

Lawrence D. Lewis
C/O 966 Bourbon Lane
Nordman, Idaho 83848
Telephone: (208) 443-3852

In The Kingdom of Almighty God
IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF BONNER

Lawrence D. Lewis,)	
PETITIONER)	CV -03-120
)	
Vs.)	Idaho Trans. Dept File No. and
)	LICENSE / IDENTIFICATION. No. QK326645B
)	
STATE OF IDAHO,)	PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION)	
Defendant.)	Appellant's BRIEF
_____)	

Peace and forgiveness to you all, from the King of Kings, Yahshua the Messiah, whose name translates from that Hebrew into anglicized Greek as Jesus the Christ.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE - FACTS

In the spring of 2002, some time in March, following the events of 9-11-2001, and realizing my Idaho Driver License was due for renewal in late June, I called the Sandpoint Driver License Office and asked what were the requirements for renewing the license --- to determine what I had to bring. I specifically asked about the requirement for supplying a Social Security Number, since I had never before been required to supply one for State or other I.D. I was told, erroneously, that if I had none on my driver license I did not need one. Some time after this, I went to the office and attempted to renew my license and was told that I would have to go to the Social Security Administration (they told me there was one vaguely in Coeur d'Alene) and obtain a written report that I had not been issued a SS#.

I began to study this situation in earnest at this time. I had vaguely thought that the system was a poor one in many respects, and the card that I had been issued to me when I was 14 or so, on the basis of what I subsequently discovered to be fraud, stated clearly on its face “NOT TO BE USED FOR IDENTIFICATION.” I had ceased using the number some 2-3 years prior, but not on a well-studied and thought out basis. I certainly was not aware at this time of the fraud and the severe flagrant violations of God’s Law. It was this forced usage in the State of what is still stated as a voluntary Federal program that forced me to pore over Scripture, devote myself to prayer, and make a determination of what I should do. I determined that I had made a grave mistake (pun intended – see Mark of the Beast following and the threat of eternal death associated with it coming soon in this Brief) in ever applying for the number in the first place.

After obtaining counsel, and further studying the Word of God, and man’s law in this regard, I found out that once one discovers fraud on a contract (arrangement, agreement, situation, whatever label is appropriate) one has a duty to tell the defrauding party and to cease using the contract for any purpose. I found out that these are well settled matters of jurisprudence, in harmony with Scripture, as I understand it, and well written about by the U.S. Supreme Court and other judicial bodies. If one fails to object, he cannot later claim to be harmed by the lying scheme in which he found himself. One has to completely disassociate himself from the violation of truth and quit sinning¹ against the Almighty Creator. In this regard, state laws and the Creator’s laws are in remarkable harmony.

So, I attempted to contact the Social Security Administration. I devoted probably 12 hours total, waiting on their recorded messages, waiting to get through to someone at various numbers in Spokane, Coeur d’Alene, and Washington, D.C. When I pleaded for the name and extension phone

¹ Sin used here means to break Almighty God’s Law, see 1 John3:4 (KJV) Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.

number of someone in some particular office to avoid the seemingly interminable waiting on the phone, I was refused at all offices when I did finally reach a non-recording (live person). I was given various information – some of it contradictory. I was told, truthfully, that Social Security was and always had been voluntary and that there was no law requiring anybody to get a number if they elected to not participate in the system.

It was by now getting close to the expire date on the license so I contacted Boise and was told that to request an Administrative Hearing was the correct thing to do. So on May 22nd, 2002, I wrote to Mr. Edward Pemble and requested this. I received in the mail on June 15, 2002, a notice of telephone hearing to be held on June 18th.

Between May 22nd and June 15th, after attempting to schedule an Administrative Hearing with a local office of the SocSec folks, I was told this was impossible, and that I would have to contact a specific address of the Social Security Administration Headquarters in Baltimore, Maryland in order to cancel or close the account. After being told repeatedly that there was no way to withdraw from the system by other receptionists / bureaucrats, this time the party to whom I was speaking seemed quite familiar with the fact that certain people had objections to the system and freely and without hesitation gave me the address and specific office to which to write to file the withdrawal. The form I used was given to me by one of those from whom I sought counsel.

Even with the extremely short notice, I elected not to ask for more time to prepare. I prepared the best I could on very short notice the documents filed with Social Security and Faxed them to the Hearing Officer as evidence for him to consider.

Rather than recite all the many steps here, I went through **all** possible steps of the Administrative procedure – asked for all the adverse rulings to be reconsidered and was finally ruled against by Order of the Director, Dwight M. Bower, on Dec 30th, 2002.

I filed this Request for Judicial Review timely and am in the process of trying to have the ruling

about which I am certainly aggrieved overturned by a judge.

STATUS

I addressed this in the Petition for Judicial Review. I will try to not be redundant, but add a note here that upon reading AmJur a little further, I may have made an error in saying that I am an American. The citizenship I claim is that of a fellowcitizen of the Kingdom of Almighty God. I owe no duty to any other Law system. I owe absolute allegiance to this Potentate and to no other earthly one. I hope this clears up this matter. I trust Idaho, unlike Islamic-dominated nations, does not have two systems of laws – one specially privileged for citizens, and another severely harsh directed toward sojourners, or people of a different status. I would hope that the religious freedom is not just for citizens, but is allowed for all who apply for Idaho Driver Licenses, and for all who find themselves within the borders of Idaho, so long as they are not using so-called religious reasons to excuse acts of licentiousness. I certainly believe I am as far from doing this as is possible.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

Did the Department of Transportation, through its Hearing Officer , Director, and Legal Counsel (Deputy Attorneys General), err when it ...

1. Failed to address the validity of a contract / application entered into by a minor?
2. Failed to address the validity of the Social Security number's voiding because of fraud?
3. Misapplied the **Miller** case as the only authority from a higher court cited relative to the religious issue as applied to Social Security numbers.
4. Failed to address whether the Social Security application creates a contractual arrangement for the receipt of legislatively provided benefits.
5. Failed to state whether the Social Security system is a contract of adhesion, but rather played cat and mouse games with the Appellant by putting his understanding of it in quotes, as if to

