

WITHHOLDING AND REPORTING DEFINITIONS

FORM INSTRUCTIONS

Last revised: 10-19-2019

Source: <http://sedm.org>

1. **PURPOSE OF THIS FORM**

- 1.1. There are many occasions in which members must interact with banks, financial institutions, and the government in the course of their commercial dealings in order to ascertain whether income tax withholding or reporting is required.
- 1.2. The focus of this form is to provide a compact, convenient form that can be presented by people doing business with:
 - 1.2.1. State and federal government agencies.
 - 1.2.2. Private employers.
 - 1.2.3. Financial institutions.
 - 1.2.4. Utility companies.
 - 1.2.5. Companies you want to go to work for.
... that is intended to be used in person as a talking point with such institutions in establishing the jurisdiction of the national government over the commercial proceeds of your business relationship.
- 1.3. Make two copies, keep one, and hand the other to the clerk processing your application and go over the definitions and why the limit or constrain what withholding form you must file and what must appear on it.
- 1.4. Please feel encouraged to present this form to your friend or relative to help them defend their rights as well.

2. **RESOURCES FOR FURTHER STUDY:**

- 2.1. *About IRS Form W-8BEN*, Form #04.202
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 2.2. *Citizenship Status v. Tax Status*, Form #10.011
<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitizenshipStatusVTaxStatus/CitizenshipVTaxStatus.htm>
- 2.3. *Citizenship Diagrams, Form #10.010*-proper citizenship status of most Americans on tax forms
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 2.4. *Non-Resident Non-Person Position*, Form #05.020
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 2.5. *Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status*, Form #02.001-withholding form to use for members
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 2.6. *W-8 Attachment: Citizenship*, Form #04.219
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 2.7. *Federal and State Withholding Options for Private Employers*, Form #09.001
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 2.8. *Federal and State Income Taxation of Individuals Course*, Form #12.003
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 2.9. *Why You are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen*, Form #05.006. Proves that you don't satisfy the qualifications for issuing a Social Security Number found in 20 C.F.R. §422.104.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 2.10. *You're Not a STATUTORY "citizen" under the Internal Revenue Code*
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Citizenship/NotACitizenUnderIRC.htm>
- 2.11. *You're not a STATUTORY "resident" under the Internal Revenue Code*
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Citizenship/Resident.htm>

WITHHOLDING AND REPORTING DEFINITIONS

1 Definitions

1. “Trade or business”:

26 U.S.C. §7701

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

(26) trade or business

"The term 'trade or business' includes the performance of the functions of a public office."

*"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 [or "license" with an SSN or TIN] 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)]

2. “United States” and “State”:

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.

TITLE 4 - FLAG AND SEAL, SEAT OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE STATES
CHAPTER 4 - THE STATES
Sec. 110. Same; definitions

(d) The term "State" includes any Territory or possession of the United States.

3. “Individual”

[26 C.F.R. 1.1441-1 Requirement for the deduction and withholding of tax on payments to foreign persons.](#)

(c) Definitions

(3) Individual.

(i) Alien individual.

The term alien individual means an individual who is not a citizen or a national of the United States. See Sec. 1.1-1(c).

[26 C.F.R. 1.1441-1T Requirement for the deduction and withholding of tax on payments to foreign persons.](#)

(c) Definitions

(3) Individual.

(ii) Nonresident alien individual.

The term nonresident alien individual means persons described in section 7701(b)(1)(B), alien individuals who are treated as nonresident aliens pursuant to § 301.7701(b)-7 of this chapter for purposes of computing their U.S. tax liability, or an alien individual who is a resident of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or American Samoa as determined under § 301.7701(b)-1(d) of this chapter. An alien individual who has made an election under section 6013(g) or (h) to be treated as a resident of the United States is nevertheless treated as a nonresident alien individual for purposes of withholding under chapter 3 of the Code and the regulations thereunder.

Based on the definitions above, the applicant sincerely believes that:

1. He/she is “foreign” and “nonresident” in respect to the place where the tax applies.
2. Not an “alien” as that term is defined in 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3), but rather a “national” per 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21).
3. Not the “individual” defined above. Applicant cannot lawfully have any civil status where he/she is:
 - 3.1. Not physically present in.
 - 3.2. Not consensually doing business in or with and therefore waiving sovereign immunity under 26 U.S.C. §1605.
 - 3.3. Not a statutory “citizen” under 8 U.S.C. §1401 who cannot be an instrumentality or agent of a foreign state. State citizens and statutory “U.S. citizens” are not equivalent and mutually exclusive.

Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyANational.pdf>
 - 3.4. Not civilly domiciled within and not representing a public office that is domiciled with under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b). Domicile in the geographical “United States” defined above is a prerequisite to all income tax liability.

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>
 - 3.5. Not contracting in or with the government of that place.
 - 3.6. Not engaged in a public office or a statutory “trade or business” within the corporation “United States” and therefore not representing a legal fiction that is a statutory “person” and likely the ONLY statutory “person” within the Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A.
 - 3.7. Not availing myself of any statutory remedy that might cause a waiver of common law or constitutional protections:

The Court developed, for its own governance in the cases confessedly within its jurisdiction, a series of rules under which it has avoided passing upon a large part of all the constitutional questions pressed upon it for decision. They are:

[...]

