

No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

In The  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

WILLIAM JOHN COX,

*Petitioner*

v.

The Government of the United States of America

*Respondent*

---

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS,  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

---

WILLIAM JOHN COX  
u2cox@msn.com  
*In Propria Persona.*

April 9, 2018

---

---

**QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW**

If it is true the American People are currently governed by a corrupt, ineffective, unrepresentative, and threatening government, do they have a reserved, inherent Right of Liberty to vote in a national referendum regarding the Voters' Bill of Rights in a peaceful attempt to recover, preserve, and better effectuate their democratic republic?

## **PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS**

### **I. Petitioner William John Cox**

Petitioner is a natural person within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States and is a citizen of the State of California and the United States of America. His citizenship exists by virtue of the residency of his family in America since before its States were united and whose forefathers set aside their Quaker religious beliefs to fight for its independence. He is an inactive member of the State Bar of California, from which he retired in 2007 as a supervising trial counsel.

### **II. Government of the United States of America**

The United States of America is represented by the Solicitor General of the United States.

## **CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Pursuant to Rule 29.6, Petitioner states that no parties are corporations.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW . . . . .	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING . . . . .	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES . . . . .	v
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PETITION	
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS . . . . .	1
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS . . . . .	1
JURISDICTION . . . . .	1
RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS . . . . .	4
STATEMENT OF THE CASE . . . . .	5
I. It is Appropriate That Mandamus Issue .	5
II. The Declaration of Independence is Incorporated in the Constitution . . . . .	7
III. The Personal Rights of Liberty are a Vested Legal Right . . . . .	10
IV. The Power of Liberty and Consent . . . . .	13
V. The Residual Rights and Powers of the States Are Transcendent . . . . .	16
VI. It is Necessary and Urgent That This Matter Be Reviewed . . . . .	17
VII. The Remedy of a National Referendum as an Expression of the Rights of Liberty is Appropriate . . . . .	19
VIII. The People are Entitled to Withdraw Their Consent to be Governed—if They are Not Allowed to Vote Effectively . . . . .	21
CONCLUSION . . . . .	23

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)**

	Page
APPENDIX	
The United States Voters' Rights Amendment	
The Voters' Bill of Rights . . . . .	App. 1

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>CASES</b>	
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S., (1 Cranch) 137 . . . . .	3, 6, 7
Garfield v. U.S., 211 U.S. 249 . . . . .	6
Costley v. U.S., 181 f.2D 723 (5th Cir.) . . . . .	6
Cotting v. Godard, 183 U.S. 79 . . . . .	9
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 369 . . . . .	9
Griswold v. Connecticut 381 U.S. 479, 484 . . . . .	12
Lawrence v. Texas, 539 U.S. 558, 579 . . . . .	14
Bush v. Gore, 531 U.S. 98 . . . . .	22
 <b>CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS</b>	
U.S. Constitution, Art. III, Sec. 2 . . . . .	1
U.S. Constitution, Eleventh Amendment . . . . .	1
U.S. Constitution, First Amendment . . . . .	3, 4, 5, 22
U.S. Constitution, Ninth Amendment . . . . .	3, 4, 5, 15, 16, 22
U.S. Constitution, Tenth Amendment . . . . .	3, 4, 5, 16, 22
U.S. Constitution, Fourteen Amendment . . . . .	14
U.S. Constitution, Fifth Amendment . . . . .	14
 <b>STATUTES</b>	
28 U.S. Code § 1651 . . . . .	5
 <b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>	
Declaration of Independence . . . . .	7
Universal Declaration of Human Rights . . . . .	23

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

---

The petitioner moves the Court for leave to file the following Petition for a Writ of Mandamus, the brief of which is hereby incorporated by reference.