- disagree without providing any evidence or legal theory why the Social Security system is a contract of adhesion or something else for those who apply.
6. Failed to provide legal justification as to why a former participant in a contract of adhesion can be compelled to continue to participate when he believes on good evidence that there is fraud surrounding such contract and desires to cease participating and putting himself in ANY position to accept benefits from such tainted contract of adhesion.
 7. Failed to, in the face of substantial evidence as to Appellant's truly and sincerely held religious beliefs, make a case as to why it was a COMPELLING state interest to obtain a Social Security number from Appellant.
 8. Failed to establish that, in the face of substantial evidence supplied by Appellant of just how severely this requirement did burden him, just how this severe and not at all incidental burden was justified by any state interest.
 9. Failed to establish that the requirement of the SS# could not be satisfied in this case and others like it by a less restrictive means. I brought it up. It was never addressed.
 10. Failed to address the Idaho State Constitution at Article I, section4, *guaranty of religious liberty*.
 11. Failed to address the issue at the heart of the matter, but rather stated erroneously that "There is no dispute in the record between the parties on the factual background in this case." (Page 2, FINAL ORDER). When Appellant read this he indeed did hotly dispute the facts in the case. Mr. Lewis, using well settled matters of law **has no Social Security number**.
 12. Failed to address the revocation of the contract with Social Security but rather just dismissed it by stating in the FINAL ORDER page 2, that "Mr. Lewis testified and provided documentary evidence that he has contacted the Social Security administration in an attempt

to have his number withdrawn, cancelled, or revoked but that the Administration has not yet done so.” This was another of those facts hotly in dispute and an error in the FINAL ORDER. By well settled legal doctrine, the number / contract is cancelled for all legal purposes. Counsel for Mr. Bower should have been aware of this.

This next one doesn’t directly relate to an error by the DOT, because it probably is not the proper forum to SETTLE this matter, but it was clearly RAISED before them. So, #13 is in a different category than the preceding 12.

13. The Idaho Code Section 49-306 fails to address a certain status of people, such as Appellant, and therefore, like its immediate predecessors, require re-writing to bring it into conformance with the Idaho Constitution, and other overarching, higher laws, such as but not limited to I.C.§ 73-402 **Free Exercise of Religion Protected.**

14. And this one is a remarkable one. This issue is about **identification**. Why are the DOT’s files in gross error? I’ll detail this in the Argument of this “Identification” Issue #14.

ARGUMENT

Issue #1. Did the Department of Transportation err when it Failed to address the validity of a contract / application entered into by a minor?

This matter is so fundamental that it does not need citation. Contracts entered into by minors are not considered enforceable. I was a minor when I was wrongly (fraudulently) told that I needed a SocSec# to work. This was and is not true. I believed it at about 14 years of age and got the number. For this reason alone, when I discovered the many deficiencies surrounding the SocSec scheme, and could articulate them, the contract, or whatever it is called precisely, must be considered void.

Issue #2. Did the Department of Transportation err when it failed to address the validity of the Social Security number's voiding because of fraud and refused to apply long standing principles that fraud voids the contract from the beginning and unwinds the situation to a time before its inception and makes it as though it never existed?

Yes they did. I alleged fraud in the evidence I supplied to SocSec and to the Hearing Officer. I was never given any kind of full disclosure of the many things I would be doing by applying for the number. I had no idea I would be participating in a scheme that is an affront to Almighty God. I had no idea I would be participating in a gigantic Ponzi scheme which, at the point of a gun, requires many more younger members to pay into in order to support the benefit recipients. Many nations are farther down the road than the U.S.A. in their realization of this. Many were demonstrating in the streets of Paris within the past two weeks over just this very issue – unfunded liability. I won't go into all the many details of the fraud as it would make this other than 'Brief,' but I must add a couple more details here. The word "insurance" is still used in the title to various sections of the laws pertaining to Soc Sec. For example: **OASI**. It stands for Old Age and Survivors **Insurance**, It is not insurance in any legal definition used prior to the SocSec act. It took the Supreme Court to clear that one up by stating that there was no property right in Soc Sec therefore it was not insurance in the usually thought of meaning of the word. And finally for here, the "trust fund." AARP cries shrilly all the time about the "trust fund." Congressmen promise to make sure the "trust fund" is secure. There is no trust fund in any meaningful use of that term. There are only are unfunded, unsecured, unmarketable IOU's. Everything everybody pays into the system is spent as it comes in. It all goes into the general fund and is spent on current Federal expenses. Lies, lies, and more lies. Fraud, plain and simple.

Issue #3. Did the Department of Transportation err when it misapplied the Miller case as the

only authority from a higher court cited relative to the religious issue as applied to Social Security numbers.

Yes. The Miller case is inapplicable here. There was no evidence from the Miller case that Mr. Miller did not participate willingly in the system. All evidence points to the fact that he was still a card-carrying (at least a card-possessing) member in good standing and had every thought of continuing to pay into the system and to extract benefits as appropriate. A case should not be cited unless it very closely approximates the facts in the situation toward which it is attempting to be applied. This case is so much different than this one as to render it inapplicable as citation for authority. It is off-point.

Issue #4. Did the Department of Transportation err when it failed to address whether the Social Security application creates a contractual arrangement for the receipt of legislatively provided benefits.

In the evidence I supplied to the DOT in the Hearing and subsequently as I attempted to clarify what I had presented at the Hearing I attempted to make two major points. One was contractual and the other was religious duty. One of my two major points seemed to be thrown back in my face as an insult by putting my characterization of my relationship with SSA as a **“contract.”** I referred to it as a specific type of contract – a contract of adhesion. Are the Directors of State agencies and their Deputy Attorneys General always in the habit of insulting and playing cat and mouse games with the public whom they are supposed to serve? If the Social Security account were not a contract, then would it not have been kinder to instruct me what precisely it is. I would have been glad to be taught where I was in error. As it stands I do take the DOT’s lawyers’ repeated putting into quotes, “contract” as just that -- an insult and continued recalcitrance and continuing to hide just what is going on – just like Social Security is doing. They apparently know something at least to not agree that what I am doing is contractual in nature, and possibly not even religious as that is in quotes also, but not repeatedly. If Social Security is not contractual in nature,

with contractual remedies for problems that arise, would the Court please clear this up? Thank you very much.

Issue #6. Did the Department of Transportation err when it failed to provide legal justification as to why a former participant in a contract of adhesion can be compelled to continue to participate when he believes on good evidence that there is fraud surrounding such contract and desires to cease participating and putting himself in ANY position to accept benefits from such tainted contract of adhesion.

I made a good faith attempt to complete any unknown obligations between the SSA and me. They were served. They chose to not respond. I have no obligations under the original contract of adhesion of this basis alone, having nothing to do with the fraud surrounding the whole scheme. If the Soc Sec is not a contract of adhesion, would the Court please clear this up for me and the 5 Attorneys General in Boise who work for the DOT as occasion arises. Thank you very much.

Issue #7. Did the Department of Transportation err when it failed to, in the face of substantial evidence as to Appellant's truly and sincerely held religious beliefs, make a case as to why it was a COMPELLING state interest to obtain a Social Security number from Appellant.

