

***PRESUMPTION:
CHIEF WEAPON FOR UNLAWFULLY
ENLARGING FEDERAL JURISDICTION***



*"As the thief is ashamed when he is found out, So is the house of Israel ashamed; They and their kings [rulers] and their princes [appointees], and their priests [judges of franchise courts] and their prophets [liberal economists], Saying to a tree, 'You are my father,' And to a stone, 'You gave birth to me.' [evolutionists] **For they have turned their back to Me [God], and not their face [by becoming like unto pagan gods themselves].** But in the time of their trouble [economic collapse] they will say, 'Arise and save us.' **But where are your [man-made] gods that you have made for yourselves?** Let them arise, if they can save you in the time of your trouble; **For according to the number of your cities [civil rulers and the people who WORSHIP, obey, and subsidize them, often at gunpoint] are your gods, O Judah.** [Jer. 2:26-28, Bible, NKJV]*

DEDICATION

“The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions.”

[Bailey v. Alabama, [219 U.S. 219](#), 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145; Manley v. Georgia, [279 U.S. 1](#), 5-6, 49 S.Ct. 215]

“But the person who does anything presumptuously, whether he is native-born or a stranger, that one brings reproach on the Lord, and he shall be cut off from among his people.”

[Numbers 15:30, Bible, NKJV]

“Ignorance more frequently begets confidence [and presumptions] than does knowledge.”

[Charles Darwin (1809-1882) 1871]

“Believing [PRESUMING without checking the facts and evidence] is easier than thinking. Hence so many more believers than thinkers.”

[Bruce Calvert]

“What luck for rulers that men do not think“

[Adolf Hitler]

“And in their covetousness (lust, greed) they will exploit you with false (cunning) arguments [“words of art” that advance FALSE presumptions]. From of old the sentence [of condemnation] for them has not been idle; their destruction (eternal misery) has not been asleep.”

[2 Peter 2:3, Bible, Amplified Edition]

“There is nothing so powerful as truth, and often nothing so strange.”

[Daniel Webster]

“Prejudices, it is well known, are most difficult to eradicate from the heart whose soil has never been loosened or fertilized by education; they grow there, firm as weeds among stones. “

[Charlotte Bronte]

“The significant problems we face cannot be solved at the same level of thinking we were at when we created them.”

[Albert Einstein]

“He who knows nothing is closer to the truth than he whose mind is filled with falsehoods and errors.”

[Thomas Jefferson]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
LIST OF TABLES	4
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	4
1 Introduction	16
2 Presumption defined and explained	16
2.1 Definition.....	16
2.2 Meaning of word “presumption” in the Bible.....	19
2.3 Presumption is a Biblical Sin.....	19
2.4 All Presumptions that Prejudice or Injure Protected Rights are a Violation of Due Process of Law that Result in a Void Judgment.....	20
2.5 Rationale for making legal presumptions	25
2.6 How presumptions affect choice of law in Court	26
2.7 Presumptions in civil litigation.....	27
2.8 Rebutting presumed facts	28
2.9 Rules of Presumption.....	29
3 How Congress abuses presumption to destroy your Constitutional rights	30
3.1 “Words of Art”: Using the Law to deceive and create false presumption	30
3.2 Vague laws	37
3.3 Statutory Presumptions that Injure Rights are Unconstitutional.....	41
3.4 Law as propaganda	44
4 How Courts abuse presumption to Destroy Your Constitutional Rights	46
4.1 Overview of abusive techniques of courts and government prosecutors	46
4.2 How governments and courts EVADE fulfilling the requirement to PROVE their presumptions	47
4.3 Purpose of Due Process: To completely remove “presumption” from legal proceedings	48
4.4 The Worst Presumption Of All: That “private law” is “law” for those not subject to it.....	50
4.5 Unconstitutional Judicial Presumptions Commonly Used in Federal Court.....	53
4.6 How corrupted judges encourage and reward presumptions by jurists in the courtroom	56
4.7 How Presumption turns Courts into Federal Churches in violation of the First Amendment.....	57
5 Prohibitions upon presumption in gathering court-admissible evidence	57
5.1 Rules of Evidence designed to completely remove presumption	57
5.2 Abuse of Presumption As Part of Legal Discovery	58
6 How the IRS and state revenue Agencies Abuse Presumption to Destroy Your Constitutional Rights	59
6.1 “Taxpayer” v. “Nontaxpayer”: Which One Are You?.....	59
6.2 Presumptions About Credibility of IRS Publications	69
6.3 IRS authority and jurisdiction presumptions	71
6.4 “Word of Art” Presumptions	73
6.5 “Exempt” presumptions on IRS Forms	75
7 Using presumption to win against the government.....	82
7.1 Federal Pleading Attachment.....	82
7.2 Rules of Presumption and Statutory Interpretation Form	82
7.3 Using Presumption in your favor in Federal court pleadings	83
7.4 Using favorable presumption to limit the adverse affect of vague definitions	84
7.5 Using Estoppel in pais to create presumptions	86
8 Resources for Further Study and Rebuttal	87
9 Questions that Readers, Grand Jurors, and Petit Jurors Should be Asking the Government	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Questions to Ask and Answer as You Read the Internal Revenue Code	32
Table 2: Things IRS is NOT responsible or accountable for.....	69
Table 3: Resources for further study and rebuttal	87

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutional Provisions

Article 1, Section 10.....	80
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2	46
Bill of Rights	28, 38, 42, 47, 70, 95
Federalist Paper # 78	42
Federalist Paper #62, James Madison	34
Fifth Amendment	52, 55
Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.....	21
First Amendment.....	56
Fourteenth Amendment.....	26, 50
Sixteenth Amendment	53
Thirteenth Amendment.....	80

Statutes

1 U.S.C. §204	29, 43, 49, 50, 94, 95
18 U.S.C. §1581	31
18 U.S.C. §201	21
18 U.S.C. §208	21, 73
18 U.S.C. §597	48
18 U.S.C. §641	73
18 U.S.C. §912	73, 76, 78
26 U.S.C. §1313	58
26 U.S.C. §1461	62
26 U.S.C. §162	62
26 U.S.C. §3121(e).....	46, 75
26 U.S.C. §3401	30
26 U.S.C. §3401(c).....	31
26 U.S.C. §6012	62
26 U.S.C. §6014	67
26 U.S.C. §6041(a).....	62
26 U.S.C. §6065	61, 86, 96
26 U.S.C. §63(a).....	64
26 U.S.C. §6901	32
26 U.S.C. §7203	37
26 U.S.C. §7214	71
26 U.S.C. §7343	63
26 U.S.C. §7426	63
26 U.S.C. §7433	67, 71
26 U.S.C. §7491	51, 55
26 U.S.C. §7701	45
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(10).....	31
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14)	58, 74, 79
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(16).....	32

26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)	74, 76, 79
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30)	58, 74
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(31)	76
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10)	73, 74, 78, 84
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A)	73
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B)	73
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(5)	75
26 U.S.C. §7701(c)	40
26 U.S.C. §864(c)(3)	74
26 U.S.C. §871(a)(3)	65
28 U.S.C. §144	21, 55
28 U.S.C. §1746(2)	46
28 U.S.C. §2201	61
28 U.S.C.A. §§ 1332, 1332(c)	53
28 U.S.C.A. §1332	53
31 U.S.C. §5331	62
4 U.S.C. §110	31
4 U.S.C. §72	42, 65, 79
42 U.S.C. §1983	29
5 U.S.C. §8422	72
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(2)	65
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21)	73, 74
8 U.S.C. §1401	46, 65, 73, 75
8 U.S.C. §1452	33, 74
California Evidence Code § 602	16
California Evidence Code §§ 621 et seq.	16
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)	61
I.R.C.	31
I.R.C. Subtitle A	60, 61, 63
Internal Revenue Code (I.R.C. , 26 U.S.C)	31
Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A	58
Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A	45, 46, 60, 76
Statute At Large	51
Tariff Act of 1930	61
Title 26	44
Title 26: Internal Revenue Code	29
Title 42: The Public Health and Welfare	29
Title 50: War and National Defense	29
U.S. Code	31

Regulations

20 C.F.R. “Employee Benefits”	65
20 C.F.R. §422.103(d)	65, 73
26 C.F.R.	73
26 C.F.R. §1.1-1	58
26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c)	46
26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3)	32
26 C.F.R. §1.6151-1	66
26 C.F.R. §1.871-2	73
26 C.F.R. §301.6671-1	71
26 C.F.R. §301.7701-5	62
26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3	32
26 C.F.R. §31.3401(c)-1	31
26 C.F.R. §31.3402(p)-1(a)	62
26 C.F.R. §601.201(k)(2)	70
26 C.F.R. Part 1	69

26 C.F.R. Part 301	69
26 C.F.R. Part 601	68, 69
31 C.F.R. §103.30(d)(2)	62
Code of Federal Regulations (CFR's).....	31

Rules

Alaska Rule of Evidence, Rule 301(b)	16
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11	55
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3).....	53
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b).....	47
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6).....	81, 82, 86
Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 43.....	53
Federal Rule of Evidence 301	16, 20
Federal Rule of Evidence 602	57
Federal Rule of Evidence 610	15, 20, 22, 57
Federal Rule of Evidence 611(c)	57, 58, 80
Federal Rule of Evidence 802	57
Federal Rules of Evidence.....	56
Hawaii Rule of Evidence 305.....	16
Hawaii Rules of Evidence 303, 304	16
Hearsay Rule, Federal Rule of Evidence 802.....	15
Maine Rule of Evidence 301(b)	16
Oregon Evidence Code, Rule 311	16
Oregon Rule of Evidence 311(2).....	16
Rule 10 of the U.S. Supreme Court.....	54
U.S. Supreme Court Rule 10. Considerations Governing Review on Writ of Certiorari	54
Vermont Rule of Evidence 301(b)	16
Wisconsin Rule of Evidence 301	16

Cases

84 Cal.App.2d. 229	48
A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.L. Chaides Constr. Co., 960 F.2d. 1020, 1037 (Fed.Cir.1992)	29
Alexander v. Inland Steel Co. (CA8 Mo) 263 F.2d. 314.....	26
Amerada Hess Pipeline Corp. v. Alaska Public Utilities Com. (Alaska) 711 P.2d. 1170	26, 27
American Banana Co. v. U.S. Fruit, 213 U.S. 347 at 357-358.....	79
American Casualty Co. v. Costello, 174 Mich.App. 1, 435 N.W.2d. 760.....	17
Arnold v. Ray Charles Enterprises, Inc., 264 N.C. 92, 141 S.E.2d. 14	26
Ashton v. Cameron County Water Improvement District No. 1, 298 U.S. 513, 56 S.Ct. 892 (1936).....	66, 85
Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm'n, 430 U.S. 442, 450, n. 7, 97 S.Ct. 1261, 1266, n. 7, 51 L.Ed.2d. 464 (1977)	24
Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm'n, 430 U.S., at 455, n. 13, 97 S.Ct., at 1269, n. 13 ...	24
Babcock v. Chesapeake & O. R. Co. (1st Dist) 83 Ill.App.3d. 919, 38 Ill.Dec. 841, 404 N.E.2d. 265.....	27
Bailey v. Alabama, 219 U.S. 219	42
Bailey v. Alabama, 219 U.S. 219 (1911).....	30, 93
Bailey v. Alabama, 219 U.S. 219 , 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145	2, 44, 49
Bailey v. Alabama, 219 U.S. 219, 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145	51
Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186, 208-210, 82 S.Ct. 691, 705-706, 7 L.Ed.2d. 663	94
Bartholomew v. United States, 740 F.2d. 526, 532 n. 3 (7th Cir. 1984)	70
Basso v. Utah Power and Light Company, 495 F.2d. 906 (1974)	54
Bates v. Bowles White & Co., 56 Wash.2d. 374, 353 P.2d. 663.....	28
Beagle v. Motor Vehicle Acc. Indemnification Corp., 44 Misc.2d. 636, 254 N.Y.S.2d. 763, 765	89
Bente v. Bugbee, 137 A. 552, 103 N.J. Law. 608 (1927).....	61
Botta v. Scanlon, 288 F.2d. 504, 508 (1961).....	61

Boulez v. C.I.R., 258 U.S.App. D.C. 90, 810 F.2d. 209 (1987).....	70
Boyd v. United States, 116 U.S. 616, 29 L.Ed. 746, 6 Sup.Ct.Rep. 524.....	50
Broadrick v. Oklahoma, 413 U.S. 601, 616 -617 (1973).....	96
Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S., at 122, 96 S.Ct., at 683.....	29
Buhler v. Maddison, 109 Utah 267, 176 P.2d. 118, 168 ALR 177.....	27
Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247 (1935).....	73
Bullock v. Latham, 306 F.2d. 45 (1962).....	64
Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325.....	84, 94
Burton v. Ohio, Adult Parole Authority (CA6 Ohio) 798 F.2d. 164, 41 BNA FEP Cas 1799, 41 CCH EPD ¶ 36544.....	28
C.I.R. v. Trustees of L. Inv. Ass'n, 100 F.2d.18 (1939).....	63
Callahan v. Van Galder, 3 Wis.2d. 654, 89 N.W.2d. 210.....	28
Cardell v. Morrison (DC Mass) 138 F.Supp. 817.....	26
Carson v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 156 Ohio.St. 104, 45 Ohio.Ops. 103, 100 N.E.2d. 197, 28 A.L.R.2d. 344.....	28
Carson v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 165 Ohio.St. 238, 59 Ohio.Ops. 310, 135 N.E.2d. 259.....	28
Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238, 56 S.Ct. 855 (1936).....	66, 85
Caterpillar Tractor Co. v. United States, 589 F.2d. 1040, 1043, 218 Ct.Cl. 517 (1978).....	70
Caterpillar Tractor v. United States, 589 F.2d. 1040, 1043, 218 Ct.Cl. 517 (1978).....	70
Charbonnet v. United States, 455 F.2d. 1195, 1199- 1200 (5th Cir.1972).....	70
Chasse v. Albert, 147 Conn 680, 166 A.2d. 148.....	26
Chicago & N. R. Co. v. C. C. Whitnack Produce Co., 258 U.S. 369, 66 L.Ed. 665, 42 S.Ct. 328.....	26
Civil Service Comm'n v. Letter Carriers, 413 U.S. 548, 556 (1973).....	96
Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. LaFleur (1974), 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215.....	22, 44
Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. LaFleur, 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215 (1974).....	29
Cline v. Frink Dairy Co., 274 U.S. 445, 47 S.Ct. 681 (1927).....	37
Coffin v. United States, 156 U.S. 432, 453 (1895).....	53
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392, and n. 10 (1979).....	82, 85
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10.....	82, 85
Computerized Radiological Services, Inc. v. Syntex Corp. (ED NY) 595 F.Supp. 1495, 40 UCCRS 49.....	27
Connally v. General Construction Co., 269 U.S. 385 (1926).....	37
Connick v. Myers, 461 U.S. 138, 147 (1983).....	96
Connizzo v. General American Life Ins. Co. (Mo App) 520 S.W.2d. 661.....	17, 88
County Court of Ulster County v. Allen, 442 U.S. 140, 60 L.Ed.2d. 777, 99 S.Ct. 2213.....	17, 88
Court in Estelle v. Williams, 425 U.S. 501 (1976).....	21
Crowell v. Benson, supra, 285 U.S., at 50-51, 52 S.Ct., at 292.....	24
CWT Farms Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 755 F.2d. 790 (11th Cir. 03/19/1985).....	70
De Santis v. Wackenhut Corp. (Tex App Houston (14th Dist)) 732 S.W.2d. 29.....	27
Del Vecchio v. Bowers, 296 U.S. 280, 286, 56 S.Ct. 190, 193, 80 L.Ed. 229 (1935).....	29
Delany v. Moralitis, C.C.A.Md., 136 F.2d. 129, 130.....	89
Delo v. Lashely, 507 U.S. 272 (1993).....	21, 30
Dick v. New York Life Ins. Co., 359 U.S. 437, 3 L.Ed.2d. 935, 79 S.Ct. 921.....	28
Donovan v. United States, 139 U.S. App. D.C. 364, 433 F.2d. 522 (D.C.Cir.), cert. denied, 401 U.S. 944, 91 S.Ct. 955, 28 L.Ed.2d. 225 (1971).....	70
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).....	23, 29, 34, 43, 96
Doyle v. Mitchell Brothers Co., 247 U.S. 179, 185, 38 S.Ct. 467 (1918).....	33
Dunphy v. United States [529 F.2d. 532, 208 Ct.Cl. 986 (1975)].....	70
Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S., 470 F.2d. 585 (1972).....	79, 80
Economy Plumbing & Heating v. United States, 470 F.2d. 585 (1972).....	64
Einhorn v. Dewitt, 618 F.2d. 347 (5th Cir. 06/04/1980).....	70
Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 207, 40 S.Ct. 189, 9 A.L.R. 1570 (1920).....	33
Empire Gas & Fuel Co. v. Muegge, 135 Tex. 520, 143 S.W.2d. 763.....	28
Employers' Liability Assur. Corp. v. Maes (CA10 NM) 235 F.2d. 918.....	28
Estep v. Norfolk & W. R. Co. (CA6 Ky), 192 F.2d. 889.....	26
Ferdinand v. Agricultural Ins. Co., 22 N.J. 482, 126 A.2d. 323, 62 A.L.R.2d. 1179.....	17, 88
Ferry v. Ramsey, 277 U.S. 88, 72 L.Ed. 796, 48 S.Ct. 443.....	27
Finch v. Hughes Aircraft Co., 57 Md.App. 190, 469 A.2d. 867.....	26, 27
Fiorentino v. United States, 607 F.2d. 963, 968, 221 Ct.Cl. 545 (1979), cert. denied, 444 U.S. 1083, 100 S.Ct. 1039, 62 L.Ed.2d. 768 (1980).....	70

Firkus v. Murphy, 311 Minn 85, 246 N.W.2d. 864.....	28
Flora v. U.S., 362 U.S. 145 (1960).....	67
Flora v. United States	71
Flora v. United States, 362 U.S. 145 (1960).....	71
Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935)	82, 85
Freeman United Coal Mining Co. v. Office of Workers' Compensation Program (CA7) 999 F.2d. 291)	27
Gardner v. Broderick, 392 U.S. 273, 277 -278 (1968)	96
Glidden Co. v. Zdanok, 370 U.S., at 548-549, and n. 21, 82 S.Ct., at 1471-1472, and n. 21	24
Glover v. Henry (Tex App Eastland) 749 S.W.2d. 502.....	17
Goldman v. Beaudry, 122 Vt. 299, 170 A.2d. 636.....	27
Gordon's Transports, Inc. v. Bailey, 41 Tenn App 365, 294 S.W.2d. 313	27
Grayned v. City of Rockford, 408 U.S. 104, 108 (1972)	37
Greene v. Willey, 147 Me. 227, 86 A.2d. 82.....	28
Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 (1906).....	50
Hammer v. Dagenhart, 247 U.S. 251, 275, 38 S.Ct. 529, 3 A.L.R. 649, Ann.Cas.1918E 724.....	66, 85
Heiner v. Donnan, 285 U.S. 312 (1932).....	51
Heiner v. Donnan, 285 U.S. 312, 52 S.Ct. 358, 76 L.Ed. 772 (1932)	22
Henderick v. Uptown Safe Deposit Co. (1st Dist) 21 Ill.App.2d. 515, 159 N.E.2d. 58	28
Higley v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 69 F.2d. 160 (1934).....	61
Hinds v. John Hancock Mut. Life Ins. Co., 155 Me. 349, 155 A.2d. 721, 85 A.L.R.2d. 703	17, 28, 88
Hoepfer v. Tax Comm'n, 284 U.S. 206, 52 S.Ct. 120, 76 L.Ed. 248 (1931)	22
Holt Service Co. v. Modlin, 163 Ga.App. 283, 293 S.E.2d. 741.....	26, 27
In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358, 364 (1970)	21
Insurance Co. of North America v. Kunin, 175 Neb. 260, 121 N.W.2d 372, 375, 376.....	54
Islamic Republic of Iran v. Pahlavi, 116 Misc.2d. 590, 455 N.Y.S.2d. 987, 990.....	38, 94
Jackson v. Coggan (SD NY) 330 F.Supp. 1060	26
Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co., 419 U.S. 345, 349 (1974)	30
Jensen v. Brown, 19 F.3d. 1413, 1415 (Fed.Cir.1994).....	29
Jodoin v. Baroody, 95 N.H. 154, 59 A.2d. 343	28
Joffre v. Canada Dry Ginger Ale, Inc., 222 Md. 1, 158 A.2d. 631	26
Johnson v. Atlantic C. L. R. Co., 217 S.C. 190, 60 S.E.2d. 226	28
Johnson v. White, 154 Mich.App. 425, 397 N.W.2d. 555.....	28
Jupiter v. United States (ED La), 181 F.Supp. 294, affd (CA5 La) 287 F.2d. 388.....	27
Kabo v. Summa Corp. (ED Pa), 523 F.Supp. 1326.....	26
Kazubowski v. Kazubowski, 45 Ill.2d. 405, 259 N.E.2d. 282, 290.....	20
Keeshin Motor Express Co. v. Park Davis Lines, Inc. (DC Mo), 119 F.Supp. 561	27
Kelley v. Johnson, 425 U.S. 238, 247 (1976).....	96
Keyes v. School Dist., 413 U.S. 189, 37 L.Ed.2d. 548, 93 S.Ct. 2686.....	26
Knight v. Handley Motor Co. (Dist Col App) 198 A.2d. 747	27
Kowalski v. Wojtkowski, 19 N.J. 247, 116 A.2d. 6, 53 A.L.R.2d. 556	27
Lachman v. Pennsylvania Greyhound Lines, Inc. (CA4 Va) 160 F.2d. 496	27
Leary v. United States, 395 U.S. 6, 29-53, 89 S.Ct. 1532, 1544-1557, 23 L.Ed.2d. 57 (1969).....	22
Lecroy 751 F.2d. at 127. See also 79 T.C. at 1069.....	70
Legille v. Dann, 178 U.S.App.DC. 78, 544 F.2d. 1, 191 U.S.P.Q. 529.....	17, 88
Levasseur v. Field (Me), 332 A.2d. 765.....	17, 88
Leventhal v. American Airlines, Inc., 347 Mass. 766, 196 N.E.2d. 924.....	26
License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866)	67
Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874).....	53
Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236 (1922).....	46, 52
Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236, 238 (1922).....	64, 69
Luhring v. Glotzbach, 304 F.2d. 560 (4th Cir. 05/28/1962).....	70
Luther v. Borden, 48 U.S. 1 (1849).....	39, 95
Lynn v. Cepurneek, 352 Pa.Super. 379, 508 A.2d. 308	29
Manchester v. Dugan (Me), 247 A.2d. 827	17, 88
Manley v. Georgia, 279 U.S. 1, 49 S.Ct. 215, 73 L.Ed. -	42
Manley v. Georgia, 279 U.S. 1, 5-6, 49 S.Ct. 215.....	2, 44, 49, 51
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)	55

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 1 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803)	32
Marquis v. St. Louis S. F. R. Co. (2nd Dist) 234 Cal.App.2d. 335, 44 Cal Rptr 367.....	26
Martin v. Phillips, 235 Va. 523, 369 S.E.2d. 397	17, 88
Maryland Casualty Co. v. Williams (CA5 Miss), 377 F.2d. 389, 35 ALR3d 275.....	26, 27
Maurer v. United States (ED Wis), 219 F.Supp. 253	27
McCulloch v. Maryland, 4 Wheat. 316, 428	76
McDougall v. Glenn Cartage Co., 169 Ohio.St. 522, 9 Ohio.Ops.2d. 12, 160 N.E.2d. 266.....	26
McMillan v. Pennsylvania, 477 U.S. 79 (1986)	42
McNamer v. American Ins. Co., 267 Wis. 494, 66 N.W.2d. 342	28
Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484 (1987).....	82, 85
Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987)	82, 85
Melville v. American Home Assur. Co. (CA3 Pa) 584 F.2d. 1306, 3 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 756	26, 27
Miller & Long Co. v. Shaw (Dist Col App), 204 A.2d. 697	26
Miller Brothers Co. v. Maryland, 347 U.S. 340 (1954).....	38, 59
Mobile, J. & K. C. R. Co. v. Turnipseed, 219 U.S. 35, 55 L.Ed. 78, 31 S.Ct. 136.....	28
Morrison v. California, 291 U.S. 82, 96 -97.....	42
Mudd v. Goldblatt Bros., Inc. (1st Dist) 118 Ill.App.3d. 431, 73 Ill.Dec. 657, 454 N.E.2d. 754.....	26
Mulroy v. Co-operative Transit Co., 142 W Va. 165, 95 S.E.2d. 63.....	28
Murray v. Montgomery Ward Life Ins. Co., 196 Colo. 225, 584 P.2d. 78.....	17, 88
Murray's Lessee v. Hoboken Land & Improvement Co., 18 How. 272, 284 (1856)	24
Myers v. Gaither (Dist Col App), 232 A.2d. 577	27
National Collegiate Athletic Assn. v. Tarkanian, 488 U.S. 179, 193, n. 13 (1988).....	30
Neither Tot v. United States, 319 U.S. 463	42
New York C. R. Co. v. Monroe (SD NY) 188 F.Supp. 826, 15 Ohio.Ops.2d. 31.....	26
New York Life Ins. Co. v. Gamer, 303 U.S. 161, 171, 58 S.Ct. 500, 503, 82 L.Ed. 726 (1938)	29
New York Times v. Sullivan, 376 U.S. 254 (1964)	16, 23, 49
Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100.....	84, 94
Newell v. Richards, 83 Md.App. 371, 574 A.2d. 370	26
Nikulnikoff v. Archbishop, etc., of Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, 142 Misc. 894, 255 N.Y.S. 653, 663.....	88
Northern Commercial Co. v. U. S., C.C.A.Alaska, 217 F. 33, 36.....	18
Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 458 U.S. 50, 102 S.Ct. 2858 (1983).....	24, 25
Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 458 U.S. at 83-84, 102 S.Ct. 2858 (1983).....	30
O'Connor v. Ortega, 480 U.S. 709, 723 (1987).....	96
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 485. (1928).....	71
Panduit Corp. v. All States Plastic Mfg. Co. (CA FC), 744 F.2d. 1564, 223 U.S.P.Q. 465	28
Papachristou v. City of Jacksonville, 405 U.S. 156 (1972).....	37
Peck v. Board of Directors of Public Schools for Parish of Catahoula, 137 La. 334, 68 So. 629, 630	18
Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U.S. 714, 24 L.Ed. 565.....	20
Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U.S. 714, 732-733 (1878).....	23
Pennsylvania, Dept. of Transp. v. United States, 226 Ct.Cl. 444, 643 F.2d. 758, 7 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1157	29
Pettit v. Penn, LaApp., 180 So.2d. 66, 69	20
Pilot Life Ins. Co. v. Boone (CA5 Ala) 236 F.2d. 457	27
Pizza v. Wolf Creek Ski Dev. Corp. (Colo) 711 P.2d. 671, 55 A.L.R.4th. 607	28
Poitras v. R. E. Glidden Body Shop, Inc. (Me) 430 A.2d. 1113	17, 88
Port Terminal & Warehousing Co. v. John S. James Co., D.C.Ga., 92 F.R.D. 100, 106	16
Portillo v. C.I.R., 932 F.2d. 1128 (5th Cir. 1991).....	54
Public Workers v. Mitchell, 330 U.S. 75, 101 (1947)	96
Raffaele v. Granger, 196 F.2d. 620 (1952).....	64
Re Estate of Borom (Ind App) 562 N.E.2d. 772	17, 88
Re Estate of Swan, 4 Utah.2d. 277, 293 P.2d. 682	28
Re Guardianship of Breece, 173 Ohio.St. 542, 20 Ohio.Ops.2d. 155, 184 N.E.2d. 386	28
Re Medico Associates, Inc. (BC DC Mass) 23 BR 307; Computerized Radiological Services, Inc. v. Syntex Corp. (ED NY) 595 F.Supp. 1495, 40 UCCRS 49.....	26
Re O'Connor's Estate, 74 Ariz 248, 246 P.2d. 1063.....	28
Reid v. Covert, 354 U.S. 1, 5 -10	42
Richardson-Merrell, Inc. v. Koller, 472 U.S. 424, 86 L.Ed.2d. 340, 105 S.Ct. 2757.....	28
Roberts v. Commissioner, 176 F.2d. 221, 225 (9 C.A., 1949)	47

Rothensis v. Ullman, 110 F.2d. 590(1940).....	64
Routen v. West, 142 F.3d. 1434 C.A.Fed.,1998.....	29
Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62 (1990).....	96
Sanders v. Glenshaw Glass Co. (CA3 Pa), 204 F.2d. 436, cert den 346 U.S. 916, 98 L.Ed. 411, 74 S.Ct. 278.....	27
Schenck v. Minolta Office Sys., Inc. (Colo App), 802 P.2d. 1131.....	28
Schlesinger v. Wisconsin, 270 U.S. 230, 46 S.Ct. 260, 70 L.Ed. 557 (1926)	22
Schlichting v. Schlichting, 15 Wis.2d. 147, 112 N.W.2d. 149	28
Schmitt v. U.S., 140 B.R. 571 (Bank W.D. Okl. 1992).....	64
Sewell v. Georgia, 435 U.S. 982 (1978).....	23, 37, 94
Shepherd v. Midland Mut. Life Ins. Co., 152 Ohio.St. 6, 39 Ohio.Ops. 352, 87 N.E.2d. 156, 12 A.L.R.2d. 1250	28
Simms. v. Ahrens, 271 S.W. 720	33
Sloan v. Comm’r, 53 F.3d. 799 (7th Cir. 1995), cert. denied, 516 U.S. 897 (1995).....	64
Sloniger v. Enterline, 400 Pa. 457, 162 A.2d. 397	26
Smiley v. Lenane, 363 Ill. 66, 1 N.E.2d. 213, 216	18
Smith v. Bohlen, 95 N.C. App 347, 382 S.E.2d. 812, affd 328 N.C. 564, 402 S.E.2d. 380.....	17, 88
Smith v. Farley, 155 App.Div. 813, 140 N.Y.S. 990, 992.....	18
Smith v. Smith, 206 Pa.Super. 310, 213 A.2d. 94	60
South Carolina v. Ragan, 465 U.S. 367 (1984).....	64
Spillman v. Succession of Spillman, 147 La. 47, 84 So. 489, 490	18
Stanley v. Illinois, 405 U.S. 645, 31 L.Ed.2d. 551, 92 S.Ct. 1208	27
State ex re. Maisano v. Mitchell, 155 Conn. 256, 231 A.2d. 539, 542.....	89
State ex. Re. Herbert v. Whims, 68 Ohio.App. 39, 38 N.E.2d. 596, 599, 22 O.O. 110.....	95
State Mut. Life Assur. Co. v. Wittenberg (CA8 Ark) 239 F.2d. 87.....	26
State v. Circuit Court of Dodge County, 176 Wis. 198, 186 N.W. 732, 734.....	18
Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)	82, 85
Stratton’s Independence v. Howbert, 231 U.S. 399, 414, 58 L.Ed. 285, 34 Sup.Ct. 136 (1913)	33
Stuart v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (Mo App) 699 S.W.2d. 450	26
Sun Oil Co. v. Wortman, 486 U.S. 717, 100 L.Ed.2d. 743, 108 S.Ct. 2117, 101 OGR 1	26
Swain v. Neeld, 28 N.J. 60, 145 A.2d. 320	25
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc. v. Barker (CA1 Mass) 228 F.2d. 842	26
Terry v. Bothke, 713 F.2d. 1405, at 1414 (1983).....	61
Texas Dept. of Community Affairs v. Burdine, 450 U.S. 248, 67 L.Ed.2d. 207, 101 S.Ct. 1089, 25 BNA FEP Cas 113, 25 CCH EPD ¶ 31544, 9 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1.....	28
Tietloff v. Lift-A-Loft Corp. (Ind App) 441 N.E.2d. 986	26, 27
Tot v. United States, 319 U.S. 463, 468-469, 63 S.Ct. 1241, 1245-1246, 87 L.Ed. 1519 (1943).....	22
Travelers’ Protective Ass’n v. Jones, 75 Ind. App. 29,127 N.E. 783,785	18
Tri-Aspen Constr. Co. v. Johnson (Colo) 714 P.2d. 484.....	28
Trinity Episcopal Corp. v. Romney, D.C.N.Y., 387 F.Supp. 1044, 1084	21
Turner v. United States, 396 U.S. 398, 418-419, 90 S.Ct. 642, 653-654, 24 L.Ed.2d. 610 (1970)	22
U.S. v. Bull, 295 U.S. 247, 26 (1935)	73
U.S. v. Slater, 545 Fed.Supp. 179,182 (1982).....	56
U.S. v. Smith, D.C.Iowa, 249 F.Supp. 515, 516.....	20
U.S. v. Will, 671 F.2d. 963 (1982).....	70
United Air Lines, Inc. v. Wiener (CA9 Cal) 335 F.2d. 379, 8 F.R.Serv.2d. 49b.42	26
United States v. Erie R. Co., 106 U.S. 327 (1882).....	76
United States v. Hover, 268 F.2d. 657 (1959).....	55
United States v. Kusche, D.C.Cal., 56 F.Supp. 201 207, 208	89
United States v. United Mine Workers of America, 330 U.S. 258 (1947)	40
Usery v. Turner Elkhorn Mining Co., 428 U.S. 1, 49 L.Ed.2d. 752, 96 S.Ct. 2882, 1 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 243	27
Valleroy v. Southern R. Co. (Mo) 403 S.W.2d. 553	27
Van Wart v. Cook, Okl.App., 557 P.2d. 1161, 1163.....	16
Vaughn v. State, 3 Tenn.Crim.App. 54, 456 S.W.2d. 879, 883	21
Vernon v. Aubinoe, 259 Md. 159, 269 A.2d. 620	26
Vicars v. Atlantic Discount Co., 205 Va. 934, 140 S.E.2d. 667.....	26
Vlandis v. Kline, 412 U.S. 441 (1973)	22
Vlandis v. Kline, 412 U.S. 441, 449, 93 S.Ct. 2230, 2235 (1973)	22, 29, 44
Waters v. New Amsterdam Casualty Co., 393 Pa. 247, 144 A.2d. 354	28

Weber v. Continental Casualty Co. (CA10 Okla) 379 F.2d. 729	26
Weeks v. United States, 232 U.S. 383 (1914)	72
Wells v. Dairyland Mut. Ins. Co., 274 Wis. 505, 80 N.W.2d. 380.....	28
Wendland v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 739 F.2d. 580, 581 (11th Cir.1984)	70
West Virginia Bd. of Ed. v. Barnett, 319 U.S. 624, 638 (1943).....	39
Western and Atlantic Railroad v. Henderson, 279 U.S. 639 (1929).....	51
Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945).....	82, 85
World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson, 444 U.S. 286 (1980).....	23
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)	40

Other Authorities

2 Bouv. Inst. n. 2279, 2327; 4 T. R. 657	23, 45
22A American Jurisprudence 2d, Death §§ 551 et seq. (1999)	26
2A N. Singer, Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992)	82, 85
Abbott and Costello.....	35
Achtemeier, P. J., Harper & Row, P., & Society of Biblical Literature. 1985. Harper's Bible dictionary. Includes index. (1st ed.). Harper & Row: San Francisco.....	89
Adolf Hitler	2
Adventures in Legal Land Video, Marc Stevens.....	84
Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status, Form #02.001	25
Albert Einstein.....	2
American Jurisprudence 2d, Estoppel and Waiver, §27: Definitions and Nature (1999).....	86
American Jurisprudence 2d, Estoppel and Waiver, §28: Basis, function, and purpose (1999)	86
American Jurisprudence 2d, Evidence, §181 (1999).....	87
American Jurisprudence 2d, Evidence, §181 (1999).....	17, 88
American Jurisprudence 2d, Evidence, §185 (1999).....	25
American Jurisprudence 2d, Evidence, §186: Choice of Law (1999)	26
American Jurisprudence 2d, Evidence, §190: Civil litigation (1999)	27
American Jurisprudence 2d, Evidence, §199	28
Aristotle for Armchair Theologians	19
Assistant for National Security Affairs, Condoleeza Rice	35
Babylon the Great is Falling.....	60
Ballentine's Law Dictionary, 3rd Edition (1969), p. 468	47
Black's Law Dictionary.....	30
Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1246	18
Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1593	24
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1162.....	50
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1185.....	17, 21, 29
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1189.....	53, 95
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1190.....	44, 51
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1292.....	88
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1407.....	89
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 423.....	31
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 485.....	60
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 500.....	21, 30, 53, 93
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581.....	85, 94
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 828.....	18
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 97.....	54
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, pp. 1158-1159	38, 94
Bruce Calvert.....	2
Charles Darwin.....	2
Charlotte Bronte	2
Confucius	25
Confucius, 500 B.C.	35
Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001.....	63
Correcting Erroneous IRS Form 1042's, Form #04.003	63

Correcting Erroneous IRS Form 1098's, Form #04.004	63
Correcting Erroneous IRS form 1099's, Form #04.005	63
Correcting Erroneous IRS Form W-2's, Form #04.006	63
Daniel Webster	2
DOJ	55
Ernest F. Kevan, The Moral Law (Jenkintown, Penna.: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1963) p. 5 f.	90
Eugene Pringle	60
Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, Rutter Group, paragraph 8:4993, p. 8K-34	22, 44
Federal Pleading/Motion/Petition Attachment, Litigation Tool #01.002	25, 82
Galileo Paradigm, Form #11.303	87
Garner, Brian A., Ed., ed (1999). Black's Law Dictionary (7th ed.). St. Paul, MN: West. p. 833	18
George Bush	35
Gilberts Law Summaries, p. 33, sections 207- 211	48
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030	30
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Form #11.302, Section 4.8	32
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Form #11.302, Sections 6.5.15, 6.5.18, 6.8.2 through 6.9.12	50
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 3.9.1 through 3.9.1.27	49
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.3.1	73
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.4.3.5	49
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.4.9	72
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.6.1	61, 73
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.6.16	61
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.6.8	61
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.9.7	73
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Sections 3.9.1.8 and 5.6.17	32
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Sections 5.4 through 5.4.3.6	57
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Sections 5.4.1 through 5.4.3.6	68
Gustave Friedrich Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1883), p. 177	92
H. de Jongste and J.M. van Krimpen, The Bible and the Life of the Christian	93
Hermann Kleinknecht and W. Guthbrod, Law (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962), p. 21	90
Hu Jintao	35
Hugh H. Currie, "Law of God," in James Hastings, ed., A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919), I, 685	91
Internal Revenue Audit Manual (1975)	67
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 1.1.1.1	86
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 1.1.1.1 (02-26-1999)	80
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.8	69, 70
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.9.8 (05/14/99)	75
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 5.1.11.6.8	67
IRS Document 7130	75
IRS Examination Branch	62
IRS Form 1040	61, 67, 73, 75
IRS Form 1040 or 1040NR	63
IRS Form 1040: Substitute For Return (SFR)	62
IRS Form 12616	62
IRS Form 12616: Correspondence Examination History Sheet	62
IRS Form 13496: IRC Section 6020(b) Certification	62
IRS Form 23C	62
IRS Form 3198: Special Handling Notice	62
IRS Form 4549: Income Tax Examination Changes	62
IRS Form 4700: Examination Work Papers	62
IRS Form 5344: Examination Closing Record	62
IRS Form 5546: Examination Return Charge-Out	62
IRS Form 5564: Notice of Deficiency Waiver	62
IRS Form 5600: Statutory Notice Worksheet	62
IRS Form 886-A: Explanation of Terms	62
IRS Form W-8BEN	73

IRS Forms 4549 and 5564.....	62
IRS R.A.C.S. 006 Report	62
J.A. Thompson: The Ancient Near Easter Treaties and the Old Testament (London: The Tyndale Press, 1964).....	91
J.B. Sykes, ed (1982). The concise Oxford dictionary of current English (7th ed.). Oxford: Clarendon. ISBN 0-19-861131-5	18
John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, bk. IV, chap. XX, para. Xiv.....	92
Katz, Federal Legislative Courts, 43 Harv.L.Rev. 894, 917-918 (1930).....	24
Kleinknecht and Gutbrod, Law, p. 125	91
Kleinknecht and Gutbrod, Law, p. 44	91
Kline, Treaty of the Great King, p. 41	92
Mao Tse-Tung, The foolish Old Man Who Removed Mountains (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1966), p. 3	90
Meaning of the Words “includes” and “including”, Form #05.014	32, 46, 84
Meredith G. Line, Treaty of the Great King, The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy: Studies and Commentary (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1963), p. 16.....	91
Morris Raphael Cohen, Reason and Law (New York: Collier Books, 1961), p. 84 f	90
Olaf Moe, “Law,” in James Hastings, ed., Dictionary of the Apostolic Church (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1919), I, 685	91
Playwright Jim Sherman	35
Political Jurisdiction, Form #05.004	23, 38, 49
President John F. Kennedy, at Yale University on June 11, 1962.....	19
President Ronald W. Reagan.....	59
Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017	81
Proof That There is a “Straw Man”, Form #05.042	46
R.J. Rushdoony, “The Myth of Nature,” in The Mythology of Science (Nutley, N.J.: The Craig Press, 1967), pp. 96-98 ...	93
Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, 1925, Roscoe Pound, p. 4.....	45
Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007.....	71, 87
Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003	38, 52, 61
Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003, Section 9.3	45
Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment, Form #05.033	16
Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002.....	25, 43, 64, 66, 75
Rules of Presumption and Statutory Interpretation, Litigation Tool #10.003	83
S.R. Driver, “Law (In Old Testament),” in James Hastings, ed., A Dictionary of the Bible, vol. III (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1919), p. 64	90
Samuel Johnson Rasselas, 1759	31
Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016.....	39, 57, 81, 93
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Manual, Form #10.005, Section 2.4.8	33
Substitute for Returns (involuntary assessments).....	62
Tax Deposition Questions, Form #03.016.....	73
Tax Procedure and Tax Fraud, Patricia Morgan, 1999, ISBN 0-314-06586-5, West Group.....	70, 71
The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001	63, 64, 75, 77
The Institutes of Biblical Law, Rousas John Rushdoony, 1973	93
The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments.....	55, 87
Thomas Jefferson	2
Treasury Order 150-02	80
U.S. attorney.....	57
U.S. Supreme Court	25, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 50, 51, 55, 66, 67, 75, 76, 85
Void for Vagueness Doctrine	37
W.J. Harrelson, “Law in the OT,” in The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, 77	91
Webster’s Dictionary, 1828.....	18
Webster’s Dictionary, 1913.....	18
Who are “Taxpayers” and Who Needs a “Taxpayer Identification Number”?, Form #05.013	46
Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002.....	46, 60, 66, 76
Why It is Illegal for Me To Request or Use a Taxpayer Identification Number, Form #04.205.....	25
Why the Government Can’t Lawfully Assess Human Beings With an Income Tax Liability Without Their Consent, Form #05.011	62
Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006.....	25, 75

Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a “Public Officer” for Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008 45

Wikipedia topic: “Ipse dixit”, 10/24/2011 19

Scriptures

1 Cor. 11:25 92

1 John 2:15-17 89

1 Sam. 15:22-23 89

2 Peter 2:3 2

Book of Judges 20

Colossians 2:8 31

Deut. 17:12-13 48

Deut. 7:7 f.; 8:17; 9:4-6 92

Deuteronomy 17:12-20 19

Deuteronomy 17:13 19

Eccl. 12:13-14 89

Ecclesiastes 7:7 22

Exodus 18:20 81

Gal. 5:14 54

Gen. 1:26 ff.; 2:15-17 92

Gen. 9:1-17 92

Genesis 7:17 19

Heb. 9:16,17 92

Hos. 12:7, 8 80

Hosea 4:6 81

Isaiah 42:21-25 80

James 4:3-4 60

Jer. 2:26-28 1

John 10:1-9 34

Joshua 1:8-9 81

Judges 21:25 20

Luke 22:20 92

Mark 14:24 92

Matt. 26:28 92

Matthew Henry’s Commentary on the Whole Bible; Henry, M., 1996, c1991, under Prov. 11:1 80

New Covenant 91

Numbers 14:44 19

Numbers 15:20 19

Numbers 15:29 19

Numbers 15:30 19, 48

Prov. 11:18-21 31

Prov. 15:27 22

Prov. 21:6 79

Prov. 26:28 20

Prov. 28:9 57

Proverbs 12:24 25

Ps 50:18 60

Psalms 119:122 19

Psalms 119:21 19

Psalms 119:69 19

Psalms 119:78 19

Psalms 119:85 19

Psalms 19 19

Psalms 19:12-13 19

Psalms 19:13 48

Psalms 94:20-23 41

Rev. 17:5 60

Revelation, Chapter 17 60

The Open Bible, New King James Version, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Copyright 1997, pp. 340-341 41

1 Introduction

The most prevalent technique used by corrupted judges and attorneys to unlawfully enlarge their jurisdiction and importance is to abuse presumption to injure your constitutionally protected rights.