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

---

**JURISDICTION**

The basic grant of judicial power in the U.S. Constitution is expansive and includes "all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution." (U.S. Constitution, Article III, Section 2)<sup>1</sup>

The original jurisdiction of the Court to directly hear matters extends to "all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be a Party." The Constitution goes on to say that, "In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make." (*ibid*) However, the Constitution does not explicitly limit the original jurisdiction of the Court to "all Cases

---

<sup>1</sup> The Eleventh Amendment to the U.S. Constitution restricted this power in "any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State."

affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be a Party." Nor, does the Constitution restrict the Court to appellate jurisdiction in all other matters—only those cases which were "before mentioned." If, therefore, the controversy is not among the enumerated cases, and if the relief sought *could only be granted by the Supreme Court*, the Court must necessarily have the original jurisdiction to consider the matter in the absence of any other effective remedy.

The granting of the requested Writ of Mandamus would aid this Court in the exercise of its jurisdiction by definitively establishing itself as a co-equal branch of the federal government, with the constitutional power to compel the Legislative and Executive branches to respect and facilitate the exercise of the inherent Rights of Liberty held by the People. Only this Court has the jurisdiction to protect the Rights of Liberty against the other two branches of government.

A declination by this Court to review this petition—basing its decision upon a narrow interpretation of its constitutional grant of original jurisdictional powers—would ignore its own previous rulings which have allowed itself and the other two powers of government to broadly increase their original grants of power.

As early as 1803, this Court expanded its jurisdiction to include judicial review of congressional acts—although not expressly



provided for in the Constitution. (*Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 1803). The Court decided that a legislative act repugnant to the Constitution is necessarily null and void, and that the Court has a duty to so rule.

In arriving at its decision in *Marbury*, The Court stated "That the people have an original right to establish for their future government such principles as, in their opinion shall most conduce to their own happiness is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been erected." It cannot be that the Constitution—founded upon the Rights of Liberty—provides no remedy for an individual citizen who perceives, correctly, that his government has become destructive of his Rights of Liberty and seeks the assistance of the only court with the power to provide relief. In such circumstances, the Court has a duty to find it has the original jurisdiction to consider the matter as being one outside those enumerated in the Constitution as appellate matters and those listed intrinsically as matters of original jurisdiction.

If this Honorable Court does not exercise its power to order a national referendum at this time of grave crisis, then the petitioner is denied an effective First Amendment right to petition his Government for redress of grievances, *and* he is not allowed the full enjoyment of his Ninth and Tenth Amendment personal Rights of Liberty. This would be intolerable.

A failure of this Court to hear this matter will deprive the petitioner of a legal remedy. No other court has the constitutional authority to compel the Executive and Legislative Powers of the United States government to conduct a national referendum on the Voters' Bill of Rights.

Moreover, questions presented by this petition regarding the inherent Rights of Liberty and the relationship of the People and their States to the United States must necessarily be decided by this Court.

---

### **RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS**

First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution:

Congress shall make no law . . . abridging . . . the right of the people peaceably . . . to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Ninth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution:

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

All Writs Act, 28 U.S. Code § 1651

(a) The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law.

(b) An alternative writ or rule nisi may be issued by a justice or judge of a court which has jurisdiction.

---

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an action brought by a natural person of liberty and a citizen of the United States of America and the State of California as a First Amendment petition for redress of grievances and a Ninth and Tenth Amendment assertion of the Rights of Liberty, presented in the form of an application for a writ of mandamus to compel a national referendum on the Voters' Bill of Rights under circumstances where there are no other viable alternatives.

#### I. It is Appropriate That Mandamus Issue

Assuming correctness of the argument presented *supra* concerning jurisdiction, the power of this Court to issue mandamus to compel compliance is inherent in the Constitution, otherwise a Person would be without a remedy should a proper question be presented. Reference in *Marbury v. Madison*, *supra* to limitations on such

power must be distinguished as *dicta* in that there the Court held there was *no* original jurisdiction. Subsequent cases decided by this Court have established the power of the Court, as a matter of due process, to mandate performance of a *ministerial* duty, e.g., *Garfield v. U.S.*, 211 U.S. 249, (1908).

