forcefully from taxpayers. Thus, taxpayers will be compelled to pay for my health care. But doctors and pill manufacturers will still be subjected to “involuntary servitude” since they’ll be forced to accept price controls on their work and products.

The author concludes,

**“Sorry, I just don’t think that’s what our founding fathers had in mind.”**

The conflict between those who advocate freedom without health care “rights” and those who advocate health care “rights” (with an necessary reduction in individual freedom) is emotionally charged and confusing. But the issue might be clarified if we understood the citizenship of those who would receive and pro-

vide health care “rights”.

The article’s constitutionalist author is espousing a level of personal freedom (and thus no health care “right”) that is characteristic of the classic natural born and State Citizens who created our government and are subject only to God. It’s almost impossible to impose a legal duty to provide health care on such Citizens without their consent – and if that consent is granted, it can always be revoked.

But whether they know it or not, the Consumer’s Union isn’t advocating a duty on Citizen-sovereigns to provide and/or receive health care. Instead, they’re trying to impose that duty and correlative “right” (actually, a “privilege”) on 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-subjects.

Thus, both sides in this issue are correct. The constitutionalist is correct that a “right” to health care is incompatible with (#2) Citizenship. But the Consumers Union is also correct in arguing that it would be legal to create a health care “right” (and also mandatory taxes) for the (#4) 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-subjects.

Much of the controversy, confusion and frustration surrounding the health care issue flows from the fact that both sides are technically correct, but neither side seems to understand that they’re talking about two different kinds of citizenship. As a result, neither side is able to un-

derstand the other’s goals or lodge effective objections to those goals.

Because our courts recognize that we can have two (or more) citizenships, American citizenship is somewhat like a modern Tower of Babel. Unless we precisely define which citizenship (#2 Citizen or #4 citizen) we are talking about, it’s almost impossible for us to understand each other on citizenship issues. And since citizenship is crucial to law, without understanding which citizenship we’re being sued or tried under, it’s almost impossible to mount an effective defense.

### Parental rights?

Another email whose primary source was “The Pilot Online” reads:

**“CPS VIOLATES FATHER’S RIGHTS:** In Virginia Beach, Virginia, Sydney Walter got a notice in the mail that he had been “convicted” of child abuse for spanking his unruly son a month earlier. In the MAIL! No trial where he could “confront his accuser” and present evidence in his defense. Not even notification that he is being “tried.” Just a “notification” that he had been “convicted,” after the time limit for appeal had gone by! Time was, we were formally arrested and tried in a real court for such things. Today, they just “decide” we’re guilty in a bureaucrat’s office and we’re guilty. No trial, no

For the most **accurate information** on the so-called “income” tax and the 16th Amendment, see:

<http://www.ottoskinner.com>

or write to [otto@ottoskinner.com](mailto:otto@ottoskinner.com)

**Don’t be fooled** by those who claim that the 16th Amendment authorized a direct tax.  
**See web site for free articles.**

“evidence,” nothing. And by the time we’re “notified,” it’s too late to do anything about it. . . . But since it is happening all over the country in just this manner, it scares the Hell out of me. There are no rights in child abuse cases and people are routinely being wrongly “convicted” of child abuse as “defined” by the “child protectors. This has got to stop.”

The author’s argument makes seeming sense to virtually every patriot, constitutionalist and parent who is terrified by government’s power over our children and indifference to our claim of “rights”. But the author’s argument may be wrong simply because we don’t understand the issue of citizenship.

I.e., can the #3 government-creation lawfully seize the children of the #2 Citizen-creators? Not in a million years.

But. Can the #3 government-creator seize the children of their #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-creations? Of course.

The problem with the aggrieved father in the previous email is that he thinks he’s a #2 Citizen-creator who the #3 government-creation must serve. However, he – and his kids – are actually #4 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-creations who are literally owned like so many head of livestock (human resources) by their #3 government-creator-farmer. Thus, government can legally cull its calves (Mr. Walter’s kids)

from the cows (Mr. & Mrs. Walter) whenever it likes.

Further, citizen-cow Walter misunderstands his role as biological father, since he thinks that biological relationship gives him some special rights relative to his kids. Nothing could be further from the truth. He has no more right to “his” kids than a bull put out to stud can claim the resulting calves.