"The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions,"
[New York Times v. Sullivan, 376 U.S. 254 (1964)]

Understanding presumptions is important because when left unchallenged, they:

1. Are very injurious to your rights and liberty.
2. Violate the [separation of powers](#) by allowing otherwise constitutional courts to unlawfully entertain "political questions".
3. Cause a violation of [due process of law](#) because decisions are not based on legally admissible evidence. Instead, presumptions unlawfully and prejudicially turn beliefs into evidence in violation of [Federal Rule of Evidence 610](#) and the [Hearsay Rule, Federal Rule of Evidence 802](#).
4. Turn judges into "priests" of a [civil religion](#).
5. Turn legal pleadings into "prayers" to the priest.
6. Turn legal process into an act of religion.
7. Transform "attorneys" into deacons of a [state-sponsored religion](#).
8. Turn the courtroom into a church building.
9. Turn court proceedings into a "worship service" akin to that of a church.
10. Turn statutes into a state-sponsored bible upon which "worship services" are based.
11. Turn "taxes" into tithes to a state-sponsored church, if the controversy before the court involves taxation.

The most important thing you can do to protect and preserve your freedom and sovereignty is to develop the crucial skills of:

1. Understanding how presumptions work and why all presumptions that prejudice rights are unconstitutional and a violation of due process of law.
2. Identifying when conclusive presumptions are being made about your status by your opponent or the court in a legal setting.
3. Being able to explain why your rights are being injured by the unfounded presumption.
4. Being able to challenge all presumptions in a legal setting with appropriate legal authorities.
5. Asserting your equal right to presume the *opposite* of the presumptions that are being made about you. If the government can presume something is "included" within a definition without any evidence, then you are equally entitled to presume that it is NOT "included". Any suggestions to the contrary violates your right to equal protection and equal treatment that is the foundation of the Constitution. See:

<p>Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment, Form #05.033 http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</p>

This memorandum of law will focus on the above goals.

2 Presumption defined and explained

2.1 Definition

Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, defines "presumption" as follows:

presumption. *An inference in favor of a particular fact. A presumption is a rule of law, statutory or judicial, by which finding of a basic fact gives rise to existence of presumed fact, until presumption is rebutted. Van Wart v. Cook, Okl.App., 557 P.2d. 1161, 1163. A legal device which operates in the absence of other proof to require that certain inferences be drawn from the available evidence. Port Terminal & Warehousing Co. v. John S. James Co., D.C.Ga., 92 F.R.D. 100, 106.*

A presumption is an assumption of fact that the law requires to be made from another fact or group of facts found or otherwise established in the action. A presumption is not evidence. A presumption is either conclusive or

rebuttable. Every rebuttable presumption is either (a) a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence or (b) a presumption affecting the burden of proof. Calif.Evid.Code, §600.

In all civil actions and proceedings not otherwise provided for by Act of Congress or by the Federal Rules of Evidence, a presumption imposes on the party against whom it is directed the burden of going forward with evidence to rebut or meet the presumption, but does not shift to such party the burden of proof in the sense of the risk of nonpersuasion, which remains throughout the trial upon the party on whom it was originally cast. Federal Rule of Evidence 301.

See also Disputable presumption; inference; Juris et de jure; Presumptive evidence; Prima facie; Raise a presumption.
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1185]

American Jurisprudence Legal Encyclopedia 2d (1999) defines "presumption" as follows:

American Jurisprudence 2d
Evidence, §181

A presumption is neither evidence nor a substitute for evidence.¹ Properly used, the term "presumption" is a rule of law directing that if a party proves certain facts (the "basic facts") at a trial or hearing, the factfinder must also accept an additional fact (the "presumed fact") as proven unless sufficient evidence is introduced tending to rebut the presumed fact.² In a sense, therefore, a presumption is an inference which is mandatory unless rebutted.³

The underlying purpose and impact of a presumption is to affect the burden of going forward.⁴ Depending upon a variety of factors, a presumption may shift the burden of production as to the presumed fact, or may shift both the burden of production and the burden of persuasion.⁵

A few states have codified some of the more common presumptions in their evidence codes.⁶ Often a statute will provide that a fact or group of facts is prima facie evidence of another fact.⁷ Courts frequently recognize this principle in the absence of an explicit legislative directive.⁸

Webster's Dictionary 1828:

PRESUMPTION, n. [L. proesumption.]

1. Supposition of the truth or real existence of something without direct or positive proof of the fact, but grounded on **circumstantial or probable** evidence which entitles it to belief. Presumption in law is of three sorts, violent or strong, probable, and light.

Next to positive proof, circumstantial evidence **or the doctrine of presumptions** must take place; for when the fact cannot be demonstratively evinced, that which comes nearest to the proof of the fact is the proof of such circumstances as either necessarily or usually attend such facts. These are called presumptions. Violent presumption is many times equal to full proof.

¹ Levasseur v. Field (Me), 332 A.2d. 765; Hinds v. John Hancock Mut. Life Ins. Co., 155 Me. 349, 155 A.2d. 721, 85 A.L.R.2d. 703 (superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Poitras v. R. E. Glidden Body Shop, Inc. (Me) 430 A.2d. 1113); Connizzo v. General American Life Ins. Co. (Mo App) 520 S.W.2d. 661.

² Inferences and presumptions are a staple of our adversary system of factfinding, since it is often necessary for the trier of fact to determine the existence of an element of a crime—that is an ultimate or elemental fact—from the existence of one or more evidentiary or basic facts. County Court of Ulster County v. Allen, 442 U.S. 140, 60 L.Ed.2d. 777, 99 S.Ct. 2213.

³ Legille v. Dann, 178 U.S.App.DC. 78, 544 F.2d. 1, 191 U.S.P.Q. 529; Murray v. Montgomery Ward Life Ins. Co., 196 Colo. 225, 584 P.2d. 78; Re Estate of Borom (Ind App) 562 N.E.2d. 772; Manchester v. Dugan (Me), 247 A.2d. 827; Ferdinand v. Agricultural Ins. Co., 22 N.J. 482, 126 A.2d. 323, 62 A.L.R.2d. 1179; Smith v. Bohlen, 95 N.C. App 347, 382 S.E.2d. 812, affd 328 N.C. 564, 402 S.E.2d. 380; Martin v. Phillips, 235 Va. 523, 369 S.E.2d. 397.

⁴ Federal Rule of Evidence 301.

⁵ §198.

⁶ California Evidence Code §§ 621 et seq.; Hawaii Rules of Evidence, Rules 303, 304; Oregon Evidence Code, Rule 311.

⁷ California Evidence Code § 602; Alaska Rule of Evidence, Rule 301(b); Hawaii Rule of Evidence, Rule 305; Maine Rule of Evidence, Rule 301(b); Oregon Rule of Evidence, Rule 311(2); Vermont Rule of Evidence, Rule 301(b); Wisconsin Rule of Evidence, Rule 301.

⁸ American Casualty Co. v. Costello, 174 Mich.App. 1, 435 N.W.2d. 760; Glover v. Henry (Tex App Eastland) 749 S.W.2d. 502.

2. Strong probability; as in the common phrase, the presumption is that an event has taken place, or will take place.
[Webster's Dictionary, 1828]

Poor Webster made a critical error. Yes he did. In the paragraph above #2 He left out the word **either**. That makes the word Or, an And, in law. This is what is said:

OR, conj. A disjunctive particle used to express an alternative or to give a choice of one among two or more things. It is also used to clarify what has already been said, and in such cases, means "in other words," "to-wit," or "that is to say." Peck v. Board of Directors of Public Schools for Parish of Catahoula, 137 La. 334, 68 So. 629, 630; Travelers' Protective Ass'n v. Jones, 75 Ind. App. 29, 127 N.E. 783, 785.

Or is frequently misused; and courts will construe it to mean "and" where it was so used. State v. Circuit Court of Dodge County, 176 Wis. 198, 186 N.W. 732, 734; Northern Commercial Co. v. U. S., C.C.A. Alaska, 217 F. 33, 36; Spillman v. Succession of Spillman, 147 La. 47, 84 So. 489, 490; Smiley v. Lenane, 363 Ill. 66, 1 N.E.2d. 213, 216. However, where the word "or" is preceded by the word "either," it is never given a conjunctive meaning. Smith v. Farley, 155 App.Div. 813, 140 N.Y.S. 990, 992.
[Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1246]

Webster's Dictionary, 1913:

Pre*sump'tion [L. praesumptio: cf. F. présomption, OF. also presumption. See Presume.] The act of presuming, or believing upon probable evidence; the act of assuming or taking for granted; belief upon **incomplete proof**.

Ground for presuming; evidence probable, but not conclusive; strong probability; reasonable supposition; as, the presumption is that an event has taken place. That which is presumed or assumed; that which is supposed or believed to be real or true, on evidence that is probable but not conclusive.

Conclusive presumption. See under Conclusive. -- Presumption of fact (Law), an argument of a fact from a fact; an inference as to the existence of **one fact not certainly known**, from the existence of some other fact known or proved, founded on a previous experience of their connection; supposition of the truth or real existence of something, without direct or positive proof of the fact, but grounded on circumstantial or probable evidence which entitles it to belief.

Burrill. Best. Wharton. -- Presumption of law (Law), a postulate applied in advance to all cases of a particular class; e. g., the presumption of innocence and of regularity of records. Such a presumption is **rebuttable** or irrebuttable.
[Webster's Dictionary, 1913]

Supposition (supposition) n. Sup`po*si"tion [F. supposition, L. suppositio a placing under, a substitution, fr. supponere, suppositum, to put under, to substitute. **The word has the meaning corresponding to suppose.** See Sub-, and Position.] The act of **supposing**, laying down, imagining, or considering as true or existing, **what is known not to be true, or what is not proved.** That which is supposed; hypothesis; conjecture; surmise; **opinion or belief without sufficient evidence.**
[Webster's Dictionary, 1913]

A statement from a person in authority that is taken as fact but which is actually nothing more than a presumption is called "ipse dixit":

"Ipse dixit lipsy diks::lt!. He himself said it; a bare assertion resting on the authority of an individual."
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 828]

Ipse dixit is a **Latin** phrase meaning he himself said it. The term labels a dogmatic statement asserted but not proved, to be accepted on faith in the speaker.⁹ Usually from a person of standing or good reputation, such as Aristotle or even Plato; a **dictum**.

The legal and philosophical principle of "Ipse dixit" involves an unproven assertion, which is claimed to be authoritative because "[Latin 'he himself said it.'] It is asserted, but not proved, for example: "His testimony that she was a liar was nothing more than an ipse dixit."¹⁰

⁹ J.B. Sykes, ed (1982). *The concise Oxford dictionary of current English* (7th ed.). Oxford: Clarendon. ISBN 0-19-861131-5.

¹⁰ Garner, Brian A., Ed., ed (1999). *Black's Law Dictionary* (7th ed.). St. Paul, MN: West. p. 833.

In the Middle Ages, scholars often applied the term to justify arguments if they had been used by Aristotle.¹¹
[Wikipedia topic: "Ipse dixit", 10/24/2011]

2.2 Meaning of word "presumption" in the Bible

The English word "presumption" (rum) is hard to get a handle on in the Biblical text. In Numbers 15:30, the Hebrew word is a qal participle meanings "shooting with the hand" or "lifting up with the hand". It is translated "offer up" in Numbers 15:29 and "heave" in Numbers 15:20. Young translated it "doeth ought with a high hand." In relation to the flood, it refers to the Ark being lifted above the earth by the waters (Genesis 7:17). If taken literally, it means some defiant gesture with the hand (like flipping the bird). If it is taken figuratively, it refers to an action whereby the Israelite or sojourner attempts to usurp the authority of God or challenge His authority or overthrow His authority. Apparently, "presumption" in the Biblical sense, refers to a self-ruled person who acts outside the authority of Biblical Law and in defiance of God's authority.

In Psalm 19, the word "presumption" is in the emphatic position in the prayer. It is consistently translated "proud" except in this verse where "zed" or "zadem" is translated "presumptuous" sins. Zadem is plural and could be translated "presumptions." And, it is an adjective. But what does it modify? Sins is not in the text but could be inferred from the noun "transgressions", the last word in the verse. Apparently, the translator inserted "sins" from the context. Apparently, the zadem were lawbreakers (Psalm 119:21) and liars (Psalm 119:69) and perverted (Psalm 119:78) involved in entrapment of the innocent (Psalm 119:85) in order to oppress them (Psalm 119:122).

2.3 Presumption is a Biblical Sin

"The greatest enemy of the truth is very often not the lie - deliberate, contrived and dishonest - but the myth - persistent, persuasive and unrealistic."
[President John F. Kennedy, at Yale University on June 11, 1962]

The Bible has some very convicting things to say about presumption that every Christian ought to teach their children, and which should also be part of the jury instructions that every jury hears:

"Who can understand his errors? Cleanse me from secret faults. Keep back Your servant also from presumptuous sins; Let them not have dominion over me. Then I shall be blameless, and I shall be innocent of great transgression."
[Psalm 19:12-13, Bible, NKJV]

Evidently, being presumptuous is a sin for which God takes offense. Our King James Bible has a footnote under the above passage that says: "The right response to God's revelation is to pray for His help with errors, faults, and sins." That same passage above under the word "presumptuous" then points to Num. 15:30, which tells the rest of the very telling story on this subject:

"But the person who does anything presumptuously, whether he is native-born or a stranger, that one brings reproach on the Lord, and he shall be cut off from among his people."
[Numbers 15:30, Bible, NKJV]

So evidently, we're dealing with very serious sin here, folks. Presumption evidently is a very big offense to the Lord. If you further research the meaning of "presumptuous", you will find in Numbers 14:44 that it means defiance and disobedience to God's laws, the Bible, His commandments, and His will revealed to us by the Holy Spirit, and through His prophets.

Let us study closely the qualifications for civil rulers from God's Book in Deuteronomy 17:12-20 to also see how the biblical prohibition against presumption impacts God's design for civil government.

"And all the people shall hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously."
[Deuteronomy 17:13, Bible, NKJV]

The verb *presumptuously* in the passage above means to act without authority, to rebel, to boil up and act subjectively. When an individual or a ruler acts without proper written authority, he commits the sin of presumption. When a person oversteps his authority, he commits an ultra vires act. The Hebrew verb is a *hiphil* verb (causative) intensifying the instruction; that is, "the people shall cause themselves to no longer act arbitrarily or presumptuously." During the wilderness journey, Israelites

¹¹ Aristotle for Armchair Theologians.

1 followed their gut instincts and corrupted their ways. In order to have godly leaders, the people themselves must have no
2 other standard than the Word of God for their civil rulers. Following “gut feelings” leads to political disaster!! Which is what
3 we have in this country today. The Book of Judges in the Bible focuses primarily upon all the consequences of a society
4 choosing to do what “feels good” or what is “politically correct” rather than what is objectively “good” according to God’s
5 word:

6 “In those days there was no king in Israel; everyone did what was right in his own eyes.”
7 [Judges 21:25, Bible, NKJV]

8 The purpose of lying by corrupt rulers is to develop in the hearts and minds of the hearers a false presumption. The more
9 ignorant and unwise and godless the hearers, the more likely they are to believe this false presumption. Those who promote
10 such lies and false presumptions will do so for selfish reasons but ultimately their purposes are harmful and hateful.

11 “A lying tongue hates those who are crushed by it, and a flattering mouth works ruin.”
12 [Prov. 26:28, Bible, NKJV]

13 Most frequently, we also acquire false presumptions by less dishonest or more casual means. For instance, we acquire false
14 presumptions mainly from the media and our associates in our normal interactions. This method is the most popular technique
15 used by our government to brainwash the sheeple, I mean people. When our government does it, it is called “propaganda”.
16 The reason more informal techniques such as this are most successful is that we just accept what people say without thinking
17 critically about it and without questioning it. We are among people and organizations that we supposedly love or trust and
18 so our intellectual defenses are down. In effect, we are intellectually lazy and don’t bother to process or analyze or question
19 new ideas or look what God’s word says about them before we commit them to our memory banks as truth.

20 Another very popular propaganda tool for creating false presumptions are the public schools which are run by our government.
21 Good parents will take the time to counteract the myths and false presumptions that liberal teachers will try to program our
22 children with, but Satan still gets his foot in the door because many children grow up in single parent families where the one
23 parent who is present doesn’t have the energy to counteract the government brainwashing on a regular basis.

24 A people who have been trained and encouraged in the public school system to engage in presumption are ripe to be exploited
25 and enslaved by the deceptions of corrupt rulers.

26 **2.4 All Presumptions that Prejudice or Injure Protected Rights are a Violation of Due Process** 27 **of Law that Result in a Void Judgment**

28 Black’s Law Dictionary defines “due process” as follows:

29 ***Due process of law.** Law in its regular course of administration through courts of justice. Due process of law*
30 *in each particular case means such an exercise of the powers of the government as the settled maxims of law*
31 *permit and sanction, and under such safeguards for the protection of individual rights as those maxims prescribe*
32 *for the class of cases to which the one in question belongs. A course of legal proceedings according to those*
33 *rules and principles which have been established in our systems of jurisprudence for the enforcement and*
34 *protection of private rights. To give such proceedings any validity, there must be a tribunal competent by its*
35 *constitution—that is, by the law of the creation—to pass upon the subject-matter of the suit; and, if that involves*
36 *merely a determination of the personal liability of the defendant, he must be brought within its jurisdiction by*
37 *service of process within the state, or his voluntary appearance. Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U.S. 714, 24 L.Ed. 565.*
38 *Due process of law implies the right of the person affected thereby to be present before the tribunal which*
39 *pronounces judgment upon the question of life, liberty, or property, in its most comprehensive sense; to be heard,*
40 *by testimony or otherwise, and to have the right of controverting, by proof, every material fact which bears on*
41 *the question of right in the matter involved. If any question of fact or liability be conclusively be presumed*
42 *[rather than proven] against him, this is not due process of law.*

43 *An orderly proceeding wherein a person with notice, actual or constructive, and has an opportunity to be heard*
44 *and to enforce and protect his rights before a court having the power to hear and determine the case. Kazubowski*
45 *v. Kazubowski, 45 Ill.2d. 405, 259 N.E.2d. 282, 290. Phrase means that no person shall be deprived of life,*
46 *liberty, property or of any right granted him by statute, unless matter involved first shall have been adjudicated*
47 *against him upon trial conducted according to established rules regulating judicial proceedings, and it forbids*
48 *condemnation without a hearing. Pettit v. Penn. LaApp., 180 So.2d. 66, 69. The concept of “due process of law”*
49 *as it is embodied in the Fifth Amendment demands that a law shall not be unreasonable, arbitrary, or capricious*
50 *and that the means selected shall have a reasonable and substantial relation to the object being sought. U.S. v.*
51 *Smith, D.C.Iowa, 249 F.Supp. 515, 516. Fundamental requisite of “due process of law” is the opportunity to be*
52 *heard, to be aware that a matter is pending, to make an informed choice whether to acquiesce or contest, and to*

assert before the appropriate decision-making body the reasons for such choice. *Trinity Episcopal Corp. v. Romney*, D.C.N.Y., 387 F.Supp. 1044, 1084. Aside from all else, “due process” means fundamental fairness and substantial justice. *Vaughn v. State*, 3 Tenn.Crim.App. 54, 456 S.W.2d. 879, 883.

Embodied in the due process concept are the basic rights of a defendant in criminal proceedings and the requisites for a fair trial. These rights and requirements have been expanded by Supreme Court decisions and include, timely notice of a hearing or trial which informs the accused of the charges against him or her; the opportunity to confront accusers and to present evidence on one’s own behalf before an impartial jury or judge; the presumption of innocence under which **guilt must be proven by legally obtained evidence** and the verdict must be supported by the evidence presented; rights at the earliest stage of the criminal process; and the guarantee that an individual will not be tried more than once for the same offence (double jeopardy). [Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 500]

The elements of due process from above that we want to emphasize are the following:

1. The accused is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty with evidence.

The presumption of innocence plays a unique role in criminal proceedings. As Chief Justice Burger explained in his opinion for the Court in *Estelle v. Williams*, [425 U.S. 501](#) (1976): [507 U.S. 284]:

The presumption of innocence, although not articulated in the Constitution, is a basic component of a fair trial under our system of criminal justice. Long ago this Court stated:

The principle that there is a presumption of innocence in favor of the accused is the undoubted law, axiomatic and elementary, and its enforcement lies at the foundation of the administration of our criminal law. *Coffin v. United States*, 156 U.S. 432, 453 (1895).

To implement the presumption, courts must be alert to factors that may undermine the fairness of the factfinding process. In the administration of criminal justice, courts must carefully guard against dilution of the principle that guilt is to be established by probative evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt. In *re Winship*, [397 U.S. 358, 364](#) (1970). [425 U.S. 501, 504]
[*Delo v. Lashely*, 507 U.S. 272 (1993)]

2. Only evidence and facts can convict a person.

“guilt must be proven by legally obtained evidence”

3. A “presumption” is not evidence, but simply a belief akin to a religion.

A presumption is an assumption of fact that the law requires to be made from another fact or group of facts found or otherwise established in the action. **A presumption is not evidence.** A presumption is either conclusive or rebuttable. Every rebuttable presumption is either (a) a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence or (b) a presumption affecting the burden of proof. *Calif.Evid.Code*, §600.

In all civil actions and proceedings not otherwise provided for by Act of Congress or by the Federal Rules of Evidence, a presumption imposes on the party against whom it is directed the burden of going forward with evidence to rebut or meet the presumption, but does not shift to such party the burden of proof in the sense of the risk of nonpersuasion, which remains throughout the trial upon the party on whom it was originally cast. Federal Evidence Rule 301.

See also Disputable presumption; inference; *Juris et de jure*; Presumptive evidence; *Prima facie*; Raise a presumption.
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1185]

4. Beliefs and opinions are NOT admissible as evidence in any court.

Federal Rules of Evidence
Rule 610. Religious Beliefs or Opinions

Evidence of the beliefs or opinions of a witness on matters of religion is not admissible for the purpose of showing that by reason of their nature the witness’ credibility is impaired or enhanced.
[SOURCE: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/fre/rules.htm#Rule610>]

5. Presumptions may not be imposed if they injure rights protected by the Constitution:

(1) [8:4993] **Conclusive presumptions affecting protected interests:**

A conclusive presumption may be defeated where its application would impair a party's constitutionally-protected liberty or property interests. In such cases, conclusive **presumptions have been held to violate a party's due process and equal protection rights.** [Vlandis v. Kline (1973) 412 U.S. 441, 449, 93 S.Ct. 2230, 2235; Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. LaFleur (1974) 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215-presumption under Illinois law that unmarried fathers are unfit violates process] [*Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, Rutter Group, paragraph 8:4993, p. 8K-34*]

6. Presumptions are the OPPOSITE of “due process” of law and undermine and destroy it:

“If any question of fact or liability be conclusively be presumed [rather than proven] against him, this is not due process of law.”

Presumptions can invade legal process at many distinct points, and every point they are allowed by the judge invade constitutes a violation of due process:

1. During the writing of the law, whereby the law itself creates a presumption of guilt and thereby removes the ascertainment of guilt from the discretion of the judge or jury:

Statutes creating permanent irrebuttable presumptions have long been disfavored under the Due Process Clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. In *Heiner v. Donnan*, 285 U.S. 312, 52 S.Ct. 358, 76 L.Ed. 772 (1932), the Court was faced with a constitutional challenge to a federal statute that created a conclusive presumption that gifts made within two years prior to the donor's death were made in contemplation of death, thus requiring payment by his estate of a higher tax. In holding that this irrefutable assumption was so arbitrary and unreasonable as to deprive the taxpayer of his property without due process of law, the Court stated that it had ‘held more than once that a statute creating a presumption which operates to deny a fair opportunity to rebut it violates the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.’ *Id.*, at 329, 52 S.Ct., at 362. See, e.g., *Schlesinger v. Wisconsin*, 270 U.S. 230, 46 S.Ct. 260, 70 L.Ed. 557 (1926); *Hooper v. Tax Comm’n*, 284 U.S. 206, 52 S.Ct. 120, 76 L.Ed. 248 (1931). See also *Tot v. United States*, 319 U.S. 463, 468-469, 63 S.Ct. 1241, 1245-1246, 87 L.Ed. 1519 (1943); *Leary v. United States*, 395 U.S. 6, 29-53, 89 S.Ct. 1532, 1544-1557, 23 L.Ed.2d. 57 (1969). Cf. *Turner v. United States*, 396 U.S. 398, 418-419, 90 S.Ct. 642, 653-654, 24 L.Ed.2d. 610 (1970). [Vlandis v. Kline, 412 U.S. 441 (1973)]

2. During the initial investigation and gathering of evidence, fact finders can presume that the accused is guilty. They purposefully gather witnesses who have biased “beliefs” (presumptions) against the defendant.

3. During pre-trial motions, whereby the judge excludes all the evidence of the accused, and leaves nothing for the jury to discuss other than the “policy” of the people assembled in the room, all of whom have a conflict of interest because:

3.1. They are “taxpayers” who don’t want to have to pay the defendant’s share of the burden.

3.2. They are recipients of federal benefits” derived from the tax that is the subject of the proceeding. In that sense, they are “tax consumers” hearing a trial involving those who don’t want to personally subsidize their lifestyle and activities.

All of the above are a civil violation of 28 U.S.C. §144, 28 U.S.C. §455 and a criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §201 and 18 U.S.C. §208. They are also a violation of the Bible:

“And you shall take no bribe, for a bribe blinds the discerning and perverts the words of the righteous.”
[Exodus 23:8, Bible, NKJV]

**“He who is greedy for gain troubles his own house,
But he who hates bribes will live.”**
[Prov. 15:27, Bible, NKJV]

**“Surely oppression destroys a wise man's reason.
And a [compelled] bribe [called an income tax] debases the heart.”**
[Ecclesiastes 7:7, Bible, NKJV]

4. During the trial:

4.1. When the judge excludes discussing the law in the courtroom, leaving nothing but belief, superstition, ignorance, and self-interest to rule the proceedings. This turns the courtroom into the equivalent of a policy board and a constitutional convention:

1 "A vague law [or NO LAW AT ALL!] impermissibly delegates basic policy matters to policemen, judges, and
2 juries for resolution on an ad hoc and subjective basis, with the attendant dangers of arbitrary and discriminatory
3 application." (Footnotes omitted.)
4 [*Sewell v. Georgia*, 435 U.S. 982 (1978)]

5 4.2. When witnesses are allowed to make prejudicial statements of their beliefs about the accused. This violates Federal
6 Rule of Evidence 610 and causes the court to engage in "political questions" that are beyond its jurisdiction and
7 thereby violate the separation of powers doctrine. See:

Political Jurisdiction, Form #05.004
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

8 5. In the court's order, when the order contains statements about the accused that are not supported by evidence in the
9 record of the proceeding and therefore constitute nothing more than beliefs and presumptions that are inadmissible as
10 evidence. This is an abuse of the legal process for political purposes that violates the separation of powers doctrine.

11 Whenever due process has been violated, the result is a judgment that is null, void, and unenforceable:

12 "A judgment rendered in violation of due process is void in the rendering State and is not entitled to full faith and
13 credit elsewhere. *Pennoy v. Neff*, 95 U.S. 714, 732-733 (1878)."
14 [*World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson*, 444 U.S. 286 (1980)]

15 The goal of all the above judicial and government abuses is to exceed the authority delegated by the constitution by abusing
16 presumptions and beliefs, and thereby creating the equivalent of a state sponsored religion that destroys equal protection by
17 making the judge and the government and the prosecutor "superior beings" and the object of pagan idol worship:

18 "The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions,"
19 [*New York Times v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964)]

20 There are only four cases where presumptions which injure constitutionally protected rights are permissible, and those
21 conditions are:

22 1. You are domiciled on federal territory where there are no constitutional rights to violate.

23 "Indeed, the practical interpretation put by Congress upon the Constitution has been long continued and uniform
24 to the effect [182 U.S. 244, 279] that the Constitution is applicable to territories acquired by purchase or
25 conquest, only when and so far as Congress shall so direct. Notwithstanding its duty to 'guarantee to every
26 state in this Union a republican form of government' (art. 4, 4), by which we understand, according to the
27 definition of Webster, 'a government in which the supreme power resides in the whole body of the people, and
28 is exercised by representatives elected by them,' Congress did not hesitate, in the original organization of the
29 territories of Louisiana, Florida, the Northwest Territory, and its subdivisions of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan,
30 Illinois, and Wisconsin and still more recently in the case of Alaska, to establish a form of government bearing
31 a much greater analogy to a British Crown colony than a republican state of America, and to vest the legislative
32 power either in a governor and council, or a governor and judges, to be appointed by the President. It was not
33 until they had attained a certain population that power was given them to organize a legislature by vote of the
34 people. In all these cases, as well as in territories subsequently organized west of the Mississippi, Congress
35 thought it necessary either to extend to Constitution and laws of the United States over them, or to declare that
36 the inhabitants should be entitled to enjoy the right of trial by jury, of bail, and of the privilege of the writ of
37 habeas corpus, as well as other privileges of the bill of rights."
38 [*Downes v. Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)]

39 2. You consent to the presumption and all of its consequences. Anything you consent to cannot form the basis for an injury
40 in a court of law:

41 "Volunt non fit injuria.
42 He who consents cannot receive an injury. 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 2279, 2327; 4 T. R. 657; Shelf. on mar. & Div. 449.

43 Consensus tollit errorem.
44 Consent removes or obviates a mistake. Co. Litt. 126.

45 Melius est omnia mala pati quam malo concentire.
46 It is better to suffer every wrong or ill, than to consent to it. 3 Co. Inst. 23.

47 Nemo videtur fraudare eos qui sciunt, et consentiunt.
48 One cannot complain of having been deceived when he knew the fact and gave his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 145."

[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;
SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]

3. You acquiesce to the presumptions being made, which indirectly means that you consented.

"SUB SILENTIO. Under silence; without any notice being taken. Passing a thing sub silentio may be evidence of consent"
[Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1593]

"Qui tacet consentire videtur.
He who is silent appears to consent. Jenk. Cent. 32."
[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;
SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]

4. You are CONSENSUALLY engaged in a government franchise. All franchises destroy or undermine rights by exchanging them for government privileges or benefits. The terms of franchise often entitle the government grantor of the franchise to engage in certain presumptions as part of the "consideration" you bestow upon them in consenting to the franchise. The term "public right" as used in the U.S. Supreme Court ruling below is a synonym for a franchise.

"The distinction between public rights and private rights has not been definitively explained in our precedents.¹² Nor is it necessary to do so in the present cases, for it suffices to observe that a matter of public rights must at a minimum arise "between the government and others." *Ex parte Bakelite Corp.*, *supra*, at 451, 49 S.Ct., at 413.¹³ In contrast, "the liability of one individual to another under the law as defined," *Crowell v. Benson*, *supra*, at 51, 52 S.Ct., at 292, is a matter of private rights. Our precedents clearly establish that only controversies in the former category may be removed from Art. III courts and delegated to legislative courts or administrative agencies for their determination. See *Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm'n*, 430 U.S. 442, 450, n. 7, 97 S.Ct. 1261, 1266, n. 7, 51 L.Ed.2d. 464 (1977); *Crowell v. Benson*, *supra*, 285 U.S., at 50-51, 52 S.Ct., at 292. See also Katz, *Federal Legislative Courts*, 43 Harv.L.Rev. 894, 917-918 (1930).FN24 Private-rights disputes, on the other hand, lie at the core of the historically recognized judicial power."

[. . .]

Although *Crowell* and *Raddatz* do not explicitly distinguish between rights created by Congress and other rights, such a distinction underlies in part *Crowell*'s and *Raddatz*' recognition of a critical difference between rights created by federal statute and rights recognized by the Constitution. Moreover, such a distinction seems to us to be necessary in light of the delicate accommodations required by the principle of separation of powers reflected in Art. III. The constitutional system of checks and balances is designed to guard against "encroachment or aggrandizement" by Congress at the expense of the other branches of government. *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S., at 122, 96 S.Ct., at 683. But when Congress creates a statutory right [a "privilege" in this case, such as a "trade or business"], it clearly has the discretion, in defining that right, to create presumptions, or assign burdens of proof, or prescribe remedies; it may also provide that persons seeking to vindicate that right must do so before particularized tribunals created to perform the specialized adjudicative tasks related to that right.FN35 Such provisions do, in a sense, affect the exercise of judicial power, but they are also incidental to Congress' power to define the right that it has created. No comparable justification exists, however, when the right being adjudicated is not of congressional creation. In such a situation, substantial inroads into functions that have traditionally been performed by the Judiciary cannot be characterized merely as incidental extensions of Congress' power to define rights that it has created. Rather, such inroads suggest unwarranted encroachments upon the judicial power of the United States, which our Constitution reserves for Art. III courts.
[*Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co.*, 458 U.S. 50, 102 S.Ct. 2858 (1983)]

Note the underlined statement above

¹² *Crowell v. Benson*, 285 U.S. 22, 52 S.Ct. 285, 76 L.Ed. 598 (1932), attempted to catalog some of the matters that fall within the public-rights doctrine:

"Familiar illustrations of administrative agencies created for the determination of such matters are found in connection with the exercise of the congressional power as to interstate and foreign commerce, taxation, immigration, the public lands, public health, the facilities of the post office, pensions and payments to veterans." *Id.*, at 51, 52 S.Ct., at 292 (footnote omitted).

¹³ Congress cannot "withdraw from [Art. III] judicial cognizance any matter which, from its nature, is the subject of a suit at the common law, or in equity, or admiralty." *Murray's Lessee v. Hoboken Land & Improvement Co.*, 18 How. 272, 284 (1856) (emphasis added). It is thus clear that the presence of the United States as a proper party to the proceeding is a necessary but not sufficient means of distinguishing "private rights" from "public rights." And it is also clear that even with respect to matters that arguably fall within the scope of the "public rights" doctrine, the presumption is in favor of Art. III courts. See *Glidden Co. v. Zdanok*, 370 U.S., at 548-549, and n. 21, 82 S.Ct., at 1471-1472, and n. 21 (opinion of Harlan, J.). See also Currie, *The Federal Courts and the American Law Institute*, Part 1, 36 U.Chi.L.Rev. 1, 13-14, n. 67 (1968). Moreover, when Congress assigns these matters to administrative agencies, or to legislative courts, it has generally provided, and we have suggested that it may be required to provide, for Art. III judicial review. See *Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm'n*, 430 U.S., at 455, n. 13, 97 S.Ct., at 1269, n. 13.

1 *"But **when Congress creates a statutory right [a "privilege" in this case, such as a "trade or business"]**, it*
2 ***clearly has the discretion, in defining that right, to create presumptions**, or assign burdens of proof, or prescribe*
3 *remedies; it may also provide that persons seeking to vindicate that right must do so before particularized*
4 *tribunals created to perform the specialized adjudicative tasks related to that right."*
5 *[Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 458 U.S. 50, 102 S.Ct. 2858 (1983)]*

6 The U.S. Supreme Court is admitting that if you apply for ANY government benefit, Congress has "the right to define
7 presumptions" in such a way that the loss of any one of your rights may become the "consideration" that they require in
8 exchange for the benefit. Don't EVER sign up for government franchises because they always write or REWRITE the
9 franchise agreement in such a way that eventually you will get the raw end of the deal and end up with no rights. Consenting
10 to government franchises amounts to the equivalent of a blank check because the only party to the franchise agreement that
11 can rewrite it without the consent of the other party is the government.

12 *"The hand of the diligent will rule,*
13 *But **the lazy [or irresponsible] man will be put to forced labor.**"*
14 *[Proverbs 12:24, Bible, NKJV]*

15 *"The more you want, the more the world can hurt you."*
16 *[Confucius]*

17 If you challenge the prejudicial presumptions in federal court, the most important thing you can do to ensure that the challenge
18 cannot be defeated is to:

- 19 1. Provide evidence proving that you are not engaged in any public right or government franchise. If that evidence goes
20 unchallenged, it becomes conclusive and binding. This means:

- 21 1.1. You do not have a Social Security Number or Taxpayer Identification Number. See:

Why It is Illegal for Me To Request or Use a Taxpayer Identification Number, Form #04.205
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 22 1.2. You are not enrolled in Social Security and terminated any illegal participation. See:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 23 2. Provide evidence that you are not domiciled on federal territory and therefore have not forfeited your rights. This means
24 you cannot claim to be a statutory "U.S. citizen", statutory "resident" (alien). See:

Why You are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 25 3. Provide evidence that you are domiciled on land protected by the Constitution. For an example of how to do this, see:

Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status, Form #02.001
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

26 We have drafted a simple form you can attach to all your pleadings in federal court which satisfies all the criteria above to
27 provide maximum protection for your rights from the prejudicial presumptions of others. That form is available below:

Federal Pleading/Motion/Petition Attachment, Litigation Tool #01.002
<http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>

28 **2.5 Rationale for making legal presumptions¹⁴**

29 Most presumptions are based at least in part on the high probability that if the basic facts exist, the presumed fact also exists;
30 the presumed fact is so likely to follow from the basic fact that in the absence of rebutting evidence merely permitting the
31 factfinder to infer the presumed fact does not adequately reflect the substantial likelihood that the presumed fact is true.¹⁵

32 Presumptions are sometimes created to offset one party's advantage or disadvantage with regard to availability of proof; for
33 instance, evidence that the shipper delivered the freight in good condition to the first of several carriers triggers a presumption

¹⁴ Adapted from Am.Jur.2d., Evidence, §185.

¹⁵ Swain v. Neeld, 28 N.J. 60, 145 A.2d. 320.

that the damage was caused by the last carrier.¹⁶ Similarly, in certain securities fraud actions, once plaintiffs prove omissions or misrepresentations by the defendants, a presumption exists that plaintiff relied on these omissions and misrepresentations to its detriment.¹⁷

Presumptions sometimes serve the purpose of facilitating the resolution of factual disputes that otherwise might not be capable of decision; for instance, the presumption that someone who has not been seen nor heard of for seven years is dead.¹⁸

Courts and legislatures also create statutory presumptions to implement social policy by assisting one class of litigants against another.¹⁹ In all cases, these statutory presumptions, if the prejudice constitutional rights, are unconstitutional. This is covered later in section 6.4.

2.6 How presumptions affect choice of law in Court²⁰

States have taken a variety of approaches to applying choice of law principles to burdens and presumptions. The traditional approach to choice of law issues applies the law of the forum state in all procedural matters while applying applicable foreign law as to substantive matters; because presumptions and burdens of proof are perceived as procedural rather than substantive, they are governed by the law of the forum.²¹

When the law of a foreign state on burdens of proof or presumptions is inseparably connected to the substantive right in question, or is intended to affect the substantive rights of the parties,²² and does not violate the public policy of the forum state, the law of the foreign state, rather than that of the forum, governs.²³

¹⁶ *Chicago & N. R. Co. v. C. C. Whitnack Produce Co.*, 258 U.S. 369, 66 L.Ed. 665, 42 S.Ct. 328.

¹⁷ *Lewis v. McGraw* (CA2 NY) 619 F.2d. 192, CCH Fed Secur L Rep ¶ 97344, cert den 449 U.S. 951, 66 L.Ed.2d. 214, 101 S.Ct. 354; *Sharp v. Coopers & Lybrand* (CA3 Pa) 649 F.2d. 175, CCH Fed Secur L Rep ¶ 97971, 71 OGR 555, cert den 455 U.S. 938, 71 L.Ed.2d. 648, 102 S.Ct. 1427 and (criticized on other grounds by *Re Atlantic Financial Management, Inc.* (CA1 Mass) 784 F.2d. 29, CCH Fed Secur L Rep ¶ 92482) and (criticized on other grounds by *Kersh v. General Council of the Assemblies of God* (CA9 Cal) 804 F.2d. 546, CCH Fed Secur L Rep ¶ 93000) and (ovrld on other grounds by *Re Data Access Systems Secur. Litigation* (CA3 NJ) 843 F.2d. 1537, CCH Fed Secur L Rep ¶ 93703) as stated in *McCarter v. Mitcham* (CA3 Pa) 883 F.2d. 196, CCH Fed Secur L Rep ¶ 94547.