6. The Court will not pass upon the constitutionality of a statute at the instance of one who has availed himself of its benefits. FN7 *Great Falls Mfg. Co. v. Attorney General*, 124 U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527; *Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co.*, 244 U.S. 407, 411, 412, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229; *St. Louis Malleable Casting Co. v. Prendergast Construction Co.*, 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351.

FOOTNOTES:

FN7 Compare *Electric Co. v. Dow*, 166 U.S. 489, 17 S.Ct. 645, 41 L.Ed. 1088; *Pierce v. Somerset Ry.*, 171 U.S. 641, 648, 19 S.Ct. 64, 43 L.Ed. 316; *Leonard v. Vicksburg, etc., R. Co.*, 198 U.S. 416, 422, 25 S.Ct. 750, 49 L.Ed. 1108. [*Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936)]

*"The words "privileges" and "immunities," like the greater part of the legal phraseology of this country, have been carried over from the law of Great Britain, and recur constantly either as such or in equivalent expressions from the time of Magna Charta. For all practical purposes they are synonymous in meaning, and originally signified a peculiar right or private law conceded to particular persons or places **whereby a certain individual or class of individuals was exempted from the rigor of the common law.** Privilege or immunity is conferred upon any person when he is invested with a legal claim to the exercise of special or peculiar rights, authorizing him to enjoy some particular advantage or exemption..."* [*The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship*, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10; SOURCE: http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_immunities_of_state_c.pdf]

FOOTNOTES:

See *Magill v. Browne*, Fed.Cas. No. 8952, 16 Fed.Cas. 408; 6 *Words and Phrases*, 5583, 5584; A J. Lien, "Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States," in *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*, vol. 54, p. 31.

4. The following documents are presented if the recipient STILL challenges the assertions in this document. They contain IRREFUTABLE evidence of the veracity of this document and its conclusions:
 - 4.1. Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority within Constitutional States of the Union, Form #05.052

4.2. *The "Trade or Business" Scam*, Form #05.001

2 Definitions based on context

Table 1: Meaning of geographical "words of art"

Law	Federal constitution	Federal statutes	Federal regulations	State constitutions	State statutes	State regulations
Author	Union States/ "We The People"	Federal Government		"We The People"	State Government	
"state"	Foreign country	Union state or foreign country	Union state or foreign country	Other Union state or federal government	Other Union state or federal government	Other Union state or federal government
"State"	Union state	Federal state	Federal state	Union state	Union state	Union state
"in this State" or "in the State" ^{1F1}	NA	NA	NA	NA	Federal enclave within state	Federal enclave within state
"State" ^{2F2} (State Revenue and taxation code only)	NA	NA	NA	NA	Federal enclave within state	Federal enclave within state
"several States"	Union states collectively ^{3F3}	Federal "States" collectively	Federal "States" collectively	Federal "States" collectively	Federal "States" collectively	Federal "States" collectively
"United States"	states of the Union collectively	Federal United States**	Federal United States**	United States* the country	Federal United States**	Federal United States**

NOTES:

1. The term "Federal state" or "Federal 'States'" as used above means a federal territory as defined in [4 U.S.C. §110\(d\)](#) and EXCLUDES states of the Union.
2. The term "Union state" means a "State" mentioned in the United States Constitution, and this term EXCLUDES and is mutually exclusive to a federal "State".
3. If you would like to investigate the various "words of art" that lawyers in the federal government use to deceive you, we recommend the following:
 - 3.1. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/FormsInstr-Cites.htm>
 - 3.2. *Great IRS Hoax*, Form #11.302, Sections 3.9.1 through 3.9.1.28.

3 Why Statutory Definitions Can't Lawfully Be Expanded by Presumption

The main purpose of law is to limit government power. The foundation of what it means to have a "society of law and not men" is law that limits government powers. This is covered in [Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014](#), Section 5. Government cannot have limited powers without DEFINITIONS in the written law that are limiting and which define and declare ALL THINGS that are included and implicitly exclude all things not expressly identified. The rules of statutory construction and interpretation recognize this critical function of law with the following maxims:

"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]

"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*

¹ See California Revenue and Taxation Code, §6017.

² See California Revenue and Taxation Code, §17018.

³ See, for instance, U.S. Constitution Article IV, Section 2.

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 ability to define terms or ADD to the EXISTING statutory definition of terms is a LEGISLATIVE function that can lawfully and constitutionally be exercised ONLY by the Legislative Branch of the government. The power to define or expand the definition of statutory terms:

1. CANNOT lawfully be exercised by either a judge or a government prosecutor or the Internal Revenue Service.
2. CANNOT be exercised by making [PRESUMPTIONS](#) about what a term means or by enforcing the COMMON meaning of the term that is already defined in a statute. See [Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017](#):

"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)]

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]

3. Unlawfully and unconstitutionally violates the [separation of powers](#) when it IS exercised by a judge or government prosecutor. See [Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023](#).
4. Produces the following consequences when it IS exercised by a judge or government prosecutor or administrative agency. The statement below was written by the man who DESIGNED our three branch system of government. He also described in his design how it can be subverted, and corrupt government actors have implemented his techniques for subversion to unlawfully and unconstitutionally expand their power:

"When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise, lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical manner.

