

Sample from my Blind Loyalty booklet so you will fully understand the numbers.
California has 52 seats for the U.S. House of Representatives. Take a look at this:

Elections - Winner/Loser (Democrats & Republicans Only)

(Note: 2P is the 2000 Primary. N/2000 are the results from November 7, 2000 between 10:00-10:30 pm. D/2000 from December 2, 2000 at 5:29 pm representing the final tally.
* indicates incumbents.)

	94	96	98	2P	N/2000	D/2000
Riggs(R)*	53/47	48/43	62/33	64/29	65/29	65/28
Herger(R)*	64/26	61/34	63/35	65/26	68/27	66/28
Fazio(D)*	50/46	54/41	52/45	61/35	60/37	56/41
Doolittle(R)*	61/35	61/36	63/34	66/27	63/32	63/32
Matsui(D)*	68/28	71/26	72/26	71/24	66/30	69/26
Woolsey(D)*	58/38	62/34	68/30	66/28	63/31	64/28
Miller(D)*	70/27	72/22	77/23	75/23	74/24	77/21
Pelosi(D)*	82/18	84/12	86/12	86/11	83/14	85/12
Dellums(D)*	72/23	77/19	83/13	85/10	83/12	85/10
Tauscher(D)*	59/39	49/47	53/43	54/18	51/47	53/44
Pombo(R)*	62/35	54/36	61/3	61/35	56/40	58/38
Lantos(R)*	67/33	72/24	74/21	74/11	74/22	75/21
Stark(D)*	65/30	65/30	71/27	68/20	70/25	71/24
Eschoo(D)*	61/39	65/31	69/28	70/26	70/26	70/26
Campbell(R)*	60/40	59/35	61/38	33/40	45/52	54/42
Lofgren(D)*	65/35	66/30	73/23	72/24	71/25	72/23
Farr(D)*	52/45	59/38	65/33	56/14	67/26	69/25
Condit(D)*	66/32	66/32	87/13	65/29	68/31	67/31

Radnovich(R)*	60/40	67/28	79/21	67/21	65/32	65/32
Dooley(D)*	57/43	57/39	61/39	52/46	50/48	52/46
Thomas(R)*	68/28	66/27	79/21	73/22	71/26	72/25
Capps(D)*	11/47	49/44	55/43	55/38	54/44	53/45
Gallegley(R)*	66/27	60/35	60/40	63/25	53/41	54/41
Sherman(D)	49/48	50/43	57/39	66/30	64/33	66/30
McKeon (became inc.)(R)	65/31	62/33	75/25	63/27	67/29	62/32
Berman(D)*	63/32	66/29	82/10	85/11	82/14	84/11
Rogan(R)*	53/42	50/43	51/46	47/48	53/44*	44/53*
Drier(R)*	67/30	61/37	58/39	63/34	63/34	57/40
Waxman(D)*	68/28	68/25	74/23	76/19	71/25	76/19
Becerra(D)*	66/28	72/19	81/19	84/11	77/18	83/12
Martinez(D)*	59/41	68/28	70/23	62/11	76/11	79/9
Dixon(D)*	78/18	82/12	87/11	77/12	79/17	84/12
Roybal-Allard(D)*	81/19	82/14	87/13	85/12	81/16	85/15
Torres(D)*	62/34	69/27	68/29	70/24	70/24	71/23
Max Waters(D)*	78/22	86/12	89/11	85/12	83/15	87/11
Harman(D)*	48/48	53/44	49/47	40/41	48/47	49/47
McDonald(D)*	77/22	85/15	85/15	82/11	80/14	82/11
Horn(R)*	58/37	53/43	53/44	51/15	53/44	49/48
Royce(R)*	66/29	63/32	63/34	68/27	65/31	63/32
Lewis(R)*	71/29	65/29	65/32	84/9	81/9	80/10
Kim(R)*	62/38	59/33	53/41	59/31	67/30	59/38