¹⁸ 22A American Jurisprudence 2d, Death §§ 551 et seq. (1999)

¹⁹ *Keyes v. School Dist.*, 413 U.S. 189, 37 L.Ed.2d. 548, 93 S.Ct. 2686, reh den 414 U.S. 883, 38 L.Ed.2d. 131, 94 S.Ct. 27, on remand (DC Colo) 368 F.Supp. 207, later proceeding (DC Colo) 380 F.Supp. 673, affd in part and revd in part on other grounds (CA10 Colo) 521 F.2d. 465, cert den 423 U.S. 1066, 46 L.Ed.2d. 657, 96 S.Ct. 806, later proceeding (DC Colo) 439 F.Supp. 393, later proceeding (DC Colo) 474 F.Supp. 1265, later proceeding (DC Colo) 540 F.Supp. 399, later proceeding (DC Colo) 576 F.Supp. 1503, later proceeding (DC Colo) 609 F.Supp. 1491, later proceeding (DC Colo) 653 F.Supp. 1536, later proceeding (DC Colo) 670 F.Supp. 1513, affd, in part, remanded (CA10 Colo) 895 F.2d. 659, cert den 498 U.S. 1082, 112 L.Ed.2d. 1040, 111 S.Ct. 951 and (disapproved on other grounds by *Price v. Austin Independent School Dist.* (CA5 Tex) 945 F.2d. 1307) and (disapproved on other grounds by *Daly v. Hill* (CA4 NC) 790 F.2d. 1071) and (among conflicting authorities noted in *Lujan v. Franklin County Bd. of Education* (CA6 Tenn) 766 F.2d. 917, 38 BNA FEP Cas 9, 37 CCH EPD ¶ 35337).

²⁰ Adapted from Am.Jur.2d., Evidence, §186: Choice of Law (1999) (1999).

²¹ *Sun Oil Co. v. Wortman*, 486 U.S. 717, 100 L.Ed.2d. 743, 108 S.Ct. 2117, 101 OGR 1; *Sylvania Electric Products, Inc. v. Barker* (CA1 Mass) 228 F.2d. 842, cert den 350 U.S. 988, 100 L.Ed. 854, 76 S.Ct. 475; *Re Medico Associates, Inc.* (BC DC Mass) 23 BR 307; *Computerized Radiological Services, Inc. v. Syntex Corp.* (ED NY) 595 F.Supp. 1495, 40 UCCRS 49, affd in part and revd in part (CA2 NY) 786 F.2d. 72, 42 UCCRS 1656; *Jackson v. Coggan* (SD NY) 330 F.Supp. 1060; *Maryland Casualty Co. v. Williams* (CA5 Miss), 377 F.2d. 389, 35 ALR3d 275; *Estep v. Norfolk & W. R. Co.* (CA6 Ky), 192 F.2d. 889; *Alexander v. Inland Steel Co.* (CA8 Mo) 263 F.2d. 314; *State Mut. Life Assur. Co. v. Wittenberg* (CA8 Ark) 239 F.2d. 87; *United Air Lines, Inc. v. Wiener* (CA9 Cal) 335 F.2d. 379, 8 F.R.Serv.2d. 49b.42, Case 1, cert dismd 379 U.S. 951, 13 L.Ed.2d. 549, 85 S.Ct. 452; *Weber v. Continental Casualty Co.* (CA10 Okla) 379 F.2d. 729; *Amerada Hess Pipeline Corp. v. Alaska Public Utilities Com.* (Alaska) 711 P.2d. 1170; *Marquis v. St. Louis S. F. R. Co.* (2nd Dist) 234 Cal.App.2d. 335, 44 Cal Rptr 367; *Chasse v. Albert*, 147 Conn 680, 166 A.2d. 148; *Miller & Long Co. v. Shaw* (Dist Col App), 204 A.2d. 697 (disapproved on other grounds by *Myers v. Gaither* (Dist Col App), 232 A.2d. 577); *Holt Service Co. v. Modlin*, 163 Ga.App. 283, 293 S.E.2d. 741; *Mudd v. Goldblatt Bros., Inc.* (1st Dist) 118 Ill.App.3d. 431, 73 Ill.Dec. 657, 454 N.E.2d. 754; *Tietloff v. Lift-A-Loft Corp.* (Ind App) 441 N.E.2d. 986; *Vernon v. Aubinoe*, 259 Md. 159, 269 A.2d. 620; *Joffre v. Canada Dry Ginger Ale, Inc.*, 222 Md. 1, 158 A.2d. 631; *Finch v. Hughes Aircraft Co.*, 57 Md.App. 190, 469 A.2d. 867, cert den 300 Md. 88, 475 A.2d. 1200, reconsideration den 301 Md. 41, 481 A.2d. 801 and cert den 469 U.S. 1215, 84 L.Ed.2d. 336, 105 S.Ct. 1190, reh den 471 U.S. 1049, 85 L.Ed.2d. 341, 105 S.Ct. 2043, later proceeding (CA FC) 926 F.2d. 1574, 17 USPQ2d 1914 and (criticized on other grounds by *Newell v. Richards*, 83 Md.App. 371, 574 A.2d. 370) and (criticized on other grounds by *Newell v. Richards* (Md App) 1990 Md.App. LEXIS 133); *Leventhal v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 347 Mass. 766, 196 N.E.2d. 924; *Stuart v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.* (Mo App) 699 S.W.2d. 450; *Arnold v. Ray Charles Enterprises, Inc.*, 264 N.C. 92, 141 S.E.2d. 14; *McDougall v. Glenn Cartage Co.*, 169 Ohio.St. 522, 9 Ohio.Ops.2d. 12, 160 N.E.2d. 266; *Sloniger v. Enterline*, 400 Pa. 457, 162 A.2d. 397; *Vicars v. Atlantic Discount Co.*, 205 Va. 934, 140 S.E.2d. 667.

²² *Kabo v. Summa Corp.* (ED Pa), 523 F.Supp. 1326 (where the burden of proof has such a substantive impact as to affect the decision of the case, or is intertwined with the statutory remedy, the burden of proof is deemed substantive, and should be determined according to the otherwise applicable law).

²³ *Cardell v. Morrison* (DC Mass) 138 F.Supp. 817; *New York C. R. Co. v. Monroe* (SD NY) 188 F.Supp. 826, 15 Ohio.Ops.2d. 31; *Melville v. American Home Assur. Co.* (CA3 Pa) 584 F.2d. 1306, 3 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 756; *Sanders v. Glenshaw Glass Co.* (CA3 Pa), 204 F.2d. 436, cert den 346 U.S. 916.

The contact approach applies the law of the state which is the most interested in the outcome of the particular question of law.²⁴

A third approach provides that the forum will apply its own local law in determining which party has the burden of persuading the trier of fact on a particular issue unless the primary purpose of the relevant rule of the state of the otherwise applicable law is to affect the decision of the issue rather than to regulate the conduct of the trial.²⁵

Regardless of a state's approach to choice of law, courts as a rule recognize that conclusive presumptions affect the substantive rights of the parties; thus, where the substantive law is supplied by a foreign state, the forum state will apply the former's conclusive presumptions.²⁶

2.7 Presumptions in civil litigation²⁷

Because a presumption is a procedural rule that, at most, imposes the burden of persuasion, presumptions in civil litigation generally do not raise constitutional issues; accordingly, whenever a legislature may enact legislation directly imposing liability on proof of certain facts, it may instead provide that those facts create a presumption which shifts the burden of persuasion on the ultimate issue.²⁸

Where a presumption intrudes upon a significant liberty interest, however, it may violate due process of law.²⁹ Barring special circumstances, however, all that is required is that there be some rational connection between the basic fact and the presumed fact.³⁰

98 L.Ed. 411, 74 S.Ct. 278; *Lachman v. Pennsylvania Greyhound Lines, Inc.* (CA4 Va) 160 F.2d. 496; *Maryland Casualty Co. v. Williams* (CA5 Miss), 377 F.2d. 389, 35 ALR3d 275; *Pilot Life Ins. Co. v. Boone* (CA5 Ala) 236 F.2d. 457; *Jupiter v. United States* (ED La), 181 F.Supp. 294, affd (CA5 La) 287 F.2d. 388; *Thompson v. Boswell* (CA6 Tenn) 166 F.2d. 106; *Maurer v. United States* (ED Wis), 219 F.Supp. 253; *Keeshin Motor Express Co. v. Park Davis Lines, Inc.* (DC Mo), 119 F.Supp. 561; *Knight v. Handley Motor Co.* (Dist Col App) 198 A.2d. 747 (disapproved on other grounds by *Myers v. Gaither* (Dist Col App), 232 A.2d. 577); *Valleroy v. Southern R. Co.* (Mo) 403 S.W.2d. 553; *Gordon's Transports, Inc. v. Bailey*, 41 Tenn App 365, 294 S.W.2d. 313; *De Santis v. Wackenhut Corp.* (Tex App Houston (14th Dist)) 732 S.W.2d. 29, writ granted (Tex) 31 Tex. Sup Ct Jour 137 and affd in part and revd in part on other grounds (Tex) 31 Tex. Sup Ct Jour 616, op withdrawn, substituted op, on reh (Tex) 793 S.W.2d. 670, 5 BNA IER Cas 739, 1990-2 CCH Trade Cases ¶ 69147, reh overr (Sep 12, 1990) and cert den 498 U.S. 1048, 112 L.Ed.2d. 775, 111 S.Ct. 755, 6 BNA IER Cas 128; *Buhler v. Maddison*, 109 Utah 267, 176 P.2d. 118, 168 ALR 177; *Goldman v. Beaudry*, 122 Vt. 299, 170 A.2d. 636.

²⁴ *Melville v. American Home Assur. Co.* (CA3 Pa) 584 F.2d. 1306, 3 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 756 (in a diversity action brought in Pennsylvania by insured against insurance company located in New York, the court applied Delaware law regarding the presumption with respect to suicide, because insured was a Delaware resident and had purchased the policy in Delaware, and the accident occurred in Delaware); *Headen v. Pope & Talbot, Inc.* (CA3 Pa) 252 F.2d. 739 (law of the state where parties were married did not control as to presumptions concerning validity of marriage); *Patten v. General Motors Corp., Chevrolet Motor Div.* (WD Okla) 699 F.Supp. 1500 (in a wrongful death and products liability action brought in Oklahoma against businesses located in Michigan, Ohio, and Florida concerning an accident in Colorado, Oklahoma's interest in compensating the survivors justified application of Oklahoma law on burden of persuasion, because the van was put into the stream of commerce in Oklahoma, plaintiffs and decedents were Oklahoma residents, and defendants did business in Oklahoma); *Sadberry v. Griffiths* (4th Dist) 191 Cal.App.2d. 610, 12 Cal Rptr 773 (in holding that California law applied as to a presumption of motor vehicle ownership, the court gave some consideration to the fact that California was the state in which plaintiffs were injured as well as the state in which the forum was located); *Myers v. Gaither* (Dist Col App), 232 A.2d. 577, remanded 131 U.S.App.DC. 216, 404 F.2d. 216 (contacts with the District of Columbia were superior to those of any other jurisdiction such that District of Columbia law governed).

²⁵ *Computerized Radiological Services, Inc. v. Syntex Corp.* (ED NY) 595 F.Supp. 1495, 40 UCCRS 49, affd in part and revd in part (CA2 NY) 786 F.2d. 72, 42 UCCRS 1656; *Melville v. American Home Assur. Co.* (CA3 Pa) 584 F.2d. 1306, 3 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 756; *Amerada Hess Pipeline Corp. v. Alaska Public Utilities Com.* (Alaska) 711 P.2d. 1170; *Holt Service Co. v. Modlin*, 163 Ga.App. 283, 293 S.E.2d. 741; *Babcock v. Chesapeake & O. R. Co.* (1st Dist) 83 Ill.App.3d. 919, 38 Ill.Dec. 841, 404 N.E.2d. 265; *Tietloff v. Lift-A-Loft Corp.* (Ind App) 441 N.E.2d. 986; *Finch v. Hughes Aircraft Co.*, 57 Md.App. 190, 469 A.2d. 867, cert den 300 Md. 88, 475 A.2d. 1200, reconsideration den 301 Md. 41, 481 A.2d. 801 and cert den 469 U.S. 1215, 84 L.Ed.2d. 336, 105 S.Ct. 1190, reh den 471 U.S. 1049, 85 L.Ed.2d. 341, 105 S.Ct. 2043, later proceeding (CA FC) 926 F.2d. 1574, 17 USPQ2d 1914 and (criticized on other grounds by *Newell v. Richards*, 83 Md.App. 371, 574 A.2d. 370) and (criticized on other grounds by *Newell v. Richards* (Md App) 1990 Md.App. LEXIS 133).

²⁶ *Maryland Casualty Co. v. Williams* (CA5 Miss), 377 F.2d. 389, 35 ALR3d 275; *Kowalski v. Wojtkowski*, 19 N.J. 247, 116 A.2d. 6, 53 A.L.R.2d. 556 (disapproved on other grounds by *B. v. O.*, 50 N.J. 93, 232 A.2d. 401); *Buhler v. Maddison*, 109 Utah 267, 176 P.2d. 118, 168 ALR 177.

²⁷ Adapted from *Am.Jur.2d.*, Evidence, §190: Civil litigation (1999)

²⁸ *Usery v. Turner Elkhorn Mining Co.*, 428 U.S. 1, 49 L.Ed.2d. 752, 96 S.Ct. 2882, 1 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 243 (superseded on other grounds by statute as stated in *Freeman United Coal Mining Co. v. Office of Workers' Compensation Program* (CA7) 999 F.2d. 291); *Ferry v. Ramsey*, 277 U.S. 88, 72 L.Ed. 796, 48 S.Ct. 443.

²⁹ *Stanley v. Illinois*, 405 U.S. 645, 31 L.Ed.2d. 551, 92 S.Ct. 1208, holding unconstitutional violation of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment a statutory presumption that unmarried fathers are unsuitable and neglectful parents.

³⁰ *Usery v. Turner Elkhorn Mining Co.*, 428 U.S. 1, 49 L.Ed.2d. 752, 96 S.Ct. 2882, 1 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 243 (superseded on other grounds by statute as stated in *Freeman United Coal Mining Co. v. Office of Workers' Compensation Program* (CA7) 999 F.2d. 291); *Dick v. New York Life Ins. Co.*, 359 U.S.

A court assessing a constitutional challenge to a conclusive presumption assesses the adequacy of the fit between the classification and the policy that the classification serves. Thus, its constitutionality is measured by the same standards as are substantive rules of law generally.³¹

2.8 Rebutting presumed facts³²

Courts have expressed the burden of proof that the adversely affected party must satisfy in order to avoid an instruction that if the jury finds the basic fact it must also find the presumed fact, in a variety of ways: the evidence rebutting a presumption must be substantial,³³ credible,³⁴ positive,³⁵ or must be sufficient to raise an issue of fact for the jury³⁶ or put the issue in equilibrium.³⁷ Other courts have held that any evidence having a tendency to support the nonexistence of the presumed fact will suffice.³⁸ With regard to a typical presumption, therefore, to avoid a directed verdict as to the presumed fact, the party adversely affected by the presumption must offer sufficient evidence to permit a rational factfinder to find the nonexistence of the presumed fact by a preponderance of the evidence.³⁹

Once the party adversely affected by the presumption offers sufficient evidence rebutting the presumption to avoid a directed verdict as to the presumed fact, the presumption drops out of the case and the burden of persuasion as to the presumed fact remains with the party who had that burden at the outset of the trial.⁴⁰

437, 3 L.Ed.2d. 935, 79 S.Ct. 921; *Mobile, J. & K. C. R. Co. v. Turnipseed*, 219 U.S. 35, 55 L.Ed. 78, 31 S.Ct. 136; *Pizza v. Wolf Creek Ski Dev. Corp.* (Colo.) 711 P.2d. 671, 55 A.L.R.4th. 607 (criticized on other grounds by *Tri-Aspen Constr. Co. v. Johnson* (Colo.) 714 P.2d. 484).

³¹ *Michael H. v. Gerald D.*, 491 U.S. 110, 105 L.Ed.2d. 91, 109 S.Ct. 2333, reh den 492 U.S. 937, 106 L.Ed.2d. 634, 110 S.Ct. 22 and reh den 499 U.S. 984, 113 L.Ed.2d. 739, 111 S.Ct. 1645 and motion den (US) 118 L.Ed.2d. 538, 112 S.Ct. 1931, later proceeding (App Div, 2d Dept) 604 NYS2d 573.

³² *Am.Jur.2d.*, Evidence, §199.

³³ *New York Life Ins. Co. v. Gamer*, 303 U.S. 161, 82 L.Ed. 726, 58 S.Ct. 500, 114 ALR 1218; *O'Brien v. Equitable Life Assur. Soc.* (CA8 Mo) 212 F.2d. 383, cert den 348 U.S. 835, 99 L.Ed. 658, 75 S.Ct. 57; *Harlem Taxicab Ass'n v. Nemesh*, 89 U.S.App.DC. 123, 191 F.2d. 459; *Union Cent. Life Ins. Co. v. Sims*, 208 Ark 1069, 189 S.W.2d. 193; *Carroll v. Carroll* (Ky) 251 S.W.2d. 989; *Anderson v. Minneapolis*, 258 Minn 221, 103 N.W.2d. 397; *Shell Oil Co. v. Kapler*, 235 Minn 292, 50 N.W.2d. 707; *Halloway v. Halloway*, 189 Miss 723, 198 So 738; *Di Paoli v. Prudential Ins. Co.* (Mo App) 384 S.W.2d. 861; *Re Will of Blake*, 21 N.J. 50, 120 A.2d. 745; *People v. Richetti*, 302 NY 290, 97 N.E.2d. 908; *Carson v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 165 Ohio.St. 238, 59 Ohio.Ops. 310, 135 N.E.2d. 259; *Shepherd v. Midland Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 152 Ohio.St. 6, 39 Ohio.Ops. 352, 87 N.E.2d. 156, 12 A.L.R.2d. 1250; *Mulroy v. Co-operative Transit Co.*, 142 W Va. 165, 95 S.E.2d. 63.

³⁴ *Schenck v. Minolta Office Sys., Inc.* (Colo App), 802 P.2d. 1131, cert den (Colo) 1990 Colo. LEXIS 889, later proceeding (Colo App) 17 Brief Times Rep 1613, reh den (Nov 26, 1993); *Greene v. Willey*, 147 Me. 227, 86 A.2d. 82; *Johnson v. White*, 154 Mich.App. 425, 397 N.W.2d. 555, app gr 428 Mich 857, 399 N.W.2d. 396, reh gr, in part 428 Mich 871, 401 N.W.2d. 615 and revd on other grounds 430 Mich 47, 420 N.W.2d. 87; *Carson v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 165 Ohio.St. 238, 59 Ohio.Ops. 310, 135 N.E.2d. 259; *Waters v. New Amsterdam Casualty Co.*, 393 Pa. 247, 144 A.2d. 354; *Johnson v. Atlantic C. L. R. Co.*, 217 S.C. 190, 60 S.E.2d. 226; *Mulroy v. Co-operative Transit Co.*, 142 W Va. 165, 95 S.E.2d. 63; *McNamer v. American Ins. Co.*, 267 Wis. 494, 66 N.W.2d. 342 (ovrld on other grounds by *Wells v. Dairyland Mut. Ins. Co.*, 274 Wis. 505, 80 N.W.2d. 380).

³⁵ *Johnson v. White*, 154 Mich.App. 425, 397 N.W.2d. 555, app gr 428 Mich 857, 399 N.W.2d. 396, reh gr, in part 428 Mich 871, 401 N.W.2d. 615 and revd on other grounds 430 Mich 47, 420 N.W.2d. 87; *Empire Gas & Fuel Co. v. Muegge*, 135 Tex. 520, 143 S.W.2d. 763.

³⁶ *Callahan v. Van Galder*, 3 Wis.2d. 654, 89 N.W.2d. 210.

³⁷ *Employers' Liability Assur. Corp. v. Maes* (CA10 NM) 235 F.2d. 918; *Hinds v. John Hancock Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 155 Me. 349, 155 A.2d. 721, 85 A.L.R.2d. 703 (superseded on other grounds by statute as stated in *Poiras v. R. E. Glidden Body Shop, Inc.* (Me) 430 A.2d. 1113) (adopting the formulation that a presumption persists until the contrary evidence persuades the factfinder that the balance of probability is in equilibrium or, stated otherwise, until the evidence satisfies the jury or factfinder that it is as probable that the presumed fact does not exist as that it does exist); *Re Guardianship of Breece*, 173 Ohio.St. 542, 20 Ohio.Ops.2d. 155, 184 N.E.2d. 386 (the production of evidence disputing or contrary to the presumption causes the presumption to disappear where such evidence to the contrary either counterbalances the presumption or even when it is only sufficient to leave the case in equipoise); *Carson v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 156 Ohio.St. 104, 45 Ohio.Ops. 103, 100 N.E.2d. 197, 28 A.L.R.2d. 344.

³⁸ *Re O'Connor's Estate*, 74 Ariz 248, 246 P.2d. 1063; *Jodoin v. Baroody*, 95 N.H. 154, 59 A.2d. 343 (a presumption is not evidence and its sole function is to take the place of evidence, so that when the latter appears if only to the extent that an inference may be drawn from it, the presumption vanishes); *Schlichting v. Schlichting*, 15 Wis.2d. 147, 112 N.W.2d. 149 (the presumption of decedent's due care disappears from the case when any evidence is introduced tending to establish negligence).

³⁹ *Henderick v. Uptown Safe Deposit Co.* (1st Dist) 21 Ill.App.2d. 515, 159 N.E.2d. 58; *Firkus v. Murphy*, 311 Minn 85, 246 N.W.2d. 864; *Re Estate of Swan*, 4 Utah.2d. 277, 293 P.2d. 682; *Bates v. Bowles White & Co.*, 56 Wash.2d. 374, 353 P.2d. 663.

⁴⁰ *Texas Dept. of Community Affairs v. Burdine*, 450 U.S. 248, 67 L.Ed.2d. 207, 101 S.Ct. 1089, 25 BNA FEP Cas 113, 25 CCH EPD ¶ 31544, 9 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1, on remand (CA5 Tex) 647 F.2d. 513, 25 BNA FEP Cas 1746, 26 CCH EPD ¶ 31898 and (not followed on other grounds by *Burton v. Ohio, Adult Parole Authority* (CA6 Ohio) 798 F.2d. 164, 41 BNA FEP Cas 1799, 41 CCH EPD ¶ 36544) and (criticized on other grounds by *Saint Mary's Honor Ctr. v. Hicks* (US) 125 L.Ed.2d. 407, 113 S.Ct. 2742, 93 CDOS 4747, 93 Daily Journal DAR 8057, 62 BNA FEP Cas 96, 61 CCH EPD ¶ 42322, 37 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 581, 7 FLW Fed S 553); *Panduit Corp. v. All States Plastic Mfg. Co.* (CA FC), 744 F.2d. 1564, 223 U.S.P.Q. 465 (disapproved on other grounds by *Richardson-Merrell, Inc. v. Koller*, 472 U.S. 424, 86 L.Ed.2d. 340, 105 S.Ct. 2757); *Pennsylvania, Dept. of Transp. v. United States*, 226

2.9 Rules of Presumption

A number of rules govern the use of “presumptions”, some of which are described above. These “laws or rules of presumption” will be further explained throughout the rest of this document:

1. In any legal proceeding, the moving party has the burden of proving, with evidence, the truth of his claim. It may not be presumed that his allegations are true unless and until he presents evidence in support of the claim.
2. Presumptions may not be used as evidence or as a substitute for evidence. A corollary to this rule is that a presumption may act only temporarily as a substitute evidence, until the party who is making it can introduce evidence that proves the point they are presuming.⁴¹

This court has never treated a presumption as any form of evidence. See, e.g., A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.L. Chaides Constr. Co., 960 F.2d. 1020, 1037 (Fed.Cir.1992) (“[A] presumption is not evidence.”); see also Del Vecchio v. Bowers, 296 U.S. 280, 286, 56 S.Ct. 190, 193, 80 L.Ed. 229 (1935) (“[A presumption] cannot acquire the attribute of evidence in the claimant's favor.”); New York Life Ins. Co. v. Gamer, 303 U.S. 161, 171, 58 S.Ct. 500, 503, 82 L.Ed. 726 (1938) (“[A] presumption is not evidence and may not be given weight as evidence.”). Although a decision of this court, Jensen v. Brown, 19 F.3d. 1413, 1415 (Fed.Cir.1994), dealing with presumptions in Va. law is cited for the contrary proposition, the Jensen court did not so decide. [Routen v. West, 142 F.3d. 1434 C.A.Fed.,1998]

3. There are two types of presumptions: Conclusive and rebuttable. Every rebuttable presumption is either:
 - 3.1. A presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence or
 - 3.2. A presumption affecting the burden of proof. Calif.Evid.Code, §600.
4. Presumptions which prejudice Constitutionally guaranteed rights are unconstitutional and may not be employed. *Vlandis v. Kline*, 412 U.S. 441, 449, 93 S.Ct. 2230, 2235 (1973); *Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. LaFleur*, 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215 (1974).
5. Presumptions which would otherwise prejudice constitutionally guaranteed rights are only permissible in the following cases:
 - 5.1. Those who are not protected by the Bill of Rights because they maintain a domicile within the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government on territory of the United States.

*“The idea prevails with some, indeed it has found expression in arguments at the bar, that **we have in this country substantially two national governments; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all of its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside the independently of that instrument, by exercising such powers [of absolutism] as other nations of the earth are accustomed to.** I take leave to say that, if the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system of government will result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism.. It will be an evil day for American liberty if the theory of a government outside the supreme law of the land finds lodgment in our constitutional jurisprudence. No higher duty rests upon this court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violation of the principles of the Constitution.”*
[Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)]

- 5.2. Persons who have voluntarily engaged in a federal franchise, “public right”, or privilege.

Although Crowell and Raddatz do not explicitly distinguish between rights created by Congress and other rights, such a distinction underlies in part Crowell's and Raddatz' recognition of a critical difference between rights created by federal statute and rights recognized by the Constitution. Moreover, such a distinction seems to us to be necessary in light of the delicate accommodations required by the principle of separation of powers reflected in Art. III. The constitutional system of checks and balances is designed to guard against “encroachment or aggrandizement” by Congress at the expense of the other branches of government. Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S., at 122, 96 S.Ct., at 683. But when Congress creates a statutory right [a “privilege” in this case, such as a “trade or business”], it clearly has the discretion, in defining that right, to create presumptions, or assign burdens of proof, or prescribe remedies; it may also provide that persons seeking to vindicate that right must do so before particularized tribunals created to perform the specialized adjudicative tasks related to that right.FN35 Such provisions do, in a sense, affect the exercise of judicial power, but they are also incidental to Congress' power to define the right that it has created. No comparable justification exists, however, when the right being adjudicated is not of congressional creation. In such a situation, substantial inroads into functions that have traditionally been performed by the Judiciary cannot be characterized merely as incidental extensions of Congress' power to

Ct.Cl. 444, 643 F.2d. 758, 7 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1157, cert den 454 U.S. 826, 70 L.Ed.2d. 101, 102 S.Ct. 117; Lynn v. Cepurneek, 352 Pa.Super. 379, 508 A.2d. 308, later proceeding 373 Pa.Super. 479, 541 A.2d. 771; Martin v. Phillips, 235 Va. 523, 369 S.E.2d. 397.

⁴¹ Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1185, presumption.

define rights that it has created. Rather, such inroads suggest unwarranted encroachments upon the judicial power of the United States, which our Constitution reserves for Art. III courts.
[Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 458 U.S. at 83-84, 102 S.Ct. 2858 (1983)]

For further information on the above, see:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

6. A Court is abusing its discretion if it employs, rewards, or encourages presumption to relieve either party to a suit from having to actually prove the truth of the fact being presumed.
7. If the party who prejudiced rights using presumptions was a government or state actor or entity, there is standing to sue the offender personally under 42 U.S.C. §1983 for “deprivation of rights under the color of law”. The burden of proof rests on the person filing the suit to prove that the discrimination results from “state action”. See *National Collegiate Athletic Assn. v. Tarkanian*, 488 U.S. 179, 193, n. 13 (1988); *Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co.*, 419 U.S. 345, 349 (1974).
8. The purpose of due process is to completely eliminate all presumptions from any legal proceeding which might impair or injure Constitutionally guaranteed rights. See Black’s Law Dictionary definition of “due process”, which says:

“If any question of fact or liability be conclusively be presumed [rather than proven] against him, this is not due process of law.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 500]

9. In the field of criminal law, a defendant must be “presumed” to be innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. *Delo v. Lashely*, 507 U.S. 272 (1993)
10. A common way to hide one’s presumptions is to cite a case as authority to act within a legal pleading and to choose a case which does not match the circumstances of your case. This is a way of imposing presumptions against a party without having to justify or prove them with evidence. This is a common tactic used by the government against those not educated in the law who are litigating “pro per” or “pro se”. We call this “encrypting” or “concealing” presumptions by abusing case law. Every case cited as authority must exactly replicate the circumstances that it is being applied to or it is useless as authority. It is a reckless and irresponsible abuse of case law as “propaganda” to cite a case as authority or “stare decisis” without at least explaining why it fits the circumstances that it is being applied to.
11. Under 1 U.S.C. §204, those titles of the U.S. Code which are not enacted into positive law are considered “prima facie evidence” of the enacted positive law. “Prima facie” is a fancy way to say that they are simply “presumed” to be law until challenged or proven otherwise. It is presumptuous, irresponsible, and a violation of due process of law to cite a section from a code that is not enacted into positive law. Examples of Titles of the U.S. Code that are NOT enacted into positive law include:
 - 11.1. Title 26: Internal Revenue Code. Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code imposes no obligation on anyone unless and until the section of code being cited as authority is definitively proven with evidence that it is positive law.
 - 11.2. Title 42: The Public Health and Welfare. Social Security is in this title. It is not positive law and therefore imposes no obligation upon anyone who does not volunteer to be subject to it.
 - 11.3. Title 50: War and National Defense. The draft laws we have are not positive law and therefore are not enforceable in states of the Union.
12. A statute which imposes a presumption that prejudices constitutionally guaranteed rights is unconstitutional.

“It is apparent that a constitutional prohibition cannot be transgressed indirectly by the creation of a statutory presumption any more than it can be violated by direct enactment. The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions.”
[*Bailey v. Alabama*, 219 U.S. 219 (1911)]

If you would like to read more authorities on the subject of “presumption”, see:

<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/presumption.htm>

3 How Congress abuses presumption to destroy your Constitutional rights

3.1 “Words of Art”: Using the Law to deceive and create false presumption

*“The wicked man does deceptive work,
But to him who sows righteousness will be a sure reward.
As righteousness leads to life,*

1 So he who pursues evil pursues his own death.
2 Those who are of a perverse heart are an abomination to the Lord,
3 But such as are blameless in their ways are a delight.
4 Though they join forces, the wicked will not go unpunished;
5 But the posterity of the righteous will be delivered."
6 [Prov. 11:18-21, Bible, NKJV]

7
8 *"Integrity without knowledge is weak and useless, and knowledge without integrity is dangerous and dreadful."*
9 [Samuel Johnson Rasselas, 1759]

10
11 *"Beware lest anyone cheat you through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men, according*
12 *to the basic principles of the world, and not according to Christ."*
13 [Colossians 2:8, Bible, NKJV]

14 Does anyone like politicians or the lawyers who write deceptive laws for them? After you read this section, you'll have even
15 less reason to like them! The Internal Revenue Code ("IRC", also called 26 U.S.C.) is a masterpiece of deception designed
16 by greedy and unscrupulous IRS lawyers to mislead Citizens into believing that they are subject to federal income tax. Most
17 of the deception is perpetrated using specialized definitions of words. The Code contains a series of directory statutes using
18 the word "shall", with provisions that are requirements for corporations, trusts, and other "legal fictions" but not for human
19 beings (men and women such as you and I). Even members of Congress are generally unaware of the deceptive legal meanings
20 of certain terms that are consistently used in the IRC. These terms have legal definitions for use in the IRC that are very
21 different from the general understanding of the meaning of the words. Such terms are called "words of art". This situation
22 is quite deliberate, and no accident at all.

23 Let's start this section by defining the term "definition":

24 ***definition:** A description of a thing by its properties; an explanation of the meaning of a word or term. The*
25 *process of stating the exact meaning of a word by means of other words. Such a description of the thing defined,*
26 *including all essential elements and excluding all nonessential, as to distinguish it from all other things and*
27 *classes."*
28 [Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 423]

29 Lack of knowledge of legal definitions used in the Internal Revenue Code causes false presumption by uninformed Americans
30 who are confused as to the correct interpretation of both the IRC and the true meaning of the tricky wording in IRS
31 instructional publications and news articles. *However, when you understand the legal definitions of these terms, the deception*
32 *and false presumption is easily recognized and the limited application of the Code becomes very clear.* This understanding
33 will help you to see that filing income tax forms and paying income taxes must be voluntary acts for most Americans
34 domiciled in states of the Union because the United States Constitution forbids the federal government to impose any tax
35 directly upon individuals.

36 Most terms used within 26 U.S.C, which is the Internal Revenue Code, appear in Chapter 79, Section 7701. Anything having
37 to do with employer withholding is defined in 26 U.S.C. §3401.

38 ***WARNING!: It is extremely important that you read and understand these definitions before you***
39 ***begin interpreting the tax codes! Deceiving definitions are the NUMBER ONE way that lawyers use***
40 ***to trick and enslave us so we should always question the meaning of words before we start trying to***
41 ***interpret the laws they write!***

42 ***Another popular lawyering technique is to use words which are undefined. This has the effect of***
43 ***encouraging uncertainty, conflict, and false presumption in the application of the law, which***
44 ***increases litigation, which in turn makes the legal profession more profitable for the lawyers who***
45 ***write the laws and judges who enforce the laws after they leave public office and go back into private***
46 ***practice. Doesn't that seem like a conflict of interest and an abuse of the public trust for private gain?***
47 ***It sure does to us!***

48 For your edification, Family Guardian has prepared a library of definitions on their website in the [Sovereignty Forms and](#)
49 [Instructions area](#) that you can and should refer to frequently at:

<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/FormsInstr-Cites.htm>

Click on “Cites by Topic” in the upper left corner to see a library of carefully researched definitions. This will allow you to see clearly for yourself how the conniving lawyers inhabiting the District of Criminals (Washington, D.C.) enticed us into slavery in violation of the [Thirteenth Amendment](#) and [18 U.S.C. §1581](#) by using deceiving definitions. Then these evil lawyers tried to cover-up their trick by violating our [Fifth Amendment](#) right of due process by adding the word “includes” to those definitions that were most suspect, like the following:

1. Definition of the term “State” found in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(10\)](#) and [4 U.S.C. §110](#).
2. Definition of the term “United States” found in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\)](#)
3. Definition of the term “employee” found in [26 U.S.C. §3401\(c\)](#) and [26 C.F.R. §31.3401\(c\)-1](#) Employee
4. Definition of the term “person” found in [26 C.F.R. §301.6671-1](#) (which governs who is liable for penalties under Internal Revenue Code)

What Congress did by defining the word “includes” the way they did was give the federal courts so much “wiggle” room and license that they could define the IRC and federal tax jurisdiction any way they want, which transformed our government from a society of laws to a society of men, in stark violation of the intent of our founding fathers and of the Fifth and Sixth Amendment, and the “void for vagueness” doctrine:

“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*, [5 U.S. 137](#); 1 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803)]

See the following resources if you would like to learn more about how they perpetrated this fraud and hoax with the word “includes”:

1. [Meaning of the Words “includes” and “including”](#), Form #05.014
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. [Great IRS Hoax](#), Form #11.302, Sections 3.9.1.8 and 5.6.17:
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

The definitions found in the U.S. Code apply NOT ONLY to the U.S. Code, but also to the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR's), which are the implementing regulations for the U.S. Code, and the IRS Publications, which are guidelines to Americans that implement these regulations. The definitions in the U.S. Code in effect supersede and in some cases are repeated or are modified and expanded by the Code of Federal Regulations and the IRS Publications. Incidentally, doesn't it seem strange that the DEFINITIONS, which describe what all of the Code means, are almost at the END of the code, instead of the beginning? Most other contracts and legal documents always START with the definitions first, and usually define ALL words open to confusion to prevent misinterpretation. Not so with the I.R.C. They leave the word "individual" undefined, for instance, because they don't want you knowing what "individual" is, since it appears on your 1040 income tax form. Wonder why they do this instead of just calling you a “Citizen”? Could it possibly be that the slick lawyers in the congress hope you won't wade through 9,500 pages of Code to get to the definitions and that you will run out of energy and interest before you read them? Are they trying to HIDE something? It is important to note that proper and clear definitions of these deceptive words never appear in any of the IRS publications, and this is part of the Great Deception we have talked about throughout this document.

As you read through these masterfully crafty deceits and definitions of IRS lawyers listed below and appearing in the Infernal (written by Satan directly from hell?), I mean Internal Revenue Code (I.R.C. , 26 U.S.C), ask yourself the following questions and critically consider the most truthful answers according the I.R.C. We compare the various definitions for each word to show you how it has been abused to cause deceit. You are probably going to be mad as hell (like I was) when you find out the trick these crafty IRS lawyers have played on you. Below are just a few examples of how these depraved, corrupt, arrogant, and power-hungry lawyers have used “legalese” to deceive you. The answers we give in the third column assume you are the average American domiciled in one of the 50 Union states and not one of the federal territories that are part of the “federal zone”, which is subsequently explained in section 4.8 of the [Great IRS Hoax](#), Form #11.302:

Table 1: Questions to Ask and Answer as You Read the Internal Revenue Code

#	Question (using legal definitions)	Translation to everyday language ("non-legalese")	Answer (in most cases)
1	Am I an "employee"?	Do I hold a privileged federal "public office" that depends exclusively on rights and privileges granted to me by the citizens who elected or appointed me?	NO. Under the case of <i>Simms. v. Ahrens</i> , 271 S.W. 720, people with everyday skills, trades, or professions or who do not work for the federal government are not considered to be employees as per the I.R.C., and therefore are not subject to "withholding".
2	Do I have "gross income" or "taxable income"?	Do I as a corporation have profit subject to indirect excise ?	NO. See: 1. <i>Eisner v. Macomber</i> , 252 U.S. 189, 207, 40 S.Ct. 189, 9 A.L.R. 1570 (1920); 2. <i>Doyle v. Mitchell Brothers Co.</i> , 247 U.S. 179, 185, 38 S.Ct. 467 (1918); 3. <i>Stratton's Independence v. Howbert</i> , 231 U.S. 399, 414, 58 L.Ed. 285, 34 Sup.Ct. 136 (1913);
3	What is an "individual" as indicated on my "1040 Individual Income Tax Return"?	What is an "individual" as indicated on my "1040 Individual Income Tax Return"?	One of the following: 1. A corporation, an association, a trust, etc. chartered in the District of Columbia with income subject to excise taxes . 2. A nonresident alien or alien as identified in 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3).
4	Am I a "taxpayer" under Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code?	Am I a person who is "liable" for paying income taxes as per the I.R.C Subtitle A?	NO. The only persons liable (under Section 1461) of Subtitle A of the I.R.C. for <u>anything</u> are withholding agents as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(16). These withholding agents are transferees for U.S. government property under 26 U.S.C. §6901 and they are "returning" (hence the name "tax return") monies <u>already owned</u> by the U.S. Government and being paid out to nonresident aliens who are elected or appointed officers of the United States Government as part of a pre-negotiated and implied employment agreement. Because the monies they are withholding <u>already</u> belong to the U.S. government even after they are paid out, the withholding agent is liable to return these monies. For private individuals who are not nonresident aliens in receipt of pay as an elected or appointed officer of the U.S. government, all "taxes" falling under Subtitle A are voluntary, which is to say that they are <u>donations</u> and not taxes. However, if you "volunteer" by submitting a tax return or instituting voluntary withholding using a W-4 form, you are referred to as a "taxpayer" because you made yourself "subject to" the tax code voluntarily and therefore are "presumed" to be liable under 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3. This artificial liability is then created in your IRS Individual Master File (IMF) by IRS agents committing deliberate fraud during data entry into their IDRS computer system. See Section 2.4.8 of the <u>Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Manual</u> for further details on how to expose this IMF fraud.
5	Am I a "tax payer"?	Have I unwittingly deceived the I.R.S. and the U.S. government, by my own ignorance and unknowing falsification on my 1040 income tax return, into thinking that I am a "taxpayer"?	YES. In most cases, people file and pay income taxes and erroneously label themselves as being "taxpayers" because of their own ignorance and the total lack of sources for truth about who are "taxpayers".
6	Am I am "employer"?	Am I someone who pays the salary and wages of an elected or appointed federal political officer?	NO
7	"Must" I pay income taxes.	1. Do I have the "IRS" permission to "volunteer" to pay income taxes, even though I don't have to. 2. "May" I pay income taxes I'm not obligated to pay, please?	Definitely!

