



"Those who say it cannot be done should not interfere with those of us who are doing it"© - S. Hickman

[Home](#)

[Against the Grain Press Loss of Liberty Revealed](#)

[Working Tommy C.](#)

[Livid Leigh](#)

[Boilin' Ed](#)

[D. Tom](#)

[The Informer](#)

[Knowledge is Freedom](#)

[Privacy](#)

[Links](#)

[Court Case](#)

[Contact Us](#)

© 1994 - 2009
Against the Grain

207,177

The Informer

Definitions that enslave you.

(Or how government screws you)

It has been long enough since I wrote my book, **Which One Are You**, that a whole new group of uneducated people are left in the dark as to a lot of discussion over what is the United States in the Internal revenue code.

I will take excerpts from my book and place them before you so as to give you a better understanding how those 535 criminals in Washington, D.C. operate and have operated since 1789. The key to understanding how they operate to your detriment, is brought forth in the acts of Congress called the OMNIBUS Acts when Alaska and Hawaii came into the Union of States. If this never happened we would still be in the dark. This requires some downright basic thinking and deduction of your thought process. Since a lot of you reading this have been dumbed down by the government schools many will be floundering with this. This shows the government fool (school) system is working fine. So with out further ado I proceed to the book.

EXCERPTS FROM BOOK

Please go to your Library and pick up the OMNIBUS Acts. They can be found by looking up 86th Congress volume 73, 1959, volume 74, 1960. These are Public Laws 86-70, 86-624. This points out the crafty way the Government uses correct English and how Congress changes words by using their definitions, for example all the United States Code definitions had to be changed to allow Alaska and Hawaii to join the Union of States. Another example is when Alaska joined the Union and left the designation of "States **OF** the United States," Congress added a new definition that never appeared before, that being;

Continental United States "Sec.48. Whenever the phrase `continental United States' is used in any law of the United States enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, it shall mean the 49 States on the North American Continent and the District of Columbia, **unless otherwise expressly provided.**"

Where is it expressly provided?

"Sec. 22 (a) Section 2202 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to missionaries in foreign service), and sections **3121 (e) (1)**, 3306 (j), 4221 (d) (4), and 4233 (b) of such code (**each relating to a special definition of `State'**) are amended by striking out `Alaska.'.

(b) Section 4262 © (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (definition of `continental United States') is amended to read as follows: `(1) **Continental United States.—The term `continental United States' means the District of Columbia and the `States' other than Alaska.**"

When Hawaii was admitted to the Union they changed the definition again to wit;

Internal Revenue Sec. 18 (a) 4262 © "(1) **Continental United States.—**

The term 'continental United States' means the District of Columbia and the States other than Alaska and Hawaii."

WHAT ARE THE STATES OTHER THAN ALASKA AND HAWAII? They certainly can't be the other 48 States **united by and under the Constitution**, because Alaska and Hawaii just joined them, RIGHT? The same definitions apply to the Social Security Acts. So what is left, Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands, Etc.. These are the States **OF** (belonging to) the United States and are referred to as "the States of the United States." Do not confuse this term with States of the Union, remember what the word "**of**" means.

Congress can change the definition of United States for two sentences and then revert back to the definition it used before the two sentences. This is what they did in Public Law 86-624 Pg. 414 under School Operation Assistance in Federally affected areas (d) (2):

"The fourth sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "in the continental United States (including Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands)" and by striking out "continental United States" in clause (ii) of such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "United States (**which for purposes of this sentence and the next sentence means the fifty States and the District of Columbia**)". The fifth sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "continental" before "United States" each time it appears therein and by striking out "(including Alaska)".

Just this little section contains all the evidence you need, by words of construction, to prove the term United States on either side of these sentences did not mean the fifty states. If that is not conclusive to you then how about this;

26 CFR § 31.3121 (e)-1 State, United States, and citizen

(a) When used in the regulations in this subpart, the term "State" includes [in its restrictive form] the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii **before** their admission as States, and (when used with respect to services performed after 1960) Guam and American Samoa.

(b) When used in the regulations in this subpart, the term "United States", when used in a **geographical sense, means** the several states (including the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii **before** their admission as States), the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. When used in the regulations in this subpart with respect to services performed after 1960, the term "United States" **also includes** [in its expansive form] Guam and American Samoa when the term is used in a **geographical sense**. The term "citizen of the United States" includes [restrictive form] a citizen of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, and effective January 1, 1961, a citizen of Guam or American Samoa."

