


CITES BY TOPIC: income

[Court Case Citations on the Nature of "income"](#)

 [How the Government Defrauds You of Legitimate Deductions for the Market Value of Your Labor, Form #05.026](#) (OFFSITE LINK) -why your personal labor is not "income" and how the government hides or avoids this.

[26 U.S.C. §83 Property transferred in connection with performance of services](#)

[TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle A](#) > [CHAPTER 1](#) > [Subchapter B](#) > [PART II](#) > § 83
[§ 83. Property transferred in connection with performance of services](#)

(a) General rule

If, in connection with the performance of services [labor], property is transferred [compensation] to any person [employee] other than the person for whom such services are performed [employer], the excess of—

(1) **the fair market value of such property [compensation]** (determined without regard to any restriction other than a restriction which by its terms will never lapse) at the first time the rights of the person having the beneficial interest in such property are transferable or are not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture, whichever occurs earlier, over

(2) **the amount (if any) paid [labor] for such property [compensation], shall be included in the gross income of the person who performed such services [employee]** in the first taxable year in which the rights of the person having the beneficial interest in such property are transferable or are not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture, whichever is applicable. The preceding sentence shall not apply if such person sells or otherwise disposes of such property in an arm's length transaction before his rights in such property become transferable or not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture.

[Internal Revenue Code of 1954, Senate Report 1622, "Report of the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, To Accompany H.R. 8300", p. 168:](#)

"Section 61(a) provides that gross income includes "all income from whatever source derived."
This definition is based upon the sixteenth amendment and the word "income" is used as in section 22(a) in the constitutional sense. It is not intended to change the concept of income that obtains under section 22(a)."

[Internal Revenue Code of 1954, Report of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, p. A18, March 9, 1954](#)

Section 61. Gross income defined

This section corresponds to section 22(a) of the 1939 Code. While the language in existing section 22(a) has been simplified, the all-inclusive nature of statutory gross income has not been affected thereby. Section 61(a) provides that gross income includes "all income from whatever source derived" **This definition is based upon the 16 Amendment and the word "income" is used in its constitutional sense.**

[26 U.S.C. §643\(b\): Definitions applicable to Subparts A, B, C, and D](#)

[TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle A](#) > [CHAPTER 1](#) > [Subchapter J](#) > [PART I](#) > [Subpart A](#) > § 643

[§ 643. Definitions applicable to subparts A, B, C, and D](#)

(b) **Income**

For purposes of this subpart and subparts B, C, and D, **the term “income”, when not preceded by the words “taxable”, “distributable net”, “undistributed net”, or “gross”, means the amount of income of the estate or trust for the taxable year determined under the terms of the governing instrument and applicable local law.** Items of gross income constituting extraordinary dividends or taxable stock dividends which the fiduciary, acting in good faith, determines to be allocable to corpus under the terms of the governing instrument and applicable local law shall not be considered income.

[26 C.F.R. §1.643\(b\)-1: Definition of income](#)

Title 26: Internal Revenue

[PART 1—INCOME TAXES](#)

[Estates, Trusts, and Beneficiaries](#)

[§ 1.643\(b\)-1 Definition of income.](#)