Brown(D)*	51/49	51/50	55/40	56/32	54/42	60/35
Calvert(R)*	55/38	55/38	56/38	58/8	76/14	74/16
Bono's(R)*	56/38	58/37	60/36	57/14	60/38	59/38
Rohrbacher(R)*	69/31	61/33	59/37	62/26	67/29	62/32
Sanchez/Dornan*	57/37	47/46	56/39	58/25	59/37	60/35
Cox(R)*	72/25	66/29	68/30	69/10	68/29	66/30
Packard*	74/22	66/27	77/13	25/11	66/26	62/28
Bilbray(R)*	49/46	53/42	49/47	51/46	47/49	46/50
Filner(D)*	57/35	62/33	99/.77	67/20	64/32	68/28
Cunningham(R)*	57/28	61/29	61/35	68/27	66/29	64/30
Hunter(R)*	64/31	66/30	76/14	71/25	65/31	65/31

Some seats changed over these years, i.e. Riggs, Dornan, Fazio, Campbell, Dellums, Harman, Lee, Solis, Martinez, Packard, Bilbray, but the focus here is not candidates, but voting patterns: winner/loser totals. Not real creative.

In the Rogan Race, at **10:36 pm**, Rogan was ahead of the Democrat **53% to 44%**. At **6:28 am** on November 8th, the Democrat allegedly moved ahead **53% to 44%**.

By Dec 2, 2000 at 5:29 pm, Rogan, one of the 13 House Managers in the phony Clinton impeachment, allegedly lost his race: **44% to Schiff's 53%**.

I don't believe it for a moment. The numbers are too obvious, at least to me: Rogan leads with 53% to 44% and loses by **44% to 53%**. Flip flop!

96% of all incumbents get "reelected." It doesn't matter how bad people want some of these candidates out of office, nationwide, the incumbents always seem to get "reelected." Polls say that one in three would vote for a third party candidate. Nationwide on election night, third party candidates celebrate if they get 1.1% of the total vote. What a farce.

"Voters decide nothing. Those who count the votes decide everything." Joseph Stalin

The electronic ballot machines count the votes, but Americans cannot see the internal software even though we pay for the entire election process in our states.

One of the greatest facilitators of vote fraud is the insidious Motor Voter Law of 1993. Below are two articles I pulled from my CD to include here.

* * * *

Written August 30, 2000 - by Devvy Kidd

During the Vote Fraud Conference I attended in August 2000, one piece of news film we viewed was Clinton's campaign headquarters on "election" day, 1992, the time was *12:15 pm EST*. You could see George Stephanopoulos celebrating with everyone because they had just been notified by the media that Mr. Clinton had "won" the 1992 presidential election at 12:15 - lunchtime. Folks, that's 9:15 in the morning here in California - one hr and 15 minutes after our polls open. Just how in the hell did they count **tens of millions of votes** in 15 or 20 states for the electoral college delegates to determine where to throw their vote by lunch time on election day? Hmmm? The comment made on this news clip was that the media doesn't tell the people at the same time 'cause it's their policy.

CBS News' anchor, Dan Rather, gives his five minute report which aired on Election Eve, 1988;

Footage of actual ballot tampering with little tweezers in Miami and Cincinnati, as reported by the late Ken & Jim Collier, co-authors of *Votescam*; an excellent five minute report by Mary Krutko and Nick Clooney (actor George Clooney's father) which aired on WKRC-TV in Cincinnati about The Wiretapper, 1987, who gave sworn court testimony that he was involved in fixing an election through wiretapping;

Senator Bob Smith relating how all four networks called his election *wrong* based on their Voter News Service exit polls. Boy, did the shysters have egg on their face! I guess they got their preprogramming of the machines wrong and had to eat it publicly.

I will tell you that on election day for the 2000 primary, I voted in the afternoon. I signed the voter book. When my husband, whose registered Republican, went to vote in the evening. My name, under his, was typed by the computer but the space where I was forced to sign in pencil --it was now blank. They also tried to give my husband an "independent ballot" instead of a "Republican ballot." Excuse me, but what difference does it make which ballot you're given? Hmm? How come we all get different ballots for different parties? If the candidates are the same, i.e. one for the Republicans, one for the Democrats, one for independents, and we're all voting for the same ballot measures, etc., how come you are given a different card just because you're a this or that? Better think about that one, folks.