Note the bolded terms. In (a), Alaska and Hawaii only fit the definition of "State" **before** joining the Union. That meant the definition of "state" never was meant to be the 48 now 50 States of the Union **unless** distinctly expressed. Well you are now confused by (b) are you not? The word "geographical" was never used in tax law until Alaska and Hawaii joined the Union, and it is not defined in the Internal Revenue Code. So we use the Standard Random House Dictionary;

"ge.o.graph.i.cal 1. of or pertaining to geography. **2.** of or pertaining to the natural features, population, industries, etc., of a region or regions."

Were you born **in** the United States? The preposition "in" shows that "United States" in this question is a place, a **geographical** place named "United States." It is singular even though it ends in "s". It also can be plural when talking about a Union which are things existing by agreement. Every human in a nation is a natural Citizen of a place called a nation if they were born in that nation. Those same people must be Naturalized (born again) if wanting to become a citizen of another Nation. Original Citizenship exists because of places, not agreements.

Here are two questions that your own answer will solve the dilemma. In a geographical sense where is the continental Iowa located on the continent? In a geographical sense where is the continental United States (Congress) located on the continent?

Now since typewriters were purchased from the areas that just joined the Union, Alaska & Hawaii, according to Title 1, Congress had to use a term that is **NOT** used in the Internal Revenue Code in order to buy the same typewriters from the same area.

"Sec. 45. Title 1 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1960, is amended by striking out the words `for the purchase within the continental

limits of the United States of any typewriting machines' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the purchase within the **STATES OF THE UNION** and the District of Columbia of any typewriting machines'."

See, they can do it when it serves their purpose. Another point brought out by the OMNIBUS Acts is that Selective Service Sec. 36 Section 16 (b) does not apply to the 50 States of the Union. Sorry all you nonresident aliens (Americans), if you have to defend the United States when it gets into wars to protect its corporate interests, like the bankers who control the oil companies and all branches of the corporate government. You're nothing more than cannon fodder for the bankers protection who loaned all their debt to the oil companies and expect a return. The rationale of such deviousness can be seen in Henry Kissinger's comment,- "Military men are dumb, stupid animals to be used as pawns for foreign policy." Quoted from "The Final Days" by Woodward and Berstein. How would you like to have your son rotting away in some enemy's cell, knowing that the Secretary of State considered him/her nothing more than bargaining fodder to be used for the foreign policy to effect the one world order? Does this prove that lack of knowledge will keep you in chains?

An analogy to the above term "United States," or "State," using the term "Car." Say Congress passed a law saying anybody owning a car would be required to pay a tax. Congress could write the statute like this.

26 USC § XXDD. TAX on CAR. Every person owning a car is required to pay a tax.
(a) Definition of taxable car.

The term "CAR" includes Chevrolet, Buick, Oldsmobile, Pontiac and Cadillac.

Say you own a Ford mustang or Chrysler Plymouth. You do own a car, so, are you required to pay a tax, according to the wording of the above (made up) law? Everybody would assume you would have to pay a tax because you own a car. Aw come on, "it's the law" and **everybody** knows what a car is, just like they know what the term "United States" is, right? If you voluntarily assume you own a taxable "CAR" and fill out any "car" tax Form, you subject yourself to the wrath of the IRS and must pay a tax on a car that is not, by statutory construction, designated to be a taxable "CAR". "Includes" is restrictive. The correct way to make all cars taxable would be stated this way.

(a) Definition of taxable car.

The term "CAR" **also** includes Chev., Buick, Olds, Cad. and Pontiac

OR

(a) Definition of taxable car.

The term "CAR" **means** all cars including Chev., Etc.,Etc..

Remember this simple explanation throughout this Book. I never say I am a United States citizen. Since this term is used in 26 CFR 1.1-1 (c), it means you are subject to **its** (United States) jurisdiction since you are deemed to be a citizen "of" the **U.S., residing** "at home" (**D.C.**) or **residing** abroad, i.e. foreign state of say New York, or anywhere else in the world. Remember, Congress can and does define any term to its liking as long as it serves their purpose. A grey elephant today can be defined as a pink elephant tomorrow, so don't argue that it's a grey elephant in court the day after tomorrow. This is the "presumption" rule expressed later on in this book.

Have you ever heard the President being introduced on TV or at any public function as "the President of the united States of America? NO? Why not? Who does he preside over? Does the Governor of your State ask Bush to OK a final Bill that he just signed?