For purposes of subparts A through D, part I, subchapter J, chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code, “income,” when not preceded by the words “taxable,” “distributable net,” “undistributed net,” or “gross,” means the amount of income of an estate or trust for the taxable year determined under the terms of the governing instrument and applicable local law. Trust provisions that depart fundamentally from traditional principles of income and principal will generally not be recognized. For example, if a trust instrument directs that all the trust income shall be paid to the income beneficiary but defines ordinary dividends and interest as principal, the trust will not be considered one that under its governing instrument is required to distribute all its income currently for purposes of section 642(b) (relating to the personal exemption) and section 651 (relating to simple trusts). Thus, items such as dividends, interest, and rents are generally allocated to income and proceeds from the sale or exchange of trust assets are generally allocated to principal. However, an allocation of amounts between income and principal pursuant to applicable local law will be respected if local law provides for a reasonable apportionment between the income and remainder beneficiaries of the total return of the trust for the year, including ordinary and tax-exempt income, capital gains, and appreciation. For example, a state statute providing that income is a unitrust amount of no less than 3% and no more than 5% of the fair market value of the trust assets, whether determined annually or averaged on a multiple year basis, is a reasonable apportionment of the total return of the trust. Similarly, a state statute that permits the trustee to make adjustments between income and principal to fulfill the trustee's duty of impartiality between the income and remainder beneficiaries is generally a reasonable apportionment of the total return of the trust. Generally, these adjustments are permitted by state statutes when the trustee invests and manages the trust assets under the state's prudent investor standard, the trust describes the amount that may or must be distributed to a beneficiary by referring to the trust's income, and the trustee after applying the state statutory rules regarding the allocation of receipts and disbursements to income and principal, is unable to administer the trust impartially. Allocations pursuant to methods prescribed by such state statutes for apportioning the total return of a trust between income and principal will be respected regardless of whether the trust provides that the income must be distributed to one or more beneficiaries or may be accumulated in whole or in part, and regardless of which alternate permitted method is actually used, provided the trust complies with all requirements of the state statute for switching methods. A switch between methods of determining trust income authorized by state statute will not constitute a recognition event for purposes of section 1001 and will not result in a taxable gift from the trust's grantor or any of the trust's beneficiaries. A switch to a method not specifically authorized by state statute, but valid under state law (including a switch via judicial decision or a binding non-judicial

settlement) may constitute a recognition event to the trust or its beneficiaries for purposes of section 1001 and may result in taxable gifts from the trust's grantor and beneficiaries, based on the relevant facts and circumstances. In addition, an allocation to income of all or a part of the gains from the sale or exchange of trust assets will generally be respected if the allocation is made either pursuant to the terms of the governing instrument and applicable local law, or pursuant to a reasonable and impartial exercise of a discretionary power granted to the fiduciary by applicable local law or by the governing instrument, if not prohibited by applicable local law. This section is effective for taxable years of trusts and estates ending after January 2, 2004.

[T.D. 9102, 69 FR 19, Jan. 2, 2004]

Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 207, 40 S.Ct. 189, 9 A.L.R. 1570 (1920):

*"In order, therefore, that the [apportionment] clauses cited from article I [§2, cl. 3 and §9, cl. 4] of the Constitution may have proper force and effect ...[i]t becomes essential to distinguish between what is an what is not 'income,' ...according to truth and substance, without regard to form. **Congress cannot by any definition it may adopt conclude the matter, since it cannot by legislation alter the Constitution, from which alone, it derives its power to legislate, and within those limitations alone that power can be lawfully exercised...** [pg. 207]...After examining dictionaries in common use we find little to add to the succinct definition adopted in two cases arising under the Corporation Tax Act of 1909, **Stratton's Independence v. Howbert**, 231 U.S. 399, 415, 34 S.Sup.Ct. 136, 140 [58 L.Ed. 285] and **Doyle v. Mitchell Bros. Co.**, 247 U.S. 179, 185, 38 S.Sup.Ct. 467, 469, 62 L.Ed. 1054..."*

[emphasis added]

So what is income? Here are some definitions direct from the U.S. Supreme Court as cited in one of the above-mentioned cases:

*"...Whatever difficulty there may be about a **precise scientific definition of 'income,'** it imports, as used here, something entirely distinct from principal or capital either as a subject of taxation or as a measure of the tax; **conveying rather the idea of gain or increase arising from corporate activities.**"*

Doyle v. Mitchell Brothers Co., 247 U.S. 179, 185, 38 S.Ct. 467 (1918)

[emphasis added]

Has the IRS been treating you as a corporation all these years? When people see this, they say things like: "That can't be right. What's going on here?". Keep reading and we will clarify. Here is the other cite defining income mentioned in the **Eisner** ruling, from **Stratton's Independence v. Howbert**, [231 U.S. 399](#), 414, 58 L.Ed. 285, 34 Sup.Ct. 136 (1913):