What Mr. Walter doesn’t understand is that through a combination of documents (like his own birth certificate and Social Security Number, and marriage license, plus the state-issued birth certificate and Social Security Number for his kids) he voluntarily assumed the mantle of 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen and donated ownership of himself and his kids (or at least his “KIDS”) to the state-farmer. As a result, because the state has owns the Walter kids, it has every right to separate that family however it pleases.

Mr. Walter (and his wife) mistakenly believe they are their children’s parents. Not so. The state is the real “parent” (creator) for 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-kids, and the biological mother and father are simply baby-sitters. Like any other good parent, if the state finds out that one of the baby-sitters is spanking one of the state’s kids, the state will instantly separate that baby-sitter from the child. Does the state-parent need evidence? No. Like any other par-

ent-owner, the mere suspicion that a baby sitter is beating the state-parent’s kid will be enough to terminate the baby sitter’s relationship to the child. The state-parent got a report that the baby-sitter (Mr. Walter) was spanking the state’s kids, and the state instantly terminated Mr. Walter’s baby sitter contract. If it were my kid, I’d do the same thing.

Mr. Walter’s mistake is that he doesn’t understand who *he* is. Although he thinks he’s a Citizen, he’s really a citizen. Because he knows intuitively that government can’t take kids from Citizens, he assumes that government can’t take his kids, too. Not so.

A classic example of the relationship of citizenship to parental rights was seen in the Elian Gonzalez case where the National government used armed force to return the child Elian to his biological father. Father’s Rights groups hailed the government’s use of force to return Elian to his father, but didn’t understand that the issue was not one of biology but citizenship.

The “calf” Elian Gonzalez was not “branded” as a 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen and therefore was not property of our government. As soon as Elian’s father showed up with proof of paternity and/or Elian’s Cuban citizenship, our government had no choice but to seize the child and return him to his lawful owner (Mr. Gonzalez and/or the Cuban government). To do otherwise would constitute kidnapping or cattle rustling.

The calf Elian was in the wrong pasture (America) with the wrong (14<sup>th</sup> Amendment) cows. The fact that the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment cows (the Gonzalez relatives in Miami) took a shine to the Elian calf made no difference since 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment cows have no rights worth mentioning anyway (except with regard to

IRS WAGE LEVIES REMOVED

Download a **free copy** of the book

“*Why No One is Required to File Tax Returns*”

at [www.anti-irs.com](http://www.anti-irs.com)

**Bill Conklin**

3296 Raleigh St.  
Denver, CO 80212

**800-759-6222**

**Fax 303-480-1799**

other 14th Amendment cows). It was incumbent on government to return the calf to the proper pasture (Cuba) and cows (Mr. Gonzalez).

If the Miami relatives had been #2 Citizens rather than #4 citizens, they might've been able to give government a run for it's money regarding Elian, but as 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizen-cows, they had no real say.

Those of you who would like to maintain a "natural" relationship with your children would do well to investigate the nature of your own citizenship, the nature of your marriage (see "Divorcing the Corporate State" Vol. 10 No. 1), and the consequences of securing a state-issued birth certificates and SSN for your children. So long as you and/or your kids are 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens, U.S. citizens, or beneficiaries of government programs, you and your kids are "human resources" owned like so much livestock on the government plantation. Your status as government property is almost identical to that of Negro slaves prior to the Civil War. The only difference is that, unlike Negroes (who were forced into slavery) you entered slavery *voluntarily* and thus did not violate the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment's prohibition of "involuntary servitude".

**A**lthough government comes in several different shapes and sizes, in the creator-creation hierarchy, government's position is relatively fixed.

#1 God

#2 Man (Citizens)

#3 Government

#4 14th Amendment citizens

That is, God is #1; We the People/ Citizens are #2; government is #3; and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens are #4. The relative positions of God and government are

## Volcano Cook Stoves

### Low Tech – Weather Proof – Emergency Stove

300 lbs. of Charcoal provide enough fuel to cook 2 meals per day for an entire year.