Here are the facts concerning the term "United States" used in the Tax Laws;

1. "United States" does not mean the fifty States of the Union, unless expressly stated.
2. "United States" means areas within the fifty States of the Union which are ceded to the "United States".
3. "United States" means the possessions which are states of Guam, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands.
4. Both 2 and 3 are called "states" and are not to be confused with States of the Union.
5. "United States" are; Congress assembled, **at home** (the seat of Government),

District of Columbia and its territories (called states) and possessions (ceded areas).

Fact number 5 "at home", as used in the first Income Tax Act of 1913, means the seat of Government as defined in Dictionaries at that time. You will not find the term "at Home" in modern day dictionaries. What are Ceded areas? Look in your State Statutes for the areas which your State ceded (turned over) to the United States. For example;

New Jersey Statute Annotated, Title 52, Chpt. 30, Sec. 1,2,& 3.
General Laws of Idaho Annotated, Chpt. 7, Sec.58 701,702,705.

Missouri Statutes, Chapter 12, Sec. 12.010, 020, 030,& 040.

Constitution of the State of Texas, Art.16, Sec.34, & Revised Civil Statute, Title 85,
Art. 5242 to 5252.

Why all this confusion over the simple term "United States"? Everybody knows that the District of Columbia is not a State, like the 50 States of the Union, and yet it is referred to in All the United States Codes as a "State". The District of Columbia is a corporation which is also known as "United States". It must have its own definition for "State" since it and the Territorial states (Guam, Etc.) were not formed **by and under the Constitution**. Since it is **THE Primary State** owning Guam, Puerto Rico, Etc., which are federal states, it is referred to as "State" in Income tax and Social Security laws, as well as all other Codes Of the United States.

How are these **states** lumped together with the 50 **American States** in the **Internal Revenue Code** when they cannot be classed as States under the Constitution? Use the word **means**, because to use **"includes"** as defined in **IRC** is restrictive. An example;

26 USC § 6103 (b) (5) State.

"The term State **means** any of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

This definition only applies to code section 6103 and not to the entire title. Congress had to do this for exchange information that has to be exchanged to those States of the Union that have income tax laws. It is also for Social Security information for those government workers that operate within the States of the Union for unemployment compensation they receive from the States.

The word "State" in 7701 (a) (4), does not mean one of the 50 States of the Union. It means the five federal states belonging to the United States. Look at the footnotes after the definition of the term State in 26 USC § 7701 (a) (10). Don't they refer to the OMNIBUS Acts I mentioned earlier to look up? You have to get both Public Laws 86-70 and 86-624 and the 1939 and 1954 Code to see how the definition of United States and State has been changed. Only then can you understand that your State of the Union is not the state defined in the tax law of the United States.

So now with an understanding of the complete OMNIBUS Acts, which you must go to the library and get, I will show how the definitions work against you when you don't have an understanding of congresses terms and you use standard common terms rather than legal terms.

Domestic Corporations are always subject to the "United States" tax, for they are chartered by Congress.

1. FOREIGN CORPORATION: A corporation doing business in one state though chartered or incorporated in another state is a foreign corporation as to the first state,...Under federal tax laws, a foreign corporation is one which is **NOT** organized under the laws of one of the states or territories **OF the United States. IRC 7701 (a) (5)**

2. DOMESTIC CORPORATION: When a corporation is organized and chartered in a particular state, it is considered a domestic corporation of that state....For tax purposes, a corporation created **or** organized in the **U.S. or under the law of the U.S. or any state or territory. IRC 4920 (a) (5), 7701 (a) (4).** Black's Law 5th ed.

This is Black's Law Dictionary interpretation of Foreign and Domestic Corporations. Would you kindly note the use of words that I highlighted. The phrase, states or territories **OF** (belonging to) the **United States (D.C.)**, which when spelled out, refers **only** to Guam, Puerto Rico, etc. and **not** the 50 States of the Union, in #1. So a corporation chartered by a State of the Union is Foreign.

In #2, the word **U.S.** means that a corporation chartered by Congress in the District of Columbia or Guam, etc., is Domestic in the place it was chartered. This even applies to a railroad company like Union Pacific, Northern Pacific, which is fully chartered by Congress and Amtrak which is partially owned and resides in a State of the Union. So the term **U.S.** is referring to **D.C. (congress)** because the word **law**, preceding **U.S.**, is singular (See Hooven and Allison v. Evatt supra). A state only has one law to incorporate. Notice the word "or". Now apply the standard that the tribunals use and replace or with "AND", knowing the state and territories belong to the U.S..