#	Question (using legal definitions)	Translation to everyday language ("non-legalese")	Answer (in most cases)
8	Do I live in a "State" or the "United States"?	Do I live in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or any other U.S. federal territory or enclave within the boundaries of a state which the residents do NOT have constitutional protections of their rights (see <i>Downes v. Bidwell</i> , 182 U.S. 244 (1901)) and are therefore subject to federal income taxes?	NO
9	Do I make "wages" as an "employee"?	Do I receive compensation for "personal services" from the U.S. government as an elected or appointed political officer NOT practicing an occupation of common right?	NO
10	Am I a "withholding agent" per the tax code?	Do I pay income to an elected or appointed officer of the U.S. government who has requested withholding on their pay or to a nonresident alien or corporation with U.S (federal zone) . Source income?	NO
11	Am I a "citizen of the United States" or a resident of the United States?	Was I born or naturalized in the District of Columbia or other federal territory or enclave or do I live there now?	NO
12	Am I a national but not citizen of the United States under 8 U.S.C. §1452?	Was I born in one of the 50 Union states outside of federal lands within those states?	YES
13	Do I conduct a "trade or business" in the "United States"?	Do I hold elected or appointed public office for the U.S. government in the federal United States or federal zone and thereby receive excise taxable privileges from the U.S. government?	NO
14	Do I make "gross income" derived from a "taxable source" as defined in 26 U.S.C. §§861 or 862?	Do I derive income from a privileged corporation that is registered and resident in the "federal zone" or from the U.S.** government as an elected or appointed political official or officer of a U.S.** Corporation?	NO
15	Do I perform "personal services"?	Am I an elected or appointed official of the U.S. government who receives a salary for my job?	NO

Jesus warned us that a thief would come to kill and hurt and destroy us by devious means, and this thief is our own government and the legal profession!:

*"Most assuredly, I say to you, **he who does not enter the sheepfold by the door, but climbs up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.** But he who enters the door is the shepherd of the sheep.....**The thief does not come except to steal, and to kill, and to destroy.** I have come that they may have life, and that they may have it more abundantly."*
[John 10:1-9, Bible, NKJV]

James Madison, one of our Founding Fathers, also warned us of the above fraud in the Federalist Papers, when he wrote:

*"The internal effects of a mutable policy are still more calamitous. **It poisons the blessing of liberty itself. It will be of little avail to the people, that the laws are made by men of their own choice, if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is to-day, can guess what it will be to-morrow. Law is defined to be a rule of action; but how can that be a rule, which is little known, and less fixed?***

Another effect of public instability is the unreasonable advantage it gives to the sagacious, the enterprising, and the moneyed few over the industrious and uniformed mass of the people. Every new regulation concerning commerce or revenue, or in any way affecting the value of the different species of property, presents a new harvest to those who watch the change, and can trace its consequences; a harvest, reared not by themselves, but by the toils and cares of the great body of their fellow-citizens. This is a state of things in which it may be said with some truth that laws are made for the FEW, not for the MANY.

***In another point of view, great injury results from an unstable government. The want of confidence in the public councils damps every useful undertaking, the success and profit of which may depend on a continuance of existing arrangements. What prudent merchant will hazard his fortunes in any new branch of commerce when he knows not but that his plans may be rendered unlawful before they can be executed?** What farmer or manufacturer will lay himself out for the encouragement given to any particular cultivation or establishment, when he can have no assurance that his preparatory labors and advances will not render him a victim to an inconstant government? In a word, no great improvement or laudable enterprise can go forward which requires the auspices of a steady system of national policy."*

1 *But the most deplorable effect of all is that diminution of attachment and reverence which steals into the hearts*
2 *of the people, towards a political system which betrays so many marks of infirmity, and disappoints so many of*
3 *their flattering hopes. No government, any more than an individual, will long be respected without being truly*
4 *respectable; nor be truly respectable, without possessing a certain portion of order and stability.*
5 *[Federalist Paper #62, James Madison]*

6 We hope that one of the lessons you will walk away with after you discover the kind of deceit above is that educating our
7 young people to make them smart without giving them a moral or character or religious education causes major problems in
8 our society like that above. Cheating in our schools is now rampant, and once these dishonest students enter the job market
9 and become lawyers, politicians, and judges, their deceit is only magnified because of greed. It's no wonder that during the
10 first half century of this country, you needed to just about have a divinity degree before you could think about studying to be
11 a lawyer! No one with any sense of morality or decency or integrity would try to deceive the way the IRS lawyers have
12 deceived us all with the tax code shown above. This also explains bible verses in which Jesus condemned lawyers. He did
13 this for a reason and now we know why! Let me repeat His very words again for your benefit:

14 *"Woe to you lawyers! for you have taken away the keys of knowledge; you did not enter yourselves, and you*
15 *hindered those who were entering."*
16 *[Luke 11:52, Bible, NKJV]*

17 How did lawyers take away the keys to knowledge? They did it by destroying or undermining the meaning of words, and
18 thereby robbing us of our liberty and our right of due process under the law. Because the law has been obfuscated, custody
19 of our liberty has been transferred from the law and our own understanding of the law to the arbitrary whims of judges, the
20 legal profession, and the courts, who we then are forced to rely upon to "interpret" the law and thereby tell us what our rights
21 are. These tactics have transformed us from a society of laws to a society of men, which eventually will be our downfall and
22 the means of totally corrupting our legal system if we don't correct it soon. Confucius said it best:

23 *"When words lose their meaning, people will lose their liberty."*
24 *[Confucius, 500 B.C.]*

25 Lastly, we'd like to offer you a funny anecdote to illustrate just what the affect has been in courtrooms all over the country
26 of the law profession's "theft" of our words and distortion of our language. Playwright Jim Sherman wrote the script below
27 just after Hu Jintao was named chief of the Communist Party in China in 2002. The dialog was patterned after a similar
28 comedic exchange in the 1920's between the Abbott and Costello called "Who's On First?" The conversation depicted below
29 is between George Bush and his Assistant for National Security Affairs, Condoleezza Rice. To apply this metaphor to a tax
30 trial, imagine that George Bush is the jury and Condi is you, who are the accused person litigating to defend your rights.
31 Notice how much confusion there is over words in this interchange. You will then understand just how difficult it is to
32 explain to jurists that the most important words in the tax code don't conform to our everyday understanding of the human
33 language in most cases.

34 **HU'S ON FIRST**

35 *By James Sherman*

36 *(We take you now to the Oval Office.)*

37 *George: Condi! Nice to see you. What's happening?*

38 *Condi: Sir, I have the report here about the new leader of China.*

39 *George: Great. Lay it on me.*

40 *Condi: Hu is the new leader of China.*

41 *George: That's what I want to know.*

42 *Condi: That's what I'm telling you.*

43 *George: That's what I'm asking you. Who is the new leader of China?*

44 *Condi: Yes.*

1 George: I mean the fellow's name.

2 Condi: Hu.

3 George: The guy in China.

4 Condi: Hu.

5 George: The new leader of China.

6 Condi: Hu.

7 George: The Chinaman!

8 Condi: Hu is leading China.

9 George: Now whaddya' asking me for?

10 Condi: I'm telling you Hu is leading China.

11 George: Well, I'm asking you. Who is leading China?

12 Condi: That's the man's name.

13 George: That's who's name?

14 Condi: Yes.

15 George: Will you or will you not tell me the name of the new leader of China?

16 Condi: Yes, sir.

17 George: Yassir? Yassir Arafat is in China? I thought he was in the Middle East.

18 Condi: That's correct.

19 George: Then who is in China?

20 Condi: Yes, sir.

21 George: Yassir is in China?

22 Condi: No, sir.

23 George: Then who is?

24 Condi: Yes, sir.

25 George: Yassir?

26 Condi: No, sir.

27 George: Look, Condi. I need to know the name of the new leader of China. Get me the Secretary General of the

28 U.N. on the phone.

29 Condi: Kofi?

30 George: No, thanks.

31 Condi: You want Kofi?

32 George: No.

Condi: You don't want Kofi.

George: No. But now that you mention it, I could use a glass of milk. And then get me the U.N.

Condi: Yes, sir.

George: Not Yassir! The guy at the U.N.

Condi: Kofi?

George: Milk! Will you please make the call?

Condi: And call who?

George: Who is the guy at the U.N.?

Condi: Hu is the guy in China.

George: Will you stay out of China?!

Condi: Yes, sir.

George: And stay out of the Middle East! Just get me the guy at the U.N.

Condi: Kofi.

George: All right! With cream and two sugars. Now get on the phone.

(Condi picks up the phone.)

Condi: Rice, here.

George: Rice? Good idea. And a couple of egg rolls, too. Maybe we should send some to the guy in China. And the Middle East. Can you get Chinese food in the Middle East?

3.2 Vague laws

Another popular technique used by corrupted politicians and lawyers for encouraging false presumption is the writing of vague laws. The U.S. Supreme Court explained the affect of vague laws using its “Void for Vagueness Doctrine”:

As we said in *Grayned v. City of Rockford*, [408 U.S. 104, 108](#) (1972):

"It is a basic principle of due process that an enactment is void for vagueness if its prohibitions are not clearly defined. Vague laws offend several important values. First, because we assume that man is free to steer between lawful and unlawful conduct, we insist that laws give the person of ordinary intelligence a reasonable opportunity to know what is prohibited, so that he may act accordingly. Vague laws may trap the innocent by not providing fair warning. Second, if arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement is to be prevented, laws must provide explicit standards for those who apply them. A vague law impermissibly delegates basic policy matters to policemen, judges, and juries for resolution on an ad hoc and subjective basis, with the attendant dangers of arbitrary and discriminatory application." (Footnotes omitted.)

See *al Papachristou v. City of Jacksonville*, [405 U.S. 156](#) (1972); *Cline v. Frink Dairy Co.*, [274 U.S. 445, 47 S. Ct. 681](#) (1927); *Connally v. General Construction Co.*, [269 U.S. 385](#) (1926).
[*Sewell v. Georgia*, [435 U.S. 982](#) (1978)]

When politicians and legislators know they lack jurisdiction to implement a particular law, they typically will write in such a vague manner that the courts will have to decide what it means. This, in effect, amounts to a license to the Judicial Branch to expand federal jurisdiction. The two branches of government are supposed to be sovereign and separate and act as checks on each other, but when they want to collude against the rights of Americans, vague laws are the method of choice. The U.S. Supreme Court said the effect of vague laws is to turn judges and juries essentially into “policy boards” and political, rather than judicial or legal, tribunals. Note the phrase above from the U.S. Supreme Court again:

1 "A vague law impermissibly delegates basic policy matters [political rather than legal choices] to policemen,
2 judges, and juries for resolution on an ad hoc and subjective basis, with the attendant dangers of arbitrary and
3 discriminatory application."

4 You will note that Black's law dictionary says that such "political questions" are completely outside of the jurisdiction of any
5 court:

6 "Political questions. Questions of which courts will refuse to take cognizance, or to decide, on account of their
7 purely political character, or because their determination would involve an encroachment upon the executive or
8 legislative powers.

9 "Political questions doctrine" holds that certain issues should not be decided by courts because their resolution
10 is committed to another branch of government and/or because those issues are not capable, for one reason or
11 another, of judicial resolution. *Islamic Republic of Iran v. Pahlavi*, 116 Misc.2d. 590, 455 N.Y.S.2d. 987, 990.

12 A matter of dispute which can be handled more appropriately by another branch of the government is not a
13 "justiciable" matter for the courts. However, a state apportionment statute is not such a political question as to
14 render it nonjusticiable. *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 208-210, 82 S.Ct. 691, 705-706, 7 L.Ed.2d. 663.
15 [Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, pp. 1158-1159]

16 Therefore, codes or laws that are deliberately written in a vague manner, such as the Internal Revenue Code, have the affect
17 of compelling Courts into the role of a political panel or policy board, rather than their legitimate, Constitutional role. Their
18 de jure role is as a fact finder and judge, but vague laws compel them into a de facto role of being a political organization.
19 See the article below for an exhaustive analysis of why they are not authorized to act in this role.

[Political Jurisdiction](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #05.004
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

20 Judges in most Courts know that when it comes to "taxes", they are really unlawfully acting in a de facto "political" rather
21 than de jure "legal" capacity. That is why:

- 22 1. Federal judges will not allow "law" to be discussed in the Courtroom in the context of income taxes. See section 4.6
23 later.
- 24 2. Federal judges will insist, along with their buddy the U.S. Attorney, that all jurists are "taxpayers" and therefore federal
25 "employees" who are subject to their jurisdiction.
- 26 3. Federal judges will not address the requirements of the law in their rulings, but instead simply state "policy" and use
27 other Court rulings instead of the law itself as their authority.
- 28 4. Federal judges will not insist that the sections of the I.R.C. cited by the U.S. Attorney must be proven to be "positive
29 law", and therefore "law". See:

[Requirement for Consent](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #05.003
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

30 The U.S. Supreme Court admitted that income taxation is largely a "political matter" rather than "legal matter" which is
31 therefore beyond the jurisdiction of any court, when it said the following:

32 "Thus, the Court has frequently held that domicile or residence, more substantial than mere presence in transit
33 or sojourn, is an adequate basis for taxation, including income, property, and death taxes. Since the Fourteenth
34 Amendment makes one a citizen of the state wherein he resides, the fact of residence creates universally
35 reciprocal duties of protection by the state and of allegiance and support by the citizen. The latter obviously
36 includes a duty to pay taxes, and their nature and measure is largely a political matter. Of course, the situs of
37 property may tax it regardless of the citizenship, domicile, or residence of the owner, the most obvious illustration
38 being a tax on realty laid by the state in which the realty is located."
39 [Miller Brothers Co. v. Maryland, 347 U.S. 340 (1954)]

40 Notice the phrase "The latter obviously includes a duty to pay taxes, and their nature and measure is largely a political
41 matter". Well, the way our courts handle liability in a "Willful Failure to File" (under 26 U.S.C. §7203) trial, in fact, is also
42 handled as a "political matter" or "political question". The Constitution reserves all such "political questions" to the
43 jurisdiction of the Legislative and Executive, and not Judicial Branches of the government. Therefore, our courts have
44 become nothing less than angry lynch mobs of "taxpayers" who insist that others "pay their fair share", rather than objective
45 assemblies of impartial persons who have read, understand, and will apply the law consistent with what the Constitution says.

1 This abuse of “democracy” to prejudice and injure rights is the heart of socialism, which has become “The New American
2 Civil Religion” that is quickly supplanting the influence of Christianity in our culture.

3 *"The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political
4 controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles
5 to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of
6 worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome
7 of no elections."*

8 [*West Virginia Bd. of Ed. v. Barnett*, [319 U.S. 624](#), 638 (1943)]

9 Please read our Memorandum of law entitled “Socialism: The New American Civil Religion” for exhaustive proof that the
10 “state” has become the new pagan false god, and replaced the true God as the sovereign who rules from above, rather than
11 serves from below, as our Constitution ordains.

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

12 The U.S. Supreme Court also warned about the evil affects of allowing judges to become involved in “political matters” when
13 it said the following prophetic words that exactly describe how tax matters are heard in federal courts all around the country,
14 every day, and all day:

15 *Another evil, alarming and little foreseen, involved in regarding these as questions for the final arbitrament*
16 *of judges would be that, in such an event, all political privileges and rights would, in a dispute among the*
17 *people, depend on our decision finally. We would possess the power to decide against, as well as for, them, and*
18 *under a prejudiced or arbitrary judiciary, the public liberties and popular privileges might thus be much*
19 *perverted, if not entirely prostrated.* But, allowing the people to make constitutions and unmake them, allowing
20 their representatives to make laws and unmake them, and without our interference as to their principles or policy
21 in doing it, yet, when constitutions and laws are made and put in force by others, then the courts, as empowered
22 by the State or the Union, commence their functions and may decide on the rights which conflicting parties can
23 legally set up under them, rather than about their formation itself. *Our power begins after theirs [the Sovereign*
24 *People] ends. Constitutions and laws precede the judiciary, and we act only under and after them, and as to*
25 *disputed rights beneath them, rather than disputed points in making them. We speak what is the law, jus dicere,*
26 *we speak or construe what is the constitution, after both are made, but we make, or revise, or control neither.*
27 *The disputed rights beneath constitutions already made are to be governed by precedents, by sound legal*
28 *principles, by positive legislation [e.g. "positive law"], clear contracts, moral duties, and fixed rules; they are*
29 *per se questions of law, and are well suited to the education and habits of the bench.* But the other disputed
30 points in making constitutions, depending often, as before shown, on policy, inclination, popular resolves and
31 popular will and arising not in respect to private rights, not what is meum and tuum, but in relation to politics,
32 they belong to politics, and they are settled by political tribunals, and are too dear to a people bred in the school
33 of Sydney and Russel for them ever to intrust their final decision, when disputed, to a class of men who are so far
34 removed from them as the judiciary, a class also who might decide them erroneously, as well as right, and if in
35 the former way, *the consequences might not be able to be averted except by a revolution, while a wrong decision*
36 *by a political forum can often be peacefully corrected by new elections or instructions in a single month; and*
37 *if the people, in the distribution of powers under the constitution, should ever think of making judges supreme*
38 *arbiters in political controversies when not selected by nor, frequently, amenable to them nor at liberty to follow*
39 *such various considerations in their judgments as [48 U.S. 53] belong to mere political questions, they will*
40 *dethrone themselves and lose one of their own invaluable birthrights; building up in this way -- slowly, but*
41 *surely -- a new sovereign power in the republic, in most respects irresponsible and unchangeable for life, and*
42 *one more dangerous, in theory at least, than the worst elective oligarchy in the worst of times. Again, instead*
43 *of controlling the people in political affairs, the judiciary in our system was designed rather to control*
44 *individuals, on the one hand, when encroaching, or to defend them, on the other, under the Constitution and*
45 *the laws, when they are encroached upon.* And if the judiciary at times seems to fill the important station of a
46 check in the government, it is rather a check on the legislature, who may attempt to pass laws contrary to the
47 Constitution, or on the executive, who may violate both the laws and Constitution, than on the people themselves
48 in their primary capacity as makers and amenders of constitutions."

49 [*Luther v. Borden*, [48 U.S. 1](#) (1849)]

50 When you remove law from its central role in the Courtroom and put people individually in charge of deciding cases based
51 on “what feels good”, the only thing left to decide with are the following evil forces:

- 52 1. Ignorance
- 53 2. Prejudice
- 54 3. Conflict of interest
- 55 4. Bias on the part of the judge
- 56 5. The opinions of biased “experts” who are subject to IRS and judicial extortion.

1 The U.S. Supreme Court described the above travesty of justice by saying that when the liberty of someone is subject to the
2 purely arbitrary will of another, then this is the very essence of slavery itself, when it said:

3 *"When we consider the nature and the theory of our institutions of government, the principles on which they are*
4 *supposed to rest, and review the history of their development, we are constrained to conclude that they do not*
5 *mean to leave room for the play and action of purely personal and arbitrary power. Sovereignty itself is, of*
6 *course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are*
7 *delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all*
8 *government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power. It is, indeed, quite true that*
9 *there must always be lodged somewhere, and in some person or body, the authority of final decision; and in many*
10 *cases of mere administration, the responsibility is purely political, no appeal lying except to the ultimate tribunal*
11 *of the public judgment, exercised either in the pressure of opinion, or by means of the suffrage. But the*
12 *fundamental rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, considered as individual possessions, are secured*
13 *by those maxims of constitutional law which are the monuments showing the victorious progress of the race in*
14 *securing to men the blessings of civilization under the reign of just and equal laws, so that, in the famous language*
15 *of the Massachusetts bill of rights, the government of the commonwealth 'may be a government of laws and not*
16 *of men.' **For the very idea that one man may be compelled to hold his life, or***
17 ***the means of living, or any material right essential to the enjoyment of***
18 ***life, at the mere will of another, seems to be intolerable in any country***
19 ***where freedom prevails, as being the essence of slavery itself.**"*
20 *[Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)]*

21 Our founding fathers bequeathed to us a "society of law and not of men":

22 ***"The historic phrase 'a government of laws and not of men' epitomized the distinguishing character of our***
23 ***political society.** When John Adams put that phrase into the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights, pt. 1, art. 30,*
24 *he was not indulging in a rhetorical flourish. He was expressing the aim [330 U.S. 258, 308] of those*
25 ***who, with him, framed the Declaration of Independence and founded the Republic. 'A government of laws and***
26 ***not of men' was the rejection in positive terms of rule by fiat, whether by the fiat of governmental or private***
27 ***power.****[or a judge or an arbitrary jury of ignorant Americans unjustly manipulated by a judge]. Every act of*
28 *government may be challenged by an appeal to law, as finally pronounced by this Court. Even this Court has the*
29 *last say only for a time. Being composed of fallible men, it may err. But revision of its errors must be by orderly*
30 *process of law. The Court may be asked to reconsider its decisions, and this has been done successfully again*
31 *and again throughout our history. Or, what this Court has deemed its duty to decide may be changed by*
32 *legislation, as it often has been, and, on occasion, by constitutional amendment.*

33 *"But from their own experience and their deep reading in history, the Founders knew that Law alone saves a*
34 ***society from being rent by internecine strife or ruled by mere brute power however disguised. 'Civilization***
35 ***involves subjection of force to reason, and the agency of this subjection is law.'** 1 *The conception of a*
36 *government by laws dominated the thoughts of those who founded this Nation and designed its Constitution,*
37 *although they knew as well as the belittlers of the conception that laws have to be made, interpreted and enforced*
38 *by men. To that end, they set apart a body of men, who were to be the depositories of law, who by their disciplined*
39 *training and character and by withdrawal from the usual temptations of private interest may reasonably be*
40 *expected to be 'as free, impartial, and independent as the lot of humanity will admit'. So strongly were the framers*
41 *of the Constitution bent on securing a reign of law that they endowed the judicial office with extraordinary*
42 *safeguards and prestige. No one, no matter how exalted his public office or how righteous [330 U.S. 258,*
43 ***309] his private motive, can be judge in his own case. That is what courts are for. And no type of controversy***
44 ***is more peculiarly fit for judicial determination than a controversy that calls into question the power of a court***
45 ***to decide.** Controversies over 'jurisdiction' are apt to raise difficult technical problems. They usually involve*
46 *judicial presuppositions, textual doubts, confused legislative history, and like factors hardly fit for final*
47 *determination by the self-interest of a party.*
48 *[United States v. United Mine Workers of America, 330 U.S. 258 (1947)]**

49 The Bible also described the travesty of justice that occurs when we throw out this "society of laws" and replace it with a
50 "society of men", which is chaos and injustice. Below is a direct quote from the Open Bible on this very subject:

51 *The Book of Judges stands in stark contrast to Joshua. In Joshua an obedient people conquered the land through*
52 *trust in the power of God. **In Judges, however, a disobedient and idolatrous people are defeated time and time***
53 ***again because of their rebellion against God.***

54 *In seven distinct cycles of sin to salvation, Judges shows how Israel had set aside God's law and in its place*
55 *substituted "what was right in his own eyes" (21:25). **The recurring result of abandonment from God's law is***
56 ***corruption from within and oppression from without.** During the nearly four centuries spanned by this book,*
57 *God raises up military champions to throw off the yoke of bondage and to restore the nation to pure worship. But*
58 *all too soon the "sin cycle" begins again as the nation's spiritual temperance grows steadily colder.*

...

The Book of Judges could also appropriately be titled "The Book of Failure."

Deterioration (1:1-3:4). Judges begins with short-lived military successes after Joshua's death, but quickly turns to the repeated failure of all the tribes to drive out their enemies. The people feel the lack of a unified central leader, but the primary reasons for their failure are a lack of faith in God and lack of obedience to Him (2:1-2). Compromise leads to conflict and chaos. Israel does not drive out the inhabitants (1:21, 27, 29, 30); instead of removing the moral cancer [IRS, Federal Reserve?] spread by the inhabitants of Canaan, they contract the disease. The Canaanite gods [money, sex, covetousness] literally become a snare to them (2:3). Judges 2:11-23 is a microcosm of the pattern found in Judges 3-16.

Deliverance (3:5-16:31). In verses 3:5 through 16:31 of the Book of Judges, seven apostasies (fallings away from God) are described, seven servitudes, and seven deliverances. **Each of the seven cycles has five steps: sin, servitude, supplication, salvation, and silence. These also can be described by the words rebellion, retribution, repentance, restoration, and rest. The seven cycles connect together as a descending spiral of sin (2:19).** Israel vacillates between obedience and apostasy as the people continually fail to learn from their mistakes. Apostasy grows, but the rebellion is not continual. The times of rest and peace are longer than the times of bondage. The monotony of Israel's sins can be contrasted with the creativity of God's methods of deliverance.

Depravity (17:1-21:25). Judges 17:1 through 21:25 illustrate (1) religious apostasy (17 and 18) and (2) social and moral depravity (19-21) during the period of the judges. Chapters 19-21 contain one of the worst tales of degradation in the Bible. **Judges closes with a key to understanding the period: "everyone did what was right in his own eyes" (21:25) [a.k.a. "what FEELS good"].** The people are not doing what is wrong in their own eyes, but what is "evil in the sight of the Lord" (2:11).
[The Open Bible, New King James Version, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Copyright 1997, pp. 340-341]

So the question then becomes:

"Why are we allowing the Congress to compel the Courts to be used to effect slavery, and isn't this a violation of the Thirteenth Amendment prohibition against involuntary servitude? Why are we allowing Congress to use ambiguity of law to turn our Courts essentially into perpetual 'Constitutional conventions', and placing the decision makers at the mercy of the very source of injustice that the courts are supposed to be protecting us from, which is the IRS? Isn't this a violation of 28 U.S.C. §455 and a conflict of interest?"

The Bible also says that Christians cannot associate with or be part of this type of evil, when it said:

"Shall the throne of iniquity, which devises evil by law, have fellowship with You?" They gather together against the life of the righteous, and condemn innocent blood. But the Lord has been my defense, and my God the rock of my refuge. He has brought on them their own iniquity, and shall cut them off in their own wickedness; **the Lord our God shall cut them off.**"
[Psalm 94:20-23, Bible, NKJV]

Who else but legislators and lawyers could "devise evil by law" as described above by using vague laws and "words of art" to deceive and entrap people? The "throne of iniquity" they are talking about is our political rulers and any judiciary that allows itself to rule on "political questions".

3.3 Statutory Presumptions that Injure Rights are Unconstitutional

A statutory presumption is a presumption which is mandated by a statute. Below is an example of such a presumption:

[26 U.S.C. Sec. 7701\(c\) INCLUDES AND INCLUDING.](#)

The terms 'include' and 'including' when used in a definition contained in this title shall not be deemed to exclude other things otherwise within the meaning of the term defined."

What Congress is attempting to create in the above is the following false presumption:

"Any definition which uses the word 'includes' shall be construed to imply not only what is shown in the statute and the code itself, but also what is commonly understood for the term to mean or whatever any government employee deems is necessary to fulfill what he believes is the intent of the code."

We know that the above presumption is unconstitutional and if applied as intended, would violate the Void for Vagueness Doctrine described. It would also violate the rules of statutory construction that say:

Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction

41 of 98

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.017, Rev. 10-16-2008

EXHIBIT: _____

1. The purpose for defining a word within a statute is so that its ordinary (dictionary) meaning is not implied or assumed by the reader.
2. When a term is defined within a statute, that definition is provided usually to supersede and not enlarge other definitions of the word found elsewhere, such as in other Titles or Codes.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled many times that statutory presumptions which prejudice or threaten constitutional rights are unconstitutional. Below are a few of its rulings on this subject to make the meaning perfectly clear:

"Legislation declaring that proof of one fact of group of facts shall constitute prima facie evidence of an ultimate fact in issue is valid if there is a rational connection between what is proved and what is to be inferred. A prima facie presumption casts upon the person against whom it is applied the duty of going forward with his evidence on the particular point to which the presumption relates. A statute creating a presumption that is arbitrary, or that operates to deny a fair opportunity to repel it, violates the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Legislative fiat may not take the place of fact in the judicial determination of issues involving life, liberty, or property. Manley v. Georgia, 279 U.S. 1, 49 S.Ct. 215, 73 L.Ed. -, and cases cited."
[Western and Atlantic Railroad v. Henderson, 279 U.S. 639 (1929)]

"[I]t is unconstitutional for a legislature to remove from the jury the assessment of facts that increase the prescribed range of penalties to which a criminal defendant is exposed. It is equally clear that such facts must be established by proof beyond a reasonable doubt."
[McMillan v. Pennsylvania, 477 U.S. 79 (1986)]

It has always been recognized that the guaranty of trial by jury in criminal cases means that the jury is to be the factfinder. This is the only way in which a jury can perform its basic constitutional function of determining the guilt or innocence of a defendant. See, e. g., United States ex rel. Toth v. Quarles, 350 U.S. 11, 15 -19; Reid v. Covert, 354 U.S. 1, 5 -10 (opinion announcing judgment). And of course this constitutionally established power of a jury to determine guilt or innocence of a defendant charged with crime cannot be taken away by Congress, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part. Obviously, a necessary part of this power, vested by the Constitution in juries (or in judges when juries are waived), is the exclusive right to decide whether evidence presented at trial is sufficient to convict. I think it flaunts the constitutional power of courts and juries for Congress to tell them what "shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction." And if Congress could not thus directly encroach upon the judge's or jury's exclusive right to declare what evidence is sufficient to prove the facts necessary for conviction, it should not be allowed to do so merely by labeling its encroachment a "presumption."
Neither Tot v. United States, 319 U.S. 463, relied [380 U.S. 63, 78] on by the Court as supporting this presumption, nor any case cited in Tot approved such an encroachment on the power of judges or juries. In fact, so far as I can tell, the problem of whether Congress can so restrict the power of court and jury in a criminal case in a federal court has never been squarely presented to or considered by this Court, perhaps because challenges to presumptions have arisen in many crucially different contexts but nevertheless have generally failed to distinguish between presumptions used in different ways, treating them as if they are either all valid or all invalid, regardless of the rights on which their use may impinge. Because the Court also fails to differentiate among the different circumstances in which presumptions may be utilized and the different consequences which will follow, I feel it necessary to say a few words on that subject before considering specifically the validity of the use of these presumptions in the light of the circumstances and consequences of their use.

In its simplest form a presumption is an inference permitted or required by law of the existence of one fact, which is unknown or which cannot be proved, from another fact which has been proved. The fact presumed may be based on a very strong probability, a weak supposition or an arbitrary assumption. The burden on the party seeking to prove the fact may be slight, as in a civil suit, or very heavy - proof beyond a reasonable doubt - as in a criminal prosecution. This points up the fact that statutes creating presumptions cannot be treated as fungible, that is, as interchangeable for all uses and all purposes. The validity of each presumption must be determined in the light of the particular consequences that flow from its use. When matters of trifling moment are involved, presumptions may be more freely accepted, but when consequences of vital importance to litigants and to the administration of justice are at stake, a more careful scrutiny is necessary. [380 U.S. 63, 79]

In judging the constitutionality of legislatively created presumptions this Court has evolved an initial criterion which applies alike to all kinds of presumptions: that before a presumption may be relied on, there must be a rational connection between the facts inferred and the facts which have been proved by competent evidence, that is, the facts proved must be evidence which is relevant, tending to prove (though not necessarily conclusively) the existence of the fact presumed. And courts have undoubtedly shown an inclination to be less strict about the logical strength of presumptive inferences they will permit in civil cases than about those which affect the trial of crimes. The stricter scrutiny in the latter situation follows from the fact that the burden of proof in a civil lawsuit is ordinarily merely a preponderance of the evidence, while in a criminal case where a man's life, liberty, or property is at stake, the prosecution must prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. See Morrison v. California, 291 U.S. 82, 96 -97. The case of Bailey v. Alabama, 219 U.S. 219, is a good illustration

of this principle. There Bailey was accused of violating an Alabama statute which made it a crime to fail to perform personal services after obtaining money by contracting to perform them, with an intent to defraud the employer. The statute also provided that refusal or failure to perform the services, or to refund money paid for them, without just cause, constituted "prima facie evidence" (i. e., gave rise to a presumption) of the intent to injure or defraud. This Court, after calling attention to prior cases dealing with the requirement of rationality, passed over the test of rationality and held the statute invalid on another ground. Looking beyond the rational-relationship doctrine the Court held that the use of this presumption by Alabama against a man accused of crime would amount to a violation of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which forbids "involuntary [380 U.S. 63, 80] servitude, except as a punishment for crime." In so deciding the Court made it crystal clear that rationality is only the first hurdle which a legislatively created presumption must clear - that a presumption, even if rational, cannot be used to convict a man of crime if the effect of using the presumption is to deprive the accused of a constitutional right. [United States v. Gainly, 380 U.S. 63 (1965)]

The reason a statutory presumption that injures rights is unconstitutional was also revealed in the Federalist Papers, which say on the subject:

"No legislative act [including a statutory presumption] contrary to the Constitution can be valid. To deny this would be to affirm that the deputy (agent) is greater than his principal; that the servant is above the master; that the representatives of the people are superior to the people; that men, acting by virtue of powers may do not only what their powers do not authorize, but what they forbid...[text omitted] It is not otherwise to be supposed that the Constitution could intend to enable the representatives of the people to substitute their will to that of their constituents. It is far more rational to suppose, that the courts were designed to be an intermediate body between the people and the legislature, in order, among other things, to keep the latter within the limits assigned to their authority. The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the courts. A Constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by judges, as fundamental law. If there should happen to be an irreconcilable variance between the two, the Constitution is to be preferred to the statute." [Alexander Hamilton, Federalist Paper # 78]

The implication of the prohibition against statutory presumptions is that:

1. No human being (man or woman) who is domiciled within a state of the Union and protected by the Bill of Rights may be victimized or injured in any way by any kind of statutory presumption.
2. Statutory presumptions may only lawfully be applied against legal "persons" who do not have Constitutional rights, which means corporations or those human beings who are domiciled in the federal zone, meaning on land within exclusive federal jurisdiction that is not protected by the First Ten Amendments to the United States Constitution. See *Downes v. Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).
3. Any court which uses "judge made law" to do any of the following in the case of a human beings protected by the Bill of Rights is involved in a conspiracy against rights:
 - 3.1. Imposes a statutory or judicial presumption.
 - 3.2. Extends or enlarges any definition in the Internal Revenue Code based on any arbitrary criteria.
 - 3.3. Invokes an interpretation of a definition within a code which may not be deduced directly from language in the code itself.

The above inferences help establish who the only proper audience for the Internal Revenue Code is, which is federal corporations, agents, and employees and those domiciled within the federal zone, and excluding those within states of the Union. The reason is that those domiciled in the federal zone are not protected by the Bill of Rights. The only exception to this rule is that any human who is domiciled in a state of the Union but who is exercising agency of a federal corporation or legal "person" which has a domicile within the federal zone also may become the lawful subject of statutory presumptions, but only in the context of the agency he is exercising. For instance, this is demonstrated in the document below:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

that those participating in the Social Security program are deemed to be "agents", "employees", and "fiduciaries" of the federal corporation called the United States, which has a "domicile" in the federal zone (District of Columbia) under 4 U.S.C. §72. Therefore, unless and until they eliminate said agency using the above document, statutory presumptions may be used against them without an unconstitutional result, but only in the context of the agency they are exercising.

3.4 Law as propaganda

In law, all presumptions against a party protected by the U.S. Constitution are a violation of due process of law. In some cases such as taxation, Congress makes entire Titles of the U.S. code into nothing more than a presumption, which means that even quoting them or using them in a court of law is a violation of due process of law. For instance, Title 26, the income tax code, is NOT defined in 1 U.S.C. §204 as positive law, which means that it is “prima facie evidence”.

[TITLE 1 > CHAPTER 3 > § 204](#)

[§ 204. Codes and Supplements as evidence of the laws of United States and District of Columbia; citation of Codes and Supplements](#)

In all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home or abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States—

*(a) **United States Code.**— The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of Laws of the United States current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, **establish prima facie the laws** of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, in force on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included: **Provided, however, That whenever titles of such Code shall have been enacted into positive law the text thereof shall be legal evidence of the laws therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.***

The above statute, which is “positive law”, establishes what is called a “statutory presumption”. The statute above creates the notion of “prima facie” evidence. “Prima facie evidence” is defined below:

*“**Prima facie evidence.** Evidence good and sufficient on its face. Such evidence as, in the judgment of the law, is sufficient to establish a given fact, or the group or chain of facts constituting the party’s claim or defense, and which if not rebutted or contradicted, will remain sufficient. Evidence which, if unexplained or uncontradicted, is sufficient to sustain a judgment in favor of the issue which it supports, but which may be contradicted by other evidence. *State v. Haremza*, 213 Kan. 201, 515 P.2d. 1217, 1222.*”

*That quantum of evidence that suffices for proof of a particular fact until the fact is contradicted by other evidence; once a trier of fact is faced with conflicting evidence, it must weigh the prima facie evidence with all the other probative evidence presented. *Godesky v. Provo City Corp.*, Utah, 690 P.2d. 541, 547. Evidence which, standing alone and unexplained, would maintain the proposition and warrant the conclusion to support which it is introduced. An inference or presumption of law, affirmative or negative of a fact, in the absence of proof, or until proof can be obtained or produced to overcome the inference. See also Presumptive evidence.”*
[*Black’s Law Dictionary*, Sixth Edition, p. 1190]

That which is “prima facie” is a presumption. All presumptions violate due process of law and are impermissible against a party protected by the Constitution.

“The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions.”
[*Bailey v. Alabama*, [219 U.S. 219](#), 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145; *Manley v. Georgia*, [279 U.S. 1](#), 5-6, 49 S.Ct. 215]

*(1) [8:4993] **Conclusive presumptions affecting protected interests:***

*A conclusive presumption may be defeated where its application would impair a party’s constitutionally-protected liberty or property interests. In such cases, conclusive **presumptions have been held to violate a party’s due process and equal protection rights.** [*Vlandis v. Kline* (1973) [412 U.S. 441](#), 449, 93 S.Ct. 2230, 2235; *Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. LaFleur* (1974) [414 U.S. 632](#), 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215-presumption under Illinois law that unmarried fathers are unfit violates process]
[[Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, Rutter Group, paragraph 8:4993, p. 8K-34](#)]*

Hence:

1. The Internal Revenue Code by itself is NOT legal evidence of any obligation on the part of anyone. Something in ADDITION to the code itself is needed to make it legal evidence. In that sense, it behaves as an offer to contract, whereby you consenting explicitly or implicitly gives it “the force of law”.
2. Any attempt to quote or use the Internal Revenue Code against a non-consenting party domiciled in a constitutional state of the Union is:

2.1. A violation of due process of law.

2.2. An abuse of law as “propaganda” against those who are not subject to it.

3. The consent of the party who is the victim of the presumption is the only thing that can overcome the fact that it is an unconstitutional presumption. This is because anything you consent to cannot form the basis for an injury in a court of law.

“Voluntis non fit injuria.

He who consents cannot receive an injury. 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 2279, 2327; 4 T. R. 657; Shelf. on mar. & Div. 449.

Consensus tollit errorem.

Consent removes or obviates a mistake. Co. Litt. 126.

Melius est omnia mala pati quam malo concentire.

It is better to suffer every wrong or ill, than to consent to it. 3 Co. Inst. 23.

Nemo videtur fraudare eos qui sciunt, et consentiunt.

One cannot complain of having been deceived when he knew the fact and gave his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 145.”

[Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856;

SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]

4. Those who acquiesce to the above abuses without at LEAST being fully informed by the court and the government of all the following facts are being deceived, abused, and NOT protected:

4.1. That the entire Title 26 is voluntary.

4.2. That they will PROTECT your right to NOT volunteer.

4.3. That they are not the statutory “person” or “taxpayer” spoken of in the code unless they lawfully held a public office independent of their status as a “taxpayer”. See:

Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a “Public Officer” for Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

5. The only way to correctly or truthfully refer to the Internal Revenue Code is as a “franchise” or “compact” RATHER than “law”. Agreements or franchises are not “law” in a classical sense, which is why they are classified instead as “compacts” and private law. Anyone that calls the Internal Revenue Code or ANY franchise LAW is committing a FRAUD:

Municipal law, thus understood, is properly defined to be “a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in a state, commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong.”

[...]

*It is also called a rule to distinguish it from a compact or agreement; **for a compact is a promise proceeding from us, law is a command directed to us.** The language of a compact is, “I will, or will not, do this”; that of a law is, “thou shalt, or shalt not, do it.” It is true there is an obligation which a compact carries with it, equal in point of conscience to that of a law; but then the original of the obligation is different. **In compacts we ourselves determine and promise what shall be done, before we are obliged to do it; in laws, we are obliged to act without ourselves determining or promising anything at all.** Upon these accounts law is defined to be “a rule.”*

[Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, 1925, Roscoe Pound, p. 4]

6. Even consent of the individual person cannot extend the powers of the national government delegated in the Constitution and if an attempt is made to do so, the public officers offering the franchise or attempting to procure your consent are violating their oath and fiduciary duty to protect your private property. See also:

Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003, Section 9.3

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

For further details on the subject of this section refer to section 4.4 later.

4 How Courts abuse presumption to Destroy Your Constitutional Rights

4.1 Overview of abusive techniques of courts and government prosecutors

The abuse of presumption to injure your rights and transfer them to the government unlawfully is accomplished by the following devious techniques by judges and lawyers in litigation against the government:

1. Making presumptions into evidence. Presumptions are NOT evidence and cannot serve as a substitute for evidence. This essentially turns the court into a religious body, whereby presumption serves as a substitute for religious faith.
2. Using “words of art” in combination with the word “includes” and then violating the rules of statutory construction to add things to definitions of words that aren’t there in order to bring you within their jurisdiction. See:

Meaning of the Words “includes” and “including”, Form #05.014

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. Presuming that you are engaged in some type of franchise based on the words they use to describe you. This violates the presumption which is the foundation of American jurisprudence, which is the presumption of innocence until proven guilty:

- 3.1. Addressing you as a “person”, “natural person”, or “individual”, all of whom are public officers in the government. See:

Proof That There is a “Straw Man”, Form #05.042

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 3.2. Addressing you a franchisee called a “taxpayer”. By doing this, they are presuming that you consented to the franchise agreement. See:

Who are “Taxpayers” and Who Needs a “Taxpayer Identification Number”?, Form #05.013

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 3.3. Addressing you as a “citizen” or “resident” who is therefore participating in the “protection franchise” called domicile and who is therefore within their jurisdiction. See:

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002

<http://sedm.org/>

4. Presuming that a statute is public law that applies equally to everyone, including nonresidents and those who do not consent to participate. Most federal law, in fact, is private law that only applies to those who consent to participate in writing. For instance, the entire Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A is private law that only applies to those domiciled in the District of Columbia and engaged in a public office in the government. All others are identified as a “foreign estate”, meaning not “exempt” but rather “not subject” to the franchise agreement.

[TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 79](#) > § 7701

[§ 7701. Definitions](#)

(a) When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof—

(31) Foreign estate or trust

(A) Foreign estate

The term “foreign estate” means an estate the income of which, from sources without the United States which is not effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States, is not includible in gross income under subtitle A.

A judge or government prosecutor who cites or enforces any provision of a franchise agreement such as the Internal Revenue Code against a non-participant called a “nontaxpayer” is guilty of slavery and involuntary servitude.