All the numbers below were obtained from the California Secretary of State's office. California has 52 seats for the House of Representatives, U.S. Congress. The media in California called the winners/losers within a minute or two after our polls closed each time. With no votes counted, only precincts "reporting." See what you think.

November 1994 General Election - Open

	Devvy (Ind)		Herger (Rep)	
	<u>(Jacobs)(Dem)</u>			
Secretary of State Certified 64.16% 55,959 26.04%	15,619	7.27%	62,055	
Newspaper next day with 33% of the precincts reporting 1 7,063 24.70%	4,095	5.90%	46,264	67%
Enterprise-Record next day with 40% of precincts reporting 65.70% 25.40%		6.70%		

Registered AIP in '94: **7,361**

Please note that Herger always beats his opponent by a margin of about 2:1:

'94: 64/26 - 7.27% (me) + 26.04% (Democrat opponent) = 33.31%

'96: 61/34

'98: 63/35

2000 primary: 65/26

If you add my alleged total of 7.27% + the democrat (Jacobs') 26.04%, the total vote of Herger's opponents is 33.31--right in keeping with what he always beats an opponent by whether it's one or two candidates he runs against. Very creative.

Secretary of State's Voter Registration for 1994:

Republicans: 143,879

Democrats: 140,760

All Other : 13,736

Decline to state: 34,380

Total: **332,755**

Voted - Sec of State only
counted Rep, Dem, AIP
and Libertarian

214,860

Difference: 117,895

Votes not cast:

8,355

Difference:

109,540 -

Where are those votes? Did 109,540 people in the Second Congressional District all walk into the voting booth and simply did not vote for a congressional seat in Congress? Hard to believe.

1996 Closed Primary

	(Rep)	Devvy (Rep)	Braden (Dem)	Herger
Certified	13,107	15.50%	71,452	84.49%
	52,082	100%		

Web site at

4:13 am

100.59% of precincts reporting 12,408 15.41% 68,108

85.59% 49,888 100%

Other candidates in that race: Todd (write-in Republican) - 10 votes; Brunner (Lib) -547; Votes not cast: Dem: 27.90%, Rep. 5.32% Lib. 25.68%

I have all the books from the '94, '96, '98 primaries, general election and 2000 primary. If you just go down the counties for these incumbents, you will see over and over and over that **the same people vote the same way, election after election**. Regardless of how many people move out of the district, how many pass away, how many want an incumbent out, they always win and you can forget "one out of three would vote for a third party."

Not to mention the fact that in Herger's case, when the Democrats outnumber the Republicans in Herger's district (he's a Republican), the Democrats appear to vote for him because he always beats his Democratic opponent by a margin of two to one or very close to that. The DNC has a real problem with party loyalty and visa versa in other districts. You see, you have to know these incumbents and their voting records to see which ones vote to further the agenda of the globalists --they are the ones who always get "reelected" or they are controlled neutralizers like many of the phony Republicans who serve in Congress.

Registered voters and Winners/Losers - 1998 General Election

	Rep.	Dem.
	Winner	Loser
Herger	132,216 70,837 (35%) (Rep)	135,365 128,372 (62%)(R)
Cunningham	169,769 71,706 (35%) (Rep)	102,120 126,229 (61%)(R)
Matsui	95,512 47,307 (26%) (Dem)	65,059 130,714 (72%)(D)
Doolittle	182,179 85,394 (34%) (Rep)	41,792 155,306 (63%) (R)
Waxman	81,878 40,282 (23%) (Dem)	184,412 131,561 (74%) (D)

At random, let's look at these numbers. All are incumbents who ran for Congress and "won":

Herger's Race:

Total registered voters: 267,581
 Votes cast for Republicans & Democrats: 199,209
 Votes cast for other parties: 6,158
 Not cast in race: 10,185

Total registered: 267,581
 Total votes all parties: 205,367

Difference: 62,000
 Not cast: 10,185

Left over votes: **51,815** - **Where are they?** All these people went into the voting booth and skipped voting for a member to serve in Congress?

Cunningham's Race:

Total registered voters: 271,889
Votes cast for Republicans & Democrats: 197,935
Votes cast for other parties: 8,943
Not cast in race: 15,616

Total Registered: 271,889
Total votes for all parties: 206,878

Difference: 65,011
Didn't vote: 15,616
Difference: **49,395** - **Where are those votes?** All these people went into the voting booth and skipped voting for a member to serve in Congress?