Here is the exact wording of the instrument (statute) created by Congress.

26 USC § 7701 (a) (4). Domestic.— The term "domestic" when applied to a corporation or partnership means created or organized **in the United States** or under the **law** of the United States or any State.

Again, note the term LAW is singular. Now following the courts determination of the word "or" to mean AND, because the word either is not found, replace each "or" with an AND.

26 USC § 7701 (a) (5). Foreign.— The term "foreign" when applied to a corporation or partnership means a corporation or partnership which is **not** domestic.

The word "State" in 7701 (a) (4), does not mean one of the 50 States of the Union. It means the five federal states belonging to the United States. Look at the footnotes after the definition of the term State in 26 USC § 7701 (a) (10). Don't they refer to the OMNIBUS Acts I mentioned earlier to look up? You have to get both Public Laws 86-70 and 86-624 and the 1939 and 1954 Code to see how the definition of United States and State has been changed. Only then can you understand that your State of the Union is not the state defined in the tax law of the United States.

In the regulations the IRS puts them all together in the administration section, remember this is their interpretation of the statute, which is quoted here.

26 CFR § 7701-5 Domestic, foreign, resident, and nonresident persons. A domestic corporation is one organized or created in the United States, including only the States (and during the periods when not States, the territories of Alaska and Hawaii), and the District of Columbia, or under the **law of the United States** or of any State or Territory. **[they made it confusing didn't they?]** A foreign corporation is one which is not domestic. A domestic corporation is a resident corporation even though it does no business and owns no property in the United States. **[has to be because Congress created it].** A foreign corporation engaged in trade or business **within** the United States is referred to in the regulations in this chapter as a resident foreign corporation, and a foreign corporation **not** engaged in trade or business within the United States, as a nonresident foreign corporation. . . . The term "nonresident alien", as used in the regulations in this chapter, includes a nonresident alien individual and a nonresident alien fiduciary.

Now for the definition of foreign and domestic corporation in Blk's Law 4th Ed.

"Domestic and foreign. With reference to the laws and the courts of any given state, a 'domestic' corporation is one created by, or organized under, the laws of that state; a 'foreign' corporation is one created by or under the laws of another **state, government [United States],** or country."

Nowhere in IRC, 7701 (a), that I can find, is the term Alien Corporation defined. You should now understand the phrase "when not manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof."

ALIEN CORPORATION: A corporation organized under the laws of a foreign power. Blk's Law 5th ed. Meaning France, China, Canada, etc.

Read Anderson & Kempf's, Business Law Principles and Cases, 6th ed. UCC, since the United States and States of the Union operate in Commerce. Page 948 & 949 describes person as would relate to the Internal Revenue Code.

Sec. 48:5 (1) (a) ...While a corporation is regarded as a "person" with respect to rights and liabilities, a corporation is not regarded as a person within a statute which uses the term to refer to natural persons.

Simply put, it means that "Person" defined in a Tax Statute, cannot be a Natural person and a Corporate person, even if the word Individual is describing a "Person," like in 26 USC § 7701 (a)(1). You can't mix apples such as trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation, with an orange such as Natural Individual. Try to

find the definition of Individual in the IRC. So the word individual, describing a person in 7701 (a) (1), is a Corporate Individual by agreement, not a Natural Individual. I refer you to:

19 C.J.S. Sec. 886. "As a general rule, a Corporation is a **citizen, resident, or inhabitant** of the state or country by or under the laws of which it was created, and of that state or country only."

This rule applies to 7701 (a) (30) United States person. In the Lexicon of Tax Terminology it says that the definition is circular. The "citizen or resident of the United States" is a Corporation since it cannot be a Natural Citizen based on 48:5 (1) (a), supra. This is why the IRS claims that you are in a business and records it on the Individual Master File in a numerical code that no natural American can understand. Therefore, you cannot properly respond to any information requests that IRS sends you and you wonder why they keep coming after you, when you respond that you are not a taxpayer. They are really asking you, in a numerical code, where is your 1040 business return. UCC 2-721 applies.

You should be familiar with the Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railway Co.. What you might not know is the Union Pacific was Chartered by Congress. That made it a **Domestic corp.** in the **United States** and also while it resided in the State for federal purposes. However, it remained foreign to the Union State it inhabited.