“The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws...”
[Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236 (1922)]

5. Presuming that the status of “exempt” on a government form is the only method for avoiding the liability described. In fact, one can be “not subject” without being “exempt”. A person in China would not be “exempt” but rather “not subject”

to the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A if he was not domiciled in the “United States” and not doing business there. See Section 6.5 later.

6. Presuming that the fact that an appeal was denied means the higher court agreed with the lower court. Case cites that include the phrase “cert denied” fall in this category. There is absolutely no evidence to support the presumption that an appeal denied implies the higher court agreed. The higher court would have to say so if they did and few denied appeals do so. Denying an appeal simply and only means they chose to exercise their discretion not to hear the appeal. Chances are good that the reason they did so was because the issues raised would have compelled them to make a ruling that would jeopardize illegal enforcement activities which enlarge their jurisdiction and importance.
7. Not challenging the presumptions of the government as moving party in a case in court against you.
8. Interfering with your challenges to the presumptions of your opponent in litigation against the government.

4.2 How governments and courts EVADE fulfilling the requirement to PROVE their presumptions

Courts and government prosecutors routinely create LIES:

1. That you are a statutory “U.S. citizen” and therefore “subject”, domiciled on federal territory and a public officer of the mother corporation.
2. Present no evidence upon which to base this usually false presumption.
3. Try to evade the burden of proving their presumption by calling you frivolous for challenging jurisdiction at the outset of the proceeding.

They do the above using the legal concept of “Fiction”, and the beauty of this approach is that you cannot counter it because of what the maxim states in their law.

***FICTION.** Derived from Fictio in Roman Law, a fiction is defined as a false averment on the part of the Plaintiff which the defendant is not allowed to traverse, the object being to give the court jurisdiction. In the case of "Willful failure to File," the Plaintiff and court invents the "fiction" that defendant is a "taxpayer." Motions and briefs which rely on precepts of law will thereafter be denied or found frivolous. This point was made clear in *Roberts v. Commissioner*, 176 F.2d. 221, 225 (9 C.A., 1949). [Ballentine's Law Dictionary, 3rd Edition (1969), p. 468]*

So now you understand the reason why some patriots lose: Because the court they are in is an Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 legislative franchise court within a private corporation that is a legal “fiction” and which forces the statutory status of a fictional “PERSON” upon you. That legal “person” is an officer and/or statutory “employee” of the private corporation. They win because:

1. You say you want the constitution enforced.
2. You are NOT party to the constitution, but rather the states are.
3. Only statutory franchisees called “persons” are parties to the constitution and you can’t be a “person” unless you are PART of the private corporate “State” mentioned in the Constitution.
4. You contradict yourself by insisting on “PRIVATE rights, by claiming you are a statutory but not constitutional “person”, which is a CONTRACT. Hence, you are a government contractor.
5. You FALSELY claim on your death bed to be a STATUTORY “U.S. citizen” per 8 U.S.C. §1401, 26 U.S.C. §3121(e), and 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c).
6. You sign any and everything locking you into their private corporation and Swear to it under penalties of perjury. See 28 U.S.C. §1746(2).
7. You submit to the jurisdiction of the court by making an “appearance”, not knowing that what you are submitting to is not even a “court” within the constitutional sense and that the court is in the Executive rather than Legislative branch of the court.

The more correct approach is to attack the Plaintiff and his court on **jurisdiction ONLY** at the outset of the proceeding. If you do NOT, you will lose.

2 "What constitutes "timely" objection?"

(a) Under state practice, D is usually required to file his motion to quash service of process before any other pleading. If he instead files a demurrer or answer (or asks for any other relief--even a continuance), he is deemed

to have made a general appearance and submitted himself to the court's jurisdiction--even if he alleges lack of jurisdiction as a "defense" in his answer [84 Cal.App.2d. 229]

(b) In federal practice, D must raise lack of personal jurisdiction by his initial pleading--in a motion to dismiss, or, if no such motion is filed, in his answer to the complaint. [FRCP 12(h)]
[Gilberts Law Summaries, p. 33, sections 207- 211]

4.3 Purpose of Due Process: To completely remove “presumption” from legal proceedings

All presumption which prejudices a right guaranteed by the Constitution represents a violation of Constitutional Due Process. The only exception to this rule is if the Defendant is not covered by the Constitution because:

1. Domiciled in areas not covered by the Bill of Rights, such as federal territories, possessions, and the federal areas within the states. These areas are called the “federal zone” in this memorandum.
2. Exercising agency of a corporation that is domiciled in the federal zone.

The above is also confirmed by reading Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b), which says that the law to be applied in a civil case must derive either from the law of the parties’ domicile or from the domicile of the corporation they are acting as an agent for.

According to the Bible, “presumption” also happens to be a Biblical sin in violation of God’s law as well, which should result in the banishment of a person from his society, which in today’s terms would mean a prison sentence:

“But the person who does anything presumptuously, whether he is native-born or a stranger, that one brings reproach on the LORD, and he shall be cut off from among his people.”
[Numbers 15:30, Bible, NKJV]

*“Keep back Your servant also from **presumptuous** sins; Let them not have dominion over me. Then I shall be blameless, And I shall be innocent of great transgression.”*
[Psalm 19:13, Bible, NKJV]

“Now the man who acts presumptuously and will not heed the priest who stands to minister there before the LORD your God, or the judge, that man shall die. So you shall put away the evil from Israel. 13 And all the people shall hear and fear, and no longer act presumptuously.”
[Deut. 17:12-13, Bible, NKJV]

We have therefore established that “presumption” which can injure others is something we should try very hard to avoid, because it is a violation of both man’s law AND God’s law. The chief purpose of Constitutional “due process” is therefore to completely remove injurious bias and the presumption that produces it from every legal proceeding in a court of law. This is done by:

1. Preventing the application of any “statutory presumptions” that might prejudice the rights of the Defendant.
2. Insisting that every conclusion is based on physical and non-presumptive (not “prima facie”) evidence.
3. To apply the same rules of evidence equally against both parties.
4. Choosing jurists who are free from bias or prejudice during the voir dire (jury selection) process.
5. Choosing judges who are free from bias or prejudice during the voir dire process.
6. Counsel on both sides ensuring that all presumptions made by the opposing party are challenged in a timely manner at all phases of the litigation.

You can tell when presumptions are being prejudicially used in a legal proceeding in federal court, for instance, when:

1. The judge or either party uses any of the following phrases:
 - 1.1. “Everyone knows. . .”
 - 1.2. “You knew or should have known...”
 - 1.3. “A reasonable [presumptuous] person would have concluded otherwise...”
2. The judge does not exclude the I.R.C. from evidence in the case involving a person who:
 - 2.1. Is not domiciled in the federal zone.

2.2. Has no employment, contracts, or agency with the federal government.

2.3. Who has provided evidence of the same above.

3. The judge allows the Prosecutor to throw accusations at the Defendant in front of the jury without insisting on evidence to back it up.
4. The judge admits into evidence or cites a statutory presumption that prejudices your rights.

"It is apparent," this court said in the Bailey Case (219 U.S. 239, 31 S.Ct. 145, 151) 'that a constitutional prohibition cannot be transgressed indirectly by the creation of a statutory presumption any more than it can be violated by direct enactment. The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions.'
[Heiner v. Donnan, 285 U.S. 312 (1932); Bailey v. Alabama, 219 U.S. 219, 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145; Manley v. Georgia, 279 U.S. 1, 5-6, 49 S.Ct. 215.]

5. A judge challenges your choice of domicile and/or citizenship. In such a case, the court is illegally involving itself in what actually are strictly political matters and what is called "political questions". One's choice of domicile is a political matter that may not be coerced or presumed to be anything other than what the subject himself has clearly and unambiguously stated, both orally and on government forms. See our free memorandum of law below:

Political Jurisdiction, Form #05.004
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Unscrupulous government prosecutors will frequently make use of false presumption as their chief means of winning a tax case as follows:

1. They will choose a jury that is misinformed or under-informed about the law and legal process. This makes them into sheep who will follow anyone.
2. They will use the ignorance and prejudices and the presumptions of the jury as a weapon to manipulate them into becoming an angry "lynch mob" with a vendetta against the Defendant. This was the same thing that they did to Jesus. See the free Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.4.3.5 entitled "Modern Tax Trials are religious 'inquisitions' and not valid legal processes" available at: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.
3. They will make frequent use of "words of art" to deceive the jury into making false presumptions that will prejudice the rights of the defendant.

"The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions,"
[*New York Times v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964)]

Most of these Some of these "words of art" are identified in the free Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 3.9.1 through 3.9.1.27 available at: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

4. They will:
- 4.1. Avoid defining the words they are using.
 - 4.2. Prevent evidence of the meaning of the words they are using from entering the court record or the deliberations.
- Federal judges will help them with this process by insisting that "law" may not be discussed in the courtroom.

A good judge will ensure that the above prejudice does not happen, because it is his primary duty to defend and protect the Constitutional rights of the parties consistent with his oath of office, which is as follows for federal judges:

"I, _____, do solemnly swear and affirm that I will administer justice without regard to persons and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all of the duties incumbent upon me as _____ under the Constitution and laws of the United States, and that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same, and that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

Judges must be especially vigilant of the requirements of the Constitution where the matter involves taxation and where there is no jury or where anyone in the jury is either a "taxpayer" or a recipient of government benefits. He must do so in order to avoid violation of 18 U.S.C. §597, which forbids bribing of voters, since jurists are a type of voter. However, as a practical matter, we have observed that there are not have many good judges who will be this honorable in the context of a tax trial because their pay and retirement, they think, depends on a vigorous illegal enforcement of the Internal Revenue Code in violation of 28 U.S.C. §455.

[TITLE 28 > PART 1 > CHAPTER 21 > § 455](#)
[§ 455. Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge](#)

(a) Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

(b) He shall also disqualify himself in the following circumstances:

[. . .]

(4) He knows that he, individually or as a fiduciary, or his spouse or minor child residing in his household, has a financial interest in the subject matter in controversy or in a party to the proceeding, or any other interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding;

Most of the injustice that occurs in federal courtrooms across the country relating to income taxation occurs primarily because the above statute is violated. This statute wasn't always violated. It was only in the 1930's that federal judges became "taxpayers". Before that, they were completely independent, which is why most people were not "taxpayers" before that. For details on this corruption of our judiciary, see:

[Great IRS Hoax](#), Form #11.302, Sections 6.5.15, 6.5.18, 6.8.2 through 6.9.12
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

The U.S. Supreme Court has declared that judges must be alert to prevent such unconstitutional encroachments upon the sacred Constitutional Rights of those domiciled in the states of the Union, when it gave the following warning, which has gone largely unheeded by federal circuit and district courts since then:

"It may be that it...is the obnoxious thing in its mildest and least repulsive form; but illegitimate and unconstitutional practices get their first footing in that way; namely, by silent approaches and slight deviations from legal modes of procedure. This can only be obviated by adhering to the rule that constitutional provisions for the security of person and property should be liberally construed. A close and literal construction deprives them of half their efficacy, and leads to gradual depreciation of the right, as if it consisted more in sound than in substance. It is the duty of the courts to be watchful for the constitutional rights of the citizens, and against any stealthy encroachments thereon. Their motto should be obsta principalis." [Mr. Justice Brewer, dissenting, quoting Mr. Justice Bradley in *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U.S. 616, 29 L.Ed. 746, 6 Sup.Ct.Rep. 524]
[*Hale v. Henkel*, [201 U.S. 43](#) (1906)]

4.4 The Worst Presumption Of All: That "private law" is "law" for those not subject to it

Among the types of evidence that may be introduced in a court setting to establish guilt include quoting the enacted law itself. Evidence based upon "law" only becomes admissible when the law cited is "positive law".

"Positive law. Law actually and specifically enacted or adopted by proper authority for the government of an organized jural society. See also Legislation."
[*Black's Law Dictionary*, Sixth Edition, p. 1162]

Evidence that is NOT positive law, becomes "prima facie" evidence, which means that it is "presumed" to be evidence unless challenged or rebutted:

[TITLE 1 > CHAPTER 3 > § 204](#)
[§ 204. Codes and Supplements as evidence of the laws of United States and District of Columbia; citation of Codes and Supplements](#)

In all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home or abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States—

(a) **United States Code.**— *The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of Laws of the United States current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, establish prima facie the laws of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, in force on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included: **Provided, however, That whenever titles of such Code shall have been enacted into positive law the text thereof shall be legal evidence of the laws therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.***

The above statute, which is “positive law”, establishes what is called a “statutory presumption” that courts are obligated to observe. The statute above creates the notion of “prima facie” evidence. “Prima facie evidence” is defined below:

“Prima facie evidence. Evidence good and sufficient on its face. Such evidence as, in the judgment of the law, is sufficient to establish a given fact, or the group or chain of facts constituting the party’s claim or defense, and which if not rebutted or contradicted, will remain sufficient. Evidence which, if unexplained or uncontradicted, is sufficient to sustain a judgment in favor of the issue which it supports, but which may be contradicted by other evidence. *State v. Haremza*, 213 Kan. 201, 515 P.2d. 1217, 1222.

That quantum of evidence that suffices for proof of a particular fact until the fact is contradicted by other evidence; once a trier of fact is faced with conflicting evidence, it must weigh the prima facie evidence with all the other probative evidence presented. Godesky v. Provo City Corp., Utah, 690 P.2d. 541, 547. Evidence which, standing alone and unexplained, would maintain the proposition and warrant the conclusion to support which it is introduced. An inference or presumption of law, affirmative or negative of a fact, in the absence of proof, or until proof can be obtained or produced to overcome the inference. See also Presumptive evidence.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1190]

A “statutory presumption” is one that occurs in a court of law because it is mandated by a positive law statute. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that “statutory presumptions”, such as [1 U.S.C. §204](#) above, which prejudice constitution rights are forbidden:

“A rebuttable presumption clearly is a rule of evidence which has the effect of shifting the burden of proof, Mobile, J. & K. C. R. Co. v. Turnipseed, 219 U.S. 35, 43, 31 S.Ct. 136, 32 L. R. A. (N. S.) 226, Ann. Cas. 1912A, 463; and it is hard to see how a statutory rebuttable presumptions is turned from a rule of evidence into a rule of substantive law as the result of a later statute making it conclusive. In both cases it is a substitute for proof; in the one open to challenge and disproof, and in the other conclusive. However, whether the latter presumption be treated as a rule of evidence or of substantive law, it constitutes an attempt, by legislative fiat, to enact into existence a fact which here does not, and cannot be made to, exist in actuality, and the result is the same, unless we are ready to overrule the Schlesinger Case, as we are not; for that case dealt with a conclusive presumption, and the court held it invalid without regard to the question of its technical characterization. This court has held more than once that a statute creating a presumption which operates to deny a fair opportunity to rebut it violates the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. For example, Bailey v. Alabama, 219 U.S. 219, 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145; Manley v. Georgia, 279 U.S. 1, 5-6, 49 S.Ct. 215.

‘It is apparent,’ this court said in the Bailey Case (219 U.S. 239, 31 S.Ct. 145, 151) ‘that a constitutional prohibition cannot be transgressed indirectly by the creation of a statutory presumption any more than it can be violated by direct enactment. The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions.’

“If a legislative body is without power to enact as a rule of evidence a statute denying a litigant the right to prove the facts of his case, certainly the power cannot be made to emerge by putting the enactment in the guise of a rule of substantive law.”
[Heiner v. Donnan, 285 U.S. 312 (1932)]

The U.S. Supreme Court has also ruled that statutes like [1 U.S.C. §204](#) impose the burden of proof upon the party who cites that which is not “positive law” or which is “prima facie” evidence of law as authority in a case, in cases where constitutional rights are at issue. To wit:

“Legislation declaring that proof of one fact of group of facts shall constitute prima facie evidence of an ultimate fact in issue is valid if there is a rational connection between what is proved and what is to be inferred. A prima facie presumption casts upon the person against whom it is applied the duty of going forward with his evidence on the particular point to which the presumption relates. A statute creating a presumption that is arbitrary, or that operates to deny a fair opportunity to repel it, violates the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Legislative fiat may not take the place of fact in the judicial determination of issues involving life, liberty, or property. Manley v. Georgia, 279 U.S. 1, 49 S.Ct. 215, 73 L.Ed. -, and cases cited.”
[[Western and Atlantic Railroad v. Henderson, 279 U.S. 639 \(1929\)](#)]

[1 U.S.C. §204](#) lists the Titles of the U.S. Code that are positive law. The Internal Revenue Code (I.R.C.) is not listed, and therefore, it is simply “presumed” to be law until challenged or proven otherwise. That challenge has to come from you, because it will NEVER come from the government. Who would look a gift horse in the mouth? The statutory “presumption” that the I.R.C. is “law” may not be used to prejudice or undermine the Constitutional rights of a person, as shown above. Therefore, it may only be cited in the case of persons who are “taxpayers”, which means persons who are subject to it. Those who are not subject to it because “nontaxpayers” may not have it cited against them without proof on the record that:

1. Proof appears on the record that the affected party performed some act that made them subject to it.

1 2. The section cited is “positive law”. This would require going back to the Statute At Large from which the section
2 derives and showing that this section is “positive law”.

3 Most people who are challenged by the government using a section of the I.R.C. as authority wrongfully “presume” that it is
4 “law” or “positive law” without even challenging this fact. This has the effect of relieving the government from the burden
5 of proving that the section they are citing is “positive law”, thereby prejudicing and destroying their Constitutional rights.
6 We must remember that the I.R.C. is:

- 7 1. “Private law” and “special law” that only applies to parties who consent individually to it, either in writing or based on
8 their behavior. In that sense, it behaves as a contract, and not a public law.
9 2. NOT “law” for a “nontaxpayer” and may not be cited against a “nontaxpayer”. See section 6.1 later for details.

10 The I.R.C. is as “foreign” as the laws of China are to an American if the subject is a “nontaxpayer”. It is just like the Criminal
11 Laws in fact, which a party can only become subject to by committing a “crime” defined therein.

12 *"The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers,*
13 *and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no*
14 *attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not*
15 *assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws..."*
16 *[Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236 (1922)]*

17 The Internal Revenue Code contains several statutory presumptions. Below is an example:

18 [TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 76](#) > [Subchapter E](#) > § 7491
19 [§ 7491. Burden of proof](#)

20 (a) Burden shifts where taxpayer produces credible evidence

21 (1) General rule

22 *If, in any court proceeding, a taxpayer introduces credible evidence with respect to any factual issue relevant to*
23 *ascertaining the liability of the taxpayer for any tax imposed by subtitle A or B, the Secretary shall have the*
24 *burden of proof with respect to such issue.*

25 (2) Limitations

26 Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to an issue only if—

27 (A) the taxpayer has complied with the requirements under this title to substantiate any item;

28 (B) the taxpayer has maintained all records required under this title and has cooperated with reasonable requests
29 by the Secretary for witnesses, information, documents, meetings, and interviews; and

30 (C) in the case of a partnership, corporation, or trust, the taxpayer is described in section [7430 \(c\)\(4\)\(A\)\(ii\)](#).

31 Subparagraph (C) shall not apply to any qualified revocable trust (as defined in section [645 \(b\)\(1\)](#)) with respect
32 to liability for tax for any taxable year ending after the date of the decedent's death and before the applicable
33 date (as defined in section [645 \(b\)\(2\)](#)).

34 (3) Coordination

35 Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any issue if any other provision of this title provides for a specific burden of
36 proof with respect to such issue.

37 If you would like to learn more about the subjects in this section, please refer to our free memorandum of law below:

[Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003](#)
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

4.5 Unconstitutional Judicial Presumptions Commonly Used in Federal Court

The bedrock of our system of jurisprudence is the fundamental presumption of “innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt”.

The presumption of innocence, although not articulated in the Constitution, is a basic component of a fair trial under our system of criminal justice. Long ago this Court stated:

The principle that there is a presumption of innocence in favor of the accused is the undoubted law, axiomatic and elementary, and its enforcement lies at the foundation of the administration of our criminal law. [Coffin v. United States, 156 U.S. 432, 453 (1895).]

The Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution then guarantees us a right of due process of law. Fundamental to the notion of due process of law is the absence of presumption of fact or law. Absolutely everything that is offered as proof or evidence of guilt must be demonstrated and revealed with evidence, and nothing can or should be based on presumption, or especially false presumption. The extent to which presumption is used to establish guilt absent evidence or as a substitute for evidence is therefore the extent to which our due process rights have been violated. Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, on page 500 under the term “due process” confirms these conclusions:

“If any question of fact or liability be conclusively be presumed [rather than proven] against him, this is not due process of law.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 500 under “due process”]

In our legal system, our Courts and judges go out of their way to create and perpetuate false presumptions to bias the legal system in their favor, and in so doing, based on the above, they commit a grave sin and violation of God’s laws and stare decisis on the matter. The only reason they get away with this tyranny in most cases is because of our own legal ignorance along with corrupted government judges and lawyers who allow and encourage and facilitate this kind of abuse of our due process rights. Below are some examples of how they do this:

1. False presumptions that the Internal Revenue Code is law. The Internal Revenue Code has not been enacted into positive law. It says that at the beginning of the Title. Any title not enacted into “positive law” is described as “prima facie evidence” of law. That means it is “presumptive” evidence that is rebuttable:

“Prima facie. Lat. At first sight on the first appearance; on the face of it; so far as can be judged from the first disclosure; presumably; a fact presumed to be true unless disproved by some evidence to the contrary. State ex rel. Herbert v. Whims, 68 Ohio App. 39, 38 N.E.2d. 596, 499, 22 O.O. 110. See also Presumption.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1189]

Since Christians are not allowed to presume anything, then they can’t be allowed to presume that the Internal Revenue Code is “law” or that it even applies to them. Technically, the Internal Revenue Code can only be described as a “statute” or “code”, but not as “law”. Here is the way the Supreme Court describes it:

“To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.

Nor is it taxation. ‘A tax,’ says Webster’s Dictionary, ‘is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.’ ‘Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.’ Cooley, Const. Lim., 479.”
[Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]

Law is evidence of explicit consent by the people. For a statute to be enacted into positive law, a majority of the people or their representatives must consent to it by voting in favor of it. When a statute is not enacted into positive law, this simply means that the people never collectively and explicitly consented to the enforcement of it. Consequently, they cannot be expected to accept any adverse impact on their rights that such legislation but not “law” might have on them. In a system of government based only on consent of the governed such as we have, such “legislation” and “presumptive evidence of law” is unenforceable and becomes mainly a political statement of public policy but not law. This is a polite way of saying that the Internal Revenue Code is simply an unenforceable, state-sponsored federal voluntary religion that has no force on the average American. Like the Bible itself, the Internal Revenue Code therefore only applies to people who volunteer or choose to “believe” in or accept its terms. To treat the I.R.C. any other way is essentially to hurt your

neighbor and disrespect his sovereignty and his rights. Christians don't force things upon others who never consented. People in the legal profession and the tax profession will readily and frequently sin all the time by making false presumptions about the liability of people under Internal Revenue Code and they will falsely assume that the I.R.C. is "law". Indirectly, they are falsely "presuming" that the target of the IRS enforcement action "consented", which is a complete lie in most cases. This type of presumptuous behavior is forbidden to Christians under God's law because it violates the second great commandment to love our neighbor and not hurt him (see Bible, Gal. 5:14). Consequently, the Internal Revenue Code cannot be treated as "law" by Christians and shouldn't be treated as "law" by the courts either. To do so would constitute sin and idolatry toward any judge that might try to coerce either jurists or the accused to make such "presumptions". Since the I.R.C. is "presumptive evidence" of law, the easy way to disprove that it is law is to demand evidence that the people consented to it. The Supreme Court said the Sixteenth Amendment didn't constitute evidence of consent. The Congress cannot enact a law that applies in states of the Union without explicit evidence of consent found in the Constitution, and there is none according to the Supreme Court. If you would like to know more about the subject of the Internal Revenue Code not being "law", see sections 5.4.1 through 5.4.1.4 later.

2. Court jurisdiction presumptions. If you appear in front of a federal court that has no jurisdiction over you and you make a "general appearance" and do not challenge jurisdiction, you are "presumed" to voluntarily consent to the jurisdiction of the court, even though that court in most cases doesn't have any jurisdiction whatsoever over you, including in personam or subject matter jurisdiction.

appearance. A coming into court as a party to a suit, either in person or by attorney, whether as plaintiff or defendant. The formal proceeding by which a defendant submits himself to the jurisdiction of the court. The voluntary submission to a court's jurisdiction.

In civil actions the parties do not normally actually appear in person, but rather through their attorneys (who enter their appearance by filing written pleadings, or a formal written entry of appearance). Also, at many stages of criminal proceedings, particularly involving minor offenses, the defendant's attorney appears on his behalf. See e.g., Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 43.

An appearance may be either general or special: the former is a simple and unqualified or unrestricted submission to the jurisdiction of the court, the latter is a submission to the jurisdiction for some specific purpose only, not for all the purposes of the suit. A special appearance is for the purpose of testing or objecting to the sufficiency of service or the jurisdiction of the court over defendant without submitting to such jurisdiction; a general appearance is made where the defendant waives defects of service and submits to the jurisdiction of court. *Insurance Co. of North America v. Kunin, 175 Neb. 260, 121 N.W.2d 372, 375, 376. [Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 97]*

Your ignorant and/or greedy attorney won't even tell you that you have the option to make a *special* appearance instead of a general appearance or to challenge jurisdiction because it would threaten his profits and maybe even his license to practice law. You have to know this, and what you don't know will definitely hurt you! However, even some federal courts admit the real truth of this matter:

"There is a presumption against existence of federal jurisdiction; thus, party invoking federal court's jurisdiction bears the burden of proof. 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 1332, 1332(c); Fed.Rules.Civ.Proc. rule 12(h)(3), 28 U.S.C.A."

"If parties do not raise question of lack of jurisdiction, it is the duty of the federal court to determine the matter sua sponte. 28 U.S.C.A. §1332."

"Lack of jurisdiction cannot be waived and jurisdiction cannot be conferred upon a federal court by consent, inaction, or stipulation. 28 U.S.C.A. §1332."

"Although defendant did not present evidence to support dismissal for lack of jurisdiction, burden rested with plaintiffs to prove affirmatively that jurisdiction did exist. 28 U.S.C.A. §1332."
[Basso v. Utah Power and Light Company, 495 F.2d. 906 (1974)]

3. Presumption of correctness of IRS assessments. The federal courts assume that the IRS' assessments are correct, but the IRS must provide facts to support the assessment and it must appear on a 23C assessment form that is signed and certified by an assessment officer.

"The tax collector's presumption of correctness has a Herculean masculinity of Goliathlike reach, but we strike an Achilles' heel when we find no muscles, no tendons, no ligaments of fact."
[Portillo v. C.I.R., 932 F.2d. 1128 (5th Cir. 1991)]

1 *"Presumption of correctness which attends determination of Commissioner of Internal Revenue may be rebutted*
2 *by showing that such determination is arbitrary or erroneous."*
3 *[United States v. Hover, 268 F.2d. 657 (1959)]*

4 However, the presumption of correctness is easily overcome by looking at the government's own audits of the IRS.
5 There are several documents on the Family Guardian website from the General Accounting Office (GAO) showing that
6 the IRS is unable to properly account for its revenues or protect the security of its taxpayer records. Presenting these
7 reports in court is a sure way to derail the presumption of correctness of any alleged assessment the IRS may say they
8 have on you. You can examine these reports for yourself on the website at:

<http://famguardian.org/PublishedAuthors/Govt/GAO/GAO.htm>

- 9 4. U.S. Supreme Court "cert denied" presumptions. When a case is lost at the federal district or circuit court level,
10 frequently it is appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court on what is called a "writ of certiorari". When the Supreme Court
11 doesn't want to hear the case, they will "deny the cert", which is often abbreviated "cert denied". A famous and evil and
12 unethical tactic by the IRS and DOJ is to cite as an authority a "cert denied" and then "presume" or "assume" that because
13 the Supreme Court wouldn't hear the appeal, then they agree with the findings of the lower court. An example of that
14 tactic is found in the IRS' famous document on their website entitled *The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments*, for
15 instance, which is rebutted on the website at: http://famguardian.org/PublishedAuthors/Govt/IRS/friv_tax_rebuts.pdf.
16 However, this fallacious logic simply is *not* a valid *presumption* or inference to make absent a detailed explanation from
17 the Supreme Court *itself* of why they denied the cert, and frequently they won't explain why they denied the appeal
18 because it would be a public embarrassment for the government to do so! For instance, if a person declares themselves
19 to be a "nontaxpayer" and a "nonresident alien", does not file a return, and challenges the authority of the IRS and
20 litigates his case all the way up to the Supreme Court to prove that the IRS has no assessment authority on him, do you
21 think the Supreme Court is going to want most Americans to hear the truth by ruling in his favor and causing our income
22 tax system to self-destruct? Rule 10 of the U.S. Supreme Court reveals *some*, but not *all* of the reasons why they might
23 deny a cert., but there are a lot more reasons they don't list, and the rule even admits that the reasons listed are incomplete.
24 The bold-faced type emphasizes the point we are trying to make here:

25 *Rule 10. Considerations Governing Review on Writ of Certiorari*

26 *Review on a writ of certiorari is not a matter of right, but of judicial discretion. A petition for a writ of certiorari*
27 *will be granted only for compelling reasons. The following, **although neither controlling nor fully measuring***
28 *the Court's discretion, indicate the character of the reasons the Court considers:*

29 *(a) a United States court of appeals has entered a decision in conflict with the decision of another*
30 *United States court of appeals on the same important matter; has decided an important federal*
31 *question in a way that conflicts with a decision by a state court of last resort; or has so far departed*
32 *from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower*
33 *court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power;*

34 *(b) a state court of last resort has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with*
35 *the decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeals;*

36 *(c) a state court or a United States court of appeals has decided an important question of federal law*
37 *that has not been, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question*
38 *in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court.*

39 ***A petition for a writ of certiorari is rarely granted when the asserted error consists of erroneous factual findings***
40 ***or the misapplication of a properly stated rule of law.***

41 In the above, DISCRETION=REASON. The above list of reasons, by the court's own admission, is *incomplete*.
42 Furthermore, there is no Supreme Court rule that says they have to list ALL their reasons for not granting a writ. This
43 very defect, in fact, is how the government has transformed us into a society of men and no laws, in conflict with the
44 intent of the founding fathers expressed in *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803):

45 *"The Government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men. It*
46 *will certainly cease to deserve this high appellation if the laws furnish no remedy for the violation of a vested*
47 *legal right."*
48 *[Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)]*

So don't let the IRS trick you into "assuming" that the supreme court agreed with them if an appeal was denied to it from a lower court that was ruled in the IRS' favor. The lower courts are obligated to follow the precedents established by the Supreme Court but frequently they don't. Rulings against gun ownership and the pledge of allegiance in 2002 coming from the radical and socialist Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals are good examples that contradict such a conclusion.

5. "U.S. citizen" presumptions. There is a very common misconception that we are all "U.S. citizens". In most cases, judges will insist that the only way that you cannot be one is if you meet the burden of proving that you *aren't*. This presumption is completely false and is undertaken to illegally pull you inside the corrupt jurisdiction of the federal courts in order to rape and pillage your liberty and your property.

*"Unless the defendant can prove he is **not** a citizen of the United States, the IRS has the right to inquire and determine a tax liability."*
[U.S. v. Slater, 545 Fed.Supp. 179,182 (1982)]

6. Burden of proof presumptions. Internal Revenue Code section 7491 places the burden of proving nonliability on the "taxpayer". Note that this section of the code never requires the government to first prove that a human being is a "taxpayer" BEFORE the burden of proof is shifted to the taxpayer. Here is the content of that section:

"If, in any court proceeding, a taxpayer introduces credible evidence with respect to any factual issue relevant to ascertaining the liability of the taxpayer for any tax imposed by subtitle A or B, the Secretary shall have the burden of proof with respect to such issue."
[26 U.S.C. §7491]

There are many other similar "presumptions" like those above that we haven't documented. We include these here only as examples so you can see how the scandal and violation of your rights and liberties is perpetrated by evil tyrants in our government who have transformed it into a socialist beast. Whatever the case, the Bible is very explicit about what we should do with those who act presumptuously: Rebuke and banish them from society. What does this mean in the case of juries and during court trials? It means that during the voir dire process of interviewing the jurors and the judges, they must both be asked about their presumptions and biases, and those who have such biases and presumptions should be banished from the jury and the case. If the judge has a bias or presumption in favor of the government's position, such as those listed above, then he too should be removed for conflict of interest under 28 U.S.C. §455 and bias and prejudice under 28 U.S.C. §144. Likewise, if you ever hear a government prosecutor use the phrase "everyone knows", then a BIG red flag should go up in your mind's eye because you are dealing with a presumption. When this happens in a courtroom, you ought to stand up and object to such nonsense immediately because your WICKED opponent is trying to frame you with presumptions and thereby violate your due process rights under the Fifth Amendment!

The reason this memorandum of law is so large and extensive in its research and authorities is because we have made a disciplined effort to avoid presumptions. We have, in fact, used evidence derived from the government's own laws, spokespersons, and courts to prove nearly every point we make in this book. This ensures that you don't have to "assume" anything and can examine the facts and evidence for yourself and reach your own independent conclusions about the truth of what we are saying. In effect, we have pretended that we are the prosecuting attorney and you are the jury and the "court" is the "court of public opinion". This provides excellent practice and preparation for a real trial, because we assume these materials will also be used in a real court to prosecute specific government servants for wrongdoing.

4.6 How corrupted judges encourage and reward presumptions by jurists in the courtroom

Federal judges have developed some rather effective and prevalent techniques for encouraging and rewarding the use of prejudicial presumption in federal courtrooms in the context of taxation so as to turn a legal proceeding essentially into a political proceeding, whereby the jury does the illegal lynching for him. Below are a few of the more common techniques:

1. Refusing to allow "law" to be discussed in the courtroom in front of a jury.
2. Refusing to allow jurists serving on jury duty to read the law.
3. Sanctioning and penalizing counsel who discuss the law during trials, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11.

If you would like to read a real-life trial transcript whereby a judge did exactly the above, see:

<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/CaseStudies/PhilRoberts/PhilRoberts.htm>

1 After law is removed from tax trials, the only thing that remains is presumption and ignorance as the means of decision,
2 which will always produce injustice, prejudice, and unlawful decisions from jurists.

3 "One who turns his ear from hearing the law [[God's law](#) or man's law], even his prayer is an abomination."
4 [[Prov. 28:9](#), Bible, NKJV]

5 **4.7 How Presumption turns Courts into Federal Churches in violation of the First Amendment**

6 "Presumption", when it is left to operate unchecked in a federal court proceeding:

- 7 1. Has all the attributes of religious "faith". Religious faith is simply a belief in anything that can't be demonstrated with
8 physical evidence absent presumption.
- 9 2. Turns the courtroom into a federal "church", and the judge into a "priest".
- 10 3. Produces a "political religion" when exercised in the courtroom.
- 11 4. Corrupts the court and makes it essentially into a political, and not a legal tribunal.
- 12 5. Violates the separation of powers doctrine, which was put in place to protect our rights from such encroachments.

13 If you would like to investigate the fascinating matter further of how the abuse of presumption in federal courtrooms has the
14 affect of creating a state-sponsored religion in violation of the First Amendment Establishment Clause, please consult:

- 15 1. Our free memorandum of law below:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 16 2. The free book below:

Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Sections 5.4 through 5.4.3.6
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

17 We strongly encourage you to rebut the evidence contained in the above references and send us the rebuttal along with court-
18 admissible evidence upon which it is based.

19 **5 Prohibitions upon presumption in gathering court-admissible evidence**

20 **5.1 Rules of Evidence designed to completely remove presumption**

21 The chief purpose of the Federal Rules of Evidence (Fed.Rule.Evid.) is to completely remove presumption from legal due
22 process so as to remove bias or prejudice from the finders of fact and witnesses.

Federal Rules of Evidence
<http://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/fre/index.html>

23 The Federal Rules of Evidence indirectly agree with these conclusions when they explain their purpose:

24 [Federal Rules of Evidence](#)
25 [Rule 102. Purpose and Construction](#)

26 *These rules shall be construed to secure fairness in administration, elimination of unjustifiable expense and delay,*
27 *and promotion of growth and development of the law of evidence to the end that the truth may be ascertained and*
28 *proceedings justly determined.*

29 The statement above doesn't define "fairness", but the implication is that nothing can be fair which is based on an
30 unsubstantiated assumption or presumption. They don't tie "presumption" to the concept of fairness because they don't want
31 you to notice when the judge and U.S. attorney are abusing it to prejudice your Constitutional rights, which is most of the
32 time.

33 This purpose of eliminating presumption from legal proceedings explains why the Federal Rules of Evidence:

1. Require all witnesses to have a personal knowledge of the facts that they are testifying about. Federal Rule of Evidence 602. Absence of personal knowledge would simply encourage and reward false or unsubstantiated presumption.
2. Prohibit “leading questions” to witnesses. Federal Rule of Evidence 611(c). A leading question is a question that contains a presupposition. Examples of such questions are found at the beginning of the next section.
3. Do not allow religious beliefs to be used to discredit or enhance the credibility of witnesses. Federal Rule of Evidence 610. Since religious beliefs cannot be substantiated with evidence, then they are themselves in effect “presumptions” on the part of the believer.
4. Exclude “hearsay” evidence from being admitted under Federal Rule of Evidence 802. Statements of third parties, which are called “hearsay”, are excluded under the “Hearsay Rule”. Such statements essentially amount to unsubstantiated opinions or presumptions that may not be used as evidence.

5.2 Abuse of Presumption As Part of Legal Discovery

Presumption is a favorite technique used by less than scrupulous attorneys in order to get answers or establish facts that they wish to establish during legal discovery. The presumptions are packaged essentially as “loaded questions” that presume a fact and, if not challenged but rather answered, establish the fact. For instance, below are a few such questions.

1. “**Have you stopped beating your wife yet?**”. Whether you answer “Yes” or “No” to the question, you still admit the premise of the question, which is that you are beating your wife. The only way to avoid admitting the premise is to respond by directly challenging the premise, such as by saying “I never have and never will beat my wife, ever.”
2. “**Have you always violated the law?**”. Whether you answer “Yes” or “No” to the question, you still admit the premise of the question, which is that you violated the law. The only way to avoid admitting the premise is to respond by directly challenging the premise, such as by saying “I never have and never will violate the law, ever.”
3. “**Do you _____ (verb)?**”. The blank part of this question contains a verb which the questioner refuses to define, and leaves it to you to presume the meaning of. If you do not ask for a definition, then you are essentially presuming or assuming that you agree with the questioner’s presumptions about what he thinks the word means, or that you know what he means, which in fact is rarely the case.
4. “**Isn’t this _____ (adjective)?**” When an adjective is used to describe a behavior whose definition is not established at the time of the question, then the witness essentially consents to accept or presume the truth of whatever definition the deposing counsel places upon the word later in the litigation. This gives a license to the deposing counsel to define the word prejudicially later, or to associate the admission with something that is prejudicial or presumptuously prejudicial.

Whenever the above tactics are employed, if the witness either refuses to answer the question or does not deny the question or does not ask for a definition of the presumptuous word or words that are being used, then he has created or at least rewarded and encouraged any one of the following types of presumptions”

1. If the witness refuses to answer the question, then it the questioner will assume that the answer is incriminating.
2. If the witness does not challenge the premise of the question, then he has admitted it and created a presumption that it is true.
3. If the witness does not ask for the definition of the adjective or verb used by the deposing counsel, he has essentially agreed to presume the definition of the word used by the deposing counsel later in the proceeding. You never want to hand to an opposing counsel an unrestricted license to control the definition of any word used in the proceeding and you never want to admit to anything that would be prejudicial to your interest because a negative adjective or verb is used to describe your behavior as a defendant.

A clue that “presumption” is being abused to establish the above types of bias and prejudice are the use of any of the following words in the question:

1. “Always”
2. “Never”
3. “Should”/”Ought”/”Must”
4. “Everyone”
5. “No one”
6. “You” or “your”
7. Cuss words

All of the above types of words have in common that they are dogmatic, bossy, and judgmental, and therefore abusive. A lawyer who is attempting to discover the objective truth and facts about a situation cannot and should not project their own interpretation or judgment upon a witness using any of the above types of words. In the legal field, this is called “Leading questions”, which violate the Federal Rule of Evidence 611(c) available at:

<http://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/fre/index.html>

6 How the IRS and state revenue Agencies Abuse Presumption to Destroy Your Constitutional Rights

6.1 “Taxpayer” v. “Nontaxpayer”: Which One Are You?

*"The taxpayer-- that's someone who works for the federal government but doesn't have to take the civil service examination."
[President Ronald W. Reagan]*

The word “taxpayer” is defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14) and 26 U.S.C. §1313 as someone who is “liable for” and “subject to” the income tax in Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A.

[TITLE 26 > Subtitle F > CHAPTER 79 > § 7701](#)
[§ 7701. Definitions](#)

(a) When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof—

(14) Taxpayer

The term “taxpayer” means any person subject to any internal revenue tax.

The “person” they are referring to above is further characterized as a “citizen of the United States” or “resident of the United States” (alien). The tax is not on nonresident aliens, but on their INCOME, therefore they cannot lawfully be “taxpayers”:

*TITLE 26--INTERNAL REVENUE
CHAPTER I--INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
PART 1 .INCOME TAXES--Table of Contents
[Sec. 1.1-1 Income tax on individuals.](#)*

(a) General rule. (1) Section 1 of the Code imposes an income tax on the income of every individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States and, to the extent provided by section 871(b) or 877(b), on the income of a nonresident alien individual.

What statutory “U.S. citizens” and “U.S. residents” share in common is a domicile on federal territory that is no part of the exclusive jurisdiction of any state of the Union. Collectively, they are called “U.S. persons” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30). Remember:

“U.S. person=domicile or residence on federal territory and not any state of the Union”

The “United States” they mean in the term “U.S. citizen” is defined as the “District of Columbia” in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) and nowhere includes any state of the Union because they are sovereign and foreign in respect to the federal government. In that sense, income taxes are a franchise tax associated with the domicile/protection franchise.