- Starts Fast, Uses Little Fuel
- Portable, Stores Easily, Only 18 lbs.
- Low Exterior Heat • Can't Tip Over
- Works Great in ALL Weather
- Made in USA – 5 year Warrantee

Toll Free Order Line: **800-480-5226**

**P. O. Box 27764 Richmond, Virginia 23261**



fixed. The only variable is the people who can voluntarily choose to live as #2 Citizens (property and servants of #1 God, but superior to #3 government) or as #4 citizens (property of and servants to #3 government).

Most of us mistakenly believe we are still #2 Citizens (like our forefathers) and entitled to the "unalienable Rights" granted by God, declared in the Declaration of Independence, and guaranteed by the Constitution (1789) and Bill of Rights (1791).

Unfortunately, we are deemed by government to be 14th Amendment citizens with only a relatively few rights and privileges (and those only against other 14th Amendment citizens). Why? In large measure, because we never understood the consequences of accepting the various benefits offered to 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizens. Most of us unwittingly traded our birthrights as #2 Citizens (to freedom, property ownership and dominion over our children) for a bowl of government pottage (14<sup>th</sup> Amendment citizenship, Social Security, etc.).

The important point is that YOU and your choice of citizenship (#2 or #4) are the principle variable in the creator-creation hierarchy. Government will behave relative to you according to which citizenship *you choose* to embrace. If you choose to live as a #2 Citizen, the #3 government will serve you. But if you choose (no matter how unwittingly)

to voluntarily join the class of 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment #4 citizens, the #3 government will not only own you but rule you, if necessary, with an iron hand.

In the final analysis, there is no total freedom in this world. Although it's possible to create the illusion of total freedom by moving to the mountains and living an isolated life, you are in fact not free, but merely a fugitive slave.

Ask Randy Weaver. He moved up onto the remote Ruby Ridge and thought he was free. No way. He was just another stray cow. The government-farmer came to claim its cows, they got uppity and government shot four and killed two.

In this life, there is not alternative: you must choose which master you will serve. You can choose to be a #2 Citizen created by and subject to #1 God (and therefore free from obedience to #3 government). Or, you can choose to be a #4 14th Amendment citizen who is created by and subject to #3 government (and free from obedience from #1 God). Would you rather serve (and be protected by) the seemingly invisible God? Or serve (and be protected by) the omnipresent government?

It's not an easy choice, but it's the only choice you have.

So it's up to you. No matter how you shuck and jive, you will be some kind of "citizen" and thus serve someone.



So who will you serve this day? God (#1 on the creator-creation hierarchy)? Or government (#3)? Your choice is expressed by your citizenship. If you make no knowing choice, government will presume you are a #4 14th Amendment citizen subject to #3 government.

If you would like to live as a Man, you'd better take a close look at #2 Citizenship and begin to devise a plan to redeem that status.

On the other hand, if the benefits of 14th Amendment citizenship seem irresistible – welcome to the farm where all animals are created equal: equally “milkable,” equally “butcherable,” and equally disposable. But note that on the 14th Amendment farm, the farmers are not equal to the animals. If you want to serve that farmer, I hope you “got milk,” cuz if not, you're gonna be steak or dog food.

Serve God or serve government. Your citizenship is your choice.

<sup>1</sup>This email appears to a reprint of an article (“Petition asks appeals court to rehear Ruby Ridge case”) by Betsy Z. Russell a “staff writer” an unspecified publication.

<sup>2</sup> Agents first confronted family friend Kevin Harris, Randy Weaver and Weaver's 14-year-old son Sam, who were all armed, at a crossroads near Weaver's cabin. The agents had Weaver under surveillance because he had failed to appear in court on a weapons charge. After an agent shot the boy's dog, a gun battle erupted in which Deputy U.S. Marshal William Degan and Weaver's son Sam both died. The next day, at the cabin, FBI sniper Lon Horiuchi shot and wounded Randy Weaver and then shot Vicki Weaver while she was clutching her 10-month old baby and holding open the cabin door,

to let Harris, Randy Weaver and their daughter Sara back inside. Horiuchi's shot went through Vickie's head, killing her, and shrapnel from the bullet wounded Kevin Harris.

Weaver was later convicted of failure to appear in court, and served 16 months in prison. However, in 1995, Weaver and his three daughters sued the federal government, which settled his multimillion-dollar suit for \$3.1 million.