A higher threshold is encountered in matters of *discretion*. Petitioner concedes the absence of authority supporting the proposition that an elected government official may be compelled to exercise his or her discretion in a particular manner. Although liability can be established once discretion has been exercised (*Costley v. United States*, 181 f.2D 723, 5th Cir., 1950), a failure to exercise discretion is not ordinarily actionable.

A more compelling case arises, however, if there are no other viable options available, and there is but one decision that provides a just remedy under the circumstances. This is especially true if ordering a national referendum regarding the Voters' Bill of Rights is the only logical and nonviolent way to effectively modify and preserve the Constitution of the United States, and if a failure to act would allow the destruction of hard-won freedoms to continue unabated.

In such case, the oath of office taken by an elected or appointed official becomes a ministerial duty to be exercised in the only manner consistent with the continuance of the United States as a healthy democratic republic. Assuming the

correctness of petitioner's asserted facts, mandamus would be appropriate to compel the performance of an *essential*, otherwise discretionary act.

At which point does a political issue become a critical matter of liberty for every American?

The very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws, whenever he receives an injury. One of the first duties of government is to afford that protection. In Great Britain the King himself is sued in the respectful form of a petition, and he never fails to comply with the judgment of the court. . . .

The government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men. It will certainly cease to deserve this high appellation, if the laws furnish no remedy for the violation of a vested legal right. (*Marbury v. Madison*, *supra*, at p. 163.)

## **II. The Declaration of Independence is Incorporated in the Constitution**

Predating the Constitution and Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence is the foundation of self government in the United States:

WE hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they

are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to *alter* or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing the powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. (Emphasis added).

The rights that are asserted in the Declaration of Independence derived from the Renaissance theory that certain rights are inherent in natural law and cannot be granted, modified, or taken away. At common law, there could be no right without a remedy (*ubi jus ibi remedium*).

Expressed otherwise as the "Dignity of the Law," or simply as the right to be treated fairly, these natural rights provided the legal basis of the original Declaration of Independence *and the American governments that followed*. The Rights of Liberty expressed in the Declaration were vested *ab initio*. They are not included in the Constitution—it is founded upon them. Unless these fundamental rights are protected by the Constitution (and this Court), it is null and void.

Although the Declaration of Independence has been mentioned more than 100 times in its decisions, this Court has never relied on the Declaration as authority. Rather, it has been cited as *dicta*. In *Cotting v. Godard*, the Court said:

While such declaration of principles may not have the force of organic law, or be made the basis of judicial decision as to the limits or right and duty, and while in all cases reference must be had to the organic law of the nation for such limits, yet the latter is but the body and the letter of which the form is the thought and the spirit, and it is always safe to read the letter of the Constitution in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence. No duty rests more imperatively upon the courts than the enforcement of those constitutional provisions intended to secure that equality of rights which is the foundation of free government. (183 U.S. 79, 107, 1901)

*Cotting* relied on *Yick Wo v. Hopkins* earlier decided by this Court in 1886:

Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power. It is, indeed, quite true that there must always be lodged somewhere,

and in some person or body, the authority of final decision; and in many cases of mere administration, the responsibility is purely political, no appeal lying except to the ultimate tribunal of the public judgment, exercised either in the pressure of opinion, or by means of the suffrage. But the fundamental rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, considered as individual possessions, are secured by those maxims of constitutional law which are the monuments showing the victorious progress of the race in securing to men the blessings of civilization under the reign of just and equal laws, so that, in the famous language of the Massachusetts bill of rights, the government of the commonwealth 'may be a government of laws and not of men.' (118 U.S. 356, 369)

### **III. The Personal Rights of Liberty are a Vested Legal Right**

Although the Rights of Liberty were not directly expressed in the Constitution, they have served as the loom upon which the fabric of freedom has been woven. In the famous words of Patrick Henry, "I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Near the end of the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln opened his Gettysburg Address with a recognition of the role of liberty in the foundation of the United States, "Four Score and



seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Lincoln concluded his Address with the resolution "that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." The right of all People to a government that respects and represents them must necessarily be included in the Rights of Liberty, even though it is not stated in the Constitution.