“Thus, the Court has frequently held that domicile or residence, more substantial than mere presence in transit or sojourn, is an adequate basis for taxation, including income, property, and death taxes. Since the Fourteenth Amendment makes one a citizen of the state wherein he resides, the fact of residence creates universally reciprocal duties of protection by the state and of allegiance and support by the citizen. The latter obviously includes a duty to pay taxes, and their nature and measure is largely a political matter. Of course, the situs of property may tax it regardless of the citizenship, domicile, or residence of the owner, the most obvious illustration being a tax on realty laid by the state in which the realty is located.”
[Miller Brothers Co. v. Maryland, [347 U.S. 340](#) (1954)]

1 *"**domicile**. A person's legal home. That place where a man has his true, fixed, and **permanent home** and*
2 *principal establishment, and to which whenever he is absent he has the intention of returning. Smith v. Smith,*
3 *206 Pa.Super. 310, 213 A.2d. 94. Generally, physical presence within a state and the intention to make it one's*
4 *home are the requisites of establishing a "domicile" therein. The permanent residence of a person or the place*
5 *to which he intends to return even though he may actually reside elsewhere. A person may have more than one*
6 *residence but only one domicile. The legal domicile of a person is important since it, rather than the actual*
7 *residence, often controls the jurisdiction of the taxing authorities and determines where a person may exercise*
8 *the privilege of voting and other legal rights and privileges."*
9 *[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 485]*

10 Those who don't want to pay the tax or be "taxpayers" simply don't partake of the government protection franchise and
11 instead declare themselves as "nonresidents" with no "residence" or "permanent address" within the jurisdiction of the taxing
12 authority on every government form they fill out. That is why "nonresident aliens" cannot be "taxpayers". For further details,
13 see:

14 [Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #05.002
15 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

16 The IRS refers to everyone as "taxpayers" because making this usually false presumption against innocent "nontaxpayers" is
17 how they recruit new "taxpayers". Here is the way one of our readers describes how he reacts to being habitually and falsely
18 called "taxpayer" by the IRS:

19 *I refuse to allow any IRS or State revenue officer to call me or any client a "taxpayer". Just because I may look*
20 *like one or have the attributes of one does not necessarily make me one. To one IRS lady, and I have no reason*
21 *to doubt that she fits this category, I use the following example. "Miss you have all of the equipment to be a whore,*
22 *but that does not make you one by presumption." Until it is proven by a preponderance of evidence I must assume*
23 *you are a lady and you will be treated as such. Please have the same respect for me, and don't slander my*
reputation and defame my character by calling me a whore for the government, which is what a "taxpayer" is.
[Eugene Pringle]

24 Funny! But guess what? This is not a new idea. We refer you to the Bible book of Revelation, Chapter 17, which describes
25 precisely who this whore or harlot is: Babylon the Great! Check out that chapter, keeping in mind that "Babylon the Great"
26 is symbolic of the city full of all the ignorant and idolatrous people who have unwittingly made themselves into government
27 whores by becoming surety for government debts in the pursuit of taxable government privileges and benefits they didn't
28 need to begin with. The Bible describes these harlots and adulterers below:

29 *"When thou sawest a thief [the IRS] then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers."*
30 *[Ps 50:18]*

31 *"Where do wars and fights [and tyranny and oppression] come from among you? Do they not come from your*
32 *desires for pleasure [pursuit of government "privileges"] that war in your members?You ask [from your*
33 *government and its THIEF the IRS] and do not receive, because you ask amiss, that you may spend it on your*
34 *own pleasures. Adulterers and adulteresses [and HARLOTS]! Do you not know that friendship with the world*
35 *[as a "citizen", "resident", "taxpayer", etc] is enmity with God? Whoever therefore wants to be a friend of the*
36 *world makes himself an enemy of God."*
37 *[James 4:3-4, Bible, NKJV]*

38 These "taxpayer" and citizen government idolaters have made government their new god (neo-god), their friend, and their
39 source of false man-made security. That is what the "Security" means in "Social Security". The bible mentions that there is
40 something "mysterious" about "Babylon the Great Harlot":

41 *"And on her forehead a name was written: MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS*
42 *AND OF THE ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."*
43 *[Rev. 17:5, Bible, NKJV]*

44 The mystery about this harlot/adulterous woman described in Rev. 17:5 is symbolic of the ignorance and apathy that these
45 people have about the law and their government. For a fascinating read into this subject, we refer you to the free book on the
46 internet below:

47 [Babylon the Great is Falling](http://www.babylonthegreatisfalling.net/)
48 <http://www.babylonthegreatisfalling.net/>

The IRS **DOES NOT** have the authority conferred by law under Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code to bestow the status of “taxpayer” on any human being who doesn’t first volunteer for that “distinctive” title. Below are some facts confirming this:

1. There is no statute making anyone liable for the income tax. Therefore, the only way you can become subject is by volunteering. Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code is therefore “private law” and “special law” that only applies to those who individually consent by connecting their earnings to a “trade or business”, which is a “public office” in the United States government. These people are referred to in the Treasury Regulations as “effectively connected with a trade or business”. BEFORE they consent, they are called “nontaxpayers”. AFTER they consent, they are called “taxpayers”.

*“To the extent that regulations implement the statute, they have the force and effect of law...The regulation implements the statute **and cannot vitiate or change the statute...**”*
[Spreckles v. C.I.R., 119 F.2d, 667]

*“**..liability for taxation must clearly appear**[from statute imposing tax].”*
[Higley v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 69 F.2d. 160 (1934)]

*“**While Congress might have the power to place such a personal liability upon trust beneficiaries who did not renounce the trust, yet it would require clear expression of such intent**, and it cannot be spelled out from language (as that here) which can be given an entirely natural and useful meaning and application excluding such intent.”*
[Higley v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 69 F.2d. 160 (1934)]

*“A tax is a legal imposition, **exclusively of statutory origin** (37 Cyc. 724, 725), and, naturally, **liability to taxation must be read in statute, or it does not exist.**”*
[Bente v. Bugbee, 137 A. 552, 103 N.J. Law. 608 (1927)]

*“...the taxpayer must be liable for the tax. **Tax liability is a condition precedent to the demand.** Merely demanding payment, even repeatedly, does not cause liability.”*
[Terry v. Bothke, 713 F.2d. 1405, at 1414 (1983)]

If you want to know more about this subject see:

- 1.1. Section 5.6.1 of the Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, which covers the subject of no liability in excruciating detail <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 1.2. The following link:
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Articles/NoStatuteLiable.htm>
- 1.3. Our memorandum of law Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003 proves that the Internal Revenue Code is “private law” and a private contract/agreement. Those who have consented are called “taxpayers” and those who haven’t are called “nontaxpayers”. This memorandum is available at:
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2. The federal courts agree that the IRS cannot involuntarily make you into a “taxpayer” when they said the following:

“A reasonable construction of the taxing statutes does not include vesting any tax official with absolute power of assessment against individuals not specified in the statutes as a person liable for the tax without an opportunity for judicial review of this status before the appellation of ‘taxpayer’ is bestowed upon them and their property is seized...”
[Botta v. Scanlon, 288 F.2d. 504, 508 (1961)]

3. IRS has no statutory authority to convert employment withholding taxes under I.R.C. Subtitle C into “income taxes” under I.R.C. Subtitle A. We show in section 5.6.8 of the Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302 that employment withholding taxes deducted under the authority of Subtitle C of the Internal Revenue Code using a W-4 voluntary withholding agreement and that the IRS classifies them in IRS document 6209 as “Tax Class 5”, which is “Estate and gift taxes”. Therefore, they are gifts to the U.S. government, not taxes that may not be enforced. We also show in section 5.6.8 of the Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302 that taxes paid under the authority of Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code are classified as Tax Class 2, “Individual Income Tax”. We also exhaustively prove with evidence in section 5.6.16 of the Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302 that IRS has no statutory or regulatory authority to convert what essentially amounts to a voluntary “gift” paid through withholding to a “tax”. Only you can do that by assessing yourself. That is why the IRS Form 1040 requires that you attach the information returns to it, such as the W-2: So that the gift and the tax are reconciled and so that the accuracy of the W-2, which is unsigned hearsay evidence, is guaranteed by the penalty of perjury signature on the IRS Form 1040 itself.

The consequence of the IRS not having any lawful authority to make anyone into a “taxpayer” is that they cannot do a lawful Substitute For Return (SFR) or penalty assessment under I.R.C. Subtitle A, as you will learn later. This is also confirmed by the following document:

Why the Government Can't Lawfully Assess Human Beings With an Income Tax Liability Without Their Consent, Form #05.011
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

If you have been the victim of an involuntary IRS assessment and do a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for assessment documents as we have, and you examine all of the documents returned, you will not see even one document signed by any IRS employee that purports to be an assessment and which has your name on it as the only subject of the assessment. The reason they won't sign the assessment document, such as the IRS Form 23C or the IRS R.A.C.S. 006 Report, under penalty of perjury is that no one is STUPID enough to accept legal liability for violating the Constitution and the rights of those they have done wrongful assessments against. The IRS knows these people are involved in wrongdoing, which is why they assign “pseudo names” (false names) to their employees: To protect them from lawsuits against them for their habitual violation of the law. The documents you will get back from the IRS in response to your FOIA include the following forms, none of which are signed by the IRS employee:

1. [IRS Form 886-A: Explanation of Terms](#)
2. [IRS Form 1040: Substitute For Return \(SFR\)](#)
3. [IRS Form 3198: Special Handling Notice](#)
4. [IRS Form 4549: Income Tax Examination Changes](#)
5. [IRS Form 4700: Examination Work Papers](#)
6. [IRS Form 5344: Examination Closing Record](#)
7. [IRS Form 5546: Examination Return Charge-Out](#)
8. [IRS Form 5564: Notice of Deficiency Waiver](#)
9. [IRS Form 5600: Statutory Notice Worksheet](#)
10. [IRS Form 12616: Correspondence Examination History Sheet](#)
11. [IRS Form 13496: IRC Section 6020\(b\) Certification](#)

If you want to look at samples of the above forms, see section 6 of the link below, under the column "Examples":

<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/IRS/IRSFormsPubs.htm>

We have looked at hundreds of these assessment documents and *every one* of them is required by [26 U.S.C. §6065](#) to be signed under penalty of perjury by the IRS employee who prepared them but *none* are. As a matter of fact, the examination documents prepared by the IRS Examination Branch to do the illegal Substitute for Returns (involuntary assessments) purport to be a “proposal” rather than an involuntary assessment, have no signature of an IRS employee, and the only signature is from the “taxpayer”, who must consent to the assessment in order to make it lawful. See, for instance, IRS Forms 4549 and 5564. What they do is procure the consent invisibly using a commercial default process by ignoring your responsive correspondence, and therefore “assume” that you consented. This, ladies and gentlemen, is constructive FRAUD, not justice. It is THEFT! The IRS Form 12616 above is the vehicle by which they show that the “taxpayer” consented to the involuntary assessment, because they can't do ANYTHING without his consent.

Furthermore, [28 U.S.C. §2201](#) also removes the authority of federal courts to declare the status of “taxpayer” on a sovereign American also!:

United States Code
TITLE 28 - JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE
PART VI - PARTICULAR PROCEEDINGS
CHAPTER 151 - DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS
Sec. 2201. Creation of remedy

(a) *In a case of actual controversy within its jurisdiction, except with respect to Federal taxes other than actions brought under section 7428 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a proceeding under section 505 or 1146 of title 11, or in any civil action involving an antidumping or countervailing duty proceeding regarding a class or kind of merchandise of a free trade area country (as defined in section 516A(f)(10) of the Tariff Act of 1930), as determined by the administering authority, any court of the United States, upon the filing of an*

appropriate pleading, may declare the rights and other legal relations of any interested party seeking such declaration, whether or not further relief is or could be sought. Any such declaration shall have the force and effect of a final judgment or decree and shall be reviewable as such.

(b) For limitations on actions brought with respect to drug patents see section 505 or 512 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

The federal courts themselves agree that they do not have the jurisdiction to bestow the status of “taxpayer” upon someone who is a “nontaxpayer”:

"And by statutory definition the term "taxpayer" includes any person, trust or estate subject to a tax imposed by the revenue act. ...Since the statutory definition of taxpayer is exclusive, the federal [and state] courts do not have the power to create nonstatutory taxpayers for the purpose of applying the provisions of the Revenue Acts..."
[C.I.R. v. Trustees of L. Inv. Ass'n, 100 F.2d.18 (1939)]

26 U.S.C. §1461 is the only statute within the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A which creates an explicit liability or “legal duty”. That duty is enforceable only against those subject to the I.R.C., who are “taxpayers” with “gross income” above the exemption amount identified in 26 U.S.C. §6012. All amounts reported by third parties on Information Returns, such as the W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099, document receipt of “trade or business” earnings. All “trade or business” earnings, as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26), are classified as “gross income”. A nonresident alien who has these information returns filed against him or her becomes his or her own “withholding agent”, and must reconcile their account with the federal government annually by filing a tax return. This is a requirement of all those who are engaged in a “public office”, which is a type of business partnership with the federal government. That business relationship is created through the operation of private contract and private law between you, the human being, and the federal government. The method of consenting to that contract is any one of the following means:

1. Assessing ourselves with a liability shown on a tax return.
2. Voluntarily signing a W-4, which is identified in the regulations as an “agreement” to include all earnings in the context of that agreement as “gross income” on a 1040 tax return. See 26 C.F.R. §31.3402(p)-1(a). For a person who is not a “public official” or engaged in a “public office”, the signing of the W-4 essentially amounts to an agreement to procure “social services” and “social insurance”. You must bribe the Beast with over half of your earnings in order to convince it to take care of you in your old age.
3. Completing, signing, and submitting an IRS Form 1040 or 1040NR and indicating a nonzero amount of “gross income”. Nearly all “gross income” and all information returns is connected with an excise taxable activity called a “trade or business” pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §871(b) and 26 U.S.C. §6041, which activity then makes you into a “resident”. See older versions of 26 C.F.R. §301.7701-5:
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/Resident-26cfr301.7701-5.pdf>
4. Filing information returns on ourself or not rebutting information returns improperly filed against us, such as the W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099. Pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §6041(a), all of these federal forms associate all funds documented on them with the taxable activity called a “trade or business”. If you are not a federal “employee” or a “public officer”, then you can’t lawfully earn “trade or business” income. See the following for details:
 - 4.1. 26 U.S.C. §6041.
 - 4.2. *The “Trade or Business” Scam*, Form #05.001
<http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf>
 - 4.3. Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 4.4. Correcting Erroneous IRS Form 1042’s, Form #04.003:
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 4.5. Correcting Erroneous IRS Form 1098’s, Form #04.004:
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 4.6. Correcting Erroneous IRS form 1099’s, Form #04.005:
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 4.7. Correcting Erroneous IRS Form W-2’s, Form #04.006:
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
5. Allowing Currency Transaction Reports (CTR’s), IRS Form 8300, to be filed against us when we withdraw 10,000 or more in cash from a financial institution. The statutes at 31 U.S.C. §5331 and the regulation at 31 C.F.R. §103.30(d)(2) only require these reports to be filed in connection with a “trade or business”, and this “trade or business” is the same “trade or business” referenced in the Internal Revenue Code at 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) and 26 U.S.C. §162. If you are

not a “public official” or if you do not consent to be treated as one in order to procure “social insurance”, then banks and financial institutions are violating the law to file these forms against you. See:

The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

6. Completing and submitting the Social Security Trust document, which is the SS-5 form. This is an agreement that imposes the “duty” or “fiduciary duty” upon the human being and makes him into a “trustee” and an officer of a the federal corporation called the “United States”. The definition of “person” for the purposes of the criminal provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, codified in 26 U.S.C. §7343, incidentally is EXACTLY the same as the above. Therefore, all tax crimes require that the violator must be acting in a fiduciary capacity as a Trustee of some kind or another, whether it be as an Executor over the estate of a deceased “taxpayer”, or over the Social Security Trust maintained for the benefit of a living trustee/employee of the federal corporation called the “United States Government”. See the following for details:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Unless and until we do any of the above, our proper title is “nontaxpayer”. The foundation of American Jurisprudence is the presumption that we are “innocent until proven guilty”, which means that we are a “nontaxpayer” until the government proves with court-admissible evidence signed under penalty of perjury that we are a “taxpayer” who is participating in government franchises that are subject to the excise tax upon a “trade or business” which is described in I.R.C. Subtitle A. For cases dealing with the term “nontaxpayer” see: *Long v. Rasmussen*, 281 F. 236, 238 (1922); *Rothensis v. Ullman*, 110 F.2d. 590(1940); *Raffaele v. Granger*, 196 F.2d. 620 (1952); *Bullock v. Latham*, 306 F.2d. 45 (1962); *Economy Plumbing & Heating v. United States*, 470 F.2d. 585 (1972); and *South Carolina v. Ragan*, 465 U.S. 367 (1984).

“The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws...”

“The distinction between persons and things within the scope of the revenue laws and those without is vital.”
[*Long v. Rasmussen*, 281 F. 236, 238 (1922)]

Since the above ruling, Congress has added new provisions to the I.R.C. which obtusely mention “nontaxpayers”, but not by name, because they don’t want people to have a name to describe their proper status. The new provision is found in 26 U.S.C. §7426, and in that provision of the I.R.C., “nontaxpayers” are referred to as “Persons other than taxpayers”. So far as we know, this is the ONLY provision within the I.R.C. that provides any remedy or standing to a “nontaxpayer”.

The behavior of the IRS confirms the above conclusions. See the following IRS internal memo proving that a return that is signed under penalty of perjury and saying “not liable” or words to that effect is treated as a non-return:

<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Evidence/Refunds/1998-053IRSMemoZeroRet.pdf>

Look what the above internal top secret IRS memo says (are they trying to hide something?.. cover-up and obstruction of justice!). Pay particular attention to the use of the word “taxpayer” in this excerpt, by the way, which doesn’t include most people:

*“A taxpayer can also negate the penalties of perjury statement with an addition. In *Schmitt v. U.S.*, 140 B.R. 571 (Bank W.D. Okl. 1992), the taxpayers filed a return with the following statement at the end of the penalties of perjury statement, “SIGNED UNDER DURESS, SEE STATEMENT ATTACHED.” In the addition, the taxpayers denied liability for tax on wages. The Service argued that the statement, added to the “return”, qualified the penalties of perjury statement, thus making the penalties of perjury statement ineffective and the return a nullity. Id. at 572.*

In agreeing with the Service, the court pointed out that the voluntary nature of our tax system requires the Service to rely on a taxpayer’s self-assessment and on a taxpayer’s assurance that the figures supplied are true to the best of his or her knowledge. Id. Accordingly, the penalties of perjury statement has important significance in our tax system. The statement connects the taxpayer’s attestation of tax liability (by the signing of the statement) with the Service’s statutory ability to summarily assess the tax.

*Similarly, in *Sloan v. Comm’r*, 53 F.3d. 799 (7th Cir. 1995), cert. denied, 516 U.S. 897 (1995), the taxpayers submitted a return containing the words “Denial & Disclaimer attached as part of this form” above their*

signatures. ***In the addition, the taxpayers denied liability for any individual income tax.*** In determining the effect of the addition on the penalties of perjury statement, the court reasoned that it is a close question whether the addition negates the penalties of perjury statement or not. The addition, according to the court, could be read just to mean that the taxpayers reserve their right to renew their constitutional challenge to the federal income tax law. However, the court concluded that the addition negated the penalties of perjury statement. *Id.* at 800.

In both *Schmitt* and *Sloan* the court questioned the purpose of the addition. Both courts found that the addition of qualifying language was intended to deny tax liability. Accordingly, this effect rendered the purported returns invalid."

The reason is clear: If you are a "nontaxpayer" who is "not liable", then you essentially are outside their jurisdiction and can't even ask for a refund of the money you paid in. All of your property is consequently classified as a "foreign estate", as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(31):

[TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 79](#) > [Sec. 7701.](#)
[Sec. 7701. - Definitions](#)

(a) When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof—

(31) Foreign estate or trust

(A) Foreign estate

The term "foreign estate" means an estate the income of which, from sources without the United States which is not effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States, is not includible in gross income under subtitle A.

If you indeed are a "nontaxpayer" and act like one, the IRS will pretend like you don't even exist, that is, until in their ignorance and greed they try years later to go after you wrongfully and unlawfully for willful failure to file, notice of deficiency, or some other contrived nonsense to terrorize you into paying and filing again. That's how they make "nontaxpayers" "volunteer" into becoming "taxpayers": with terrorism and treason against the rights of sovereign Americans, starting with "mailing threatening, false, and harassing communications" in violation of 18 U.S.C. §876. Lawyer hypocrites! Jesus was right!

"Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law: justice and mercy and faith. These you ought to have done, without leaving the others undone."
[Matt. 23:23, Bible]

Now that we understand the difference between "taxpayer" and a "nontaxpayer", allow us to make a very critical distinction that is the Achilles Heel of the IRS fraud. Ponder for a moment in your mind the following very insightful question:

"Is a person in law always either a 'taxpayer' or a 'nontaxpayer' as a whole? Can a person simultaneously be BOTH?"

Once you understand the answer to this crucial question, you will understand how to get your money back in an IRS refund claim without litigating! The answer, by the way, is **YES**! Let us now explain why this is the case.

We said above that if you are a "nontaxpayer", the IRS will basically try to completely ignore your refund claim and you are lucky if they even respond. At worst, they will illegally try to penalize you and at best, they will ignore you. We must remember, however, that it is "taxable income" that makes you a "taxpayer". "Taxable income" is "gross income" minus "deductions", as described in 26 U.S.C. §63(a). Therefore, we must earn "gross income" as legally defined in order to have "taxable income". One cannot earn "gross income" unless they fit into one of the following categories:

1. **Domestic taxable activities**: Activities within the "United States", which is defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) as the District of Columbia.
 - 1.1. **Federal "Employees", Agencies, and "Public Officials"** – meaning those who are federal "public officers", federal "employees", and elected officials of the national government. This is one reason why 26 U.S.C. §6331(a) lists only federal officers, federal employees, federal instrumentalities, and elected officials as ones who can be served with a levy upon their compensation, which is actually a payment from the federal government.

1.2. Federal benefit recipients. These people are receiving “social insurance” payments such as Medicare, Social Security, or Unemployment. These benefits are described as “gross income” in 26 U.S.C. §871(a)(3). When they signed up for these programs, they became “trustees”, “employees”, and instrumentalities of the U.S. government. They are described as “federal personnel” in the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a(a)(13). Neither the Constitution nor the Social Security Act authorize these benefits to be offered to anyone domiciled outside of federal territories and possessions. For details on this scam, see:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

1.3. Those who operate in a representative capacity in behalf of the federal government via contract. This includes those who have a valid Taxpayer Identification Number, which constitutes a constructive trust contract with the federal government and use that federal property [number] as per 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d). They are identified as federal trustees and/or federal employees as referenced in 20 C.F.R. “Employee Benefits”. For details on this scam, see:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2. Foreign taxable activities: Activities in the states of the Union or abroad.

2.1. Domiciliaries of the federal zone abroad and in a foreign country pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §911 who are engaged in a “trade or business”:

2.1.1. Statutory “U.S. citizens” - those are federal statutory creations of Congress and defined specifically at 8 U.S.C. §1401 to be those who were born in a U.S. territory or possession AND who have a legal domicile there.

2.1.2. Statutory “Residents” (aliens). These are foreign nationals who have a legal domicile within the District of Columbia or a federal territory or possession. They are defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A) and 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(2).

If you would like to know more about why the above are the only foreign subjects of taxation, see:

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2.2. States of the Union. Neither the IRS nor the Social Security Administration may lawfully operate outside of the federal zone. See:

2.2.1. 4 U.S.C. §72 limits all “public offices” to the District of Columbia. It says that the “public offices” that are the subject of the tax upon a “trade or business” must be exercised ONLY in the District of Columbia and not elsewhere, except as expressly provided by law.

2.2.2. 26 U.S.C. §7601 limits IRS enforcement to internal revenue districts. The President is authorized to establish internal revenue districts pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7621, but he delegated that authority to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to Executive Order 10289. Treasury Order 150-02, signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, says that the only remaining internal revenue district is in the District of Columbia. It eliminated all the other internal revenue districts.

2.2.3. 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) define the term “United States” as the District of Columbia. Nowhere anyplace else is the tax described in Subtitle A expanded to include anyplace BUT the “United States”.

2.2.4. The U.S. Supreme Court said Congress enjoys NO LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION within states of the Union and the Internal Revenue Code is “legislation”.

“It is no longer open to question that the general government, unlike the states, Hammer v. Dagenhart, 247 U.S. 251, 275, 38 S.Ct. 529, 3 A.L.R. 649, Ann.Cas.1918E 724, possesses no inherent power in respect of the internal affairs of the states; and emphatically not with regard to legislation.”
[Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238, 56 S.Ct. 855 (1936)]

“The difficulties arising out of our dual form of government and the opportunities for differing opinions concerning the relative rights of state and national governments are many; but for a very long time this court has steadfastly adhered to the doctrine that the taxing power of Congress does not extend to the states or their political subdivisions. The same basic reasoning which leads to that conclusion, we think, requires like limitation upon the power which springs from the bankruptcy clause. United States v. Butler, supra.”
[Ashton v. Cameron County Water Improvement District No. 1, 298 U.S. 513, 56 S.Ct. 892 (1936)]

2.2.5. The U.S. Supreme Court said Congress Cannot establish a “trade or business” in a state and tax it. A “trade or business” is the main subject of Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code. See the following court cite:

“Thus, Congress having power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes, may, without doubt, provide for granting coasting licenses, licenses to pilots, licenses to trade with the Indians, and any other licenses necessary or proper for the exercise of that great and extensive

power; and the same observation is applicable to every other power of Congress, to the exercise of which the granting of licenses may be incident. All such licenses confer authority, and give rights to the licensee.

But very different considerations apply to the **internal commerce or domestic trade** of the States. Over this commerce and trade Congress has **no power of regulation nor any direct control**. This power belongs **exclusively** to the States. **No interference by Congress with the business of citizens transacted within a State is warranted by the Constitution, except such as is strictly incidental to the exercise of powers clearly granted to the legislature.** The power to authorize a business within a State is plainly repugnant to the exclusive power of the State over the same subject. It is true that the power of Congress to tax is a very extensive power. It is given in the Constitution, with only one exception and only two qualifications. Congress cannot tax exports, and it must impose direct taxes by the rule of apportionment, and indirect taxes by the rule of uniformity. Thus limited, and thus only, it reaches every subject, and may be exercised at discretion. But, it reaches only existing subjects.

Congress cannot authorize a trade or business within a State in order to tax it.

[License Tax Cases, [72 U.S. 462](#), 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866)]

Based on options above, most people do not have “gross income” as legally defined, and they are actually deceiving the government if they put anything but zero on their income tax return. Because none of the earnings of the typical person who is employed in the private sector can legally be classified as either “income” or “gross income”, what you put down for “gross income” on your tax return boils down to the question of:

“How much of my receipts do I want to ‘volunteer’ or ‘elect’ or ‘choose’ to call ‘income’ or ‘gross income’ for the purposes of federal taxes?”

How you choose to answer that question then determines the net “donation” (not “tax”, but “donation”) you are making to the federal government based on the tax rate schedule that your fictitious and fabricated “gross income” falls into. As the Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302 said at the beginning of chapter 5 section 5.1.5, the income tax is “voluntary” and it really meant it! Not only that, but the U.S. Supreme Court agrees with us!

“Our system of taxation is based upon voluntary assessment and payment, not distraint.”
[Flora v. U.S., [362 U.S. 145](#) (1960)]

Returning to our original question, then, “*Can a person be simultaneously BOTH a ‘taxpayer’ and a ‘nontaxpayer’?*”, the answer is **YES**. Why? Because so long as we as biological people aren’t “employees” (synonymous with elected or appointed officers of the U.S. government) any amount we put down for “gross income” on our tax return is a *voluntary choice* and not REAL “gross income” as legally defined. That amount, and ONLY that amount, which we volunteer to define as “gross income” on our tax return makes us into a “*taxpayer*”, but only for the specific *sources* of revenue we voluntarily identified as “gross income”! All other monies that we earned are, by definition and implication, not taxable and not “gross income”, which means that for those “*sources*” of revenue that are not “gross income”, we are a “nontaxpayer” and NOT a “taxpayer”.

So when someone asks you if you are a “taxpayer”, both the question and your answer must be put in the context of a *specific* source of income. You should respond by first asking: “for which revenue *source*?” The answer can seldom be a general “yes” or “no” for ALL RECEIPTS. Consequently, if we put down one cent for “gross income” on our tax return, then ONLY for *that source* of revenue do we become “taxpayers”. All other sources of revenue for us are, by implication, NOT either “gross income” or “taxable income”, which means that for those revenues and receipts, we are a “nontaxpayer”. Furthermore, once we make the determination of “gross income” and self-assessment on the tax return that only we can do on ourselves, the IRS has NO AUTHORITY to make us into a “taxpayer” or assess us an involuntary liability associated with any receipts other than those that we specifically identify as “gross income”:

“Our tax system is based on individual self-assessment and voluntary compliance”.
[Mortimer Caplin, Internal Revenue Audit Manual (1975)]

Remember, the only amount we are responsible for paying is the amount we assess ourselves that appears on a tax return that ONLY WE FILL OUT. The Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 5.1.11.6.8 confirms that the IRS is NOT AUTHORIZED to do a Substitute For Return (SFR) on our behalf for the IRS Form 1040 or any of its derivatives (e.g. 1040X, 1040EZ, 1040NR, etc). Furthermore, [26 C.F.R. §1.6151-1](#) confirms that you are only responsible for paying the amount shown on a return (because it says “shall pay”).

TITLE 26--INTERNAL REVENUE
CHAPTER I--INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
Procedure and Administration--Table of Contents

Sec. 1.6151-1 Time and place for paying tax shown on returns.

(a) In general.

Except as provided in section 6152 and paragraph (b) of this section, the tax shown on any income tax return shall, without assessment or notice and demand, be paid to the internal revenue officer with whom the return is filed at the time fixed for filing the return (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing the return). For provisions relating to the time for filing income tax returns, see section 6072 and Secs. 1.6072-1 to 1.6072-4, inclusive. For provisions relating to the place for filing income tax returns, see section 6091 and Secs. 1.6091-1 to 1.6091-4, inclusive.

(b)(1) Returns on which tax is not shown.

If a taxpayer files a return and in accordance with section 6014 and the regulations thereunder, elects not to show the tax on the return, the amount of tax determined to be due shall be paid within 30 days after the date of mailing to the taxpayer a notice stating the amount payable and making demand upon the taxpayer therefor. However, if the notice is mailed to the taxpayer more than 30 days before the due date of the return, payment of the tax shall not be required prior to such due date.

26 U.S.C. §6020(b) does not authorize the IRS to do an assessment on you because only you (as the “sovereign”) can do an assessment on yourself for a voluntary donation program called the Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A. The only exception to this rule is under 26 U.S.C. §6014, where you can delegate to the IRS the authority to do a return on your behalf, which we don’t recommend. Are you beginning to see through the fog? It took us four years of diligent study to figure this scam out and we are trying to save you some time.

We wish to conclude this section by revealing some very important implications of being a “nontaxpayer” that we need to be very aware of in order to avoid jeopardizing our status and creating a false presumption that we are a “taxpayer”, which are summarized below:

1. You cannot quote any section of the Internal Revenue Code that requires you to be a “taxpayer” in order to claim its benefit. For instance, 26 U.S.C. §7433, which purports to allow anyone to file a suit against an IRS agent for wrongful collection actions, says the following:

TITLE 26 > Subtitle F > CHAPTER 76 > Subchapter B > § 7433
§ 7433. Civil damages for certain unauthorized collection actions

(a) In general

If, in connection with any collection of Federal tax with respect to a taxpayer, any officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service recklessly or intentionally, or by reason of negligence, disregards any provision of this title, or any regulation promulgated under this title, such taxpayer may bring a civil action for damages against the United States in a district court of the United States. Except as provided in section 7432, such civil action shall be the exclusive remedy for recovering damages resulting from such actions.

Note the phrase above “with respect to a taxpayer”, which are no accident. If you are a “nontaxpayer”, then you have no recourse under the above statute. HOWEVER, you still have recourse under the constitution for deprivation of property without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment. If you filed a lawsuit against an IRS agent, your remedy would then have come from citing the Constitution and possibly also cite the criminal code, which is also positive law, but NOT any part of the I.R.C.

2. You cannot call the Internal Revenue Code “law” or a “statute”, but only a “code” or a “title”. It can only be “law” if you are a “taxpayer”. What makes anything “law” is your consent, according to the Declaration of Independence, and calling the IRC “law” is an admission that you consent to its provisions and are subject to them. See section 5.4.1 through 5.4.3.6 the Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302 for details on this scam.
3. You cannot fill out and submit any form that can only be used by “taxpayers” nor can you sign any form that uses the word “taxpayer” to identify you. Family Guardian has gone through and created substitute versions of most major IRS forms to remove such false presumptions from the forms at:
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/IRS/IRSFFormsPubs.htm>
4. When you get an IRS notice that either calls you a “taxpayer” or uses a “Taxpayer Identification Number” (TIN), then the notice is in error and you have a duty to bring this to the attention of the IRS. Only “taxpayers” can have a TIN.
5. You must include the following language in all your correspondence with the tax authorities in order to emphasize your status as a “nontaxpayer”:

I look forward to being corrected promptly in anything you believe is inconsistent with reality found in this correspondence or any of its attachments. If you do not respond, I shall conclude that you believe I am a "nontaxpayer" who is neither subject to nor liable for any internal revenue tax.

"The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws..."

"The distinction between persons and things within the scope of the revenue laws and those without is vital."
[Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236, 238 (1922)]

I remind you that your own IRS mission statement says that you can only help "taxpayers" to understand their tax responsibilities and therefore, if you won't talk with me, the only thing I can logically conclude is that I must not be a "taxpayer" and instead am a "nontaxpayer" not subject to any provision within the I.R.C. In that case, thank you for confirming that I am person outside your jurisdiction and not "liable" for any internal revenue tax:

Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 1.1.1.1 (02-26-1999) TA \I "Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 1.1.1.1 (02-26-1999)" \s "Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 1.1.1.1 (02-26-1999)" \c 3
IRS Mission and Basic Organization

The IRS Mission: **Provide America's taxpayers top quality service** by helping them understand and meet their tax responsibilities and by applying the tax law with integrity and fairness to all.

6. Any IRS publication addressed to "taxpayers" isn't meant for you and you cannot rely upon it. For instance, [IRS Publication 1 is entitled Your Rights as a Taxpayer](#). The title of this publication is an oxymoron: Taxpayers don't have rights! A "nontaxpayer" cannot cite this pamphlet as authority for defending his rights. We called the IRS and asked them if they have an equivalent pamphlet for "nontaxpayers" and they said no. Then we asked whether the rights mentioned in the pamphlet also apply to "nontaxpayers" and they reluctantly said "yes". Someone wrote an "improved" version of this pamphlet entitled [Your Rights as a Nontaxpayer](#) which you may wish to read at: <http://sedm.org/LibertyU/NontaxpayerBOR.pdf>

6.2 Presumptions About Credibility of IRS Publications

Many people falsely "presume" that what appears in the IRS Publications is truthful and accurate, and that the IRS is just as accountable for what they put in those publications as what a person would put on their tax return. After all, isn't this the very essence of "equal protection of the law"? Well, we have news for you: Everyone who believes this is making yet another false presumption. In fact, the federal courts and the IRS' own Internal Revenue Manual address this issue quite forcefully, by saying that you not only cannot and should not trust ANYTHING THAT APPEARS IN ANY IRS PUBLICATION OR ON THE IRS WEBSITE, but that you can also be PENALIZED for relying on these sources. Ditto for anything an IRS or government representative individually says or writes. This may sound hard to believe, but our corrupt federal courts refuse to hold the IRS accountable for any of the following:

1. The content of their publications or even their forms. See Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.8.
2. Following its own written procedures found in the [Internal Revenue Manual \(IRM\)](#)
3. Following the procedural regulations developed by the Secretary of the Treasury under [26 C.F.R. Part 601](#).
4. The oral agreements or statements that its representatives make, even when their delegation order authorizes them to make such agreements. Instead, most settlements and agreements must be reduced to writing or they are unenforceable.

For this determination, we rely on the following cases, downloaded from the VersusLaw website (<http://www.versuslaw.com>) and posted prominently on our website. Read the authorities for yourself. We have highlighted the most pertinent parts of these authorities:

Table 2: Things IRS is NOT responsible or accountable for

<i>Not responsible for:</i>	<i>Controlling Case(s):</i>
Following revenue rulings, handbooks, etc	CWT Farms Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 755 F.2d. 790 (11th Cir. 03/19/1985)

Following procedures in the Internal Revenue Manual (IRM)	U.S. v. Will, 671 F.2d. 963 (1982)
Following procedural regulations found in 26 C.F.R. Part 601	1. Einhorn v. Dewitt, 618 F.2d. 347 (5th Cir. 06/04/1980) 2. Luhring v. Glotzbach, 304 F.2d. 560 (4th Cir. 05/28/1962)
Oral agreements or statements	Boulez v. C.I.R., 258 U.S.App. D.C. 90, 810 F.2d. 209 (1987)

The most blatant and clear statement was made in the case of *CWT Farms, Inc.*, above, which ruled:

"It is unfortunately all too common for government manuals, handbooks, and in-house publications to contain statements that were not meant or are not wholly reliable. If they go counter to governing statutes and regulations of the highest or higher dignity, e.g. regulations published in the Federal Register, they do not bind the government, and persons relying on them do so at their peril. Caterpillar Tractor Co. v. United States, 589 F.2d. 1040, 1043, 218 Ct.Cl. 517 (1978) (A Handbook for Exporters, a Treasury publication). Dunphy v. United States [529 F.2d. 532, 208 Ct.Cl. 986 (1975)], supra (Navy publication entitled All Hands). In such cases it is necessary to examine any informal publication to see if it was really written to fasten legal consequences on the government. Dunphy, supra. See also Donovan v. United States, 139 U.S. App. D.C. 364, 433 F.2d. 522 (D.C.Cir.), cert. denied, 401 U.S. 944, 91 S.Ct. 955, 28 L.Ed.2d. 225 (1971). (Employees Performance Improvement Handbook, an FAA publication)(merely advisory and directory publications do not have mandatory consequences). Bartholomew v. United States, 740 F.2d. 526, 532 n. 3 (7th Cir. 1984)(quoting Fiorentino v. United States, 607 F.2d. 963, 968, 221 Ct.Cl. 545 (1979), cert. denied, 444 U.S. 1083, 100 S.Ct. 1039, 62 L.Ed.2d. 768 (1980).

*Lecroy 's proposition that the statements in the handbook were binding is inapposite to the accepted law among the circuits that publications are not binding.*fn15 We find that the Commissioner did not abuse his discretion in promulgating the challenged regulations. First, Farms and International did not justifiably rely on the Handbook. Taxpayers who rely on Treasury publications, which are mere guidelines, do so at their peril. Caterpillar Tractor v. United States, 589 F.2d. 1040, 1043, 218 Ct.Cl. 517 (1978). Further, the Treasury's position on the sixty-day rule was made public through proposed section 1.993-2(d)(2) in 1972, before the taxable years at issue. Charbonnet v. United States, 455 F.2d. 1195, 1199- 1200 (5th Cir.1972). See also Wendland v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 739 F.2d. 580, 581 (11th Cir.1984). Second, whatever harm has been suffered by Farms and International resulted from a lack of prudence. As even the Lecroy 751 F.2d. at 127. See also 79 T.C. at 1069. "*
[*CWT Farms Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 755 F.2d. 790 (11th Cir. 03/19/1985)*]

Even the IRS' own [Internal Revenue Manual \(IRM\)](#) warns you that you ***can't*** depend on their publications, which include all of their forms!:

"IRS Publications, issued by the National Office, explain the law in plain language for taxpayers and their advisors... While a good source of general information, publications should not be cited to sustain a position."
[Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.8 (05-14-1999)]

After reading the above, additional conclusions and inferences can safely and soundly be drawn by implication:

1. If the IRS is not responsible for following its own internal regulations found in [26 C.F.R. Part 601](#), then it couldn't possibly be held liable for what it puts in its publications to the public EITHER. They could literally lie through their teeth and fool everyone into thinking they were "taxpayers" and not be held liable.
2. In the *Boulez* case above, an IRS representative who had explicit authority to make an agreement with the "taxpayer" still could not be held accountable for an oral agreement. This implies that all the phone advice given by IRS agents on their national 800 number cannot be relied upon as a basis for "good faith belief".
3. ONLY the Statutes at Large, as well as the regulations written by the Secretary of the Treasury found in [26 C.F.R. Part 1](#) and [26 C.F.R. Part 301](#), may be relied upon as having the "force of law", as the courts above described. Since [26 U.S.C.](#) (also called the Internal Revenue Code) was never enacted as positive law, it stands only as "prima facie evidence of law" which may be rebutted by citing the sections of the Statutes at Large from which it was compiled.

To put one last nail in the coffin of this issue, below is a quote from a book entitled *Tax Procedure and Tax Fraud*, Patricia Morgan, 1999, ISBN 0-314-06586-5, West Group:

p. 21: "As discussed in §2.3.3, the ***IRS is not bound by its statements or positions in unofficial pamphlets and publications.***"

p. 34: "6. IRS Pamphlets and Booklets. ***The IRS is not bound by statements or positions in its unofficial publications, such as handbooks and pamphlets.***"

p. 34: "7. Other Written and Oral Advice. Most taxpayers' requests for advice from the IRS are made orally. Unfortunately, the IRS is not bound by answers or positions stated by its employees orally, whether in person or by telephone. According to the procedural regulations, 'oral advice is advisory only and the Service is not bound to recognize it in the examination of the taxpayer's return.' 26 C.F.R. §601.201(k)(2). In rare cases, however, the IRS has been held to be equitably estopped to take a position different from that stated orally to, and justifiably relied on by, the taxpayer. The Omnibus Taxpayer Bill of Rights Act, enacted as part of the Technical and Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1988, gives taxpayers some comfort, however. It amended section 6404 to require the Service to abate any penalty or addition to tax that is attributable to advice furnished in writing by any IRS agent or employee acting within the scope of his official capacity. Section 6404 as amended protects the taxpayer only if the following conditions are satisfied: the written advice from the IRS was issued in response to a written request from the taxpayer; reliance on the advice was reasonable; and the error in the advice did not result from inaccurate or incomplete information having been furnished by the taxpayer. Thus, it will still be difficult to bind the IRS even to written statements made by its employees. As was true before, taxpayers may be penalized for following oral advice from the IRS."