Citing a statute is not the same as making a case that in the facts surrounding the instant case, there is compelling state interest. I never challenged the State's need to identify individuals. The history that is in the Respondent's Brief at page 4 + 5 is of value, but the conclusion that Idaho has a **compelling** interest for obtaining a SocSec from this man is without merit. In this case there is a **less restrictive means** to identify me that that of forcing me to lie, when I stated in good faith that I would not accept any benefits associated with the tainted contract and use a fraudulent scheme which is an abomination in the eyes of the Creator. Please so rule.

Issue #8. Did the Department of Transportation err when it failed to recognize, in the face of substantial evidence supplied by Appellant, just how severely this requirement did burden him, and how this severe burden was justified by any state interest? To show that this burden was not incidental or trivial, I offer the following:

I may not have been as articulate as I would have liked to be when I supplied the evidence before to the DOT. I will attempt to do better here, not by way of any new evidence, but by better argument of my truly and sincerely held beliefs as to my duties before my Maker and His other Creations, my neighbors and fellow men. Here goes. I certainly did present evidence of this nature to the DOT. You determine if this is incidental or not. I certainly think it is not only NOT INCIDENTAL, but severely huge, impinging on matters of eternity and ultimate judgment of the only Righteous and Ultimate Judge of all of us. My concern is not mainly with others' Judgment but with mine, because I can control my actions around which I will be judged daily by Almighty God as well as Finally, in the future.

I, Lawrence D. Lewis state the following from my personal knowledge as true, regarding my religious beliefs about the Biblical "Mark of the Beast" and its relationship to SSNs, and my duties to my Creator. First, the Bible is the Creator's revelation of Himself to us, his created. The name of the Creator is to the best of my current knowledge, Yahweh. One of his titles is Almighty God. I firmly know and believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of the one and true living God; Yahweh, that nobody goes unto the Father except by belief and faith in His Son, Yahshua the Messiah, more commonly known to most in this culture as Jesus the Christ. I believe that the Lord Jesus' sacrifice on the cross at Calvary 2000-odd years ago satisfied the righteous demands of the Law. This being that those in rebellion to their Creator and Heavenly Father deserve the death penalty for their rebellion and disobedience. By Christ's sacrifice, he provided the way for restoration of fellowship

between rebellious prodigal sons and their Father. This is truly Good News. One who loved us took our place and through his shed blood, served our sentenced, exchanging his righteousness for our sinfulness. That is a good deal. I believe that salvation is the gift of God, obtainable only by belief that Christ is the Son of God sent to save the world from its sins.

I further possess a firmly held religious belief that sometime in the future and possibly during my lifetime, the Anti-Christ, as described in the Bible's Book of Revelation¹, will appear upon the earth and will attempt to cause all people to be marked upon their right hand or forehead with the 'Mark of the Beast.' I believe that discerning Christians may recognize the Beast's symbolic 'Mark' by way of its connection to the number '666' as described in Revelation 13. Further, I believe that as an obedient Disciple of Christ, I cannot worship the Beast or identify with the Beast's mark upon penalty of eternal damnation.

I sincerely believe that the social security number, as established under federal law, is either the precursor to the 'Mark of the Beast,' or is actually the mark itself and it will in the future be implanted on an individual's right hand or forehead.

I am a religious objector to possessing a social security account and am conscientiously opposed to the acceptance of social security benefits.

I am a member by calling of Almighty God, in his ecclesia, His called out ones, His Church.

Continuing is a statement of my beliefs concerning what the Word of God, as encompassed in

¹ Revelation 13: 11-18, N.I.V. makes the following prophecy: "Then I saw another beast, coming out of the earth. He had two horns like a lamb, but he spoke like a dragon. He exercised all the authority of the first beast on his behalf, and made the earth and its inhabitants worship the first beast, whose fatal wound had been healed. And he performed great and miraculous signs, even causing fire to come down from heaven to earth in full view of men. Because of the signs he was given power to do on behalf of the first beast, he deceived the inhabitants of the earth. He ordered them to set up an image in honor of the beast who was wounded by the sword yet lived. He was given power to give breath to the image of the first beast, so that it could speak and cause all who refused to worship the image to be killed. He also forced everyone, small and great, rich and poor, free and slave, to receive a mark on his right hand or on his forehead, so that no one could buy or sell unless he had the mark, which is the name of the beast or the number of his name. *This calls for wisdom. If anyone has insight, let him calculate the number of the beast, for it is a man's number. His number is 666.*"

the Holy Bible, declares about being a beneficiary of social security.

Social security is deserving of God's wrath and judgment because it is deceitful, thieving, corrupt, sinful and prone to encourage sin. The Bible defines sin as any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God. Earnestly convinced of the unrighteousness of my coerced involvement with this government enterprise and having reached majority, I took steps to nullify, void, revoke, and/or rescind a contractual relationship with that system which had been established by written application without my consent and knowledge when I was a minor.

The social security system violates at least five of the 10 commandments as found in Exodus 20. I am not exempt from any of these commandments, but am subject to and liable for performance under them. Involvement in social security is contradicted by the:

- >* First commandment (no other gods)
- >* Fifth commandment (honoring my parents and receiving honor from my children)
- >* Eighth commandment ("Thou shalt not steal")
- >* Ninth commandment (no false witness or testimony)
- >* 10th commandment (do not covet).

It is perhaps enough to rescind, nullify and revoke any connection I may have formerly had with a social security account and number. But I will go further, as God has given me means to do so. Trusting in God's mercy and providence, I will keep my children, should I be blessed with such, out of the system and, instead, will teach them God's truth and praying for them, trusting that when they are of maturity, they can decide for themselves not to enter into such covenant with social security.

My religious convictions about this great evil in our day are sincere, abiding, and deeply held, based on my belief in God, as an individual, and based upon a duty, growing out of religious

training and belief, which is truly and sincerely held; and that it is this duty which makes using or obtaining a social security account and number an impossible task.

Christians are equipped by the God of Holy Scripture for “every good work to do His will” (Hebrews 13:21). Sustaining my family, and myself, and not participating in a taxpayer-funded retirement scheme, is something God has equipped me for. Among the equipment God has blessed me with, in the grace of His providence: good health, regular employment, savings, family, personal possessions, and modest, moderate habits.

As regards my safeguards in the event that I become physically decrepit and in need of care and mercy at the end of my life, God has blessed me with a heritage. “Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it” (Proverbs 22:6). Any children with which I may be blessed by Almighty God will be instructed to uphold the fifth commandment, “Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long upon the land which the Lord your God is giving you” (Exodus 20:12). Insofar as such children live out the duties given in this commandment, the charge of my care in twilight years will fall upon them and upon my own capital resources, and not the American taxpayers and others who, either voluntarily or by force, fraud and deceit, fund the federal government’s vastly over-obligated retirement machinery.

