

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENSES REPORT

State of Nevada

Jesse Dominic Harris Asm 21

Name (print) *Jesse Dominic Harris* Office (if applicable) *Asm 21* District (if applicable) _____
 Mailing Address (include city and zip code) *1801 N. Green Valley Pkwy #94 Henderson NV 89074* Telephone No. *(702) 521-7281*
 E-Mail Address *jharris@homepcimprovement*

Select Appropriate Box(es) CANDIDATE PAC BAG POL PRTY IND EXP AMENDED ANNUAL FILING

365

Annual Filing - Due January 15, 2004
 Period: January 1, 2003 - December 31, 2003

Report #1 - Due August 31, 2004
 Incumbents in an Office with a 4-year term Period: Jan. 5, 2001 - Aug 26, 2004
 Incumbents in an Office with a 6-year term Period: Dec. 20, 1998 - Aug 26, 2004
 All others Period: Jan. 1, 2004 - Aug. 26, 2004
 Ballot Advocacy Groups (BAGs) only: Period: Dec. 5, 2002 - Aug 26, 2004

Report #2 Due - October 26, 2004
 Period: Aug. 27, 2004 - Oct. 21, 2004

Report #3 Due - January 15, 2005*
 Period: Oct. 22, 2004 - Dec. 31, 2004
 BAGs only: Period: Oct. 22, 2004 - Dec. 5, 2004

Annual Filing - Due January 15, 2005
 Period: January 1, 2004 - December 31, 2004

* Third Report suffices for 2005 Annual Filing if candidate also filed Report Nos. 1 and 2

FILE
AUG 31 2004
 DEAN HELLER
 SECRETARY OF STATE
 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

CONTRIBUTIONS SUMMARY

	This Period	Cumulative From Beginning of Report Period #1 through End of This Reporting Period
1. Total Monetary Contributions Received in Excess of \$100 <i>if "\$" means silver dollars</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
2. Total Monetary Contributions Received of \$100 or Less <i>if "\$" means silver dollars</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
3. Total Amount of Monetary Contributions Received (Add Lines 1 and 2) <i>if "\$" means silver dollars</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
4. Total Value of In Kind Contributions Received in Excess of \$100 <i>if "\$" means silver dollars</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

EXPENSES SUMMARY

5. Total Monetary Expenses Paid in Excess of \$100 <i>if "\$" means silver dollars</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
6. Total Monetary Expenses Paid of \$100 or Less <i>if "\$" means silver dollars</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
7. Total Amount of All Monetary Expenses Paid (Add Lines 5 and 6) <i>if "\$" means silver dollars</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
8. Total Value of In Kind Expenses in Excess of \$100 <i>if "\$" means silver dollars</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

AFFIRMATION

I Declare Under Penalty of Perjury That the Foregoing is True and Correct.

See Attached

Signature

Date

ATTACHMENT TO THE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENSE REPORT

August 26th in the year of our Lord 2004

Dear Secretary of State Heller,

I am writing to you as a candidate for office and as the Clark County Chairman of the Independent American Party. Christopher Hansen just returned from a trial in Florida where I was able to watch a Department of Justice attorney, Mr. Peluso, question a witness asking about perjury and also give an explanation of what perjury was. Mr. Peluso told the courtroom that if the witness had signed a form under penalties of perjury and did not know it to be true and correct that he had committed perjury. That was also my understanding of the law although I am not an attorney. Mr. Hansen also questioned the defense attorney, Joel Hansen, about exactly what perjury was and he agreed with Mr. Peluso that if a person did not know that the statements he signed were true and correct and/or did not absolutely believe they were true and correct, that the signer of the document was indeed committing perjury.

Members of the Independent American Party have asked you many questions over the last eight years concerning the language on the Contribution and Expense forms and you have not ever answered these questions. You once claimed such questions placed you on the classic, "Horns of Dilemma." I understand your feeling about this as you have once again placed me and others on the classic "Horns of a Dilemma" by demanding that I, and others, send in the Contribution and Expense report when you have not answered our questions about the forms.

The Campaign Contribution and Expenses Report forms issued by you, the Nevada Secretary of State, have the word AFFIRMATION on the form followed by "I declare under penalty of perjury that the forgoing is true and correct."

This wording does not say, "to the best of my knowledge" or anything similar to such wording but contains the less forgiving term "the forgoing is true and correct." This allows no leeway. You must know it is true and correct. You cannot think it is true and correct. You cannot hope it is true and correct. You must know it is true and correct and if you do not know it and you sign it that is perjury and perjury is a felony.