[Tax Procedure and Tax Fraud, Patricia Morgan, 1999, ISBN 0-314-06586-5, West Group]

If the IRS isn't held accountable in a court of law for what they say or even what they write, then they are, by implication, totally unaccountable to the public that they were put into existence to "serve". The Internal Revenue SERVICE, therefore, only SERVES the interests of itself and not the public at large. Furthermore, we believe the same rules should apply to Americans submitting their tax returns as those that apply to the IRS: not liable or responsible for what is written on the return. For instance, the "I declare under penalty of perjury" should be replaced with "I declare that this return as accurate and trustworthy as the advice and writings of the IRS". That is equivalent to saying that it is untrue and NOT trustworthy, and that will get you off the hook and also point out the hypocrisy and lawlessness of the IRS! What is good for the goose is good for the gander. Any other approach would be to condone hypocrisy and lawlessness and tyranny on the part of our government. Why aren't IRS agents required to sign their correspondence under penalty of perjury like all of the communication coming from the "taxpayer" so they CAN be held accountable? Here is what the U.S. Supreme Court had to say about this kind of hypocrisy and lawlessness. You be the judge!:

"Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker [or a hypocrite with double standards], it breeds contempt for the law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy. To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means...would bring terrible retribution. Against that pernicious doctrine this Court should resolutely set its face."

[Justice Brandeis, *Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 438, 485. (1928)]

If you would like to know more about what constitutes a "reasonable basis for belief" about one's tax liability, a free memorandum of law is available on the subject at the address below:

[Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #05.007
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

The exhaustive analysis of all sources of law in the article above concludes that the only sources of information you can use in forming a reasonable belief about tax liability are:

1. The Constitution.
2. Rulings of the Supreme Court and not lower Courts.
3. The Statutes at large after January 2, 1939.

The above article also concludes that no other resource of information, including the advice of a tax professional or the Internal Revenue Code, are reasonable sources of authoritative belief that are useful in forming a reasonable belief that can stand court scrutiny and survive a criminal prosecution.

6.3 IRS authority and jurisdiction presumptions

The Judicial Branch of the government isn't the only one that makes extensive use of presumption in its favor. The IRS and state revenue agencies are notorious for this abusive and illegal tactic as well. Below are some examples of how they do this:

1. IRS authority to make assessments or to change your self-assessment presumptions. Because our income tax system is based on voluntary self assessment and payment, according to the Supreme Court in *Flora v. United States*, 362 U.S. 145 (1960), then the only person who can assess you, a human being, with a liability under Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code is YOU and only YOU and the only person who can file a return with your name on it is you. The IRS'

own Internal Revenue Manual, in section [5.1.11.6.10](#) clearly shows that Substitute For Returns (SFRs), which are returns filed in place of those which “taxpayers” refuse to file, cannot be filed for any specie of IRS Form 1040s (1040, 1040A, 1040EZ, etc) and the reason is because the tax is voluntary, which is to say more properly that it is a DONATION and not a TAX. Once you make this “assessment” as authorized by [26 U.S.C. §6201\(a\)\(1\)](#) and send it in, the IRS has no lawful authority to change or adjust the assessment, even if they believe you made an error, without your permission! You can search for implementing regulations under 26 C.F.R. 1.X until the cows come home and you won’t find a regulation that authorizes them to change your self assessment! Your average misinformed American, however, naturally “assumes” that the IRS has the authority to change it whether you want to or not. If the IRS then finds that you did make an error, they will “presume” that they have the lawful authority to change it by typically sending back a revised assessment and give you a certain amount of time to respond or protest it before it becomes cast in stone. When they do this, they are basically asking you for permission to make the change, and your silence or acquiescence constitutes implied consent to the change. This whole scheme works in the IRS’ favor because of the ignorance of the average American about what the law really says. It seems that too many people have been relying on IRS publications rather than reading the law for themselves. BUT, you can shift this contemptible situation completely around the other way in your favor by knowing the law! All you have to do is attach to your return specific instructions stating specifically and clearly that the IRS:

- 1.1. May NOT change or especially increase the amount of “income” on the return without invalidating EVERYTHING on the return and causing you to withdraw your consent. This makes the return to be filed under duress and inadmissible as evidence in court according to the Supreme Court in *Weeks v. United States*, 232 U.S. 383 (1914).
- 1.2. May not rely on hearsay evidence of receipt of funds from employers in the form of W-2 or 1099 forms, because they are not authenticated with a notary affidavit.
- 1.3. May not file a Substitute for Return (SFR) in place of your return because there is no statute or implementing regulation authorizing it and section [5.1.11.6.10](#) of the Internal Revenue Manual does not allow it either.
- 1.4. Should not assume that the form or ANY information on it is *accurate* if the form IN TOTAL is not accurate and acceptable AS SUBMITTED.
- 1.5. Is not authorized to “propose” any changes, only to file the return IN TOTAL in your administrative record and send you a letter explaining what they disagree with and the authorities (statutes and regulations and IRM sections and Supreme Court rulings) their determination is based on.
- 1.6. If they protest the amount of “income” on the return, must provide a definition of “income” that is consistent with the following web address and with the Constitutional definition made by the Supreme Court:
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/income.htm>
- 1.7. Any protests or disagreements they make must include a cite of the specific statutes AND implementing regulations AND the section from the Internal Revenue Manual which document and authorize their position or their position will be will presumed in the absence of evidence to the contrary to be illegal, unlawful, not authorized by law, null and void, and *frivolous*.
- 1.8. May not cite any court case below the Supreme Court as justification for their position, based on the content of their own [Internal Revenue Manual, section 4.10.7.2.9.8](#).
- 1.9. May not institute penalties because they violate the prohibition on Bills of Attainder under Article 1, Section 9, Clause 3 of the Constitution and because such penalties can only apply to employees of a corporation per 26 C.F.R. §301.6671-1(b), which you are not until proven otherwise, with EVIDENCE.

If you use the above tactics and file a return with a 1 cent “income” and ask for all your money back, that along with the above tactics will drive the average IRS agent bonkers and he simply won’t know what to do and he will have no choice but to give you your ALL your withheld tax back!

2. Legitimate authority presumptions: When an IRS agent or investigator contacts someone to investigate a tax matter, the average Joe six pack citizen “presumes” that they have authority to do what they are doing. After all, the agent will pull out a rather official looking “pocket commission” that makes it look like they are official. However, in most cases this pocket commission is an “Administrative” commission issued to administrative IRS employees who have no authority whatsoever to be doing any kind of enforcement actions such as investigations, seizures, liens, and levies. Administrative pocket commissions are easily recognizable because they have a serial number that begins with the letter “A”, indicating that they are Administrative rather than “E”, which means Enforcement. Enforcement Pocket Commissions are black instead of Red in color. This is also covered in section 5.4.9 of the *Great IRS Hoax*, Form #11.302. Whenever you talk with an IRS agent in person or on the phone, demand to see their pocket commission and get the serial number of their pocket commission for your records so you can sue the bastard if he illegally institutes collection actions in violation of 26 U.S.C. §7433 and 26 U.S.C. §7214. When they appear or call for questions, tell them you are really glad to see them and say that you will be cooperating fully with them AFTER they answer your questions first which will prove they have authority to be doing what they are doing. This amounts to a conditional

acceptance and it will be very hard for them to argue with you. This is the way that you can “question authority” if you have an IRS agent breathing down your neck. Then when they start answering your questions about their authority to investigate, grill them on camera or using a tape recorder with witnesses present in the room using the following:

Tax Deposition Questions, Form #03.016
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. Consent for withholding of Social Security Insurance Premiums presumption. If one is hired on to work for the government, then under 5 U.S.C. §8422, they are “deemed” to consent to the withholding of Social Security and Medicare and are never even asked whether they want to do so. Use of the word “deemed” is legalese for “presumed”. Below is the content of that section. Refer to section 5.9.7 of the Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302 for further details on this conspiracy against your property rights:

5 U.S.C. §8422 Deductions of OASDI for Federal Employees

(b) Each employee or Member is deemed to consent and agree to the deductions under subsection (a). Notwithstanding any law or regulation affecting the pay of an employee or Member, payment less such deductions is a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands for regular services during the period covered by the payment, except the right to any benefits under this subchapter, or under subchapter IV or V of this chapter, based on the service of the employee or Member.

6.4 “Word of Art” Presumptions

We need to be very careful when corresponding with the government, and especially when filling out their forms.

1. “Taxpayer” presumptions. The IRS refers to everyone as “taxpayers”, creating a false presumption on everyone’s part that we indeed are. As you may also learn from reading Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.6.1, there is no statute making anyone liable for paying Subtitle A income taxes and without a liability statute, then no one is “subject to” that part of the Internal Revenue Code unless they volunteer to be. Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.3.1 also shows that the only person who can lawfully identify you as a “taxpayer” is you, and that the government has no authority to use this word to describe you without your consent. In most tax trials, the judges or juries will seldom question the determinations of the IRS. Instead, the burden falls on the “taxpayer” to prove that the IRS’ determinations were incorrect. Then the IRS will refuse to provide evidence to this alleged “taxpayer” that is needed for him to prove that they are wrong. Here is how the Supreme Court describes this scandal in Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247 (1935):

Thus, the usual procedure for the recovery of debts is reversed in the field of taxation. Payment precedes defense, and the burden of proof, normally on the claimant, is shifted to the taxpayer.

The [tax] assessment supersedes the pleading, proof, and judgment necessary in an action at law, and has the force of such a judgment. The ordinary defendant stands in judgment only after a hearing. The taxpayer often is afforded his hearing after judgment and after payment, and his only redress for unjust administrative action is the right to claim restitution.⁴²

2. Government form presumptions. Filling out of most government forms is in most cases completely voluntary and unnecessary. Whenever you submit a government form, you are “presumed” to be in pursuit of a government “privilege” and consent to be bound by all laws of the government that produced that form, even if you would not otherwise be so! For instance:

- 2.1. If you submit an IRS Form 1040, you are “presumed” to be a “taxpayer” who is “subject to” the Internal Revenue Code, even though if you had not done so, you would not be.
- 2.2. The Department of State DS-11 form used for obtaining a U.S. passport has only one block for indicating your citizenship, which contains “U.S. citizen” and NO blocks for specifying that you are a “national”, creating a presumption that the only thing you can be in order to get a passport is a “U.S. citizen”.
- 2.3. The IRS Form W-8BEN creates a presumption that you are a “beneficial owner”, which is then defined as someone who has to include ALL income as gross income on their tax return, even though the law says this is not required. All of these are major, very serious, and FALSE presumptions that significantly prejudice and abuse your rights.

The government only gets away with this type of fraud and abuse because the people filling out the forms don’t question authority or challenge the presumptions on the form. We have successfully overcome most of these

⁴² U.S. v. Bull, 295 U.S. 247, 26 (1935), emphasis added.

presumptions by modifying or redesigning the forms in original print to shift the presumption in our favor before we submit it. The modified forms then slip by inattentive and underpaid government clerks and we can then use this as evidence in our favor. Fight fire with fire!

3. “residence” or “permanent residence” block on government forms presumption: If you fill in any federal form that has a block named any of the following, you are declaring a legal “domicile” and agreeing to become a “taxpayer” within that jurisdiction:

4.1. “residence”: “Residence” is equivalent to “domicile” for legal purposes. According to 26 C.F.R. §1.871-2, the only people who can have a “residence” are “aliens” and not “U.S. citizens” as defined under 8 U.S.C. §1401, “nonresident aliens” as defined under 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B), or “nationals” but not “citizens” under 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21). When you declare a “residence” on a government tax form, you are declaring TWO things, not one: (1) That you are an “alien”; (2) That you have a domicile in the place indicated. You don’t want to declare EITHER of these things on any government form, folks!

4.2. “permanent address”: This is equivalent to “domicile”.

4.3. “domicile”: A person’s domicile establishes where they are a “taxpayer”.

For details, see the article entitled “Why ‘domicile’ and income taxes are voluntary” available at:

<http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>

4. Social Security Number presumptions.

4.1. The Treasury Regulations in 26 C.F.R. contain a presumption that if you have a Socialist Security Number, then you must be a “U.S. person” with a domicile in the District of Columbia:

[26 C.F.R. § 301.6109-1\(g\)](#)

(g) Special rules for taxpayer identifying numbers issued to foreign persons—

(1) General rule—

(i) Social security number.

A social security number is generally identified in the records and database of the Internal Revenue Service as a number belonging to a U.S. citizen or resident alien individual. A person may establish a different status for the number by providing proof of foreign status with the Internal Revenue Service under such procedures as the Internal Revenue Service shall prescribe, including the use of a form as the Internal Revenue Service may specify. Upon accepting an individual as a nonresident alien individual, the Internal Revenue Service will assign this status to the individual's social security number.

You will note that “citizens” (under 8 U.S.C. §1401) and “residents” (under 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A)) have in common a legal “domicile” in the “United States”, which is defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) as the District of Columbia and no part of any state of the Union.

4.2. Those who put a Social Security Number on any government form also create a presumption that they are federal “employees” or “public officers” on official federal government business in the context of whatever they attach the Social Security Number to. 20 C.F.R. §422.104 describes the conditions under which SSNs may be issued. You will note that Title 20 of the C.F.R. says “EMPLOYEE BENEFITS”, which means federal employees and not private employees. This means that the number can only be issued to and therefore used by federal “employees” on official business. 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) furthermore says that “Social Security Numbers” are government property. Government property can only be issued to government employees on official business. It is a crime to use “public property” for a “private use”:

4.3.1. 18 U.S.C. §641 makes it a crime to embezzle public property, including the SSN, and use it for private use.

4.3.2. 18 U.S.C. §912 makes it a crime to impersonate a federal officer or employee.

4.3.3. 18 U.S.C. §208 makes it a crime to perform any act with government property that affects a “private interest”.

5. Use of the word “resident” presumptions. There is a presumption that if you use the word “resident” on any government form, then you are an alien with a domicile in the District of Columbia. This is confirmed by the definition of “resident” found in 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A). This subject is exhaustively covered in the free article entitled “You’re Not a ‘resident’ under the Internal Revenue Code” available at:

<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Citizenship/Resident.htm>

6. Use of the word “U.S. citizen” presumptions: There is a presumption that if you describe yourself as “U.S. citizen”, then you are a statutory “U.S. citizen” defined under 8 U.S.C. §1401 who maintains a domicile in a federal territory, possession, or area within a state and NOT within a state of the Union. Persons domiciled in a state of the Union are

not “U.S. citizens”, but rather “nationals but not citizens” defined in 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) and 8 U.S.C. §1452. See the article below:

Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

7. Tax Return Presumptions: If you fill out a federal tax return, the IRS will make the following often false presumptions:

- 7.1. That you are a “U.S. person” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30) and who maintains a domicile in the District of Columbia under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10). This is also confirmed by IRS Document 7130, which identifies the IRS Form 1040 for use only by “citizens” and “residents” of the “United States”, both of whom have in common a domicile in the District of Columbia.
- 7.2. That you are a “taxpayer” subject to the I.R.C. as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14). After all, a “nontaxpayer” is not required to file tax returns and should at least theoretically have no reason to send in a form.
- 7.3. That the submitter has excise taxable earnings called “gross income” (defined under 26 U.S.C. §61) which are “effectively connected with a trade or business” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26). In fact, the ONLY type of “income” that can go on the IRS Form 1040 is “trade or business” in come from sources within the District of Columbia. This is confirmed by 26 U.S.C. §864(c)(3). See the article below:

The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

7.4. That if a Social Security Number appears on the form, then the submitter is acting as a Social Security Trustee, who is a federal “employee” on official business managing the Social Security Trust for the benefit of its Beneficiary, which is not the Trustee but the United States Government. See the following for proof of this scam:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

8. Authority of federal courts presumptions. The IRS will commonly cite irrelevant case law in its correspondence from the Circuit, District, and Tax Courts which its own Internal Revenue Manual says may NOT be cited. What this amounts to is a “presumption” of authority where none actually exists. This results in an abuse of due process if done against a “nontaxpayer”. Below is the IRS’ own guidance on this subject to prove that they are violating their own rules:

Internal Revenue Manual
Section 4.10.7.2.9.8 (01-01-2006)

1 “Decisions made at various levels of the court system are considered to be interpretations of tax laws and may be used by either examiners or taxpayers to support a position.

2. Certain court cases lend more weight to a position than others. A case decided by the U.S. Supreme Court becomes the law of the land and takes precedence over decisions of lower courts. The Internal Revenue Service must follow Supreme Court decisions. For examiners, Supreme Court decisions have the same weight as the Code.

3. Decisions made by lower courts, such as Tax Court, District Courts, or Claims Court, are binding on the Service only for the particular taxpayer and the years litigated. Adverse decisions of lower courts do not require the Service to alter its position for other taxpayers.”
[SOURCE: http://www.irs.gov/irm/part4/irm_04-010-007.html]

6.5 “Exempt” presumptions on IRS Forms

Another devious technique frequently used on government forms to trick “nontaxpayers” into making an unwitting election to become “taxpayers” is:

1. Omit the “not subject” option.
2. Present the “exempt” option as the only method for avoiding the liability described.
3. Do one of the following:
 - 3.1. Statutorily define the term “exempt” to exclude persons who are “not subject”.
 - 3.2. PRESUME that the word “exempt” excludes persons who are “not subject” and hope you don’t challenge the presumption.

This form of abuse exploits the common false presumption among most Americans, which is the following:

1 "Government forms present ALL of the lawful options available to avoid the liability described."

2 In fact, government is famous for limiting options in order to advantage or benefit them. In effect, they are constraining your
3 options to compel you to select the lesser of evils and remove the ability to avoid all evil. This devious technique is also
4 called an "adhesion contract". In summary, they are violating the First Amendment by instituting compelled association in
5 which you are coerced to engage in commercial activity with them and become subject to their pagan laws.

6 There are two ways that one can use to describe oneself on government forms:

- 7 1. "Exempt". This is a person who is otherwise subject to the provision of law administering the form because they are an
8 "individual" or "person" and yet who is expressly made exempt by a particular provision of the statutes forming the
9 franchise agreement. This option appears on most government forms.
- 10 2. "Not subject". This would be equivalent to a "nontaxpayer" who is not a "person" or franchisee within the meaning of
11 the statute in question. You almost never see this option on government forms.

12 There is a world of difference between these two statuses and we MUST understand the difference before we can know
13 whether or how to fill out a specific government form describing our status. In this section we will show you how to choose
14 the correct status above and all the affects that this status has on how we fill out government forms.

15 On the subject of "exempt", the U.S. Supreme Court has held the following:

16 *In imposing a tax, says Mr. Chief Justice Marshall, the legislature acts upon its constituents. "All subjects," he*
17 *adds, "over which the power of a State extends are objects of taxation, but those over which it does not extend*
18 *are, upon the soundest principles, exempt from taxation. This proposition *334 may almost be pronounced*
19 *self-evident." McCulloch v. Maryland, 4 Wheat. 316, 428.*
20 *[United States v. Erie R. Co., 106 U.S. 327 (1882)]*

21 From the above, we can see that:

- 22 1. The civil laws enacted by the legislature act ONLY upon "constituents" and "subjects". They DO NOT act upon "all
23 people", but only on "constituents" and "subjects".
- 24 2. You have to VOLUNTEER to become a "constituent" or "subject". See:
25

<i>Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent</i> , Form #05.002 http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
--
- 26 3. "Constituents" and "subjects" include STATUTORY "citizens" pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401, 26 U.S.C. §3121(e) and
27 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c) and exclude CONSTITUTIONAL citizens, who are "non-citizen nationals" under statutory law.
28 If you are not a STATUTORY citizen, which the court calls a "SUBJECT" or "constituent", then you can't be taxed.
29 The court refers to those who can't be taxed as "aliens", and they can only mean STATUTORY aliens, not
30 CONSTITUTIONAL aliens.
- 31 4. Federal tax liability is a CIVIL liability, and therefore, those who are not STATUTORY citizens domiciled on federal
32 territory cannot have such a CIVIL liability.
- 33 5. Like most other legal "words of art", there are TWO contexts in which the word "exempt" can be used:
34 5.1. Statutory law. This includes people who are "subjects" or "constituents", but who otherwise are granted a
35 privilege or exemption by virtue of their circumstances. An example would be the "exempt individual" found in
36 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(5).
37 5.2. Common law. This implies people who never consented to be and therefore are NOT "subjects" or
"constituents". Those who are NOT "subjects", are "not subject".

38 We will begin our explanation with an illustration. If you are domiciled in California, you would describe yourself as
39 "subject" to the laws in California. However, in relation to the laws of every other civil jurisdiction outside of California,
40 you would describe yourself as:

- 41 1. "Not subject" to the civil laws of that place unless you are physically visiting that place.
- 42 2. Not ANYTHING described in the civil law that the government has jurisdiction over or may impose a "duty" upon, such
43 as a "person", "individual", "taxpayer", etc.
- 44 3. Not a "foreign person" because not a "person" under the civil law.
- 45 4. "foreign".
- 46 5. A "nonresident".

1 6. A “transient foreigner”.

2 A human being who is domiciled in California, for instance, would not be subject to the civil laws of China unless he was
3 either visiting China or engaged in commerce within the legislative jurisdiction of China with people who were domiciled
4 there and therefore protected by the civil laws there. He would not describe himself as being “exempt” from the laws of
5 China, because one cannot be “exempt” without FIRST also being “subject” by having a domicile or residence within that
6 foreign jurisdiction. Another way of stating this is that he would not be a “person” under the civil laws of China and would
7 be “foreign” unless and until he either physically moved there or changed his domicile or residence to that place and thereby
8 became a “protected person” subject to the civil jurisdiction of the Chinese government.

9 All income taxation within the United States of America takes the form of an excise tax upon an “activity” implemented by
10 the civil law. In the case of the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A, that activity is called a “trade or business”. This fact
11 exhaustively proven in the following amazing article:

The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

12 A “trade or business” is then defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) as follows:

13 [TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 79](#) > § 7701
14 [§ 7701. Definitions](#)

15 (a) When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent
16 thereof—

17 (26) “The term ‘trade or business’ includes the performance of the functions [activities] of a public office.”

18 Those who therefore lawfully engage in a public office in the U.S. government BEFORE they sign or submit any tax form
19 are then described as a “franchisee” called a “taxpayer” under the terms of the excise tax or franchise agreement codified in
20 Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A. Those who are not “public officers” also cannot lawfully “elect” themselves into “public
21 office” by signing or submitting a tax form either, because this would constitute impersonating an officer or employee of the
22 government in violation of 18 U.S.C. §912. This is confirmed by 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(31), which describes all those who are
23 nonresident within the “United States” (District of Columbia) and not engaged in the “trade or business”/“public office”
24 activity as being a “foreign estate”, which simply means “not subject”, to the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A franchise or
25 excise tax:

26 [TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 79](#) > § 7701
27 [§ 7701. Definitions](#)

28 (a) When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent
29 thereof—

30 (31) Foreign estate or trust

31 (A) Foreign estate

32 The term “foreign estate” means an estate the income of which, from sources without the United States which is
33 not effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States, is not includible in
34 gross income under subtitle A.

35 The entity or “person” described above would NOT be “exempt”, but rather simply “not subject”. The reason is that the term
36 “exempt” has a specific legal definition that does not include the situation above. Notice that the term “exempt” is used along
37 with the word “individual”, meaning that you must be a “person” and an “individual” BEFORE you can call yourself
38 “exempt”:

39 [TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 79](#) > Sec. 7701.
40 [Sec. 7701. - Definitions](#)

41 (b)(5) Exempt individual defined

For purposes of this subsection -

(A) In general

An individual is an exempt individual for any day if, for such day, such individual is -

(i) a foreign government-related individual,

(ii) a teacher or trainee,

(iii) a student, or

(iv) a professional athlete who is temporarily in the United States to compete in a charitable sports event described in section 274(l)(1)(B).

(B) Foreign government-related individual

The term "foreign government-related individual" means any individual temporarily present in the United States by reason of -

(i) diplomatic status, or a visa which the Secretary (after consultation with the Secretary of State) determines represents full-time diplomatic or consular status for purposes of this subsection,

(ii) being a full-time employee of an international organization, or

(iii) being a member of the immediate family of an individual described in clause (i) or (ii).

(C) Teacher or trainee

The term "teacher or trainee" means any individual -

(i) who is temporarily present in the United States under subparagraph (J) or (Q) of section 101(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (other than as a student), and

(ii) who substantially complies with the requirements for being so present.

(D) Student

The term "student" means any individual -

(i) who is temporarily present in the United States -

(I) under subparagraph (F) or (M) of section 101(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or

(II) as a student under subparagraph (J) or (Q) of such section 101(15), and (ii) who substantially complies with the requirements for being so present.

(E) Special rules for teachers, trainees, and students

(i) Limitation on teachers and trainees

An individual shall not be treated as an exempt individual by reason of clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) for the current year if, for any 2 calendar years during the preceding 6 calendar years, such person was an exempt person under clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A). In the case of an individual all of whose compensation is described in section 872(b)(3), the preceding sentence shall be applied by substituting "4 calendar years" for "2 calendar years".

(ii) Limitation on students

For any calendar year after the 5th calendar year for which an individual was an exempt individual under clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A), such individual shall not be treated as an exempt individual by reason of clause (iii) of subparagraph (A), unless such individual establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such individual does not intend to permanently reside in the United States and that such individual meets the requirements of subparagraph (D)(ii).

The Internal Revenue Code itself does not and cannot regulate the conduct of those who are not “taxpayers”.

“Revenue Laws relate to taxpayers [officers, employees, and elected officials of the Federal Government] and not to non-taxpayers [American Citizens/American Nationals not subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government]. The latter are without their scope. No procedures are prescribed for non-taxpayers and no attempt is made to annul any of their Rights or Remedies in due course of law. With them[non-taxpayers] Congress does not assume to deal and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of federal revenue laws.”
[*Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S.*, 470 F.2d. 585 (1972)]

Consequently, all tax forms you fill out PRESUPPOSE that the person filling it out is a franchisee called a “taxpayer” who occupies a public office within the U.S. government and who is therefore a “person” or an “individual”. Since the Internal Revenue Code is civil law, it also must presuppose that all “persons” or “individuals” described within it are domiciled on federal territory that is no part of a state of the Union. This is confirmed by the definition of “United States” found in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10), which is defined as the District of Columbia and not part of any state of the Union. If you do not lawfully occupy such a public office, it would therefore constitute fraud and impersonating a public officer in violation of 18 U.S.C. §912 to even fill such a form out. If a company hands a “nontaxpayer” a tax form to fill out, the only proper response is ALL of the following, and any other response will result in the commission of a crime:

1. To not complete or sign any provision of the form.
2. To line out the entire form.
3. To write above the line “Not Applicable”.
4. To NOT select the “exempt” option within the form or select any status at all on the form. If you aren’t subject to the Internal Revenue Code because you don’t have a domicile on federal territory and don’t engage in taxable activities, then you can’t be described as a “person”, “individual”, “taxpayer”, or anything else who might be subject to the I.R.C.

“The foregoing considerations would lead, in case of doubt, to a construction of any statute as intended to be confined in its operation and effect to the territorial limits over which the lawmaker has general and legitimate power. ‘All legislation is prima facie territorial.’ Ex parte Blain, L. R. 12 Ch. Div. 522, 528; State v. Carter, 27 N. J. L. 499; People v. Merrill, 2 Park. Crim. Rep. 590, 596. Words having universal scope, such as ‘every contract in restraint of trade,’ ‘every person who shall monopolize,’ etc., will be taken, as a matter of course, to mean only everyone subject to such legislation, not all that the legislator subsequently may be able to catch. In the case of the present statute, the improbability of the United States attempting to make acts done in Panama or Costa Rica criminal is obvious, yet the law begins by making criminal the acts for which it gives a right to sue. We think it entirely plain that what the defendant did in Panama or Costa Rica is not within the scope of the statute so far as the present suit is concerned. Other objections of a serious nature are urged, but need not be discussed.”
[*American Banana Co. v. U.S. Fruit*, 213 U.S. 347 at 357-358]

5. To either not return the form to the person who asked for it or to return it with the modifications above.
6. If you return the form to the person who asked for it, to clarify on the form why you are not “exempt”, but rather “not subject”.
7. To attach the following form to the tax form:

Tax Form Attachment, Form #04.013
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Another alternative to all the above would be to simply add a “Not subject” option or to select “Exempt” and then redefine the word to add the “not subject” option to the definition. Then you could attach the Tax Form Attachment mentioned above, which also redefines words on the government form to immunize yourself from government jurisdiction.

If we had an honorable government that loved the people under its care and protection more than it loved deceiving you out of and stealing your money, then they would indicate at the top of the form in big bold letters EXACTLY what laws are being enforced and who the intended audience is so that those who are not required to fill it out would not do so. However, if they did that, hardly anyone would ever pay taxes again. Of this SCAM, the Bible and a famous bible commentary says the following:

*“Getting treasures by a lying tongue [or by deliberate omission intended to deceive] is the fleeting fantasy of those who seek **death**.”*
[*Prov. 21:6*, Bible, NKJV]

*“As religion towards God is a branch of universal righteousness (he is not an honest man that is not devout), so **righteousness towards men is a branch of true religion, for he is not a godly man that is not honest**, nor can he expect that his devotion should be accepted; for, **I. Nothing is more offensive to God than deceit in commerce.**”*

A false balance is here put for all manner of unjust and fraudulent practices [of our public dis-servants] in dealing with any person [within the public], which are all an abomination to the Lord, and render those abominable [hated] to him that allow themselves in the use of such accursed arts of thriving. It is an affront to justice, which God is the patron of, as well as a wrong to our neighbour, whom God is the protector of. Men [in the IRS and the Congress] make light of such frauds, and think there is no sin in that which there is money to be got by, and, while it passes undiscovered, they cannot blame themselves for it; a blot is no blot till it is hit, Hos. 12:7, 8. But they are not the less an abomination to God, who will be the avenger of those that are defrauded by their brethren. 2. Nothing is more pleasing to God than fair and honest dealing, nor more necessary to make us and our devotions acceptable to him: A just weight is his delight. He himself goes by a just weight, and holds the scale of judgment with an even hand, and therefore is pleased with those that are herein followers of him. A balance cheats, under pretence of doing right most exactly, and therefore is the greater abomination to God."
[Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible; Henry, M., 1996, c1991, under Prov. 11:1]

In the case of income tax forms, for instance, the warning described above would say the following:

1. This form is only intended for those who satisfy all the following conditions:

1.1. "taxpayer" as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14):

"Revenue Laws relate to taxpayers [officers, employees, instrumentalities, and elected officials of the Federal Government] and not to non-taxpayers [American Citizens/American Nationals not subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government]. The latter are without their scope. No procedures are prescribed for non-taxpayers and no attempt is made to annul any of their Rights or Remedies in due course of law. With them[non-taxpayers] Congress does not assume to deal and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of federal revenue laws."
[Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S., 470 F.2d. 585 (1972)]

1.2. Lawfully engaged in a "public office" in the U.S. government, which is called a "trade or business" in the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A at 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26).

1.3. Exercising the public office ONLY within the District of Columbia as required by 4 U.S.C. §72, which is within the only remaining internal revenue district, as confirmed by Treasury Order 150-02.

2. If you do not satisfy all the requirements indicated above, then you DO NOT need to fill out this form, nor can you claim the status of "exempt".

3. This form is ONLY for use by "taxpayers". If you are a "nontaxpayer", then we don't have a form you can use to document your status. This is because our mission statement only allows us to help "taxpayers". It is self-defeating to help "nontaxpayers" because it only undermines our revenue and importance. We are a business and we only focus our energies on things that make money for us, such as deceiving "nontaxpayers" into thinking they are "taxpayers". That is why we don't put a "nontaxpayer" or "not subject" option on our forms: Because we want to self-servingly and prejudicially presume that EVERYONE is engaged in our franchise and subject to our plunder and control.

Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 1.1.1.1 (02-26-1999)
IRS Mission and Basic Organization

The IRS Mission: Provide America's taxpayers top quality service by helping them understand and meet their tax responsibilities and by applying the tax law with integrity and fairness to all.

We hope that you have learned from this section that:

1. He who makes the rules or the forms always wins the game. The power to create includes the power to define.
2. All government forms are snares or traps designed to trap the innocent and ignorant into servitude to the whims of corrupted politicians and lawyers.

"The Lord is well pleased for His righteousness' sake; He will exalt the law and make it honorable. But this is a people robbed and plundered! [by the IRS] All of them are snared in [legal] holes [by the sophistry of greedy IRS lawyers], and they are hidden in prison houses; they are for prey, and no one delivers; for plunder, and no one says, "Restore!"

Who among you will give ear to this? Who will listen and hear for the time to come? Who gave Jacob for plunder, and Israel to the robbers? [IRS] Was it not the Lord, He against whom we have sinned? For they would not walk in His ways, nor were they obedient to His law, therefore He has poured on him the fury of His anger and the strength of battle; it has set him on fire all around, yet he did not know; and it burned him, yet he did not take it to heart."
[Isaiah 42:21-25, Bible, NKJV]a

3. The snare is the presumptions which they deliberately do not disclose on the forms and which are buried in the “words of art” contained in their void for vagueness codes. See:

Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

4. The main reason for reading and learning the law is to reveal all the presumptions and deceptive “words of art” that are hidden on government forms so that you can avoid them.

"My [God's] people are destroyed [and enslaved] for lack of knowledge [of God's Laws and the lack of education that produces it]."

[[Hosea 4:6](#), Bible, NKJV]

"And thou shalt teach them ordinances and laws [of both [God](#) and [man](#)], and shalt shew them the way wherein they must walk, and the work [of obedience to God] that they must do."

[[Exodus 18:20](#), Bible, NKJV]

"This [Book of the Law](#) shall not depart from your mouth, but you shall meditate in it day and night, that you may observe to do according to all that is written in it. For then you will make your way prosperous, and then you will have good success. Have I not commanded you? Be strong and of good courage; do not be afraid, nor be dismayed, for the LORD your God is with you wherever you go."

[[Joshua 1:8-9](#), Bible, NKJV]

5. Government forms deliberately do not disclose the presumptions that are being made about the proper audience for the form in order to maximize the possibility that they can exploit your legal ignorance to induce you to make a “tithe” to their state-sponsored civil religion and church of socialism. That religion is exhaustively described below:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

6. All government forms are designed to encourage you to waive sovereign immunity and engage in commerce with the government. Government does not make forms for those who refuse to do business with them such as “nontaxpayers”, “nonresidents”, or “transient foreigners”. If you want a form that accurately describes your status as a “nontaxpayer” and which preserves your sovereignty and sovereign immunity, you will have to design your own. Government is *never* going to make it easy to reduce their own revenues, importance, power, or control over you. Everyone in the government is there because they want the largest possible audience of “customers” for their services. Another way of saying this is that they are going to do everything within their power to rig things so that it is impossible to avoid contracting with or doing business with them. This approach has the effect of compelling you to contract with them in violation of Article 1, Section 10 of the Constitution, which is supposed to protect your right to NOT contract with the government.

7. The Thirteenth Amendment prohibits involuntary servitude. Consequently, the government cannot lawfully impose any duty, including the duty to fill out or submit a government form. Therefore, you should view every opportunity that presents itself to fill out a government form as an act of contracting away your rights.

8. In the case of government tax forms, the purpose of all government tax forms is to ask the following presumptuous and prejudicial question:

“What kind of ‘taxpayer’ are you?”

. . .rather than the question:

“Are you a ‘taxpayer’?”

The above approach results in what the legal profession refers to as a “leading question”, which is a question contaminated by a prejudicial presumption and therefore inadmissible as evidence. Federal Rule of Evidence 611(c) expressly forbids such leading questions to be used as evidence, which is also why no IRS form can really qualify as evidence that can be used against anyone: It doesn’t offer a “nontaxpayer” or a “foreigner” option. An example of such a question is the following:

“Have you always beat your wife?”

The presumption hidden within the above leading question is that you are a “wife beater”. Replace the word “wife beater” with “taxpayer” and you know the main method by which the IRS stays in business.

7 Using presumption to win against the government

7.1 Federal Pleading Attachment

Those litigating in federal court are sitting ducks in relation to the presumptions of government prosecutors and judges. Just about everything the government does to win focuses on the abuse of one or more forms of presumption. Their techniques, however, have an Achilles Heel. Their malicious and abusive techniques:

1. Depend on your omission in completely and truthfully characterizing your status in relation to the government. If you don't characterize yourself as a person outside their jurisdiction, they are entitled to assume that you are until proven otherwise. You can't participate in their protection franchise without being a protected person within their jurisdiction.
2. Are based on abuse of "words of art".
3. Mainly attempt to add things to definitions that aren't expressly there, in violation of the rules of statutory interpretation.

"It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term. Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392, and n. 10 (1979). Congress' use of the term "propaganda" in this statute, as indeed in other legislation, has no pejorative connotation.[19] As judges, it is our duty to [481 U.S. 485] construe legislation as it is written, not as it might be read by a layman, or as it might be understood by someone who has not even read it."

[Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484 (1987)]

"When a statute includes an explicit definition, we must follow that definition, even if it varies from that term's ordinary meaning." *Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987)* ("It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term"); *Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10* ("As a rule, 'a definition which declares what a term "means" . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated'"); *Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945)*; *Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935)* (Cardozo, J.); see also 2A N. Singer, *Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction* § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992) (collecting cases). That is to say, the statute, read "as a whole," post at 998 [530 U.S. 943] (THOMAS, J., dissenting), leads the reader to a definition. That definition does not include the Attorney General's restriction -- "the child up to the head." Its words, "substantial portion," indicate the contrary."

[Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)]

4. All depend on the court acting in a political rather than legal capacity. You can call them on it by pointing out the limitations on their authority to do so.

We have developed a form to attach to your pleadings in federal court that will proactively prevent the most common forms of judicial and government prosecutor verbicide and abuse identified above. We normally attach it to the first pleading we file in any federal court in any action before the court. It is structured in such a way that it indicates that it also applies to all future pleadings filed in the action on both sides in order to prevent having to file it again. Below is the form:

Federal Pleading/Motion/Petition Attachment, Litigation Tool #01.002
<http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>

The above form uses the following techniques to counteract presumption and verbicide by your government opponent or the judge, who are usually in cahoots to destroy your rights:

1. Defines all key words of art in advance, so their meaning is not understood.
2. Establishes your citizenship and domicile to place you out of their jurisdiction and ensure that you are not part of their "protection franchise" as either a "citizen" or a "resident" of federal territory.
3. Specifically asks them to remain silent on everything they agree with and invokes Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6) as authority for an estoppel, laches, and nihil dicit judgment.

7.2 Rules of Presumption and Statutory Interpretation Form

If you want to go even further than the form in the previous section in carefully and exhaustively preventing their abuses of "words of art" and your citizenship and domicile status, we also recommend the following additional form be attached to your first filing in any action in federal court. This form is mandatory in all tax cases, whereas the form above is useful in all cases:

7.3 Using Presumption in your favor in Federal court pleadings

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6) indicates that anything not specifically denied in any pleading requiring a response is automatically admitted:

Rule 8. General Rules of Pleading
(d) Effect of Failure To Deny.

Averments in a pleading to which a responsive pleading is required, other than those as to the amount of damage, are admitted when not denied in the responsive pleading. Averments in a pleading to which no responsive pleading is required or permitted shall be taken as denied or avoided.
[SOURCE: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/frcp/Rule8.htm>]

This means that if you fill your legal pleadings with lots of affidavits and facts, and make them long, you impose an enormous burden of proof upon the responding party to rebut these facts, and if they don't, they have admitted them and created a presumption that what you said is true.

Another very effective litigation technique to employ at court hearings is to use the presumption of innocence in order to:

1. Trap the judge into admitting that the government prosecutor has such a high burden of proof that he couldn't possibly convict.
2. Admit that the court is engaging in prejudicial presumptions and effecting the equivalent of a religion that destroys your rights and sovereignty.

Below is an example court dialogue between a criminal defendant and the judge which demonstrates this technique in traffic court.

1. Complete the form indicating your plea. Say that you are proposing a plea of guilty but don't sign it.
2. Wait in traffic court for your name to be called.
3. When you opportunity to be heard by the court occurs, follow the technique below:

Court: What is your plea?

You: Your honor, I propose a plea of guilty. I haven't signed my plea form until I understand the charges completely and have had my rights read to me. I'm not a lawyer and I don't want a trial, but I'd like to understand the criminal charges against me and have them explained to me by the court. I'd like to avoid this whole thing. I have a life and a job and I'd like to get on with both. I don't understand all the ins and outs. As long as I can be informed, I'd be more than happy to pay your fine.

Court: OK. Well, what are your questions?

You: Am I entitled to a fair trial?

Court: Yes. You are absolutely entitled to a fair trial. We're fair in this court.

You: That's great, your honor. Am I entitled to a meaningful hearing?

Court: Yes. Absolutely.

You: So if I ask questions, I can expect that you would be responsive?

Court: Yes.

You: If there is something I don't understand, you will do your best to explain it to me?

1 Court: Yes.

2

3 You: Great. Thank you. Am I presumed innocent of this alleged crime?

4

5 Court: Yes. Of course you are.

6

7 You: Good. Well, I guess I'm presumed innocent. Am I presumed innocent of *every element* of this alleged crime?

8

9 Court: You're presumed innocent of the charge, move on.

10 4. Beyond the above, the judge now has to be much more specific and apply the innocence to each fact that must be proved

11 with evidence. He has already said you are presumed innocent, and now he has to follow through with his part of the

12 bargain. The judge, however, usually won't be laughing because he is the one who must enforce the burden of proof

13 you have just established against the prosecutor. If there are other lawyers in the room, they will often be snickering and

14 laughing as you ask the above questions. They may say "Well how many elements do you think there are?" To that,

15 you say "I'll get to that, after this issue is directly addressed. That's not my burden to know how many elements there

16 are. That's the cop and the prosecutor's job."

17

18 You: Well your honor, no I can't do that. I don't understand. All I need is a response of yes or no, sir. Am I presumed

19 innocent of every element of this alleged crime?

20 5. At this point, the judge will often turn beat red. He wants to impose his presumptions upon you but he can't do it now

21 and you have just created a tremendous burden of proof for him that will make it extremely labor intensive for he and

22 the prosecutor to pick pocket you as a team.