Here now are my obligations before God as regards social security and in the context of the 10 commandments, which is a summary of God’s law.

1st Commandment

“I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. You shall have no other gods before me” (Exodus 20:2, 3)

For me to be a beneficiary of Social security is to accept the claim that God will provide no care for me and my Christian family, that He will bestow no blessings upon me, that He will provide no private or charitable aid upon me if He ordains a disaster to befall me, that His mercies are

insufficient, that He has no practical, providential ministry in the lives of those He has chosen. To become a claimant upon the federal government's social security system is to believe that a manmade idol can conceivably make my life, future and family secure; that it can provide me shelter and money if I am foolish with my family's capital; that I do not need to obey God or beseech His blessing upon my prosperity; that I can enrich myself from the public treasury and overlook God's commandments regarding theft, bearing false witness and covetousness.

Since God has commanded that I use other institutions of His own making which He has expressly appointed to secure myself and my family, and since He has forbidden the civil authorities from usurping the role of these other institutions, I would be disregarding God's authority as Lawgiver (which He expresses in the first commandment) by following some other authority which has set itself up in place of the one true Lawgiver.

Indeed God has every prerogative, as He is sovereign, to claim my life and that of my family by a sovereign act subject to His decree, and not rescue me from misery, if that is for His glory. I do not count necessarily on His saving me as I might wish to be saved. But I rest in the comfort of His love and eternal mercy, as did Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, who said to the king, "O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou has set up" (Daniel 3, 17, 18).

To my understanding following prayer and study of the Scriptures, the duties required in the first commandment are, the knowing and acknowledging of God to be the only true God; and our God, and to worship and glorify him accordingly, by thinking, meditating, remembering, highly esteeming, honoring, adoring, choosing, loving, desiring, fearing of Him; believing Him; trusting, hoping, delighting, rejoicing in Him, being zealous for Him; calling upon Him, giving all praise and

thanks, and yielding all obedience and submission to Him with the whole man, being careful in all things to please Him, and sorrowful when in anything He is offended; and walking humbly with Him.

“Today you have proclaimed the LORD to be your God, and that you will walk in His ways and keep His statutes, His commandments, and His judgments, and that you will obey His voice.” (Deuteronomy 26:17)

“Now by this we know that we know Him, if we keep His commandments. He who says, “I know him,” and does not keep His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. But whoever keeps His word, truly the love of God is perfected in Him.” (1 John 2:3-5)
“Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD is one! You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your strength.” (Deuteronomy 6:4)
“Trust ye in the Lord forever: for in YAH [Jehovah or Yahweh], the LORD, is everlasting strength.” (Isaiah 26:4)
“It is written, ‘Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God.’” (Matthew 4:4)
“Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy and where thieves break in and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust destroys and where thieves do not break in and steal. For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.” (Matthew 6:19-21)

“Therefore whoever hears these sayings of Mine, and does them, I will liken him to a wise man who built his house on the rock: and the rain descended, the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house; and it did not fall, for it was founded on the rock. But everyone who hears these sayings of Mine, and does not do them, will be like a foolish man who built his house on the sand: and the rain descended, the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house; and it fell. And great was its fall.” (Matthew 7:24-26)
“Trust in the LORD with all your heart, and lean not on your own understanding. In all your ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct your paths.” (Proverbs 3:5, 6)
“The LORD will not allow the righteous soul to famish, but he casts away the desire of the wicked.” (Proverbs 10:3)

The sins forbidden in the first commandment are, among others, idolatry, in having or worshipping more gods than one, or any with or instead of the true God; the not having and avouching Him for God, and our God, the omission or neglect of anything due to Him or required in His commandment; ignorance, forgetfulness, misapprehensions, false opinions, unworthy and wicked thoughts of Him; self-love, self-seeking, and all other setting of our mind, will, or affections upon other things, and taking them off from Him in whole or in part; vain credulity, unbelief,

heresy, misbelief, distrust, despair, carnal security, tempting of God; using unlawful means and trusting in unlawful means; discontent and impatience at God's dispensations; and ascribing the praise of any good we have or can do to idols, ourselves or any other creature.

“Away with you, Satan! For it is written, ‘You shall worship the LORD your God, and Him only you shall serve.’ (Matthew 4:10)

“Little children, keep yourselves from idols. Amen.” (1 John 5:21)

I do not have a social security account out of an abundance of caution as to property claims such involvement may create upon me. Involvement in social security involves the obtaining of an inscription, which implies a grant of ownership or jurisdiction over my person which God has not given me leave to grant. Jesus declared that an inscription on a coin gave Caesar legal title to possess it.

“So they watched Him, and sent spies who pretended to be righteous, that they might seize on His words, in order to deliver Him to the power and the authority of the governor. Then they asked him, saying, “ Is it lawful for us to pay taxes to Caesar or not?” But He perceived their craftiness, and said to them, ‘Why do you test Me? Show me a denarius. Whose image and inscription does it have?’ They answered and said, “Caesar’s.” And He said to them, “Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and to God the things that are God’s.” (Luke 20:20-25)

5th Commandment

God, in the 5th commandment, says, “Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long upon the land which the Lord your God is giving you” (Exodus 20:12).

The scheme of social security is a defiant temptation of God in that it allows successive generations to forget the duty to parents, to leave care of parents to the state. It perversely subsidizes the destruction of families so that parents care not for the inheritance of their children, and the offspring see no duty in caring for their parents. As society is atomized, each generation views its own needs without any context of history or any orientation to the future. A system, which encourages the breaking up, of families in this way is a curse, and those who easily participate in its profits bring into their families the judgment befitting of the offense.

The fifth commandment has three views. It governs how we are to act in regards to our inferiors (children), our superiors (parents, civil and ecclesiastical authority) and our equals.

That the American people have entered into covenant with the federal power, to have taxpayers fund the routine expenses of their elderly, indicates the extent to which they have lost confidence in the mercies of God. Many citizens, and many Christians, no longer assume the existence of a providential God who will assist them, as a separate people, in honoring the duties to their superiors. (Sometimes, for His own glory and our training in holiness, God might not assist a particular individual, family or city physically, since that is His absolutely sovereign prerogative.)

That they have entered agreements, willingly or via deceit and fraud, with the social security program makes it difficult or practically impossible to teach inferiors – namely their children – the necessity of honoring their parents, particularly when they are elderly, decrepit and in need of mercy. Social security subsidizes moral and familial carelessness, and disallows the binding of care and duty among generations.

Inferiors owe superiors due honor. Children owe their aged parents fidelity, defense and maintenance of their persons and authority, bearing with their infirmities and covering them with love.