Nevertheless, a furor has persisted since some elements of the public can't understand how FBI marksman Lon Horiuchi (reputed able to hit a target the size of a quarter at 100 yards) could be excused from personal liability from shooting Vickie Weaver in the head while she was holding a baby. If Horiuchi had shot a man, or a woman armed with a rifle, he would probably have escaped personal liability. But since Vickie was a mother holding a baby, an emotional element was added to the killing that, so far, the FBI has been unable to shake.

The issue is primarily a Public Relations dilemma : How can the FBI (and the courts) justify killing mothers while they hold babies without diminishing public confidence in our “system of administration of justice”? On the other hand, how can the courts expose Horiuchi to criminal liability for killing Mrs. Weaver without adversely effecting the morale of government hit-men who've come to depend on their “right” to shoot civilians with impunity. The government's dilemma may be further exacerbated if Agent Horiuchi knows where other FBI “bodies are buried” (figuratively speaking) and threatened to blow the whistle if he's prosecuted criminally.

The courts are figuratively damned regardless of their decision. If they rule for public (government *can't* murder civilians without criminal liability), they risk

antagonizing their snipers. If they rule for the snipers (government *can* murder civilians without criminal liability) they risk inciting the serfs to write letters to their Congressmen. Tough choice, hmmm?

My bet is that, with typical courage and integrity, the honorable courts will simply duck the issue and allow the case to slowly die the death of a thousand appeals until most of us can't remember 1992 let alone Ruby Ridge and Vickie Weaver. Then, because the witnesses are all dead or their testimony no longer reliable, the criminal case will be “unfortunately” dismissed.

That way, the public can maintain their comforting belief that government can't safely shoot them, and government agents can maintain their comforting belief that they can safely shoot any uppity civilian without incurring criminal liability. That way everyone is “comfortable” (except Sam and Vickie Weaver who are dead).

In the meantime, the government will probably throw a couple of civil awards to the survivors. Randy Weaver and family already received a \$3.1 million settlement. Kevin Harris is suing for \$10 million and he'll probably be paid about \$1.5 million to go away.

Of course, all of that money will be paid by the American taxpayers who did not kill Sam and Vickie Weaver, or wound Randy Weaver and Kevin Harris. Thus, the actual government killers and officers responsible for the various deaths and injuries won't do time or pay a dime. In other words, members of the public gets shot and members of the public pays the penalty but the actual government shooters pay nothing. Y' see why they call it “the best legal system in the world”? They just don't bother to tell us “best for *who*?”

# A Warning From the United States Supreme Court!

**“75 to 90 percent of American Trial Lawyers  
are incompetent, dishonest, or both.”**

Chief Justice Warren Burger, U.S. Supreme Court

If this statement is true, shouldn't you consider learning a little about law yourself,  
even if only to keep your lawyers in line?

When legal problems are in front of you, if you don't know your rights, you might as well not have any.

Lawyers are advantaged in that they know how to find the law in the library. This knowledge is not an occult mystery.

The laws are supposed to be made by the people and for the people. They are not supposed to make lawyers and bureaucrats a privileged ruling elite.

That's why Citizens' Law Digest was created solely to put knowledge into the hands of the general public, and to teach you how to find the law.

Lawyers are often not only overpriced, but also are frequently tough to deal with.

Too many do not listen to clients, do not do enough research and do not pay enough attention to details..., and that can cost you.

You have the right under the Constitution to act as your own attorney.

And if you don't know the Constitution, both of this country and your state, then you are at a great disadvantage. Many politicians, police and bureaucrats don't want you to know what is in these documents.

Our newsletter is designed to put you on a more level playing field with lawyers and adversaries.

You'll be better able to negotiate, argue and plead. Your results cannot be guaranteed, but we can guarantee that after reading Citizens' Law Digest you will know more about law.

And once you've become our reader, Justice is much closer in reach.

And then you can teach others what they need to know.

It's the American way!

---

Enroll me as a subscriber for the next \_\_\_ issues of **CITIZENS' LAW DIGEST**

I enclose \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Rates: 1 year (12) issues \$49.00  
2 years (24) issues \$89.00

Return to: **Citizens Law Digest**  
**P.O. Box 90**  
**Hull, MA 02045**

Please visit us at [www.citizensjustice.com](http://www.citizensjustice.com)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone (optional) \_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail (optional) \_\_\_\_\_