Mr. Brushaber was a nonresident alien living in New York, a **Union State**, therefore, he did not **reside** in the **United States**. He did own bonds of the **Domestic corp.** which he derived interest from and that was a **trade or business** carried on with the **United States**. We all know the decision of the Court was that the Tax imposed was an Excise based on a "privilege".

TREASURY DECISION (T.D. 2313).

"Under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railway Co., decided January 24, 1916, it is hereby held that income accruing to **nonresident aliens** in the form of interest from bonds and dividends on the stock of **domestic corporations** is subject to the income tax imposed by the act of October 3, 1913.

Nonresident aliens are not entitled to the specific exemption designated in paragraph C of the income tax law, but are liable for the normal and additional tax upon the entire net income 'from all property owned, and of every **business**, trade, or profession carried on **in the United States**,' computed upon the basis prescribed by law."

Wasn't Mr. Brushaber a resident of **the state of the forum**, which had nothing to do with the fact he lived in New York as a nonresident alien to the **geographical** area of the United States (D.C.)? He was a nonresident alien geographically, but a resident alien of **the state of the forum**, when "effectively connected" with a business agreement UCC 1-201 (3), with the United States domestic corporation chartered by Congress. What was the **source** of the income? Does this sound similar to the Erie Railway case supra?

This is what Roger Foster stated in;
A Treatise on the FEDERAL INCOME TAX Under the Act of 1913. 2nd. Ed. The Lawyers co-operative Publishing Co. Rochester, N.Y. 1915

"...The Act expressly directs: 'That the word 'State' or 'United States' when used in this section shall be construed to include any Territory, Alaska, the District of Columbia, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, when such construction is necessary to carry out its provisions.' Although there might be ground for argument that the phrase 'any Territory' applies to the Hawaiian Islands, it was the evident intention of Congress that the residents of Hawaii, **at least when not citizens of the United States, are exempt from the tax,....**"

THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AND SOCIAL SECURITY ONLY APPLY TO THE U.S. AND ITS citizens, domestic corps., residents and NONRESIDENTS WHILE WORKING AND MAKING WAGES FROM A SOURCE WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.

When the States of the Union require you to give them a Soc. Security number to obtain a Driver license, they use as their authority,

42 U.S.C. 405 (2) © (I) "It is the policy of the United States that **any State** (or political subdivision thereof) may, in the administration of **any tax...**"

Everybody believes the word **State** refers to their State of the Union, such as Idaho, Calif., etc.. Even your employer would use this to justify why he needs your SS #. But this word **State**, does not mean the 50 States of the Union because;

42 U.S.C. 405 (2) © (vi) defines **State** as; "for purposes of **clause (I)** of this subparagraph, the term "**state**" includes The District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

You don't see the 50 **States of the Union** mentioned. Congress would have to use the phrase; and **also includes** the States of the Union. When you read the definitions in the Social Security Act it states; "**Title 8, SEC. 811. WHEN USED IN THIS TITLE--... (b)** The term 'employment' means any service, of whatever nature, performed **within the United States** by an employee for his employer, except--..."

I am now going to bring in those P.L. 86-70 & 86-624, that I mentioned earlier, because the United States (Congress) had to change **ALL** the definitions of United States and State in the Codes of the United States, when Alaska and Hawaii left the **federal states status** to become States of the Union. First is the internal revenue code then Social Security in Title 42 when Alaska joined the Union.

"(g) **Section 7701 (a) (9)** of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of "United States") is amended by striking out 'the territories of Alaska and Hawaii' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Territory of Hawaii'."

"(h) **Section 7701 (a) (10)** of the Internal revenue code of 1954 (relating to definition of State) is amended by striking out 'Territories' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Territory of Hawaii'."

So this left Hawaii still defined as "State" because Alaska just became a State of the Union and lost this designation. In fact this is what is stated in P.L. 86-70 under Social Security Act at page 149;

"(d) **(1)** Paragraph (1) of section 1101 (a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 1301 (a) (1)), relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out 'Alaska, Hawaii,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Hawaii'."

"**(2)** Paragraph (2) of such section (42 U.S.C. 1301 (a) (2)), relating to definition of United States, is amended by striking out 'Alaska'."

Now lets see what happened to these sections when Hawaii joined the Union.