“Let the elders who rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in the word and doctrine. For the Scripture says, ‘You shall not muzzle an ox while it treads out the grain,’ and ‘The laborer is worthy of his wages.’ “ (1 Timothy 5:17, 18)

The Pharisees in Jesus’ day had a scheme whereby they could avoid having to care for their parents. Jesus condemned these ostensibly pious clerics as hypocrites.

“Why do you also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition? For God commanded, saying, ‘Honor your father and your mother’; and, ‘He who curses father or mother, let him be put to death.’ But you say, ‘Whoever says to his father or mother, ‘Whatever profit you might have received from me is a gift to God’ – then he need not honor his father or mother.’ Thus you have made the commandment of God of no effect by your tradition. Hypocrites!” (Matthew 15:4-7)

“Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right.” (Ephesians 6:1)

“Listen to your father who begot you, and do not despise your mother when she is old.”
(Proverbs 23:22)

)“But Shem and Japhet took a garment, laid it on both their shoulders, and went backward and covered the nakedness of their father [Noah]. Their faces were turned away, and they did not see their father’s nakedness.” (Genesis 9:23)

“Behold, children are a heritage from the LORD, the fruit of the womb is a reward. Like arrows in the hand of a warrior, so are the children of one’s youth. Happy is the man who has his quiver full of them; they shall not be ashamed, but shall speak with their enemies in the gate.” (Psalm 127:3)

Superiors owe inferiors due instruction and discipline. Scripture is replete with examples of families whose laxness in instructing children to obey the word of God brings chastisement or judgment.

“Now Eli heard everything his sons did to all Israel, and how they lay with the women who assembled at the door of the tabernacle of meeting. So he said to them, ‘Why do you do such things? For I hear of your evil dealings from all the people.’ Nevertheless they did not heed the voice of their father, because the LORD desired to kill them.” (1 Samuel 2: 22, 23, 25b)

Absalom provided himself with chariots and horses etc.” (2 Samuel 15:1-12)

”He who mistreats his father and chases away his mother is a son who causes shame and brings reproach.” (Proverbs 19:26)

”And you, fathers, do not provoke your children to wrath, but bring them up in the training and admonition of the Lord.” (Ephesians 6:4)

”The righteous man walks in his integrity; his children are blessed after him.” (Proverbs 20:7)

As a Disciple of the living Christ, I have a personal duty to care for parents, widows and the needy, and cannot let ignorance of this commandment, nor greed, come between godly duty and me. Proverbs makes this point:

“The LORD will destroy the house of the proud, but He will establish the boundary of the widow.” (Proverbs 15:25)

“He who is greedy for gain troubles his own house, but he who hates bribes will live.”
(Proverbs 15:27)

“Better is a little with righteousness, than vast revenues without justice.” (Proverbs 16:8)

The duty I have in light of God’s commands, and the history of His people as recorded in Scripture, is to honor my mother and father, and not abandon them. Secondly, I am to teach my children the same, and to claim God’s covenant promises to me. I am to hope, in faith, claiming

God's promises to me, that my children will do their part in honoring God's commands as regards their duty to me in my old age.

To believe that my children will not honor me in my waning years is to disbelieve God's covenant promises to His people, and to too weakly lay claim upon His vow to aid and encourage all those who love Him.

In light of this commandment, I am forbidden from engaging in a scheme that would weaken my obligations to my children and parents, and I am forbidden from supporting and encouraging others to neglect their duties. I am obligated to reject social security because it weakens the bonds of faith I might forge with any children I might have and my surviving parents, and it would not glorify God.

8th Commandment

God prohibits theft in the 8th commandment. "Thou shall not steal" (Exodus 20:15). Here is what is prohibited: receiving anything that is stolen, false weights and measures, removing landmarks, unfaithfulness in contracts or in matters of trust. I am prohibited from receiving anything that is stolen or the fruit of fraud or deception.

Social security involves the exercise of federal political and police power against the property rights of the American people. Many people involve themselves in the system eagerly, voluntarily, in the hope of profiting on what they see as an investment. But others – both taxpayers and nontaxpayers alike – have social security contributions and benefits thrust upon them involuntarily. Under duress, the victims of either ignorance, error and/or deceit, many Americans sign federal forms which either initiate the social security "contract," or continue it with each successive employment or economic endeavor. Many who are taxpayers are coerced into signing their children into social security servitude because they are denied tax deductions if their children are not traded into the system as guarantors and beneficiaries.

I am duty bound before God to avoid social security as I would an enterprise of thieves. In a plethora of verses, God commands all men to avoid alliances with thieves and abstain from enriching themselves from their booty.

“My sons, if sinners entice you, do not consent. If they say, ‘Come with us, let us lie in wait to shed blood; Cast in your lot among us, let us all have one purse’ – my son, do not walk in the way with them.”(Proverbs 1:10, 11, 14.)

“Do not be envious of evil men, nor desire to be with them; for their heart devises violence, and their lips talk of troublemaking.” (Proverbs 24:1, 2)

“Do not envy the oppressor, and choose none of his ways; for the perverse person is an abomination to the LORD, but his secret counsel is with the upright. The curse of the LORD is on the house of the wicked. But He blesses the home of the just.” (Proverbs 3:31-33)

“He who trusts in his riches will fall, but the righteous will flourish like foliage.” (Proverbs 11:28)

“Do not rob the poor because he is poor, nor oppress the afflicted at the gate; for the LORD will plead their cause, and plunder the soul of those who plunder them.” (Proverbs 22:22, 23)

“Wealth gained by dishonesty will be diminished, but he who gathers by labor will increase.” (Proverbs 13:11)

“In the house of the righteous is much treasure, but in the revenue of the wicked is trouble.” (Proverbs 15:6)

“He who is slothful in his work is a brother to him who is a great destroyer.” (Proverbs 18:15)

“The lazy man will not plow because of winter; he will beg during harvest >and have nothing.” (Proverbs 20:4)

A related issue under the eighth commandment is that of being surety or a pledge for debts of another. Participants in social security are entangling themselves and their inheritance with a debtor, promising to be his surety. God warns against it.

“My son, if you become surety for your friend, if you have shaken hands in pledge for a stranger, you are snared by the words of your mouth; you are taken by the words of your mouth. So do this, my son, and deliver yourself; For you have come into the hand of your friend; go and humble yourself. *** Deliver yourself like a gazelle from the hand of the hunter, and like a bird from the hand of the fowler.” (Proverbs 6:1-5)

“He who is surety for a stranger will suffer, but one who hates being surety is secure.” (Proverbs 11:15)

9th Commandment

God’s ninth commandment prohibits the bearing of false testimony. “You shall not bear false

witness against your neighbor” (Exodus 20:16).