Matsui's Race:

Total registered voters: 264,387
Votes cast for Republicans & Democrats: 178,021
Votes cast for other parties: 3,816
Not cast in race: 9,856

Total registered: 264,387
Total votes for all parties: 181,817

Difference: 82,570
Not voted: 9,856
Difference: **72,714** - **Where are those votes?** All these people went into the voting booth and skipped voting for a member to serve in Congress?

Doolittle's Race:

Total registered voters: 323,971
Votes cast for Republicans & Democrats: 240,700
Votes cast for other parties: 7,524
Not cast in race: 15,715

Total registered: 323,971
Total votes for all parties: 248,224

Difference: 75,747
Not voted: 15,715
Difference: **60,032** - **Where are those votes?** All these people went into the voting booth and skipped voting for a member to serve in Congress?

Waxman's Race:

Total registered voters: 266,290
Votes cast for Republicans & Democrats: 171,843
Votes cast for other parties: 6,251
Not cast in race: 11,809

Total registered: 266,290
Total votes for all parties: 178,094

Difference: 88,196

Not voted: 11,809

Difference: **76,387** - **Where are those votes?** All these people went into the voting booth and skipped voting for a member to serve in Congress?

I would like to direct your attention to a report done in 1996 by a woman named Bonnie Kibbee out of San Diego, CA. She ran in the 1996 primary and experienced what you see above. Bonnie prepared a **very detailed** report to the phony Republican Secretary of State here in California, Bill Jones. The same Bill Jones that told me that if I didn't like the election returns I could just go sue the state. In any event, Bonnie's meticulous research shows that in her primary, between several candidates the **lost vote count** was **272,508 votes!** No one could ever account for them.

Her eye-opening report, based on actual, official documents was ignored and it is a travesty against the people of this nation that this kind of chicanery is going on and right in front of everyone's face. What's even more disgusting is that when you contact the elected officials in your own party, they thumb their nose at you if you're not the anointed one.

How about these numbers for 11 congressional seats in California, March 26, 1996 primary - winner/loser by percentage. Wish I would have had money on these numbers. All incumbents were winners. Everyone in 11 districts all voted the same. My, my.

Herger 84%

Kidd 16%

McKeon 84%

Starr 15%

Fazio 81%

McAfee 18%

Berman 83%

Gibson 16%

Garstecki 15%

Hughes 85%

Paul 12%

Rogan 87%

Dellums 85%

Stewart 14%

Boatner 18%

Stepanek 81%

Baker 81%
Williams 18%

Cunningham 86%
Pardo 13%

Brink 85%
Muller 14%

You see, California is a big state, just like Texas, Florida, Michigan and others. On election night, people are watching local news coverage. If it's a presidential election year, you'll get that coverage, otherwise, most people are watching their house seat, the mayor's race, supervisor and others in **their** area. A person in Placerville, CA (40 miles east of Sacramento) isn't watching the results of a house seat in Chula Vista (near San Diego and about 500 miles away) unless they have a relative running in that district.

Los Angeles carries a huge number of house seats. Who in Happy Camp, CA (just below the Oregon border) is watching the returns of a house seat in Santa Barbara, CA., hundreds of miles away? Yet, when you get all the election material from the Secty of State's office, then you can see the incredible story for yourself. Not too easy to accomplish in Connecticut or Rhode Island but the big states are a cake walk.

How about all the rhetoric about how people want change? Here in California the voters want change so bad, the same incumbents keep getting elected. We have **52** house seats. Guess how many incumbents were "voted back" in recent elections? In '94: **46**. In '96: **46**. In '98: **48** and the 2000 primary - **48**. Some change.

REPEAL THE MOTOR VOTER LAW

Updated January 11, 2001

The piece below is critical and Americans of all political persuasions must hammer on these people in Congress to repeal the insidious Motor Voter Law of 1993. It is nothing but an open invitation to fraud.