More recently, President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave expression to the Rights of Liberty in several declarations of rights. In his State of the Union address in 1941, he proposed that people, "everywhere in the world" ought to enjoy the freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. Roosevelt relied upon these four freedoms as a justification for the Nation's participation in World War II. The cry of young people today for an end to gun violence in their schools is but an expression of their right to be free from fear. Even though it is not listed in the Constitution, the right to learn in a peaceful environment has to be among the Rights of Liberty.

Near the end of World War II and his own death, Roosevelt proposed a "Second Bill of Rights" that included: Employment (right to work), food, clothing

and leisure with enough income to support them; farmer's rights to a fair income; freedom from unfair competition and monopolies; housing; medical care; social security; and education. Although these rights have not been expressly included in the Constitution, surely they are included in the Rights of Liberty that created it.

In *Griswold v. Connecticut*, decided in 1965, the opinion of Court was delivered by Justice Black. The Court found that—when viewed in its entirety—the Constitution provides a right to privacy (contraception). The majority opinion held that ". . . specific guarantees in the Bill of Rights have penumbras, formed by emanations from those guarantees that help give them life and substance." (381 U.S. 479, 484)

It was, however, the concurring opinion of Justice Goldberg (joined by Chief Justice Warren and Justice Brennan) that provided the majority in *Griswold* and which offered a pertinent discussion of the Rights of Liberty. Relying on the Ninth Amendment, Justice Goldberg stated, "I do agree that the concept of liberty protects those personal rights that are fundamental, and is not confined to the specific terms of the Bill of Rights."

Justice Goldberg emphasized the priority of the Ninth Amendment by quoting James Madison, the author of the Bill of Rights:

It has been objected also against a bill of rights that, by enumerating particular

exceptions to the grant of power, it would disparage those rights which were not placed in that enumeration, and it might follow, by implication, that those rights which were not singled out were intended to be assigned into the hands of the General Government, and were consequently insecure. This is one of the most plausible arguments I have ever heard urged against the admission of a bill of rights into this system, but I conceive that it may be guarded against. I have attempted it, as gentlemen may see by turning to last clause of the fourth resolution [the Ninth Amendment]. (381 U.S. 479, 489-490)

If it is true that the People memorialized their sovereignty by way of the Ninth Amendment, then their Rights of Liberty are inherent in the Constitution and necessarily constitute a vested legal right which demands the protection of this Court.

#### **IV. The Unlimited Power of Liberty and Consent**

Originating with each Person, the flow of the power of liberty begins with each individual's consent to be governed by local councils, state governments, and the federal government. The power of the People's consent extends well beyond their elected federal officials, to join with all of humanity at the United Nations.

The extraordinary power of the People creates a Personhood of Liberty, encompassing the States and

the United States, as a unity of all of the People therein.

Illuminating the darkness of government—allowing the People to control its performance—is the light of every Person's Rights of Liberty. Possessed by all Americans, the combined, residual power of consent must always exceed that of any of its delegations and enumerations. Consent is the *sine qua non* of legitimate government power. Without it, there is nothing.

The Fourteenth Amendment—which established a personal right of citizenship in every Person's state of residency *and* of the United States—expanded due process and equal protection and provided means for the People to enforce their constitutional rights against the States. (U.S. Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment)

In *Lawrence v. Texas*, this Court affirmed that the due process provisions of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment provide a right to liberty, and went on to say, "As the Constitution endures, persons in every generation can invoke its principles in their own search for greater freedom." (539 U.S. 558, 579, 2003)

The Due Process Clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments did not alter or impose limits on the Rights of Liberty—as they are natural and cannot be restricted or revoked. These rights extend beyond the protections afforded by the Bill of Rights and subsequent amendments, including

the Fourteenth. Just because a right is not expressed, does not mean that the right does not exist.