Included in the duties of this commandment are to promote the truth between man and man, to appear and stand for the truth, and from the heart, sincerely, freely, clearly and fully speak the truth, and only the truth, in matters of judgment and justice. This commandment forbids me from prejudicing the truth, calling good evil and evil good, concealing the truth, undue silence in a just cause, holding my peace when iniquity calls for either a reproof from ourselves or complaint to others, neglecting things that are of good report.

I do not willingly have any part in social security because it would assert a false claim. To be a beneficiary of social security is to affirm that it is legitimate and honorable. Since it is, on the contrary, an offense to Almighty God, I must not make a pretense of embracing or supporting this wicked scheme.

Social security has the appearance of a bilateral contract, yet the obligation of the United States Congress to fund social security is political, not legal, and can be stopped at will without legal recourse of its beneficiaries. To enter a claim for benefits with social security would be falsely testifying that the system is a regular investment scheme or a contract for insurance, when in fact social security puts all those on its rolls at the mercy of an improvident federal Congress. For me to participate in the scheme would be to place an interest in it, to place a treasure in it, and act upon a desire for it to continue for my benefit, despite the coercion and deceit used against many natural persons by employers and the federal government to fund it.

“These are the things you shall do: speak each man the truth to his neighbor; give judgment in your gates for truth, justice, and peace; Let one of you think evil in your heart against your neighbor, and do not love a false oath. For all these are things that I hate,’ says the LORD.” Zechariah 8:16, 17)

“I rejoiced greatly that I have found some of your children walking in truth, as we received commandment from the Father.” (2nd John 4)

“You shall do no injustice in judgment. You shall not go about as a talebearer among your people; nor shall you take a stand against the life of your neighbor; I am the LORD.” (Leviticus 19:15a, 16)

“He who speaks truth declares righteousness, but a false witness, deceit. The truthful lip shall be established forever, but a lying tongue is but for a moment. Deceit is in the heart of those who devise evil, but counselors of peace have joy. Lying lips are an abomination to the LORD, but those who deal truthfully are His delight.” (Proverbs 12:17, 19, 22)

“Do not remove the ancient landmark which your fathers have set.” (Proverbs 22:28)

“A righteous man hates lying, but a wicked man is loathsome and comes to shame.” (Proverbs 13:5)

10th Commandment

God’s 10th commandment prohibits covetousness and demands that we be content with the property and gifts that God, in His grace, has bestowed upon us. “You shall not covet your neighbor’s house; you shall not covet your neighbor’s wife, nor his male servant, nor his female servant, nor his ox, nor his donkey, or anything that is your neighbor’s.”

This commandment requires a full contentment with our own condition, and such a charitable attitude from one’s entire being toward our neighbor as that all our inward motions and affections touching him tend to, and further all that good which is his.

The commandment forbids discontentment with my own estate, envying and grieving at the good of my neighbor, together with all inordinate motions and affections to anything that is his.

To covet a life of leisure, nonproductivity and unemployment, as envisioned by social security, is prohibited by the 10th commandment.

“Let your conduct be without covetousness; be content with such things as you have. For he Himself has said, ‘I will never leave you nor forsake you.’ So we may boldly say, ‘The LORD is my helper, I will not fear. What can man do to me?’” (Hebrews 13:5, 6)

“Love suffers long and is kind; love does not envy; love does not parade itself, is not puffed up; does not behave rudely, does not seek its own, is not provoked, thinks no evil; does not rejoice in iniquity, but rejoices in the truth; bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.” (1 Corinthians 13:4-6)

“Let us not become conceited, provoking one another, envying one another.” (Galatians 5:26)

“But if you have bitter envy and self-seeking in your hearts, do not boast and lie against the truth. This wisdom does not descend from above, but is earthly, sensual, demonic. For where envy and self-seeking exist, confusion and every evil thing are there.” (James 3:14, 15)

“Therefore put to death your members which are on the earth: fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry. Because of these things the

wrath of God is coming upon the sons of disobedience, in which you yourselves once walked when you lived in them.” (Colossians 3:5, 7)

**Conclusion – To ISSUE #8 Argument To Help The Court Determine if the above are
“INCIDENTAL”**

The Bible’s great interest is that God’s people be free from sin and that they be sons, servants and slaves to God. Salvation lifts the sinner out of the dungeon of enslaving sin and into the great liberty of God’s mercy and salvation, and a life of holy obedience. A derivative interest in God’s statutes is that God’s people, as much as possible, avoid becoming beholden to men, that they not let their sins and frailties drag them into subjection, liability, debt, obligation, servitude and slavery. Social security is the equivalent to the first century beast mentioned in Revelations. When I used the term “cat and mouse” to describe what lawyers often do and what it seemed to me they were doing with me, was to indeed describe the actions of a cruel beast.

Yes, Paul exhorts all men to be content with their stations in life, whether slave or free. He urges on all men the freedom in Christ, in which context all of the elect have equal standing before God.

“There is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3:28).

However, he exhorts that if a man of God is a slave that he use all lawful means to become a free man: “You were bought with a price; do not become slaves of men” (1 Corinthians 7:21 ff).

In our day, social security is an idol that enslaves all those it purports to benefit. Every employer, many businesses, most civil authorities insist that one cannot act as a natural person, but must be a member of the social security pool. However, there is no human law that compels me to have a social security account and be a beneficiary of federal welfare. There is no human law, in other words, that poses an obstacle for a disciplined man like me to assert his Christian liberty to object to being a welfare beneficiary. Compelled by these Scriptural convictions, I have acted

lawfully and legally to extricate myself from the human servitude of the social security system, and am prohibited from making application for a social security account and number.

I have no part in it, and have severed myself from any legal right to make a claim upon it. I trust that the thrice-holy God of heaven will deal mercifully with me.

“Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him. Even so, I will defend my own ways before Him. He also shall be my salvation” (Job 13: 15, 16).

My temporal and spiritual security rest in God’s providence, not in the coercive ministries of federal agencies who lord it over their fearful and thankful subjects. I am confident the Lord God will bless any effort of mine to obey His commandments.

These issues elucidated above are so far from being “incidental” that to hang such a label on them is insulting. These are the gut issues of daily life. Congress in Public Law 97-280 suggested that Americans voluntarily study and apply the teachings of Scripture. They quoted a former President, Andrew Jackson. He said that the Scripture (the Holy Bible) was the “Word of God,” and it was “the Rock on which the Republic rested.” The above are not the rantings of a madman hell-bent on following Islamist teachings and crashing airplanes into tall buildings. Please rule on this issue alone so that these are not “incidental”, frivolous, or minor things that the state may burden at its will. Thank you very much.