*"This court had decided in the Pollock Case that the income tax law of 1894 amounted in effect to a direct tax upon property, and was invalid because not apportioned according to populations, as prescribed by the Constitution. The act of 1909 avoided this difficulty by imposing not an income tax, but an **excise tax upon the conduct of business in a corporate capacity**, measuring, however, the amount of tax by the income of the corporation...**Flint v. Stone Tracy Co.**, [220 U.S. 107](#), 55 L.Ed. 389, 31 Sup.Ct.Rep. 342, Ann. Cas."*

You don't have to believe us that "income" can only be defined by the U.S. Constitution as corporate profit. Look in section 3.7.15.1 of [The Great IRS Hoax](#), which talks about the legislative intent of the Sixteenth Amendment. That section has the entire speech of President

Taft given before Congress on June 16, 1909 given to introduce the Sixteenth Amendment for ratification. Here is an excerpt from that speech:

*I therefore recommend to the Congress that both Houses, by a two-thirds vote, **shall propose an amendment to the Constitution conferring the power to levy an income tax upon the National Government** without apportionment among the States in proportion to population.*

...

Second, the decision in the Pollock case left power in the National Government to levy an excise tax, which accomplishes the same purpose as a corporation income tax and is free from certain objections urged to the proposed income tax measure.

*I therefore recommend an amendment to the tariff bill Imposing upon all corporations and joint stock companies for profit, except national banks (otherwise taxed), savings banks, and building and loan associations, an excise tax measured by 2 per cent on the net income of such corporations. **This is an excise tax upon the privilege of doing business as an artificial entity and of freedom from a general partnership liability enjoyed by those who own the stock.** [Emphasis added] I am informed that a 2 per cent tax of this character would bring into the Treasury of the United States not less than \$25,000,000.*

*The decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Spreckels Sugar Refining Company against McClain (192 U.S., 397), seems clearly to establish the principle that such a tax as this is an **excise tax upon privilege and not a direct tax on property**, and is within the federal power without apportionment according to population. The tax on net income is preferable to one proportionate to a percentage of the gross receipts, because it is a tax upon success and not failure. It imposes a burden at the source of the income at a time when the corporation is well able to pay and when collection is easy.*

Bowers v. Kerbaugh-Empire Co., 271 U.S. 170, 174, (1926)

"The Sixteenth Amendment declares that Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes on income, "from [271 U.S. 174] whatever source derived," without apportionment among the several states and without regard to any census or enumeration. It was not the purpose or effect of that amendment to bring any new subject within the taxing power. Congress already had power to tax all incomes. But taxes on incomes from some sources had been held to be "direct taxes" within the meaning of the constitutional requirement as to apportionment. Art. 1, § 2, cl. 3, § 9, cl. 4; Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., 158 U.S. 601. The Amendment relieved from that requirement, and obliterated the distinction in that respect between taxes on income that are direct taxes and those that are not, and so put on the same basis all incomes "from whatever source derived." Brushaber v. Union P. R. Co., 240 U.S. 1, 17. **"Income" has been taken to mean the same thing as used in the Corporation Excise Tax Act of 1909, in the Sixteenth Amendment, and in the various revenue acts subsequently passed. Southern Pacific Co. v. Lowe, 247 U.S. 330, 335; Merchants' L. & T. Co. v. Smietanka, 255 U.S. 509, 219. After full consideration, this Court declared that income may be defined as gain derived from capital, from labor, or from both combined, including profit gained through sale or conversion of capital. Stratton's Independence v. Howbert, 231 U.S. 399, 415; Doyle v. Mitchell Brothers Co., 247 U.S. 179, 185; Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 207.** And that definition has been adhered to and applied repeatedly. See, e.g., Merchants' L. & T. Co. v. Smietanka, supra; 518; Goodrich v. Edwards, 255 U.S. 527, 535; United States v. Phellis, 257 U.S. 156, 169; Miles v. Safe Deposit Co., 259 U.S. 247, 252-253; United States v. Supplee-Biddle Co., 265 U.S. 189, 194; Irwin v. Gavit, 268 U.S. 161, 167; Edwards v. Cuba Railroad, 268 U.S. 628, 633. In determining what constitutes income, substance rather than form is to be given controlling weight. Eisner v. Macomber, supra, 206. [271 U.S. 175]"