Were it not for the Ninth Amendment, the failure of the Constitution, and its amendments, to explicitly acknowledge the broad personal Rights of Liberty as a restraint upon the government of the United States would be a fatal omission, inasmuch as these natural rights are more than inherent; they are absolute!

Every woman and man—every child—every person must necessarily be afforded the full protection of their personal Rights of Liberty, otherwise the incumbent federal government no longer serves the American People, or their States. Such a government loses its legitimacy and risks becoming a nullity.

The consent of the People to be governed cannot be taken for granted. The concentration of power derived from consent has legitimacy only so long as the government exists as a beneficial political expression of the needs and desires of the American People. The government cannot exist as a threatening and repressive force that endangers the People, and the future of their children.

These personal Rights of Liberty—which are the foundation of the Constitution and were reaffirmed through the Ninth and Tenth Amendments—had their origin in the natural right of Dignity Before the Law. That basic and

elemental human right continues to be shared by all Americans, in concert with their States.

#### **V. The Residual Rights and Powers of the States Are Transcendent**

The extraordinary retained power of the People, and their unity, can be alternatively imagined and perceived as the *People of the States United of America*. It is perhaps a more accurate way of defining the political relationship between the People, their States, and their federal government.

Under the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, the Rights of Liberty are retained by the People and their States. This potent residual power establishes the priority between the People and their States on one hand, and the more limited grant of powers held by the government of the United States.

Encompassing the duality of state and federal citizenships, is the Personhood of Liberty that includes all of the American People. United in self government, the People—always and necessarily—hold the ultimate power, extending through the governments of their communities, States, and United States.

Viewing the Rights of Liberty as creating a communion of the People in a transcendent States United of America, is a more meaningful way to define the relationships of the existing governments in the United States of America to all of the People who reside therein.

A unanimous legislative vote by the States would be sufficient to challenge the legitimacy of any incumbent federal government of the United States. Such a joint action would be a persuasive demonstration of the power of liberty.

A demand by the States for a national referendum on the Voters' Bill of Rights could not be ignored by the federal government—without confirming its illegitimacy. The alternative would be another Constitutional Convention—the outcome of which would be entirely unpredictable.

The People's reserved Rights of Liberty, as expressed through their States, transcends and defeats any attempt by the federal government to limit those rights.

#### **VI. It Is Necessary and Urgent That This Matter Be Reviewed**

The Legislative and Executive Powers are failing to act in the best interests of the American People—in that they are operating a corrupt, ineffective, unresponsive, and threatening government.

Because of the enormous expense of conducting political campaigns, elected officials and judges, at every level, have become politically obligated to a powerful combination of large corporations, special interest groups, and a wealthy elite for campaign funding. This dependence threatens the personal Rights of Liberty of every American, and every legislative attempt to restrain the political

corruption has been struck down or limited. In these circumstances, the People are justified in withdrawing their consent to be governed and to declare their personal Rights of Liberty as protection against the United States government—which is acting contrary to the rights and best interests of the American People.

Evidence of the failure of the federal government is abundant. The most recent Gallup poll places the approval of Congress by the American People at 16 percent. Registering as low as 32 percent, President Trump's approval rating is the lowest of any president in history, especially when burdened by a 44 percent disapproval rating. The approval rate of this Court is currently higher at 49 percent, but it is also disapproved of by 40 percent of the People.

Neither the Legislative, nor the Executive Power, are acting competently to deal with the critical political, environmental, economic, and militarization issues that threaten not only the liberty and freedoms of all Americans, but the entirety of humanity.

With the renewal of the USA PATRIOT Act and the warrantless surveillance program, violations of the personal Rights of Liberty—including privacy—take place against the American People on a constant basis.

Not only does the government of the United States no longer represent the American People, there are major, unresolved political and security



issues regarding the legitimacy of the 2016 presidential election and the manipulative influence of a foreign power in that election.