Issue #9. Did the Department of Transportation err when it failed to establish that the requirement of the SS# could be satisfied in this case and others like it by a less restrictive means. I brought it up. It was never addressed.

The cost to the state would be zero. I already have an alphanumeric 9 digit identifier -- QK326645B. I pointed out in my prior brief to the DOT that people such as myself would be easier to identify as we would be such a small group. I do not object to the color of the government’s file cabinets based on my beliefs, nor do I object to keeping track of me by name and number. But

please do not force me to participate **in any way** in a system as evil and wicked as described in Issue #8 above. Especially when I stated, following well-settled legal doctrine, that I would not do so. I do not see that the DOT ever addressed using the least restrictive means of furthering what I agreed was indeed a compelling state interest (identification). This mandated point wasn't even glossed over – it was ignored. Please so rule that a less restrictive means of furthering the state's compelling interest **MUST** be used in similar situations as mine.

Issue #10. Did the Department of Transportation err when it failed to address the Idaho State Constitution at Article I, section 4, “*guaranty of religious liberty*”?

When I use “address” here, I do not mean to type out the part of the Constitution, and then imagine that because it is printed in some document, that it is in full force in every situation. I brought up the issue of not being licentious. That verbiage is in the pertinent part. Why did the DAG not describe my action as not being within the scope of the guaranty? Words are meaningless by themselves. They need to be rightly applied in every specific situation. I do not believe it came even close in the proceeding before the DOT, and subsequent appeals / filings based on evidence submitted, and ongoing attempts to engage Soc Sec. That is why I am invoking I.C. § 73-402 (4) in this proceeding against the agency action. Pursuant to (5), and detailed in Issue #8 before, this chapter is not triggered by technical, trivial, or de minimus infractions. In page 8 of the Final Order, the parts of the religious test that I am NOT challenging **were** mentioned, while the **burden** was never brought up. This is a large oversight.

Once a bona fide First Amendment issue is joined, the burden that must be shouldered by the government to defend a regulation with impact on religious actions is a heavy one. I guess the load was too heavy for the DOT to engage. Please, will the Court step up to the weightlifter's platform and show us that they can bear this burden. The burden of stating that the burden DOT is

attempting to place on this case is way out of bounds as regards the above-cited portions of Idaho law. Please rule accordingly.

Issue #11. Did the Department of Transportation err when it failed to address the issue at the heart of the matter, but rather stated erroneously “There is no dispute in the record between the parties on the factual background in this case.” (Page 2, FINAL ORDER). When Appellant read this he indeed did hotly dispute the facts in the case. Mr. Lewis, using well settled matters of law has no Social Security number. This is one of the major issues at the heart of this matter before the Court.

To gloss over the matter of Social Security’s refusal to engage in any dialog is egregious. They were served. They chose to not address the issues raised and, by legal maxims, stand as stated by me. I therefore have no social security number. This should be recognized as such by the DOT. Don’t their lawyers take any tests any more? Is there no such thing as tacit procurement? Does not judgment get entered if the answering party fails to answer? Isn’t this called a default judgment? Doesn’t this happen nearly every time a court is in session in the entire U.S.A.? The SocSec Admin must abide by the law the same as me or anyone else. They lost by default. These are well settled matters of law. To deny this is to deny a remedy at law in similar situations, public or private. Do you really expect a party frauding another to pleasantly agree and to apologize publicly and repent? Not in the world of sinning men – individuals or bureaucratic officeholders. That is why the remedy for fraud is as it is. Notice must be given and participation must be cut off – completely. This works for man’s statutes, which in this instance are in harmony with the “plethora” cited in Issue #8 above, cited at length from God’s Law. Where did Blackstone get his commentaries largely? Not all, but most of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence has its roots in Holy Scripture, in Moses. Moses bringing down the Ten Commandments from Mt. Sinai is carved in rock on one of the walls

of the U.S. Supreme Court building. Have we all forgotten these things? Or, in the words of Ben Franklin at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, in the notes of James Madison, “Have we forgotten the [Creator] or do we imagine we no longer need His assistance?”

Issue #12. Did the Department of Transportation err when it failed to address the revocation of the contract with Social Security but rather just dismissed it by stating in the FINAL ORDER page 2, that “Mr. Lewis testified and provided documentary evidence that he has contacted the Social Security administration in an attempt to have his number withdrawn, cancelled, or revoked but that the Administration has not yet done so.” This was another of those facts hotly in dispute and an error in the FINAL ORDER. By well settled legal doctrine, the number / contract is cancelled for all legal purposes. Counsel for Mr. Bowen should have been aware of this.

I suppose this is a bit redundant with Issue #11, or at best overlapping. The SocSec does not have to pass on this. The contract or whatever it is, is cancelled for all legal purposes. There is no number that can be used in this case. To do so would be for ME to commit fraud.

The above 12 issues are all I can CURRENTLY think of that the DOT and its legal counsel did wrong, sloppily, incompletely, or illegally. The next issue is of a different ilk.

Issue #13. The Idaho Code Section 49-306 fails to address a certain status of people, such as Appellant, (me) and therefore, like its immediate predecessors, requires re-writing to bring it into conformance with the Idaho Constitution, and other overarching, higher laws, such as but not limited to I.C.§ 73-402 Free Exercise of Religion Protected.

Are we to think that a group of fallible, mistake-making men and women ALWAYS get their legal verbiage right. Not just no, but an emphatic **NO!** That’s what Courts are for, one of the

reasons for the “checks and balances” in the western way of doing things, and one of the major reasons why I am pursuing this Judicial Review. I certainly raised this issue before the DOT. I got records to the extent they were available to me from Boise. They indicate that the current statute was written because it was inadequate to the needs of certain groups of people. I maintain it still is.

I don’t know if I should direct to the part where I raised this issue before the DOT or put it all here, so I’ll put it here. Hope this is OK. The following is from my Memorandum In Support of Request for Review, the Dark Blue tab on my copy of the file, pages numbered 54-55, and 62-69 of the DOT’s was submitted to the Court as its record in this case:

- 1. The Statute requiring the use of Social Security Numbers on Driver License Applications [I.C. §49-306(2)] leaves out a group of people.** Namely, those who for good cause, cannot in good conscience continue to use the Social Security system for any reason now, though they had signed a contract of adhesion in the past. **One of that group is me.** This situation is not at all unlike the situation in Idaho previously. In 1998, after passing the House Bill No. 431, in 54th Legislature, 2d regular session 1998, which had absolute requirement that all applicants have a SSN, the Senate in its deliberations in 1999 by its Transportation Committee discovered that the original wording was too broad. **See also EXHIBIT “A”, 2 pages of documentation of legal quotes on Contracts, Fraud, and Religious Freedom.**

In their words: (Regarding the discussions involved in the correcting of the too broad 1998 legislation) Senator Wheeler: He said that

“ ... the Idaho Law requires a Social Security Number to apply for a driver’s license bill. This presents a real hardship for those who are unable or unwilling to get a Social Security number. He explained that, for U.S. citizens who choose not to obtain a Social Security number a birth certificate, together with a letter from the Social Security Administration would be sufficient to obtain a driver’s license.”