[Bowers v. Kerbaugh-Empire Co., [271 U.S. 170](#), 174, (1926)]

[Pete Hendrickson on the Meaning of "Income" \(MP3, 3 Mbytes\)](#)

U.S. v. Whiteridge, [231 U.S. 144](#), 34 S.Sup. Ct. 24 (1913)

“As repeatedly pointed out by this court, the Corporation Tax Law of 1909..**imposed an excise or privilege tax, and not in any sense, a tax upon property or upon income merely as income.** It was enacted in view of the decision of Pollock v. Farmer’s Loan & T. Co., 157 U.S. 429, 29 L. Ed. 759, 15 Sup. St. Rep. 673, 158 U.S. 601, 39 L. Ed. 1108, 15 Sup. Ct. Rep. 912, which held the income tax provisions of a previous law to be unconstitutional because amounting in effect to a direct tax upon property within the meaning of the Constitution, and because not apportioned in the manner required by that instrument.”

[U.S. v. Whiteridge, [231 U.S. 144](#), 34 S.Sup. Ct. 24 (1913)]

 [47A Corpus Juris Secundum \(C.J.S.\) Pages 182 through 189, Sections 56-58: Income Taxable In General](#) (796 KBytes)

Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railroad Co., [240 U.S. 1](#), 16-17 (1916)

“The conclusion reached in the Pollack case.. recognized the fact that taxation on income was, in its nature, an excise...”

[Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railroad Co., [240 U.S. 1](#), 16-17 (1916)]

Southern Pacific Co., v. Lowe, [247 U.S. 330](#), 335, 38 S.Ct. 540 (1918)

“We must reject in this case, as we have rejected in cases arising under the Corporation Excise Tax Act of 1909 (Doyle, Collector, v. Mitchell Brothers Co., 247 U.S. 179, 38 Sup. Ct. 467, 62 L. Ed.--), the broad contention submitted on behalf of the government that all receipts—everything that comes in—are income within the proper definition of the term ‘gross income,’ and that the entire proceeds of a conversion of capital assets, in whatever form and under whatever circumstances accomplished, should be treated as gross income. Certainly the term “income’ has no broader meaning in the 1913 act than in that of 1909 (see Stratton’s Independence v. Howbert, 231 U.S. 399, 416, 417 S., 34 Sup. Ct. 136), and for the present purpose we assume there is not difference in its meaning as used in the two acts.”

[Southern Pacific Co., v. Lowe, [247 U.S. 330](#), 335, 38 S.Ct. 540 (1918)]

Stapler v. U.S., 21 F.Supp. 737,U.S. Dist. Ct. EDPA (1937)

"Income within the meaning of the **16th Amendment** and the **Revenue Act** means, gain ... and in such connection gain means profit ... proceeding from property severed from capital, however invested or employed and coming in, received or drawn by the taxpayer for his separate use, benefit and disposal"

[Stapler v. U.S., 21 F.Supp. 737,U.S. Dist. Ct. EDPA (1937)]

Goodrich v. Edwards, [255 U.S. 527](#) (1921) and Conner v. U.S., 303 F.Supp. 1187 (1969):

"Whatever may constitute income, therefore must have the essential feature of gain to the recipient. This was true when the **16th Amendment** became effective, it was true at the time of **Eisner v. Macomber**, supra, it was true under **sect. 22(a)** of the **Internal Revenue Code** of 1938, and it is likewise true under **sect. 61(a)** of the **I.R.S. Code** of 1954. If there is not gain, there is not income Congress has taxed INCOME and not compensation."