Most critically, President Trump has delegated his command and control of war-making powers to battlefield-level officers, who are being guided by a revised Nuclear Posture Review that accepts the use of tactical nuclear weapons in conventional settings. This is an extremely dangerous and unconstitutional expansion and misuse of executive powers. In either case, the threat of nuclear war represents a clear and present danger to the American People, if not all of humanity.

**VII. The Remedy of a National Referendum as an Expression of the Rights of Liberty is Appropriate**

It does not matter who, or which party, an American citizen votes for, the result will be the same. Whether the voter is a Republican, Democrat, Libertarian, Green, or Independent, the government is more likely to be responsive to powerful corporations, special interest groups, and the wealthy elite than to the American People.

Petitioner is confident that through the Court's own judicial notice, aided by the receipt and consideration of *amicus curiae* offered by learned, responsible, and reliable friends of the Court, his allegations will be confirmed to the Court's satisfaction.

The Rights of Liberty can be expressed in ways other than by voting for candidates and petitioning. Although not expressly provided for in the Constitution, *there is also a natural right to have a voice in matters of supreme importance*. Voting yes or no on the United States Voters' Rights Amendment (USVRA) in a national referendum would be an expression of the inherent Rights of Liberty.

The USVRA is a Voters' Bill of Rights. It is a comprehensive update of the Constitution to honor all voters by providing a constitutional right to vote; it ensures equal rights to women, and it makes all votes count equally. The Amendment demands truth from the government, educates voters and future leaders, allows the People to make policy, and forces their representatives to keep their promises.

Finally, the People will be given the right to directly vote on the most critical *political policy* issues facing the Nation each time they elect a new president.<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps because voting was primarily left up to the States, the U.S. government has never conducted a national referendum; however, many of the States (and the District of Columbia) allow direct voting. Moreover, the right to vote on critical issues is increasingly being expressed as an essential human right. Many countries are now

---

<sup>2</sup> The complete Voters' Bill of Rights is set forth in the Appendix and is hereby incorporated by reference.

presenting matters of national importance to their citizens for a vote. Most recently, the British people voted to decide whether the United Kingdom would remain in the European Union.

Here is the crisis confronting this Court: If mandamus does not issue to compel the government to allow the People a healing vote on the future of their Nation, there is a grave risk of a violent insurrection. From that, nothing good could result. The only peaceful and reasonable alternative is to trust the collective wisdom of the American People, who hold the inherent power to transform their government into one that will better serve their needs and those of future generations.

Alexis de Tocqueville wrote that, "The greatness of America lies not in its being more enlightened than any other nation, but rather in her ability to repair her faults." Therein lies the genius of self government—the human survival instinct to evolve in confronting new challenges.

### **VIII. The People are Entitled to Withdraw Their Consent to be Governed—if They are Not Allowed to Vote Effectively**

Whether Americans have the right to vote is an unresolved issue. The Constitution largely left voting rights up to the States—as the Constitution does not contain an explicit right to vote.

The individual citizen has no federal constitutional right to vote for electors for

the President of the United States unless and until the state legislature chooses a statewide election as the means to implement its power to appoint members of the Electoral College. (*Bush v. Gore*, 531 U.S. 98, 104, 2000)

Perhaps because only a minority of the People were allowed to vote at the time the Constitution was written and amended by the Bill of Rights, *the right of every person to petition their government for redress of grievances* was given priority in the First Amendment. (U.S. Constitution, First Amendment)

The preeminence of the right to petition is strong evidence that the right involves more than the ability to vote for representatives. The only effective forum to bring such a petition against the government of the United States—given the present crisis—is in this Supreme Court.