23 Court: [gruffly] You are presumed innocent of the charge! Now move on!

24

25 You: Sir, with all due respect, I can't move on. I need a response of yes or no to my last question. Yes or no? Are you

26 going to answer me or not? You just said you would answer my questions.

27 6. At this point, the judge usually calls in security and will have you hauled out. This looks REALLY bad to observers in

28 the court who are watching, because all you are doing is engaging in discovery and the court is violating your right of

29 discovery, and thereby violating your right to a fair and meaningful trial. He doesn't want others in the courtroom

30 imitating this technique, and he doesn't want to make any more work for himself and the prosecutor than he has to. You

31 have checkmated him into acting irrationally and denying you due process of law.

32 If you would like to know more about the above technique, we highly recommend the following YouTube video:

Adventures in Legal Land Video, Marc Stevens
<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=7238921269249750961>

33 **7.4 Using favorable presumption to limit the adverse affect of vague definitions**

34 As we said earlier in section 3.2, vague laws are the method of choice for the Legislative Branch of the government to

35 unlawfully compel courts into a political or policymaking role. Most of the vagueness within the Internal Revenue Code

36 surrounds the definitions of words. This is covered in the free pamphlet below:

Meaning of the Words "includes" and "including", Form #05.014
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

37 In order to limit the adverse affect of presumptions relating to the meaning of words, we can not only cite the above pamphlet

38 as authority, but we can also cite what are called the "Rules of Statutory Construction", which govern the methods that judges

39 and lawyers must abide by in interpreting the meaning of vague laws. Below is one important rule of statutory construction

40 that works in our favor to limit government jurisdiction:

41 *"Expressio unius est exclusio alterius. A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that **the expression of one***

42 ***thing is the exclusion of another.** Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325; Newblock v. Bowles,*

170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100. Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another. **When certain persons or things are specified in a law, contract, or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be inferred.** Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general rule or assumes to specify the effects of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are excluded.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581]

The U.S. Supreme Court repeated and reinforced this same rule of statutory construction and interpretation when it said:

“It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term. *Colautti v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. 379, 392, and n. 10 (1979). Congress’ use of the term “propaganda” in this statute, as indeed in other legislation, has no pejorative connotation.[19] As judges, it is our duty to [481 U.S. 485] construe legislation as it is written, not as it might be read by a layman, or as it might be understood by someone who has not even read it.”
[*Meese v. Keene*, 481 U.S. 465, 484 (1987)]

“When a statute includes an explicit definition, we must follow that definition, even if it varies from that term’s ordinary meaning.” *Meese v. Keene*, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987) (“It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term”); *Colautti v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10 (“As a rule, ‘a definition which declares what a term “means” . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated”); *Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot*, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945); *Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J.*, 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935) (Cardozo, J.); see also 2A N. Singer, *Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction* § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992) (collecting cases). That is to say, the statute, read “as a whole,” post at 998 [530 U.S. 943] (THOMAS, J., dissenting), leads the reader to a definition. That definition does not include the Attorney General’s restriction -- “the child up to the head.” Its words, “substantial portion,” indicate the contrary.”
[*Stenberg v. Carhart*, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)]

The above rule of statutory construction creates a “presumption” that a law doesn’t apply to you unless you are specifically spelled out SOMEWHERE in the law as a person subject. For instance, the definition of “United States” for the purpose of the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A, is as follows:

[TITLE 26 > Subtitle F > CHAPTER 79 > Sec. 7701.](#) [Internal Revenue Code]
[Sec. 7701. - Definitions](#)

(a) When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof—

(9) United States

The term “United States” when used in a geographical sense includes only the [States](#) and the District of Columbia.

(10): State

The term “State” shall be construed to include the District of Columbia, where such construction is necessary to carry out provisions of this title.

Under the rules of statutory construction, that which is not explicitly included may safely be presumed to be excluded by implication. There is no definition of the term “United States” above anywhere in Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code which would expand upon the above definition or apply it to states of the Union. Therefore, it does not apply there and the U.S. Supreme Court even admitted that it does not apply there, when it said:

“The difficulties arising out of our dual form of government and the opportunities for differing opinions concerning the relative rights of state and national governments are many; **but for a very long time this court has steadfastly adhered to the doctrine that the taxing power of Congress does not extend to the states or their political subdivisions.** The same basic reasoning which leads to that conclusion, we think, requires like limitation upon the power which springs from the bankruptcy clause. *United States v. Butler*, supra.”
[*Ashton v. Cameron County Water Improvement District No. 1*, 298 U.S. 513, 56 S.Ct. 892 (1936)]

“It is no longer open to question that **the general government, unlike the states**, *Hammer v. Dagenhart*, 247 U.S. 251, 275, 38 S.Ct. 529, 3 A.L.R. 649, Ann.Cas.1918E 724, **possesses no inherent power in respect of the internal affairs of the states; and emphatically not with regard to legislation.**”
[*Carter v. Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U.S. 238, 56 S.Ct. 855 (1936)]

7.5 Using Estoppel in pais to create presumptions

All is not lost for those fighting for the protection of their Constitutional rights. Just like the government uses “presumption” to prejudice and destroy our constitutional rights, we too can use “presumption” to destroy their jurisdiction and legal standing in court. We call the technique for doing this the “Notary Certificate of Default”. In the legal field, it is also called by any of the following names:

1. Estoppel in pais.
2. Equitable estoppel.
3. Default judgment

Below is a description of the principle from the American Jurisprudence 2d legal encyclopedia:

“Equitable estoppel, or estoppel in pais, is a term applied usually to a situation where, because of something which he has done or omitted to do, a party is denied the right to plead or prove an otherwise important fact. The term has also been variously defined, frequently by pointing out one or more of the elements of, or prerequisites to, the application of the doctrine or the situations in which the doctrine is urged. The most comprehensive definition of equitable estoppel or estoppel in pais is that it is the principle by which a party who knows or should know the truth is absolutely precluded, both at law and in equity, from denying, or asserting the contrary of, any material fact which, by his words or conduct, affirmative or negative, intentionally or through culpable negligence, he has induced another, who was excusably ignorant of the true facts and who had a right to rely upon such words or conduct, to believe and act upon them thereby, as a consequence reasonably to be anticipated, changing his position in such a way that he would suffer injury if such denial or contrary assertion was allowed. In the final analysis, however, an equitable estoppel rests upon the facts and circumstances of the particular case in which it is urged, considered in the framework of the elements, requisites, and grounds of equitable estoppel, and consequently, any attempted definition usually amounts to no more than a declaration of an estoppel under those facts and circumstances. The cases themselves must be looked to and applied by way of analogy rather than rule.”
[American Jurisprudence 2d, Estoppel and Waiver, §27: Definitions and Nature (1999)]

“The doctrine of estoppel is based upon the grounds of public policy, fair dealing, good faith, and justice, and its purpose is to forbid one to speak against his own act, representations, or commitments to the injury of one to whom they were directed and who reasonably relied thereon. The doctrine of estoppel springs from equitable principles and the equities in the case. It is designed to aid the law in the administration of justice where without its aid injustice might result. Thus, the doctrine of equitable estoppel or estoppel in pais is founded upon principles of morality and fair dealing and is intended to subserve the ends of justice. It always presupposes error on one side and fault or fraud upon the other and some defect of which it would be inequitable for the party against whom the doctrine is asserted to take advantage. It concludes the truth in order to prevent fraud and falsehood and imposes silence on a party only when in conscience and honesty he should not be allowed to speak.”

The proper function of equitable estoppel is the prevention of fraud, actual or constructive, and the doctrine should always be so applied as to promote the ends of justice and accomplish that which ought to be done between man and man. Such an estoppel cannot arise against a party except when justice to the rights of others demands it and when to refuse it would be inequitable. The doctrine of estoppel should be applied cautiously and only when equity clearly requires it to be done. Hence, in determining the application of the doctrine, the counterequities of the parties are entitled to due consideration. It is available only in defense of a legal or equitable right or claim made in good faith and can never be asserted to uphold crime, fraud, injustice, or wrong of any character. Estoppel is to be applied against wrongdoers, not against the victim of a wrong, although estoppel is never employed as a means of inflicting punishment for an unlawful or wrongful act.”
[American Jurisprudence 2d, Estoppel and Waiver, §28: Basis, function, and purpose (1999)]

In short, the method creates presumptions based on omission by the responding party. These presumptions are used to establish fact. For instance, you send the government a correspondence directly addressing why they have no lawful authority or standing to do what they are doing, you give them a time limit to respond, and you ask them for the help that the Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 1.1.1.1 says they HAVE to provide in resolving the conflict. If they fail to respond by the time limit specified, you send them a “Notice of Default” letter identifying what they agreed to by their omission, and you do it certified mail with a Proof of Mailing so you have legally admissible proof that they agreed to your conclusions. This, by the way, is EXACTLY the same technique they use against you in collecting taxes, so we are in effect fighting fire with fire.

The detailed method for applying the Notary Certificate of Default technique is documented in a free article at the address below:

<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Instructions/0.5CommercialLaw.htm>

8 Resources for Further Study and Rebuttal

If you would like to study the subjects covered in this short pamphlet in further detail, may we recommend the following authoritative sources, and also welcome you to rebut any part of this pamphlet after you have read it and studied the subject carefully yourself just as we have:

Table 3: Resources for further study and rebuttal

Reference	Type	Available at:
Galileo Paradigm, Form #11.303	Free downloadable book	http://famguardian.org/Publications/GalileoParadigm/TheGalileoParadigm.pdf
Meaning of the Words “Includes” and “Including”	Free downloadable pamphlet	http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm (see item 5.014)
Rebutted version of the IRS pamphlet: “The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments”	Free downloadable pamphlet	http://famguardian.org/PublishedAuthors/Govt/IRS/friv_tax_rebuts.pdf
Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability	Free memorandum of law	http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/ReasonableBelief.pdf
Liberty University	Free educational materials for regaining your sovereignty as an entrepreneur or private person	http://sedm.org/LibertyU/LibertyU.htm
Family Guardian Website, Taxes page	Free website	http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/taxes.htm
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, and especially sections 5.6.11 and 5.6.13 through 5.6.13.12.	Free downloadable electronic book	http://famguardian.org/Publications/GreatIRSHoax/GreatIRSHoax.htm
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions	Free references and tools to help those who want to escape federal slavery	http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/FormsInstr.htm

9 Questions that Readers, Grand Jurors, and Petit Jurors Should be Asking the Government

These questions are provided for readers, Grand Jurors, and Petit Jurors to present to the government or anyone else who would challenge the facts and law appearing in this pamphlet, most of whom work for the government or stand to gain financially from perpetuating the fraud. If you find yourself in receipt of this pamphlet, you are demanded to answer the questions within 10 days. Pursuant to [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8\(b\)\(6\)](#), failure to deny within 10 days constitutes an admission to each question. Pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §6065](#), all of your answers must be signed under penalty of perjury. We are not interested in agency policy, but only sources of reasonable belief identified in the pamphlet below:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Your answers will become evidence in future litigation, should that be necessary in order to protect the rights of the person against whom you are attempting to unlawfully enforce federal law.

1. Admit that “presumptions” may not be used as evidence or as a substitute for evidence.

American Jurisprudence 2d
Evidence, §181

A presumption is neither evidence nor a substitute for evidence.⁴³ Properly used, the term "presumption" is a rule of law directing that if a party proves certain facts (the "basic facts") at a trial or hearing, the factfinder must also accept an additional fact (the "presumed fact") as proven unless sufficient evidence is introduced tending to rebut the presumed fact.⁴⁴ In a sense, therefore, a presumption is an inference which is mandatory unless rebutted.⁴⁵
[American Jurisprudence 2d, Evidence, §181 (1999)]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

2. Admit that "presumption" which is not supported by authoritative evidence is the equivalent of "religious faith", which is also based in most cases on belief that cannot be supported by evidence.

"Religion. Man's relation to Divinity, to reverence, **worship**, obedience, and **submission to mandates and precepts** of supernatural or **superior beings**. In its broadest sense includes all forms of **belief in the existence of superior beings exercising power over human beings by volition, imposing rules of conduct, with future rewards and punishments**. **Bond uniting man to God, and a virtue** whose purpose is to **render God worship due him as source of all being and principle of all government of things**. Nikulnikoff v. Archbishop, etc., of Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, 142 Misc. 894, 255 N.Y.S. 653, 663."
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1292]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

3. Admit that "presumption" which prejudices Constitutional rights to create unequal protection, has the effect of making the government into a "superior being" relative to the object of the presumption:

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

4. Admit that "worship" is defined as follows:

worship, the attitude and acts of reverence to a deity. The term 'worship' in the OT translates the Hebrew word meaning 'to bow down, prostrate oneself,' a posture indicating reverence and homage given to a lord, whether human or divine. **The concept of worship is expressed by the term 'serve.'** **In general, the worship given to God was modeled after the service given to human sovereigns [government rulers]; this was especially prominent in pagan religions.** In these the deity's image inhabited a palace (temple) and had servants (priests) who supplied food (offered sacrifices), washed and anointed and clothed it, scented the air with incenses, lit lamps at night, and guarded the doors to the house. Worshipers brought offerings and tithes to the deity, said prayers and bowed down, as one might bring tribute and present petitions to a king. Indeed the very purpose of human existence, in Mesopotamian thought, was to provide the gods with the necessities of life.

Although Israelite worship shared many of these external forms, even to calling sacrifices 'the food of God' (e.g., Lev. 21:6), its essence was quite different. As the prophets pointed out, **God could not be worshiped only externally. To truly honor God, it was necessary to obey his laws, the moral and ethical ones as well as ritual laws. To appear before God with sacrifices while flouting his demands for justice was to insult him** (cf. Isa. 1:11-17; Amos 5:21-22). God certainly did not need the sacrifices for food (Ps. 50:12-13); rather sacrifice and other forms of worship were offered to honor God as king.

⁴³ Levasseur v. Field (Me), 332 A.2d. 765; Hinds v. John Hancock Mut. Life Ins. Co., 155 Me. 349, 155 A.2d. 721, 85 A.L.R.2d. 703 (superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Poitras v. R. E. Glidden Body Shop, Inc. (Me) 430 A.2d. 1113); Connizzo v. General American Life Ins. Co. (Mo App) 520 S.W.2d. 661.

⁴⁴ Inferences and presumptions are a staple of our adversary system of factfinding, since it is often necessary for the trier of fact to determine the existence of an element of a crime—that is an ultimate or elemental fact—from the existence of one or more evidentiary or basic facts. County Court of Ulster County v. Allen, 442 U.S. 140, 60 L.Ed.2d. 777, 99 S.Ct. 2213.

⁴⁵ Legille v. Dann, 178 U.S.App.DC. 78, 544 F.2d. 1, 191 U.S.P.Q. 529; Murray v. Montgomery Ward Life Ins. Co., 196 Colo. 225, 584 P.2d. 78; Re Estate of Borom (Ind App) 562 N.E.2d. 772; Manchester v. Dugan (Me), 247 A.2d. 827; Ferdinand v. Agricultural Ins. Co., 22 N.J. 482, 126 A.2d. 323, 62 A.L.R.2d. 1179; Smith v. Bohlen, 95 N.C. App 347, 382 S.E.2d. 812, affd 328 N.C. 564, 402 S.E.2d. 380; Martin v. Phillips, 235 Va. 523, 369 S.E.2d. 397.

[Achtemeier, P. J., Harper & Row, P., & Society of Biblical Literature. 1985. Harper's Bible dictionary. Includes index. (1st ed.). Harper & Row: San Francisco]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

5. Admit that “obedience” is the essence of “worship”, according to the Bible:

*"Has the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices,
As in obeying the voice of the LORD?
Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice,
And to heed than the fat of rams.
For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft,
And stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry.
Because you have rejected the word of the LORD,
He also has rejected you from being king[and sovereign over your government]."
[1 Sam. 15:22-23, Bible, NKJV]*

*"Do not love the world or the things in the world. If anyone loves [is a "citizen", "resident", or "taxpayer" of] the world, the love of the Father is not in Him. For all that is in the world--the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life--is not of the Father but is of the world. And the world is passing away, and the lust of it; but he who does the will of God abides forever."
[1 John 2:15-17, Bible, NKJV]*

*"Let us hear the conclusion of this whole matter: Fear [respect] God and keep [obey] His commandments, for this is man's all. For God will bring every work into judgment, including every secret thing, whether good or evil."
[Eccl. 12:13-14, Bible, NKJV]*

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

6. Admit that the purpose of Court is to compel “obedience”, and therefore to compel “worship” toward a higher being called the “State” or the “Judge”.

State. A people permanently occupying a fixed territory bound together by common-law habits and custom into one body politic exercising, through the medium of an organized government, independent sovereignty and control over all persons and things within its boundaries, capable of making war and peace and of entering into international relations with other communities of the globe. United States v. Kusche, D.C.Cal., 56 F.Supp. 201 207, 208. The organization of social life which exercises sovereign power in behalf of the people. Delany v. Moralitis, C.C.A.Md., 136 F.2d. 129, 130. In its largest sense, a "state" is a body politic or a society of men. Beagle v. Motor Vehicle Acc. Indemnification Corp., 44 Misc.2d. 636, 254 N.Y.S.2d. 763, 765. A body of people occupying a definite territory and politically organized under one government. State ex re. Maisano v. Mitchell, 155 Conn. 256, 231 A.2d. 539, 542. A territorial unit with a distinct general body of law. Restatement, Second, Conflicts, §3. Term may refer either to body politic of a nation (e.g. United States) or to an individual government unit of such nation (e.g. California).

[...]

The people of a state, in their collective capacity, considered as the party wronged by a criminal deed; the public; as in the title of a cause, "The State vs. A.B." [Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1407]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

7. Admit that the worship of the “State” as the supreme Sovereign, instead of the Individual, is the essence of socialism as a political philosophy

Law is in every culture religious in origin. Because law governs man and society, because it establishes and declares the meaning of justice and righteousness, law is inescapably religious, in that it establishes in practical fashion the ultimate concerns of a culture. Accordingly, a fundamental and necessary premise in any and every study of law must be, first, a recognition of this religious nature of law.

Second, it must be recognized that in any culture the source of law is the god of that society. If law has its source in man's reason, then reason is the god of that society. If the source is an oligarchy, or in a court, senate, or ruler, then that source is the god of that system. Thus, in Greek culture law was essentially a religiously humanistic concept,

In contrast to every law derived from revelation, nomos for the Greeks originated in the mind (nous). So the genuine nomos is no mere obligatory law, but something in which an entity valid in itself is discovered and appropriated...It is "the order which exists (from time immemorial), is valid and is put into operation."⁴⁶

Because for the Greeks mind was one being with the ultimate order of things, man's mind was thus able to discover ultimate law (nomos) out of its own resources, by penetrating through the maze of accident and matter to the fundamental ideas of being. As a result, Greek culture became both humanistic, because man's mind was one with ultimacy, and also neoplatonic, ascetic, and hostile to the world of matter, because mind, to be truly itself, had to separate itself from non-mind.

Modern humanism, the religion of the state, locates law in the state and thus makes the state, or the people as they find expression in the state, the god of the system. As Mao Tse-Tung has said, "Our God is none other than the masses of the Chinese people."⁴⁷ In Western culture, law has steadily moved away from God to the people (or the state) as its source, although the historic power and vitality of the West has been in Biblical faith and law.

Third, in any society, any change of law is an explicit or implicit change of religion. Nothing more clearly reveals, in fact, the religious change in a society than a legal revolution. When the legal foundations shift from Biblical law to humanism, it means that the society now draws its vitality and power from humanism, not from Christian theism.

Fourth, no disestablishment of religion as such is possible in any society. A church can be disestablished, and a particular religion can be supplanted by another, but the change is simply to another religion. Since the foundations of law are inescapably religious, no society exists without a religious foundation or without a law-system which codifies the morality of its religion.

Fifth, there can be no tolerance in a law-system for another religion. Toleration is a device used to introduce a new law-system as a prelude to a new intolerance. Legal positivism, a humanistic faith, has been savage in its hostility to the Biblical law-system and has claimed to be an "open" system. But Cohen, by no means a Christian, has aptly described the logical positivists as "nihilists" and their faith as "nihilistic absolutism."⁴⁸ Every law-system must maintain its existence by hostility to every other law-system and to alien religious foundations or else it commits suicide.

In analyzing now the nature of Biblical law, it is important to note first that, for the Bible, law is revelation. The Hebrew word for law is torah which means instruction, authoritative direction.⁴⁹ The Biblical concept of law is broader than the legal codes of the Mosaic formulation. It applies to the divine word and instruction in its totality:

...the earlier prophets also use torah for the divine word proclaimed through them (Is. viii. 16, cf. also v. 20; Isa. xxx. 9 f.; perhaps also Isa. i. 10). Besides this, certain passages in the earlier prophets use the word torah also for the commandment of Yahweh which was written down: thus Hos. viii. 12. Moreover there are clearly examples not only of ritual matters, but also of ethics.

Hence it follows that at any rate in this period torah had the meaning of a divine instruction, whether it had been written down long ago as a law and was preserved and pronounced by a priest, or whether the priest was delivering it at that time (Lam. ii. 9; Ezek. vii. 26; Mal. ii. 4 ff.), or the prophet is commissioned by God to pronounce it for a definite situation (so perhaps Isa. xxx. 9).

⁴⁶ Hermann Kleinknecht and W. Gutbrod, *Law* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962), p. 21.

⁴⁷ Mao Tse-Tung, *The foolish Old Man Who Removed Mountains* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1966), p. 3.

⁴⁸ Morris Raphael Cohen, *Reason and Law* (New York: Collier Books, 1961), p. 84 f.

⁴⁹ Ernest F. Kevan, *The Moral Law* (Jenkintown, Penna.: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1963) p. 5 f. S.R. Driver, "Law (In Old Testament)," in James Hastings, ed., *A Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. III (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919), p. 64.

Thus what is objectively essential in torah is not the form but the divine authority.⁵⁰

The law is the revelation of God and His righteousness. There is no ground in Scripture for despising the law. Neither can the law be relegated to the Old Testament and grace to the New:

The time-honored distinction between the OT as a book of law and the NT as a book of divine grace is without grounds or justification. Divine grace and mercy are the presupposition of law in the OT; and the grace and love of God displayed in the NT events issue in the legal obligations of the New Covenant. Furthermore, the OT contains evidence of a long history of legal developments which must be assessed before the place of law is adequately understood. Paul's polemics against the law in Galatians and Romans are directed against an understanding of law which is by no means characteristic of the OT as a whole.⁵¹

There is no contradiction between law and grace. The question in Jame's Epistle is faith and works, not faith and law.⁵² Judaism had made law the mediator between God and man, and between God and the world. It was this view of law, not the law itself, which Jesus attacked. As Himself the Mediator, Jesus rejected the law as mediator in order to re-establish the law in its God-appointed role as law, the way of holiness. He established the law by dispensing forgiveness as the law-giver in full support of the law as the convicting word which makes men sinners.⁵³ The law was rejected only as mediator and as the source of justification.⁵⁴ Jesus fully recognized the law, and obeyed the law. It was only the absurd interpretations of the law He rejected. Moreover,

We are not entitled to gather from the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels that He made any formal distinction between the Law of Moses and the Law of God. His mission being not to destroy but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets (Mt. 5:17), so far from saying anything in disparagement of the Law of Moses or from encouraging His disciples to assume an attitude of independence with regard to it, He expressly recognized the authority of the Law of Moses as such, and of the Pharisees as its official interpreters. (Mt. 23:1-3).⁵⁵

With the completion of Christ's work, the role of the Pharisees as interpreters ended, but not the authority of the Law. In the New Testament era, only apostolically received revelation was ground for any alteration in the law. The authority of the law remained unchanged.

St. Peter, e.g. required a special revelation before he would enter the house of the uncircumcised Cornelius and admit the first Gentile convert into the Church by baptism (acts 10:1-48) --a step which did not fail to arouse opposition on the part of those who "were of the circumcision" (cf. 11:1-18).⁵⁶

The second characteristic of Biblical law is that it is a treaty or covenant. Kline has shown that the form of the giving of the law, the language of the text, the historical prologue, the requirement of imprecations and benedictions, and much more, all point to the fact that the law is a treaty established by God with His people. Indeed, "the revelation committed to the two tables was rather a suzerainty treaty or covenant than a legal code."⁵⁷ The full covenant summary, the Ten Commandments, was inscribed on each of the two tables of stone, one table or copy of the treaty for each party in the treaty, God and Israel.⁵⁸

The two stone tables are not, therefore, to be likened to a stele containing one of the half-dozen or so known legal codes earlier than or roughly contemporary with Moses as though God had engraved on these tables a corpus of law. The revelation they contain is nothing less than an epitome of the covenant granted by Yahweh, the sovereign Lord of heaven and earth, to his elect and redeemed servant, Israel.

⁵⁰ Kleinknecht and Gutbrod, *Law*, p. 44.

⁵¹ W.J. Harrelson, "Law in the OT," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, 77.

⁵² Kleinknecht and Gutbrod, *Law*, p. 125.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 74, 81-91.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁵⁵ Hugh H. Currie, "Law of God," in James Hastings, ed., *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919), I, 685.

⁵⁶ Olaf Moe, "Law," in James Hastings, ed., *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919), I, 685.

⁵⁷ Meredith G. Line, *Treaty of the Great King, The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy: Studies and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1963), p. 16. See also J.A. Thompson: *The Ancient Near Eastern Treaties and the Old Testament* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1964).

⁵⁸ Kline, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

Not law, but covenant. That must be affirmed when we are seeking a category comprehensive enough to do justice to this revelation in its totality. At the same time, the prominence of the stipulations, reflect in the fact that "the ten words" are the element used as pars pro toto, signifies the centrality of law in this type of covenant. There is probably no clearer direction afforded the biblical theologian for defining with biblical emphasis the type of covenant God adopted to formalize his relationship to his people than that given in the covenant he gave Israel to perform, even "the ten commandments." Such a covenant is a declaration of God's lordship, consecrating a people to himself in a sovereignly dictated order of life.⁵⁹

This latter phrase needs re-emphasis: the covenant is "a sovereignly dictated order of life." God as the sovereign Lord and Creator gives His law to man as an act of sovereign grace. It is an act of election, of electing grace (Deut. 7:7 f.; 8:17; 9:4-6, etc.).

The God to whom the earth belongs will have Israel for His own property, Ex. xix. 5. It is only on the ground of the gracious election and guidance of God that the divine commands to the people are given, and therefore the Decalogue, Ex. xx. 2, places at its forefront the fact of election.⁶⁰

In the law, the total life of man is ordered: "there is no primary distinction between the inner and the outer life; the holy calling of the people must be realized in both."⁶¹

The third characteristic of the Biblical law or covenant is that it constitutes a plan for dominion under God. God called Adam to exercise dominion in terms of God's revelation, God's law (Gen. 1:26 ff.; 2:15-17). This same calling, after the fall, was required of the godly line, and in Noah it was formally renewed (Gen. 9:1-17). It was again renewed with Abraham, with Jacob, with Israel in the person of Moses, with Joshua, David, Solomon (whose Proverbs echo the law), with Hezekiah and Josiah, and finally with Jesus Christ. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is the renewal of the covenant: "this is my blood of the new testament" (or covenant), so that the sacrament itself re-establishes the law, this time with a new elect group (Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25). The people of the law are now the people of Christ, the believers redeemed by His atoning blood and called by His sovereign election. Kline, in analyzing Hebrews 9:16, 17, in relation to the covenant administration, observes:

...the picture suggested would be that of Christ's children (cf. 2:13) inheriting his universal dominion as their eternal portion (note 9:15b; cf. also 1:14; 2:5 ff.; 6:17; 11:7 ff.). And such is the wonder of the messianic Mediator-Testator that the royal inheritance of his sons, which becomes of force only through his death, is nevertheless one of co-regency with the living Testator! For (to follow the typographical direction provided by Heb. 9:16,17 according to the present interpretation) Jesus is both dying Moses and succeeding Joshua. Not merely after a figure but in truth a royal Mediator redivivus, he secures the divine dynasty by succeeding himself in resurrection power and ascension glory.⁶²

The purpose of God in requiring Adam to exercise dominion over the earth remains His continuing covenant word: man, created in God's image and commanded to subdue the earth and exercise dominion over it in God's name, is recalled to this task and privilege by his redemption and regeneration.

The law is therefore the law for Christian man and Christian society. Nothing is more deadly or more derelict than the notion that the Christian is at liberty with respect to the kind of law he can have. Calvin whose classical humanism gained ascendancy at this point, said of the laws of states, of civil governments:

I will briefly remark, however, by the way, what laws it (the state) may piously use before God, and be rightly governed by among men. And even this I would have preferred passing over in silence, if I did not know that it is a point on which many persons run into dangerous errors. For some deny that a state is well constituted, which neglects the polity of Moses, and is governed by the common laws of nations. The dangerous and seditious nature of this opinion I leave to the examination of others; it will be sufficient for me to have evinced it to be false and foolish.⁶³

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 17.

⁶⁰ Gustave Friedrich Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1883), p. 177.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 182.

⁶² Kline, *Treaty of the Great King*, p. 41.

⁶³ John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, bk. IV, chap. XX, para. Xiv. In the John Allen translation (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christiana Education, 1936), II, 787 f.

Such ideas, common in Calvinist and Lutheran circles, and in virtually all churches, are still heretical nonsense.⁶⁴ Calvin favored "the common law of nations." But the common law of nations in his day was Biblical law, although extensively denatured by Roman law. And this "common law of nations" was increasingly evidencing a new religion, humanism. Calvin wanted the establishment of the Christian religion; he could not have it, nor could it last long in Geneva, without Biblical law.

Two Reformed scholars, in writing of the state, declare, "It is to be God's servant, for our welfare. It must exercise justice, and it has the power of the sword."⁶⁵ Yet these men follow Calvin in rejecting Biblical law for "the common law of nations." But can the state be God's servant and by-pass God's law? And if the state "must exercise justice," how is justice defined, by the nations, or by God? There are as many ideas of justice as there are religions.

The question then is, what law is for the state? Shall it be positive law, after calling for "justice" in the state, declare, "A static legislation valid for all times is an impossibility." Indeed!⁶⁶ Then what about the commandment, Biblical legislation, if you please, "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not steal"? **Are they not intended to valid for all time and in every civil order? By abandoning Biblical law, these Protestant theologians end up in moral and legal relativism.**

Roman Catholic scholars offer natural law. The origins of this concept are in Roman law and religion. For the Bible, there is no law in nature, because nature is fallen and cannot be normative. Moreover the source of law is not nature but God. There is no law in nature but a law over nature, God's law.⁶⁷

Neither positive law [man's law] nor natural law can reflect more than the sin and apostasy of man: revealed law [e.g. ONLY THE BIBLE] is the need and privilege of Christian society. It is the only means whereby man can fulfill his creation mandate of exercising dominion under God. Apart from revealed law [the BIBLE!], man cannot claim to be under God but only in rebellion against God.

[*The Institutes of Biblical Law*, Rousas John Rushdoony, 1973, The Craig Press, Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 72-79485, pp. 4-5, Emphasis added]

See:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION: _____

8. Admit that an important purpose of "due process" is to remove presumption and the prejudice to rights that it effects, from the legal process.

"If any question of fact or liability be conclusively be presumed [rather than proven] against him, this is not due process of law."

[*Black's Law Dictionary*, Sixth Edition, p. 500]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION: _____

9. Admit that statutory presumptions which might prejudice Constitutional rights are not permissible.

"It is apparent that a constitutional prohibition cannot be transgressed indirectly by the creation of a statutory presumption any more than it can be violated by direct enactment. The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions."

[*Bailey v. Alabama*, 219 U.S. 219 (1911)]

⁶⁴ See H. de Jongste and J.M. van Krimpen, *The Bible and the Life of the Christian*, for similar opinions (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1968), p. 66 ff.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁶⁷ The very term "nature" is mythical. See R.J. Rushdoony, "The Myth of Nature," in *The Mythology of Science* (Nutley, N.J.: The Craig Press, 1967), pp. 96-98.

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

10. Admit that misinterpretation of the use of the word “includes” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(c) has the effect of compelling a presumption that cannot be supported by the rules of statutory construction:

*“Expressio unius est exclusio alterius. A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that **the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another.** Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325; Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100. Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another. **When certain persons or things are specified in a law, contract, or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be inferred.** Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general rule or assumes to specify the effects of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are excluded.”*
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581]

See also: Meaning of the words “includes” and “including”, <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Includes.pdf>

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

11. Admit that vague laws have the effect of compelling the Courts to make presumptions about the meaning of the law in question.

*“It is a basic principle of due process that an enactment is void for vagueness if its prohibitions are not clearly defined. Vague laws offend several important values. First, because we assume that man is free to steer between lawful and unlawful conduct, we insist that laws give the person of ordinary intelligence a reasonable opportunity to know what is prohibited, so that he may act accordingly. Vague laws may trap the innocent by not providing fair warning. Second, if arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement is to be prevented, laws must provide explicit standards for those who apply them. **A vague law impermissibly delegates basic policy matters to policemen, judges, and juries for resolution on an ad hoc and subjective basis, with the attendant dangers of arbitrary and discriminatory application.**”*
[Sewell v. Georgia, 435 U.S. 982 (1978)]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

12. Admit that vague laws written by the Legislative Branch of the government have the affect of compelling Courts to engage in “political matters” and make policy decisions:

A vague law impermissibly delegates basic policy matters [also called “political questions”] to policemen, judges, and juries for resolution on an ad hoc and subjective basis, with the attendant dangers of arbitrary and discriminatory application.”
[Sewell v. Georgia, 435 U.S. 982 (1978)]

“Political questions. Questions of which courts will refuse to take cognizance, or to decide, on account of their purely political character, or because their determination would involve an encroachment upon the executive or legislative powers.

“Political questions doctrine” holds that certain issues should not be decided by courts because their resolution is committed to another branch of government and/or because those issues are not capable, for one reason or another, of judicial resolution. Islamic Republic of Iran v. Pahlavi, 116 Misc.2d. 590, 455 N.Y.S.2d. 987, 990.

A matter of dispute which can be handled more appropriately by another branch of the government is not a “justiciable” matter for the courts. However, a state apportionment statute is not such a political question as to render it nonjusticiable. Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186, 208-210, 82 S.Ct. 691, 705-706, 7 L.Ed.2d. 663.
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, pp. 1158-1159]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

13. Admit that Courts are constitutionally barred from engaged in “political questions” because this violates the separation of powers doctrine, which requires that all “political questions” be handled by the political branches of government, which includes the Executive and the Legislative branches and excludes the Juridical branch.

Another evil, alarming and little foreseen, involved in regarding these as questions for the final arbitrament of judges would be that, in such an event, all political privileges and rights would, in a dispute among the people, depend on our decision finally. We would possess the power to decide against, as well as for, them, and, under a prejudiced or arbitrary judiciary, the public liberties and popular privileges might thus be much perverted, if not entirely prostrated. But, allowing the people to make constitutions and unmake them, allowing their representatives to make laws and unmake them, and without our interference as to their principles or policy in doing it, yet, when constitutions and laws are made and put in force by others, then the courts, as empowered by the State or the Union, commence their functions and may decide on the rights which conflicting parties can legally set up under them, rather than about their formation itself. Our power begins after theirs [the Sovereign People] ends. Constitutions and laws precede the judiciary, and we act only under and after them, and as to disputed rights beneath them, rather than disputed points in making them. We speak what is the law, jus dicere, we speak or construe what is the constitution, after both are made, but we make, or revise, or control neither. The disputed rights beneath constitutions already made are to be governed by precedents, by sound legal principles, by positive legislation [e.g. "positive law"], clear contracts, moral duties, and fixed rules; they are per se questions of law, and are well suited to the education and habits of the bench. But the other disputed points in making constitutions, depending often, as before shown, on policy, inclination, popular resolves and popular will and arising not in respect to private rights, not what is meum and tuum, but in relation to politics, they belong to politics, and they are settled by political tribunals, and are too dear to a people bred in the school of Sydney and Russel for them ever to intrust their final decision, when disputed, to a class of men who are so far removed from them as the judiciary, a class also who might decide them erroneously, as well as right, and if in the former way, the consequences might not be able to be averted except by a revolution, while a wrong decision by a political forum can often be peacefully corrected by new elections or instructions in a single month; and if the people, in the distribution of powers under the constitution, should ever think of making judges supreme arbiters in political controversies when not selected by nor, frequently, amenable to them nor at liberty to follow such various considerations in their judgments as [48 U.S. 53] belong to mere political questions, they will dethrone themselves and lose one of their own invaluable birthrights; building up in this way -- slowly, but surely -- a new sovereign power in the republic, in most respects irresponsible and unchangeable for life, and one more dangerous, in theory at least, than the worst elective oligarchy in the worst of times. Again, instead of controlling the people in political affairs, the judiciary in our system was designed rather to control individuals, on the one hand, when encroaching, or to defend them, on the other, under the Constitution and the laws, when they are encroached upon. And if the judiciary at times seems to fill the important station of a check in the government, it is rather a check on the legislature, who may attempt to pass laws contrary to the Constitution, or on the executive, who may violate both the laws and Constitution, than on the people themselves in their primary capacity as makers and amenders of constitutions."

[Luther v. Borden, 48 U.S. 1 (1849)]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

14. Admit that “prima facie” evidence is simply “presumed” to be evidence until challenged or rebutted:

“Prima facie Lat. At first sight; on the first appearance; on the face of it; so far as can be judged from the first disclosure; presumably; a fact presumed to be true unless disproved by some evidence to the contrary. State ex. Re. Herbert v. Whims, 68 Ohio.App. 39, 38 N.E.2d. 596, 599, 22 O.O. 110. See also Presumption”

[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1189]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

15. Admit that “prima facie” evidence that might otherwise prejudice Constitutional rights may only be used against a party who either has no Constitutional rights or who has surrendered them through his right to contract.

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

16. Admit that 1 U.S.C. §204, which is positive law, identifies the Internal Revenue Code as “prima facie” evidence of law, which means that it is only “presumed” to be law but is not actually proven to be law.

1 U.S.C. §204: Codes and Supplements as evidence of the laws of United States and District of Columbia; citation of Codes and Supplements

In all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home or abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each

State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States -

(a) United States Code. -

[1] The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of Laws of the United States current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, establish prima facie [by presumption] the laws of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, in force on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included:

[2] Provided, however, That whenever titles of such Code shall have been enacted into positive law the text thereof shall be legal evidence of the laws therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

17. Admit that federal employees have no constitutional rights in relation to their “employer”, the federal government “corporation”, while on official duty:

“The restrictions that the Constitution places upon the government in its capacity as lawmaker, i.e., as the regulator of private conduct, are not the same as the restrictions that it places upon the government in its capacity as employer. We have recognized this in many contexts, with respect to many different constitutional guarantees. Private citizens perhaps cannot be prevented from wearing long hair, but policemen can. Kelley v. Johnson, 425 U.S. 238, 247 (1976). Private citizens cannot have their property searched without probable cause, but in many circumstances government employees can. O'Connor v. Ortega, 480 U.S. 709, 723 (1987) (plurality opinion); id., at 732 (SCALIA, J., concurring in judgment). Private citizens cannot be punished for refusing to provide the government information that may incriminate them, but government employees can be dismissed when the incriminating information that they refuse to provide relates to the performance of their job. Gardner v. Broderick, [497 U.S. 62, 95] 392 U.S. 273, 277-278 (1968). With regard to freedom of speech in particular: Private citizens cannot be punished for speech of merely private concern, but government employees can be fired for that reason. Connick v. Myers, 461 U.S. 138, 147 (1983). Private citizens cannot be punished for partisan political activity, but federal and state employees can be dismissed and otherwise punished for that reason. Public Workers v. Mitchell, 330 U.S. 75, 101 (1947); Civil Service Comm'n v. Letter Carriers, 413 U.S. 548, 556 (1973); Broadrick v. Oklahoma, 413 U.S. 601, 616-617 (1973).”
[Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62 (1990)]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

18. Admit that persons resident on federal territory or in federal areas are not protected by the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, but instead are completely subject to the totalitarian legislative jurisdiction of Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution.

“CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS [Bill of Rights] WERE NOT APPLICABLE to the areas of lands, enclaves, territories, and possessions over which Congress had EXCLUSIVE LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION”
[Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)]

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

19. Based on the foregoing four questions, admit that the federal “employees” and persons domiciled on federal territory are among those against whom “presumptions” may be openly employed in federal court without violating Constitutionally guaranteed rights.

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

20. Admit that persons domiciled in a state of the Union who have no contracts, employment, or agency with the federal government and who are litigating in a federal court may NOT lawfully become the subject of any presumptions by the Court or the jury which might prejudice rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America.

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

21. Admit that a Court which “presumes” that a person is domiciled on federal territory or that he or she is an “employee” without insisting that there is evidence on the record of same is making an impermissible presumption which injures Constitutional rights if the person instead is domiciled in a state of the Union and has not agency, fiduciary duty, or employment with the federal government.

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

22. Admit that a population of jurists who are not educated in the law are far more likely to engage in prejudicial or unconstitutional “presumptions” than one that is.

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

23. Admit that a majority of Americans receive NO LEGAL EDUCATION whatsoever in PUBLIC (meaning GOVERNMENT) grammar school, grade school, or high school.

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

24. Admit that legal ignorance on the part of the average jurist makes them putty in the hands of a judge who wants to employ “presumption” as a means to prejudice the rights of a litigant who is fighting illegal actions by the government.

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

25. Admit that a trial where litigants are forbidden from discussing the law makes that proceeding into primarily a political, rather than a legal, proceeding subject to the whims, prejudices, ignorance, and bias instead of focused on strict adherence to the law and correct application of it to the circumstances of the Respondent or Defendant.

YOUR ANSWER: ____Admit ____Deny

CLARIFICATION:_____

Affirmation:

I declare under penalty of perjury as required under [26 U.S.C. §6065](#) that the answers provided by me to the foregoing questions are true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge and ability, so help me God. I also declare that these answers are completely consistent with each other and with my understanding of both the Constitution of the United States, Internal Revenue Code, Treasury Regulations, the Internal Revenue Manual, and the rulings of the Supreme Court but not necessarily lower federal courts.

1 Name (print): _____
2 Signature: _____
3 Date: _____
4 Witness name (print): _____
5 Witness Signature: _____
6 Witness Date: _____