"**(I) Section 7701 (a) (9)** of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of 'United States') is amended by striking out, 'the Territory of Hawaii,'"

"**(j) Section 7701 (a) (10)** of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of 'State') is amended by striking out 'the Territory of Hawaii and'."

And for Social Security;

"(d) **(1)** Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 1101 of such Act, relating to the definition of State, is amended by striking out 'Hawaii,'"

"**(2)** Paragraph (2) of such subsection, as amended, relating to definition of 'United States', is amended by striking out ',Hawaii,'"

What is left? Five of the original Seven **federal states**. So how can the corporate government explain this irrefutable fact which is found in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act on page 417 of P.L. 86-624? I quote;

". . . for purposes of such promulgations and computations, Alaska **shall not be included as part of the 'United States'.**"

And look at this glaring colorable piece of statute (law) from P L 86-624 when laid

AND LOOK at this glaring colorful piece of statute (law) from P.L. 89-227, which ran side by side. I discussed typewriters before.

PRINTING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 890), is amended by striking out the words 'the continental United States' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'the **States of the United States** and the District of Columbia'."

PURCHASES OF TYPEWRITERS

"Sec. 45. Title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1960, is, amended by striking out the words 'for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the purchase within the **States of the Union** and the District of Columbia of any typewriting machines'."

Here are some cases to enlighten you the next time you are asked to sign a government form.

U.S. v. Minker, 350 U.S. 179, 187.

"Because what appears to be a lawful command on the surface, many citizens, because of their respect for the law, are cunningly coerced into waiving their rights, due to ignorance."

Guardian T&D Co. v. Fisher 26 S.Ct. 186, 188.

"An individual may be under no obligation to do a particular thing and his failure to act creates no liability, but if he voluntarily attempts to and do the particular thing, he comes under an implied obligation in respect to the manner in which he does it."

Butler v. Collins, 12 Cal. 457, 463.

"Consent in law is more than mere formal act of the mind. It is an act unclouded by fraud, duress, or sometimes even mistake."

Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1983)

"A waiver of constitutional rights in any contractual language relied upon must on its face amount to a waiver."

Ohio Bell Tel. Co. v. Public Utilities Comm., 301 U.S. 292

"acquiescence in loss of fundamental rights will not be presumed."

Regina v. Day, 9 Car. & P. 722

"There is a difference between 'consent' and 'submission', but it by no means follows that a mere submission involves consent."

Empak v. United States, 349 US 190.

"the courts must indulge every reasonable presumption against waiver of fundamental constitutional rights."

Twining v. NJ, 211 US 78.

"that it is only those rights which **do not** grow out of the character of the national Citizenship **that are subject** to the regulatory powers of the state."

In the end, the great orator of liberty, Patrick Henry, said,

"If there be a real check intended to be left on Congress. it must be left in

the State governments. There will be some check, as long as the judges are incorrupt. As long as they are upright, you may preserve your liberty. But what will the judges determine when the State and federal authority come to be contrasted? Will your liberty then be secure, when the congressional laws are declared paramount to the laws of your State, and the judges are sworn to support them?" "I look on that paper [constitution] as the most fatal plan that could possibly be conceived to enslave a free people."

He didn't think it would work and envisioned the federal government becoming stronger and denying all rights to the states and eventually to the people. The "democracy" that was offered to you, because you thought you could get all this welfare (SS), is short lived isn't it? We are a debtor nation conceived by the unconstitutional 14th Amendment; the 1913 income tax law; the federal reserve system Inc.; the abolition of the U.S. Treasury; and the abolition of the standard of money and the lack of following God's Law. Patrick Henry was right, wasn't he?

Even though you read and put into practice the defenses that are found in this book and declare all your rights, the government usurpers are going to fight you even harder. They can't let you win because others might realize they don't have to follow the evil laws either, be it driver license issue, State or Federal income taxes, permits, zoning, etc., etc.. Remember, "Courts of Law" are really Tribunals of Statutes, read Chapter XX last page. You have to prove you are not subject to the purview by first challenging jurisdiction, nothing else. They will put you in jail, fine you, and/or confiscate your property, even though you are 100% correct. Until the masses wake up, don't expect much support unless you join many of the growing "patriot First Amendment groups throughout America.

END OF EXCERPTS

Well folks if you are getting an education; getting to know you are screwed by government not of your making; learning that there are "legal" terms and "common" terms and never the twain shall meet, then let the people at atgpress know you gained an education. After all isn't that what you are fighting, *Against the Grain*?

Sincerely
The Informer