Additionally, Regarding Senate Bill 1170. 55th Legislature, First regular session, 1999, the statement of purpose is as follows:

Currently a social security number or verification that a person has been assigned such by the Social Security Administration is the only identification that can be used to file an application for a drivers license.

There are many persons (legal residents on visa, exchange students, spouses and children of workers, and migrants with credentials) who do not have social security numbers issued to them.

The Department of Transportation has adopted rules to allow these special cases to file license applications. Their motives are not questioned, but this legislation should be passed to contain the same language used in the rules.

- 2. The statute I.C. 49-306 (2)is not constitutional as it applies to me.** Where Righteousness secured by Almighty God, and rights secured by the U.S. Constitution are involved, THERE CAN BE NO LEGISLATION OR RULEMAKING THAT WOULD ABROGATE THEM. One specific right enumerated in the U.S. Constitution is that Congress shall pass no law impairing the obligation of contracts. The Social Security System is by contract, specifically a Contract of Adhesion. Unconscionable contracts are null and void from the beginning. Fraudulent contracts are the same. The U.S. Congress at 96 Stat 1211, declared the Holy Bible to be the “Word of God,” and the “Rock

on which the Republic rests,” and urged Americans to “Study and apply the teachings of the Scriptures.” Upon doing so, I come to the conclusion that I have a duty to Almighty God to NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY WAY in the Social Security System due to its many violations of the commands of Scripture. The obligation of contracts cut two ways. One is that they require specific performance. A second is the requirement to get out of them if they are fraudulent, or in any way unconscionable. It is unconstitutional to forbid the impairing of the obligation of contracts. One obligation, under duty to Almighty God, and statutes, as construed by courts, is to cease participating in bad contracts.

Another dimension of this is that the Social Security adhesion contract was apparently changed, after I was by fraud, mistake, and ignorance induced to participate. To force me to participate in any way in what is unconscionable is unjust and goes against clear U.S. Supreme court rulings. Particularly ones dealing with religious freedom, fraud and how one should react when fraud is even SUSPECTED about something in which one has participated.

If for no other reason, this request for review should be favorably ruled on by the board for this reason. That is, I did sign a contract a long time ago. I now realize, that this action was wrong, for multiple reasons, based on a duty to God. However, the contract of adhesion that I signed, while I was underage, and legally incapable of entering into a binding contract, has had its provisions changed. When I signed, the contract specifically stated that it was **NOT TO BE USED FOR IDENTIFICATION**. Now this has changed. Should I be FORCED to continue to participate and USE the number of this contract now that for this reason, and many others, I find it morally unconscionable to do so. I should be allowed to withdraw, if there are no obligations of mine toward the Soc Sec Administration. I am certainly not aware of any obligations of mine toward them. I have released them of any obligations toward me and make no claim of future benefits. I should be released from this unconscionable contract since the provisions became changed to impinge on and violate duties to Almighty God, when they were unilaterally changed. I should not then be forced to continue to use the old number of the old tainted contract.

By stating that I should be granted the request in this memorandum, there are still other even more valid legal reasons that I do not waive by this statement. Fraud being one that I have articulated in my correspondence to Soc Sec and incorporated into this document by **“EXHIBIT SSA” – 6 pages of my two recent correspondences with SocSec Admin. See also EXHIBIT “A”, 2 pages of documentation of legal quotes on Contracts, Fraud, and Religious Freedom.**

Please rule on this issue – that the wording of the statute leaves out a particular group of people.

I asked SocSec to treat my filing with them as a Freedom Of Information Act request. They ignored both. I asked just how many Americans had filed similar documents as mine. I don’t know directly from them, but I believe it to number in the several thousands, and possibly as high as 100,000. We may be a minority, but isn’t that one of the things that made America great – their respect for the “downtrodden” the weak, the powerless, the minority?

Issue #14. I don’t know what to do about this but want it here to set the record correctly. I just found out about this as I was flyspecking the Department’s records in this case. They are just about the same as mine. I was curious and my statement about this issue is in the file. I wondered how I could not get a response from SSA and DOT could. So I inspected the records about **their**

attempt to verify information with the Social Security Administration. The matters on this #14 issue are on pages 82 and 83 of the DOT's paperwork sent to this Court. Page 83 is not germane to this appeal and concerns the "Muddy Waters" communication between the DOT and me. But page 82 has a Social Security number on it about which I have written¹ is incorrect and instructed DOT not to use it. The SS# is not the issue here. The DOB I assume stands for "date of birth." It is incorrect. I do not know why. I stated twice in this file that I was born on June 22nd, 1950. I don't know why June 20th is in the DOT's records. I assume it was an unintentional clerical error on someone's part. For all I know it was wrong on the Tennessee driver license which I surrendered to get the Idaho one. I do not celebrate birthdays² and until recently upon going over this paperwork had seldom about mine. The date of birth is not the problem though. What is a problem is that any Social Security number should come out of ANY records for June 20, 1950, **AND** have a notation on Idaho State records that it was "VERIFIED." I don't know what else to ask the Court to do about this – just wanted to point it out for two reasons – to set the record straight AND point out the absurdity of this identification issue as of paramount importance as pertains to SocSec #s.

CONCLUSION to this Appellant's Brief

For the many reasons given above, the Appellant should be allowed to renew his Idaho Driver License without the use of any Social Security number. Please so direct the Director of the Idaho Transportation Department.

Thank you very much.

¹ page 1 of 2 of my letter to Mr. Pemble in "Muddy Waters" category – not in DOT's wad
² for religious reasons – someone always died in Scripture on birthdays and it fosters pride.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of Almighty God, and the State of Idaho, that the foregoing, are, to the very best of my informed knowledge and belief, true, accurate and correct, so help me God.

Subscribed this 16th day of June 2003 A.D.

Lawrence D. Lewis dated this 16th day of June 2003.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 16th day of June, 2003, I sent a true and accurate copy of this APPELLANT's BRIEF by sending a complete copy, to Legal Section, Idaho Transportation Department, P.O. Box 7129; Boise, Idaho 83707-1129. by First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid. I also sent the same way, to the Court in Sandpoint and to the Judge's office in Coeur d'Alene on 16 June 2003.

16 June 2003.