As we all know, because of the Councilwoman Janet Moncrief scandal, if a false statement is made on the Campaign Contribution and Expense report a person may be subject to criminal prosecution. Councilwoman Moncrief subjected herself to prosecution by voluntarily signing the form. Of course it had to be voluntary because since the form is a demand for information by the government that can obviously be used against the signer in a court of law no one can be penalized for refusing to sign the form because no one, not even a candidate for office, is required "to answer official questions put to him in any . . . proceeding, civil or criminal, formal or informal, where the answers might incriminate him in future criminal proceedings."

On October 31, Nevada Day, in the year of our Lord 2002 in the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada concerning Dzul v. State the OPINION by the Court, was written by Justice BECKER, and states:

"The Fifth Amendment has long been interpreted to mean that a defendant may refuse to answer official questions put to him in any proceeding, civil or criminal, formal or informal, where the answers might incriminate him in future criminal proceedings. A defendant therefore retains his Fifth Amendment rights and a state may not impose substantial penalties on a person who decides to invoke his right against self-incrimination."

It appears that the STATE OF NEVADA alleges, in violation of both State and Federal Supreme Court decisions, that it can impose a substantial penalty on a candidate that decides to invoke his right against self-incrimination as the STATE OF NEVADA is currently attempting to unequally enforce large civil penalties against former Independent American candidates that invoked their right to refuse to give information that could be used against them in future possible criminal proceedings.

With all of that said I must ask some questions and make some statements.

If I sign the Campaign Contribution and Expenses Report and declare under penalty of perjury that the forgoing is true and correct then I would be committing perjury if I did not believe what I placed on the form to be true and correct therefore I must give you the following definitions to certain words, terms and/or symbols used on the form. If my understanding of these words, terms or symbols used on the form is incorrect please inform me of the legal reasons they are incorrect and what the Constitutional definitions of the word, terms and symbols are. Naturally I need the constitutional definitions since modern definitions may have attempted to alter the real meaning of the words as the Founding Fathers of our country were well aware.

If you do not define the words and phrases I will presume that the definitions that I am giving to you below are true and correct, not just to the best of my knowledge, but are actually true and correct as I will have no reason to believe that they are not completely true and correct and that any action you and/or the STATE OF NEVADA may take against me in any court or other proceeding will include these definitions as a part of my defense.

My experience with the STATE OF NEVADA is that they will deal very treacherously with me and members of the Independent American party and that many government employees would as soon violate my rights and the rights of others as to find out when their next smoke or coffee break is. You know how the STATE OF NEVADA has violated my rights in the past, as you have assisted in those violations, and have been involved with at least one court case that clearly demonstrated violations of my rights by the STATE OF NEVADA.

The following is my explanation and understanding of words and terms used on the Campaign Contribution and Expenses Report found on your website at:
<http://sos.state.nv.us/nvelection/reports/EL201.pdf>

I have silver dollars minted by the United States Mint from 1988 AD to 2004 AD. They have a face value of One Dollar and yet they cost between 10 Federal Reserve notes and 24 Federal Reserve notes a piece. (See attached exhibit A) found at:
http://www.centercoin.com/coin_catalog/silver_american_eagle.htm

Article 1 Section. 10 of the USA Constitution states: "No State shall . . . make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts."

I have never found any Constitutional Amendment that has changed this requirement on the States. My understanding, therefore, is that anytime the STATE OF NEVADA uses the term money or "\$" it MUST be describing gold and/or silver as no other meaning is Constitutionally allowable for states.

On the Campaign Contribution and Expenses Report forms is found a sign to represent what I must suppose means a silver dollar. It is the standard "\$" sign. My understanding of the symbol "\$" means: "The dollar is represented by the symbol \$."

From the 1913 AD unabridged Webster's dictionary is the following definition of a dollar: 1. (a) A silver coin of the United States containing 371.25 grains of silver and 41.25 grains of alloy, that is, having a total weight of 412.5 grains. Previous to 1837 the silver dollar had a larger amount of alloy, but only the same amount of silver as now, the total weight being 416 grains.