Edwards v. Keith, 231 F. 111, (1916)

"... one does not derive income by rendering services and charging for them."

Oliver v. Halstead, 196 Va. 992, 86 S.E.2d 858 (1955)

"There is a clear distinction between profit and wages or compensation for labor. Compensation for labor cannot be regarded as profit within the meaning of the law."

Lauderdale Cemetery Assoc. v. Matthews, 345 Pa. 239 (1946), 47 A.2d. 277, 280

"Reasonable compensation for labor or services rendered is not profit."

 **Murphy v. IRS, DC Court of Appeals No. 03cv02414**

So. Pacific v. Lowe, 238 F. 847, 247 U.S. 30 (1918)(U.S. Dist. Ct. S.D. N.Y. 1917)

"... `income' as used in the statute should be given a meaning so as not to include everything that comes in, the true function of the words `gains' and `profits' is to limit the meaning of the word `income'"

[So. Pacific v. Lowe, 238 F. 847, [247 U.S. 30](#) (1918)(U.S. Dist. Ct. S.D. N.Y. 1917)]

Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 207, 40 S.Ct. 189, 9 A.L.R. 1570 (1920):

"... the definition of income approved by the Court is:

`The gain derived from capital, from labor, or from both combined, provided it be understood to include profits gained through sale or conversion of capital assets.'"

Helvering v. Edison Bros. Stores, 133 F.2d. 575 (1943)

"The Treasury Department cannot, by interpretative regulations, make income of that which is not income within the meaning of the revenue acts of Congress, nor can Congress, without apportionment, tax as income that which is not income within the meaning of the Sixteenth Amendment. Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 40 S. Ct. 189, 64 L. Ed. 521, 9 A.L.R. 1570; M. E. Blatt Co. v. United States, 305 U.S. 267, 59 S. Ct. 186, 83 L. Ed. 167."

[Helvering v. Edison Bros. Stores, [133 F.2d. 575](#) (1943)]

20 C.F.R. §416.1102: What is income

Income is anything you receive in cash or in kind that you can use to meet your needs for food, clothing, and shelter. Sometimes income also includes more or less than you actually receive

(see § 416.1110 and § 416.1123(b)). In-kind income is not cash, but is actually food, clothing, or shelter, or something you can use to get one of these.

[56 F.R. 3212, Jan. 29, 1991]

[\[20 C.F.R. §416.1102: What is income\]](#)

20 C.F.R. §416.1103: What is not income

*Some things you receive are not income because you cannot use them as food, clothing, or shelter, or use them to obtain food, clothing, or shelter. In addition, **what you receive from the sale or exchange of your own property [and the Supreme Court in Butcher's Union declared that labor is property] is not income; it remains a resource.** The following are some items that are not income:*

(a) Medical care and services. Medical care and services are not income if they are any of the following:

(1) Given to you free of charge or paid for directly to the provider by someone else;

(2) Room and board you receive during a medical confinement;

(3) Assistance provided in cash or in kind (including food, clothing, or shelter) under a Federal, State, or local government program, whose purpose is to provide medical care or services (including vocational rehabilitation);

(4) In-kind assistance (except food, clothing, or shelter) provided under a nongovernmental program whose purpose is to provide medical care or medical services;

(5) Cash provided by any nongovernmental medical care or medical services program or under a health insurance policy (except cash to cover food, clothing, or shelter) if the cash is either:

(i) Repayment for program-approved services you have already paid for; or

(ii) A payment restricted to the future purchase of a program-approved service.

