

44429

RECORDING REQUESTED BY
DAVID BRIAN SUNDEVol. m92 Page 9645

And when recorded mail to

[Name DAVID BRIAN SUNDEStreet P.O. Box 5005

City, State, Zip

[KIAMATH FALLS, OR 97601

(Space above for recorder's use)

REVOCATION OF POWER OF ATTORNEY

I, DAVID BRIAN SUNDE, hereby revoke, rescind and make void ab initio, all powers of attorney, in fact or otherwise, implied in law or otherwise, signed either by me or anyone else, which the State of Oregon or the United States Governments may possess and which these governments may use as their authority to state and assert that I am a citizen of the United States and of the state in which I reside direct and immediate from the 14th Amendment to the Constitution for the United States of America.

I do this in accord with the understanding and belief I possess as outlined in the attache affidavit.

See attached exhibit "A".

Witness my hand this 4th day of May, 1992.

David Brian Sunde

State of Oregon

County of Klamath

SS

On this 4th day of May, 1992, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of Oregon, personally appeared David Brian Sunde, proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the Citizen who subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he executed it.

Witness my hand and official seal.



Tina M. Fisher

Notary Republic

3-10-95

EXHIBIT A

AFFIDAVITCounty of LAMATHState of OREGON ss

1. DAVID BRIAN SUNDE, being of sound mind and lawful age, do solemnly declare:

1. I was born in OHIO State of parents who were Citizen-Principals thereof and, as their parents time out of mind had been, were white. And as an hereditament I acquired directly and immediately the status of Citizen-Principal of said state sharing equally in its sovereignty.

2. The supreme Court in the Slaughter-House Cases in the portion I have attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporate herein by this reference, among other things, states:

It had been said by eminent Judges that no man was a citizen of the United States except as he was a citizen of one of the states composing the Union. Those, therefore, who had been born and always resided in the District of Columbia or in the territories, though within the United States, were not citizens. Whether this proposition was sound or not had never been judicially decided. But it had been held by this Court, in the celebrated Dred Scott Cases, only a few years before the outbreak of the Civil War, that a man of African descent, whether a slave or not, was not and could not be a citizen of a state or of the United States ... This decision ... had never been overruled; and, if it was to be accepted as a constitutional limitation to the right of citizenship, then all of the negro race who had recently been made freemen were still not only not citizens, but were incapable of becoming so by anything short of an amendment to the Constitution...

To remove this difficulty primarily ... the 1st clause of the 1st section [of the 14th Amendment] was framed ... That its main purpose was to establish the citizenship of the negro can admit of no doubt...

The next observation [respecting the first clause] ... is that the distinction between citizenship of the United States and citizenship of a state is clearly recognized and established

It is quite clear, then, 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 characteristic or circumstance in the individual....

AFFIDAVIT

We think this distinction and its explicit recognition in the Amendment of great weight in this argument, because the next paragraph in the same section ... speaks only of privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, and does not speak of those of the several states....

The language is: "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States." It is a little remarkable, if this clause was intended as a protection of the citizen of a state against the legislative power of his own state, that the words "citizen of the state" should be left out when it is so carefully used, and used in contradistinction of "citizens of the United States" in the very sentence which preceded it. It is too clear for argument that the change in phraseology was adopted understandingly and with a purpose.

Of the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States and of the privileges, and immunities of the citizens of a state ... it is only the former which are placed by this clause [the second clause of the 14th Amendment] under the protection of the Federal Constitution, and that the latter, whatever they may be, are not intended to have any additional protection by this paragraph of the Amendment.... the latter must rest for their security and protection were they have heretofore rested, for they are not embraced by this paragraph of the Amendment...

But with ... exception ... few ... the entire domain of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the state, as above defined, lay within the constitutional and legislative power of the state, and without that of the Federal government. Was it the purpose of the 14th Amendment ... to transfer the security and protection of all the civil rights which we have mentioned, from the states to the Federal government. And ... that Congress shall have ... the entire domain of civil rights heretofore belonging exclusively to the states? ... (emphasis added)

We are convinced that no such results were intended by the Congress which proposed these amendments, nor by the legislature of the states, which ratified them...

Having shown that the privileges and immunities relied on in the argument are those which belong to citizens of the states as such, and that they are left to the state governments ... we may hold ourselves excused from defining the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States which no state can abridge, until some case involving those privileges may make it necessary to do

so.

Slaughter-House Cases, 83 U.S (16 Wall) 36, 21 L.Ed 394, 407-409 (1872).

3. The supreme Court in United States v Wong Kim Ark in the portion I have attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporate herein by this reference, among other things, states:

Chief Justice Waite said: "Allegiance and protection are, in this connection (that is, in relationship to citizenship) reciprocal obligations. The one is the compensation for the other; allegiance for protection, and protection for allegiance." "At common law, with the nomenclature with which the framers of the constitution were familiar, it was never doubted that all children born in a country, of parents who were its citizens, become themselves, upon their birth, citizens also...." Minor v Happersett (1874) 21 Wall 162, 166-168....