The Coinage Act, passed by the U.S. Congress on April 2, 1792 AD, established the U.S. Mint and regulated coinage of the United States. The long title of the legislation is, An act establishing a mint, and regulating the Coins of the United States. It defines a dollar in the following manner: Dollars or Units - \$1 - 371 4/16 grain pure or 416 grain standard silver. I know of no other law defining what a lawful dollar is and therefore know that a dollar is a specific amount of silver. A dollar cannot be made of paper unless it can be exchanged for its face value of 371 4/16 grain pure or 416 grain standard silver. I know of no such paper note or silver certificate available today that is printed by the State of Nevada or the United States.

The word "Dollar" is found in the United States of America Constitution in Art. 1 Sec. 9 and also in the 7th Amendment and therefore its definition cannot be changed from what it meant in 1787 AD by any simple act of Congress, executive branch order or any critical or judicial ruling just as the word "State" or "income" (see the 16th amendment) cannot be changed from its original meaning by any act of congress, court ruling or judicial ruling. If the meaning of words found in the Constitution could be changed from their original meanings then the Constitution would be a worthless scrap of paper. And in your words, Secretary of State Heller, "It's the Constitution Stupid."

Such changes in the words used in the Constitution are known as verbicide. Verbicide is a relatively new English word. It means the murder of a word or its intentional misuse. I believe that this has been attempted by the governments of these united States of America concerning what lawful money is in an attempt to defraud Americans. It was first used and defined by the famous English author and Oxford professor C. S. Lewis, but its dangers have been recognized for millennia. Confucius circa 500 B. C. is reported to have said:

"When words lose their meaning, people will lose their liberty."

Senator Sam Ervin, of Watergate hearing fame, understood verbicide and changing the meaning of words and how it is not allowable and if it occurred what its possible effects on law and the Constitution would be. He said:

"[J]udicial verbicide is calculated to convert the Constitution into a worthless scrap of paper and to replace our government of laws with a judicial oligarchy."

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Sr. understood the dangers of verbicide. He said:

"Life and language are alike sacred. Homicide and verbicide that is, violent treatment of a word with fatal results to its legitimate meaning, which is its life are alike forbidden."

The Founding Fathers were very clear on this subject:

In a letter to Henry Lee, James Madison wrote:

"I entirely concur in the propriety of resorting to the sense in which the Constitution was accepted and ratified by the nation. In that sense alone it is the legitimate Constitution... What a metamorphosis would be produced in the code of law if all its ancient phraseology were to be taken in the modern sense."

In a letter to William Johnson, Thomas Jefferson echoed Madison's sentiments:

"On every question of construction (of the Constitution) let us carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text, or intended against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed."

It is also my understanding that Federal Reserve notes are debt notes and have no intrinsic value so any use of them has no actual value but is only the exchange of debt and not the payment of debt. Therefore nothing of value actually changes hands.


I understand that the value of something is the fair market value of a product after you own it. If you do not own it then it belongs to another and you have no control over it. Therefore the value of a political flyer, sign, campaign advertisement, etc. is the value, in silver dollars that these products can be sold for after they are owned by a candidate. In the past I have been unable to sell any campaign materials for any dollars. I must, therefore, because my personal experience, believe that such materials have no value.

I will report ONLY those contributions and expenses that are in excess of \$100.00 (according to the value of a silver dollar as was the common understanding of a dollar when the Constitution of the United States of America was adopted) on my campaign that are received for or paid for in Silver Dollars as no other such meaning of dollar is allowable by law. If I were to do so and said so on the Campaign Expense Report I would be committing perjury. Are you telling me I should do this?

I am sending in your form only under threat of civil penalty and not of my own free will as I believe the entire reporting process is a violation of God given and Constitutionally protected rights.

I cannot sign the form under an Affirmation as to do so is a violation of my deeply held religious beliefs and the STATE OF NEVADA has no right to force me to sign an affirmation when I am willing to sign an oath.

I do solemnly Swear in the name of Jesus Christ that the foregoing is true and correct according to my best knowledge and understanding of these complicated issues. No intent to defraud or misrepresent my beliefs is found in this document.

 8/31/2004
Jesse Dominic Harris

I am also requesting answers to important questions not only for me but for members of the Independent American Party


1. Will your office accept the Campaign Contribution and Expense report if the candidate removed the Affirmation and instead signs under oath?
2. We would like to know why the standard Solemnly Swear (or affirm) (please note that affirm is in the secondary position) has not been used on the form as it appears to be a removal of the choice to choose God?