What is "income" and how to I place a "value" on it?-Independent American Party

Income was defined by the Congress before the 16th Amendment. The did so in the law concerning the Income tax that was declared unconstitutional before the 16th Amendment. (Was that passed legally? I doubt it.) It means corporate profit. You cannot have profit from trading a thing of value for another thing of value or trading a thing of value for a thing of no value. If you charge 10.00 and hour for your employee and you charge 20.00 an hour and the costs of hiring the employee is 18.00 an hour then you have a 2.00 profit on the employee. If you buy a widget for 100.00 and you sell it for 200.00 and it cost you 50.00 to sell it then you have 50.00 profit or income. If you trade your labor worth \$10.00 an hour for a note that has no value then you lost income. (Bad investment) If you trade your labor for \$10.00 for one hour then you broke even and cannot have income or profit. This is, of course, not only understandable, it is fair and honest. Our government, however, has established a New American Civil Religion which is anti-Christ and anti-truth and has been established by the [High Priests of this New American Civil Religion](#).

Income Taxes and Social Security taxes are nothing more than the tithing for this [Religion of Socialism](#). To me that is enough of a reason not to pay it since it is a violation of the First Amendment but then that is another story.

Of course evil becomes good and good evil in this Civil Religion: Isa. 5: 20 ¶ Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!

So how do you know if you have income or owe a tax. Well the first thing you must do is determine if you have any income and if it can be determined by the “value” of “dollars” since “Federal income tax is imposed in terms of dollars. U.S. v. Rickman 638 F.2d 182, *184 (C.A.Kan., 1980)

Dollar IS defined by Congress in U.S.C. 31 Sec. 5112 in (a) (e) and (d)(1). It is not defined in Title 26 the Internal Revenue Code. The value of a dollar is not defined anywhere else that I can find and I have looked for over ten years. (If anyone can find another definition made by Congress that shows the value of a dollar please let me know.) The Board of Governors sent an Independent American Party Candidate a letter stating that a “dollar” has no “set value” but it appears they either lied or did not know the law.

A dollar has a “value” and it has been “regulated” by Congress at [U.S.C. 31, Section 5112](#) as per the United States Constitution. (Do a word search on the word “value” and you will see that the code is very clear on what kind of “dollars” have a given value. You will note that Federal Reserve Notes are not included.)

Textual Canons

Textual canons are rules of thumb for understanding the words of the text. Some of the canons are still known by their traditional Latin names.

Expressio unius est exclusio alterius (The express mention of one thing excludes all others)

Items not on the list are assumed not to be covered by the statute. However, sometimes a list in a statute is illustrative, not exclusionary. This is usually indicated by a word such as “includes.”

In pari materia (Upon the same matter or subject)

When a statute is ambiguous, its meaning may be determined in light of other statutes on the same subject matter.

Noscitur a sociis (A word is known by the company it keeps)

When a word is ambiguous, its meaning may be determined by reference to the rest of the statute.

The legislature intended to use ordinary English words in their ordinary senses.

[F]irst, “the ordinary rule of statutory construction” that “if Congress intends to alter the usual constitutional balance between States and the Federal Government, **it must make its intention to do so unmistakably clear in the language of the statute,**” Will, 491 U.S., at 65, 109 S.Ct. 2304 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); see also Gregory v. Ashcroft, 501 U.S. 452, 460-461, 111 S.Ct. 2395, 115 L.Ed.2d 410 (1991); United States v. Bass, 404 U.S. 336, 349, 92 S.Ct. 515, 30 L.Ed.2d 488 (1971), and second, the doctrine that statutes should be construed so as to avoid difficult constitutional questions. (Vermont Agency of Natural Resources v. U.S. ex rel. Stevens, 529 U.S. 765, 787, (2000))

So is Congress intends to “alter the usual constitutional balance between States and the Federal Government, it must make its intention to do so unmistakably clear in the language of the statute...”

So what should the “balance be” when it comes to money between the States and the Federal government?