United States v. Wong Kim Ark, 18 S.Ct. 456, 468-469 (1898), and

where there is no protection or allegiance or sovereignty there can be no claim to obedience. 4 Wheat 254....

Id. 470, and

the opening sentence of the fourteenth amendment is throughout affirmative and declaratory, intended to allay doubts and to settle controversies which had arisen, and not to impose any new restrictions on citizenship. (emphasis added)

Id. 471, and further Mr. Justice McKenna in his dissenting opinion stated:

At that time the theory largely obtained, as stated by Mr. Justice Story, in his Commentaries on the Constitution (section 1693), "that every citizen of a state is ipso facto a citizen of the United States."

Id. 482.

4. Based on the above considerations and my other studies and deliberations and being under no duress, coercion, promise of reward or gain, or undue influence I have of my own free will determined it is clear from the above opinions of the supreme Court that prior to the 14th Amendment a white citizen of any of the several states ipso facto, derivative and mediate of his state citizenship, was a Citizen of the United States, that is, one of the principals of the political association identified as the United States of America;

AFFIDAVIT

PAGE 3

5. And as the 14th Amendment did "not ... impose any new restrictions on citizenship," all white men born in any of the several states, "of parents who were its citizens. become themselves, upon their birth, citizens also," and are "not intended to have any additional protection by ... the [14th] Amendment";

6. And as such a white man's citizenship was not restricted by the 14th Amendment and he receives no protection from it, he has no reciprocal obligation to a 14th Amendment allegiance or sovereignty and owes no obedience to anyone under the 14th Amendment;

7. And in deed it is a manifest fact, observed by the supreme Court, that it was not sovereignty (politically free will) in the black man, the government of the several states or the United States in any capacity that granted the citizenship established in the 14th Amendment; it was the sovereignty in "the voice of the people," Slaughter-House Cases, supra, at 406, of the several states;

8. And the people did not intend the 14th Amendment "as a protection of the citizen of a state against the legislative power of his own state";

9. And by my birth I am a free Citizen of the aforesaid State of my birth and derivative and mediate thereof of the United States of America, as contemplated in the Constitutional Contract of 1787;

10. And that I am not a citizen of the United States as contemplated by the 14th Amendment and that I do not reside in any state with the intention of receiving from the Federal government or any other party a protection against the legislative power of that state pursuant to the authority of the 14th Amendment;

11. And, therefore, I am "nonresident" to the residency and "alien" to the citizenship of the 14th Amendment and, in the terminology of the Internal Revenue Code, I am a "nonresident alien individual" and subject to taxation imposed under Section 871 of the Code;

12. And as the tax imposed in 26 U.S.C. 1, pursuant to 26 C.F.R. 1.1-1, is on citizens and residents as contemplated by the 14th Amendment, it is not an applicable Internal Revenue Law to me as such, as I am neither such a citizen or resident, and can only be applicable to me under the conditions enumerated in 26 U.S.C. 871(b) or 871(d), on a year by year basis, if applicable;

13. And with respect to an election under 26 U.S.C. 871(d) I have never knowingly, willingly, or with my informed consent voluntarily made such an election; notwithstanding I may have in years past filed Form 1040 U.S. Individual Income Tax Returns, such was done under mistake, not knowing that it was mandated only on

citizens and residents of the United States as contemplated by the 14th Amendment, and with no knowledge that such filing would or could be construed to constitute an election under 26 U.S.C. 871(d);

14. I reiterate that I have made the above determinations and this declaration under no duress, coercion, promise of reward or gain, or undue influence and of my own free will, with no mental reservation and with no intent to evade any legal duty under the laws of the United States or any of the several states.

15. I sincerely invite any person who has reason to know or believe that I am in error in my determinations and conclusions above to so inform me and to state the reason(s) they believe I am in error in writing at the location of my abode shown below.

Date: 5-4-92 With express reservation of all my rights in law, equity and all other natures of law.


DAVID BRIAN SUNDE
Name

P.O. Box 5005
Street location

Klamath Falls OR 97601 America
City State Zip, Country

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN To before me this 4th day of May, 1992.

Tina M. Fisher
Notary Public
My Commission Expires 3-10-95



STATE OF OREGON: COUNTY OF KLAMATH: ss.

Filed for record at request of David Brian Sunde the 4th day of May A.D., 19 92 at 2:33 o'clock P M., and duly recorded in Vol. M92 of Power of Attorney on Page 9645.

FEE \$30.00
cc 3.50

Evelyn Biehn County Clerk
By Pauline M. Sunde

AFFIDAVIT

PAGE 5