All power not delegated by the Constitution to the federal government or reserved to the States, resides with the People. (U.S. Constitution, Ninth and Tenth Amendments) These elemental Rights of Liberty create a personal power that is held by each and every American citizen. It can be expressed by an individual's vote, or by a petition for redress of grievances; however, the potential power of personal liberty—including the right to vote in referenda—far exceeds these manifestations. Deprived of these fundamental rights, the ultimate expression of the natural power of liberty is the

unrestrained ability of the People to withdraw their consent to be governed.

Having the Voter's Bill of Rights as the subject of a referendum will be a complete remedy, as the U.S. Voters' Rights Amendment provides the manner and means for its own ratification and implementation.

### CONCLUSION

Petitioner acknowledges his inability to adequately present the overwhelming evidence supporting his allegation that the United States government has become corrupt, ineffective, unrepresentative, and threatening; however he has confidence in the wisdom of this Court to judicially notice the state of the Nation, and to welcome and consider *amicus curiae* briefs filed in the matter, before rendering a just decision.

Living under a failed government, petitioner's options are to continue voting for the best of bad candidates, solicit money to run for public office, or contribute to political candidates who make empty and misleading promises. None of these options are appealing. Not only would they be destined for failure, petitioner is 77 years old and does not have the energy or means to undertake the effort required.

Whereas at common law and under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Section 8), there can be no right without an adequate remedy—and since the *only peaceful way* the

American People can effectively assert their Rights of Liberty is through a referendum on the future of their Nation—then an order to the Legislative and Executive Powers to hold such a referendum would be a constitutionally appropriate, and *necessary*, exercise of the Court's balancing power.

Based on the foregoing, the granting of this Petition for Writ of Mandamus is essential. The petitioner respectfully requests that an order and rule be entered and issued directing respondent to show cause why a writ of mandamus should not be issued against it and why your petitioner should not have such other and further relief in the premises as may be just and proper.

The Executive and Legislative Powers must be ordered to conduct and facilitate a national referendum on the Voters' Bill of Rights in conjunction with the next federal election.

The petitioner calls upon the assistance of this Honorable Court in this effort to defuse and resolve a dire threat to the survival of the United States of America. The thoughtful exercise of discretion by each individual Justice in deciding this matter is crucial—as not since Dred Scott appeared before this Court has it faced such a moral and critical question. Are we a free People, or not?

Respectfully Submitted  
**WILLIAM JOHN COX**  
*In Propria Persona.*

**The United States Voter's Rights Amendment**  
**The Voters' Bill of Rights**

**Section 1.**

The right of all citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to cast effective votes in political elections is inherent under this Constitution and shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State.

**Section 2.**

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

**Section 3.**

The States shall ensure that all citizens who are eligible to vote are registered to vote.

In balancing the public benefit of maximum voter participation with the prevention of voting fraud, Congress and the States shall not impose any unjustifiable restriction on registration or voting by citizens.

The intentional suppression of voting is hereby prohibited and, in addition to any other penalty imposed by law, any person convicted of the intentional suppression of voting shall be ineligible for public office for a period of five years following such conviction.

**Section 4.**

The rights protected by the Constitution of the United States are the rights of natural persons only.

Artificial entities established by the laws of any State, the United States, or any foreign state shall have no rights under this Constitution and are subject to regulation by the People, through Federal, State, or local law.

The privileges of artificial entities shall be determined by the People, through Federal, State, or local law, and shall not be construed to be inherent or inalienable.

**Section 5.**

Federal, State and local government shall regulate, limit, or prohibit contributions and expenditures, to ensure that all citizens, regardless of their economic status, have access to the political process, and that no person gains, as a result of their money, substantially more access or ability to influence in any way the election of any candidate for public office or any ballot measure.

Federal, State and local government shall require that any permissible contributions and expenditures be publicly disclosed.

The judiciary shall not construe the spending of money to influence elections to be speech under the First Amendment.

**Section 6.**

Nothing contained in this article shall be construed to abridge the freedom of the press, which includes electronic and digital publication.



**Section 7.**

In balancing the public benefits of corruption-free elections with allowing candidates to accept private campaign contributions, Congress and the States shall favor public financing over private contributions.