My God, isn't what we've seen over the past 40 years, coupled with the joke they called "elections" last November, enough to convince people that the billions of dollars invested or to be invested in electronic voting machines vs. the cheap cost of paper ballots, enough yet?

Despite my urging, not a single candidate I know audited their precincts. Serious about catching vote fraud in the act? I guess not.

Who makes the laws in this land? The Congress, the state legislatures, city councils and county supervisors. Who carries out and enforces these laws? Your sheriffs and the courts. Where do they get the power to do these things? From the ballot box. It all starts there and if the ballot box is compromised, and we know it is, don't moan and groan in

between elections about the same old crooks, cowards and criminals getting "elected." Get off your duffs and begin the work of cleaning up our voting rolls and system.

Don't buy into this dangerous and evil rhetoric going around about getting the Feds involved in creating "uniform" voting in the 50 states of the Union. It is unconstitutional as all hell. Congress may set the dates of the national elections, but all the rest of the entire election process is the right of the states under the Tenth Amendment.

A long time ago, the people in Athens, TN had their belly full of crooked elections. Today we have a bunch of cattle, perfectly content to allow our most precious right, the right to fair and impartial elections, be stolen right out from underneath their lazy noses. Well, I know there are a lot of good, concerned people out there who want to do something, and in my piece mentioned above and this bill below are ways to get this done.

Now is the time for all members of all political parties to demand from their state party leadership and central committees that they push their state legislatures to clean up our voting system and purge the voting rolls. Now is the time for all members of all political parties to demand from their Congress critter to repeal this insidious Motor Voter law - not two weeks from the 2002 election!

* * *

REPEAL THE MOTOR VOTER LAW BILL IN CONGRESS

To repeal the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. (Introduced in the House)

HR 38 IH

106th CONGRESS

1st Session

To repeal the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 6, 1999

Mr. STUMP introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

A BILL

To repeal the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.) is repealed.

Congressman Stump's remarks in the Congressional Record:

REPEAL THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT -- HON. BOB STUMP

(Extension of Remarks - January 06, 1999)

[Page: E3] GPO's PDF

HON. BOB STUMP

in the House of Representatives

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing my legislation to repeal the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, the 'motor-voter' bill.

The law, which took effect in most states on January 1, 1995, requires states to establish voter registration procedures for federal elections so that citizens may register to vote by mail, at state and local public assistance agencies and while applying for a driver's license. Motor voter provides no funding to the states to carry out any of these prescribed features.

The motor voter law was crafted to increase voter turnout by making the ballot more accessible. In one sense, it has achieved its goal. Motor voter has extended voting rights to non-citizens, dead people, children and even animals. On a more serious note, motor voter has fallen woefully short of its intended goal. While it is responsible for adding massive numbers of new voters to the rolls, voter turnout remains at dismally low levels. In 1996, voter participation dropped to 49.7%, one of the lowest rates in this century.

Motor voter has been a nightmare for many state election officials. Some have stated that motor voter has caused them to lose control over potential voter fraud. It ties their hands in removing 'dead wood' from their rolls by requiring them to keep registrants who fail to vote or who are unresponsive to voter registration correspondence to be maintained on voter rolls for years.

Moreover, it fails to provide for citizenship verification. As troubling, the law has actually hindered citizens' voting rights. In the last election, in my home State of Arizona, voters who registered to vote while applying for a driver's license were turned away at the polls. Apparently, their applications were not properly forwarded to the election recorder. Mr. Speaker, this presents an interesting and poignant question: Why would we entrust our privileged right to vote to the wrong people?

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no need for this unyielding federal presence in voter registration. The states carry the responsibility for administering all elections and should be free to do so without unnecessary and heavy-handed federal intervention. Last Congress, we were unsuccessful in mitigating some of the more egregious provision of motor voter.

Although I found this disappointing, I was encouraged by the heightened interest in reversing the law.

Mr. Speaker, the fraud perpetuated by motor voter will undoubtedly contribute to increasing voter apathy. I urge my colleagues to continue their fight to preserve the integrity of the vote by repealing motor voter. Voters must have assurances that a fraudulent ballot will not negate their precious vote. Please join me in repealing this ill-conceived federal mandate, which is a threat to our democracy.