Section. 8. The Congress shall have Power To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

Art. 1, Section. 10. No State shall ... make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts;

But they had better “make its intention to do so unmistakably clear in the language...” so that means that Money needs to be coin and dollar needs to be defined or Congress had better be VERY clear how they are doing it, what is money and what is a dollar and if not then “Keeping in mind the well-settled rule that the citizen is **exempt from taxation** unless the same is imposed by clear and unequivocal language, and that where the construction of a tax law is doubtful, the doubt is to be resolved in favor of those upon whom the tax is sought to be laid...” Spreckels Sugar Refining Co. v. McClain, 192 U.S. 397, 24 S.Ct. 376, 418, U.S. 1904

A Federal Reserve Note has, according to the Treasury Department <http://www.treas.gov/education/faq/currency/legal-tender.shtml> has “no value.” “Federal Reserve notes are not redeemable in gold, silver or any other [commodity](#), and receive no backing by anything. This has been the case since 1933. **The notes have no value for themselves**, but for what they will buy.”

Now that is clear and unequivocal language. “Federal Reserve notes are not redeemable in... any... [commodity](#)” and “have no value for themselves.”

By the way that would mean that “lawful money” is not a [commodity](#) as per [U.S.C. 31, sec. 411](#) which says: Federal reserve notes... shall be redeemed in lawful money on demand at the Treasury Department of the United States...”

It seems to be impossible to have “income” if you receive something that has “no value.” Cannot be redeemed in an [commodity](#) and has no value for themselves. I mean if it has no value how and cannot be redeemed for something of value how can it be profit? How can it have “value” if it has “no value”?

So how can we avoid Income taxes?

“I live in Alexandria, Virginia. Near the Supreme Court chambers is a toll bridge across the Potomac. When in a rush, I pay the dollar toll and get home early. However, I usually drive a free bridge outside the downtown section of the city, and cross the Potomac on a free bridge. This bridge was placed outside the downtown Washington, D.C. area to serve a useful social service: getting drivers to drive the extra mile to help alleviate congestion during rush hour. If I went over the toll bridge and through the barrier without paying the toll, I would be committing tax evasion. If, however, I drive the extra mile and drive outside the city of Washington, I am using a legitimate, logical and suitable method of tax avoidance, and I am performing a useful social service by doing so. For my tax evasion, I should be punished. For my tax avoidance, I should be commended. The tragedy of life today is that so few people know that the free bridge event exists.” U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis

This seems very clear. We need to judge our income by the “value” of the “dollars” we receive in “income” while subject to Federal jurisdiction in a taxable “district” while working in a taxable occupation. So if you know what all of those mean and how they personally affect you in “clear and unequivocal language” then you are not exempt from income tax so shut up and pay. If on the other hand you feel you are unsure because the language does not appear to be “clear and unequivocal” and you are no longer sure what a “dollar” is or you believe you do know what a ‘dollar’ is and you did not have any “income” in “dollars” then you are probably exempt.

Therefore if you have income in “dollars” you should pay the “toll.” If you do not have income in dollars or if you do not have enough income in dollars to meet the exemption limit established by Congress then you should not pay the “toll” and you will be “performing useful social service by doing so.”

“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.

“But the most deplorable effect of all is that diminution of attachment and reverence which steals into the hearts of the people, towards a political system which betrays so many marks of infirmity, and disappoints so many of their flattering hopes. **No government, any more than an individual, will long be respected without being truly respectable;** nor be truly respectable, without possessing a certain portion of order and stability.” **PUBLIUS. (Madison) Federalist Papers 62** (Note: Congressman Rob Gramms of Minnesota said in 1999 AD in Congress that the code consists of over 7,000,000 words, and has been changed 5,400 times since 1986.)

“Permit me to issue and control the money of a nation and I care not who makes its laws.” Mayer Amschel Rothschild of Germany (1743–1812)

So tell me the truth. Can you now, in all honesty, sign a 1040 form under penalties of perjury **knowing** that you have income in dollars? Because if you cannot then you will commit a felony known as perjury by signing it. So the question is will you uphold the law or will you commit a felony out of fear?

“Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.” - George Washington, Farewell Address 1796 AD.

“If you love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude better than the animating contest of freedom, go home from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or arms. **Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains set lightly upon you and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen.**” – Samuel Adams, 1776

Copyright Family Guardian Fellowship

Last revision: 8/16/09

This private system is NOT subject to monitoring