Broadcasters using the public airwaves shall provide free airtime for political campaign programming; ensure controversial issues of public importance are presented in an honest, equitable and balanced manner; and provide equal time to opposing candidates and political points of view.

No campaign for elective public office, including receipt of campaign contributions, shall commence prior to six months before such election.

**Section 8.**

Election districts represented by members of Congress, or by members of any State legislative body, shall be compact and composed of contiguous territory. The State shall have the burden of justifying any departures from this requirement by reference to neutral criteria such as natural, political, or historical boundaries or demographic changes. Enhancing or preserving the power of any political party or individual shall not be such a neutral criterion.

Congress shall apportion the number of representatives according to the decennial census to ensure the representation of a maximum of 250,000 Persons in each district.

**Section 9.**

It shall be a primary function of the government to ensure that the People are supplied with truthful, unbiased, objective, and timely information regarding the political, economic, environmental, financial, and social issues that affect them, and that all students are educated in the nature and responsibilities of representative democracy.

The University of the United States shall be established to incorporate all federal service academies and to provide education on the nature and responsibilities of representative democracy, the meaning of freedom, and the appropriate limitations on the use of coercion and force.

**Section 10.**

During the calendar year preceding a presidential election, Congress shall solicit public comment regarding the political issues that most concern the People.

Prior to the end of the calendar year preceding a presidential election, Congress shall adopt a joint resolution articulating questions regarding the twelve most critical policy issues to be addressed by the next president and Congress.

Failure of Congress to adopt such a joint resolution prior to the end of such calendar year shall result in the disqualification of all sitting members of Congress to be eligible for reelection.

**Section 11.**

Federal elections conducted every second year shall be held on a national voters' holiday, with full pay for all citizens who cast ballots.

Federal elections shall be conducted on uniform, hand-countable paper ballots and, for the presidential election, ballots shall include the twelve most critical policy questions articulated by Congress, each to be answered yes or no by the voters.

Paper ballots shall provide space allowing voters to handwrite in their choice for all elective federal offices, if they choose, and all such votes shall be counted.

**Section 12.**

Clauses Two and Three of Article Two, Section One and the Twelfth and Twenty-third articles of amendment to the Constitution of the United States are hereby repealed.

Clause Four of Article Two, Section One of the Constitution of the United States is amended to read as follows: "The Congress shall determine the dates of the primary and general elections of the president and vice president, which dates shall be the same throughout the United States. The presidential and vice presidential candidates receiving the most popular votes by all citizens of the United States shall be elected."

**Section 13.**

No person, having previously served as an official of the federal government, whether elected, appointed, employed, or serving in the military shall engage in any employment to advocate an interest or position to any Government official for a period of time following such service equal to the period of such service.

No person advocating an interest or position to any government official, whether or not for pay, shall offer or provide any campaign contribution, gifts, or things of value, including favors, services, travel, meals, entertainment, honoraria, and promises of future employment to such government official, nor shall such official accept any such proffering.

Restrictions imposed on such persons by this section shall not be deemed to violate the rights of free speech or petition for redress.

**Section 14.**

No member of Congress, federal judge, or federal official shall vote, or rule on any matter in which such person or their spouse, domestic partner, child, or contributor of more than minor amounts of campaign funds has a financial, legal, or beneficial interest.

**Section 15.**

This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution.

Delegates to State conventions to ratify this amendment shall be selected by special elections held within three months of its being proposed by Congress to the States. The voters in each congressional district in the several States shall elect one delegate. All delegate candidates shall affirm under oath when filing as a candidate whether they will vote yes or no for ratification of the proposed amendment, and their position shall be printed with their names on the special election ballot. Delegates shall not have the power to vote differently than their stated intention.

Conventions shall be held in the capitals of each State within three months of the election of delegates, with the chief justice of the highest court in the State chairing the convention. Tie votes by delegates shall be considered a vote for ratification.