* * *

For all information on status, floor actions, etc, please go to:

<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d106:h.r.00038:>

Congressman Bob Stump does not have a web site but he sits on the Veteran's Affairs committee and you can send him an e-mail through their web site at:

<http://veterans.house.gov/>

You can also call his office to thank Congressman Stump and let him know that the people are rallying to get this bill to a vote: 202-225-4576/Room 311.

* * *

Here's another outrage for you:

To make available funds under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1991 to provide scholarships for nationals of any of the independent states of the former Soviet Union to undertake doctoral... (Introduced in the Senate)

S 69 IS

106th CONGRESS

1st Session

S. 69

To make available funds under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1991 to provide scholarships for nationals of any of the independent states of the former Soviet Union to undertake doctoral graduate study in the social sciences.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

January 19, 1999

Mr. MOYNIHAN introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations

A BILL

To make available funds under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1991 to provide scholarships for nationals of any of the independent states of the former Soviet Union to undertake doctoral graduate study in the social sciences.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SCHOLARSHIPS FOR NATIONALS OF THE INDEPENDENT STATE OF THE

FORMER SOVIET UNION.

(a) AUTHORITY-

(1) IN GENERAL- Subject to subsection (b), the President is authorized to provide scholarships under chapter 11 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1991 (relating to assistance to the independent states of the former Soviet Union; 22 U.S.C. 2295 et seq.) for 100 nationals of the independent states of the former Soviet Union (as defined in section 3 of the FREEDOM Support Act (22 U.S.C. 5801)) who seek to commence graduate study in a six-year program in any field of social science.

(2) SUPERSEDING EXISTING LAW- The authority of paragraph (1) shall be exercised without regard to any other provision of law.

(b) REQUIREMENTS-

(1) NON-FEDERAL SHARE- The President shall require that not less than 20 percent of the costs of each student's doctoral study be provided from non-Federal sources.

(2) REQUIREMENT OF HOME COUNTRY SERVICES- Notwithstanding any other

provision of law, any student supported under this section who does not perform after graduation at least one year of service in the student's home country for each year of study supported under this section shall not be eligible to be issued a visa to be admitted to the United States.

(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS- Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to

carry out chapter 11 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1991 (relating to assistance to the independent states of the former Soviet Union; 22 U.S.C. 2295 et seq.) for fiscal years 2000 through 2009, the following amounts are authorized to be available to carry out subsection (a):

- (1) For fiscal year 2000, \$3,500,000 for not to exceed 100 scholarships.
- (2) For fiscal year 2001, \$7,500,000 for not to exceed 200 scholarships.
- (3) For fiscal year 2002, \$10,500,000 for not to exceed 300 scholarships.
- (4) For fiscal year 2003, \$14,000,000 for not to exceed 400 scholarships.
- (5) For fiscal year 2004, \$17,500,000 for not to exceed 500 scholarships.
- (6) For fiscal year 2005, \$17,500,000 for not to exceed 500 scholarships.
- (7) For fiscal year 2006, \$14,000,000 for not to exceed 400 scholarships.
- (8) For fiscal year 2007, \$10,500,000 for not to exceed 300 scholarships.
- (9) For fiscal year 2008, \$7,500,000 for not to exceed 200 scholarships.
- (10) For fiscal year 2009, \$3,500,000 for not to exceed 100 scholarships.

Who paid for your child's college education? You did not pay for either of my step children or my daughter. My husband and I paid and that's the way it should be. There isn't a scintilla of authority under Art. 1, Sec. 8 for the Federal Department of Education to even exist. It's flat out unconstitutional and so is this malarkey. The countries of the world must take care of educating their people. We can't be everything to the entire world. It's simply impossible. The sovereign citizens of the 50 Republics which make up America are under no constitutional obligation to fund the education of the world's children. I'm sorry if that sounds hard-nosed but that's life and that is how our Republic was set up by the Founders.

Tomorrow when you get up to go work your fingers to the bone, just remember: you are

working to give money to educate children around the world, provide condoms to people in Pakistan, abortions in Africa and millions to build the military might of foreign countries. **That's** what you slave at work for and that's what people support when they continue to vote for these same incumbents in Congress responsible for this rape of the people's labor.