NRS 282.020 Form of official oath. Members of the Legislature and all officers, executive, judicial and ministerial, shall, before they enter upon the duties of their respective offices, take and subscribe to the following oath, resolution or law of any state notwithstanding, and that I will well and faithfully perform all the duties of the office of, on which I am about to enter; (if an oath) so help me God; (if an affirmation) under the pains and penalties of perjury.

As you see they are obviously quite different and swearing does not require the statutory penalties clause.

3. We would like to know, since the form clearly states: "I declare under penalty of perjury that the forgoing is true and correct," if any of us were to sign the form knowing full well that we had not collected a single "dollar" as that unchangeable definition as was used in the USA Constitution and were to instead replace those numbers with numbers we knew for a fact were not truly representative of Constitutional "money" or "\$" or "dollars" and that Federal Reserve Notes have no true association with a real "dollar" would, we be committing perjury?

4. If not why not?

 8/31/2004
Jesse Dominic Harris

Dear Mr. Heller,

Members of the Independent American Party have been demanding information about the Financial Disclosure laws for over 8 years. You have refused to answer our questions and have instead sued us and lied about us in to the press. Here is my response to your request.

In your letter dated August 25, 2004, you wrote:

1. "I am confident that you share my conviction that campaign finance reporting should be complete and meaningful to promote open government and trust in our democratic process."

My response:

1. The 2003 Nevada Legislature completely rejected your proposals you are trying to force on candidates with your letter and threats. In the words of Senator Townsend on May 7, 2003, during the hearings on A. B. 529, "At some point, you are not going to get anyone to run for office anymore. There are good people out there who cannot afford it and that is a tragedy because we need everyone representing the State of Nevada from all walks of life. You are going to make this so onerous and absurd, people are going to be afraid to do anything? I am terrified." You have attempted to bypass the Legislative intent with this threatening letter. This letter appears to be a violation of Nevada elections laws and you held no hearings where the public or candidates were properly informed that your office would be sending out this letter which has cost Nevada Tax payers without Legislative approval.

You Wrote:

2. "It is critical that the public disclosure of campaign finances be both transparent and understandable, not a pale imitation of the intent of the law."

My Response:

2. This is a lie. The legislative intent rejected your proposal. In fact Renee Parker, Chief Deputy Secretary of State, on May 7th 2003 while testifying before the Nevada Legislature stated: "This was originally our bill. In its current form, it is no longer the bill we proposed. Assembly Bill 529 actually does the opposite of what we had originally proposed?" See Nevada Legislature website at: <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/72nd/Minutes/Senate/GA/Final/2932.html> The original intent of this law rejected your proposals and now you are trying to bypass the legislative intent. You are attempting to be a tyrant.

You wrote:

3. "Unfortunately, the form approved by the Legislative Commission does not include information that is necessary to achieve meaningful disclosure of campaign contributions and expenses."

My response:

3. Mr. Heller you felt it was unfortunate, not the Legislature. They rejected your proposal, as your proposal was dangerous to the political process and liberty.

You wrote:

4. "Accordingly, as Secretary of State, I am requesting that you make voluntary disclosure of all you campaign funds, including beginning and ending balances, by submitting the following information and affixing your signature below."

My response:

4. You have no such authority. You are trying to circumvent the Nevada Legislature and impose what you wanted and did not get at the Legislature. I am considering taking legal action against you as you are using Tax payers' funds without Legislative consent.

You wrote

5. "Thank you for taking the time to respond to our request. You have demonstrated your desire to have meaningful disclosure of your campaign contributions and expenses."

My Response:

5. You are not welcome. You have once again stolen my time while you attempt to bypass the legislative intent.

You wrote:


6. "My office will be compiling a list of those candidates/elected officials who voluntarily provide full disclosure of campaign monies, as well as those who decline to do so, and this information will be posted on our website for the public to view."

My response:

6. Under what statute or regulation will you be doing this, Mr. Heller? How much will this be costing Nevada Tax payers? I demand you post those figures and the law or regulation that allowed you to request and/or post this information that was not required by the Nevada Legislature.

If you do post the responses on your website be sure to include this response, Mr. Heller. I will be sending this letter to my State Senators and Assemblyman and also to other members of the Legislature that I feel will be angered by your attempt to bypass the intent of the law they passed which as you know, "actually does the opposite of what we (Office of the Secretary of State) had originally proposed."

You are not the Nevada Legislature, Mr. Heller. Obey the law and stop trying to write your own laws to circumvent the Nevada Legislative original intent.


Jesse Dominic Harris

8/31/2004