Again, there is no liberty, if the judiciary power be not separated from the legislative and executive. Were it joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control; for the judge would be then the legislator. Were it joined to the executive power, the judge might behave with violence and oppression [sound familiar?].

There would be an end of everything, were the same man or the same body, whether of the nobles or of the people, to exercise those three powers, that of enacting laws, that of executing the public resolutions, and of trying the causes of individuals."

[. . .]

In what a situation must the poor subject be in those republics! The same body of magistrates are possessed, as executors of the laws, of the whole power they have given themselves in quality of legislators. They may plunder the state by their general determinations; and as they have likewise the judiciary power in their hands, every private citizen may be ruined by their particular decisions."

[*The Spirit of Laws*, Charles de Montesquieu, 1758, Book XI, Section 6;
SOURCE: http://famguardian.org/Publications/SpiritOfLaws/sol_11.htm]

5. Constitutes engaging in communism as defined by the national government. A communist is legally defined as someone in the government who refuses to recognize or abide by legal and constitutional limits on their authority. The main place that limit occurs is in statutory definitions themselves:

The Congress finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States [consisting of the IRS, DOJ, and a corrupted federal judiciary], although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the [de jure] Government of the United States [and replace it with a [de facto government ruled by the judiciary](#)]. It constitutes an authoritarian dictatorship [IRS, DOJ, and corrupted federal judiciary in collusion] within a [constitutional] republic, demanding for itself the rights and [FRANCHISE] privileges [including immunity from prosecution for their wrongdoing in violation of [Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the Constitution](#)] accorded to political parties, but denying to all others the liberties [Bill of Rights] guaranteed by the Constitution [Form #10.002]. Unlike political parties, which evolve their policies and programs through public means, by the reconciliation of a wide variety of individual views, and submit those policies and programs to the electorate at large for approval or disapproval, the policies and programs of the Communist Party are secretly [by corrupt judges and the IRS in complete disregard of, Form #05.014, the tax franchise "codes", Form #05.001] prescribed for it by the foreign leaders of the world Communist movement [the IRS and Federal Reserve]. Its members [the Congress, which was terrorized to do IRS bidding by the framing of [Congressman Traficant](#)] have no part in determining its goals, and are not permitted to voice dissent to party objectives. Unlike members of political parties, members of the Communist Party are recruited for indoctrination [in the public FOOL system by homosexuals, liberals, and socialists] with respect to its objectives and methods, and are organized, instructed, and disciplined [by the IRS and a corrupted judiciary] to carry into action slavishly the assignments given them by their hierarchical chieftains. Unlike political parties, the Communist Party [thanks to a corrupted federal judiciary] acknowledges no constitutional or statutory limitations upon its conduct or upon that of its members [ANARCHISTS!, Form #08.020]. The Communist Party is relatively small numerically, and gives scant indication of capacity ever to attain its ends by lawful political means. **The peril inherent in its operation arises not from its numbers, but from its failure to acknowledge any limitation as to the nature of its activities, and its dedication to the proposition that the present constitutional Government of the United States ultimately must be brought to ruin by any available means, including resort to; force and violence [for using income taxes]. Holding that doctrine, its role as the agency of a hostile foreign power [the Federal Reserve and the American Bar Association (ABA)] renders its existence a clear present and continuing danger to the security of the United States. It is the means whereby individuals are seduced [illegally KIDNAPPED via identity theft!, Form #05.046] into the service of the world Communist movement [using FALSE information returns and other PERJURIOUS government forms, Form #04.001], trained to do its bidding [by FALSE government publications and statements that the government is not accountable for the accuracy of, Form #05.007], and directed and controlled [using FRANCHISES illegally enforced upon NONRESIDENTS, Form #05.030] in the conspiratorial performance of their revolutionary services. Therefore, the Communist Party should be outlawed**

Any judge, prosecutor, or clerk in an administrative agency who tries to EXPAND or ADD to statutory definitions is violating all the above. Likewise, anyone who tries to QUOTE a judicial opinion that adds to a statutory definition is violating the separation of powers, usurping authority, and STEALING your property and rights. It is absolutely POINTLESS and an act of ANARCHY, lawlessness, and a usurpation to try to add to statutory definitions.

The most prevalent means to UNLAWFULLY and UNCONSTITUTIONALLY add to statutory definitions is through the abuse of the words "[includes](#)" or "including". That illegal and unconstitutional tactic is thoroughly described and rebutted in:

<p>Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014, Section 15.2 DIRECT LINK: https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/LegalDecPropFraud.pdf FORMS PAGE: https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</p>
--

Government falsely accuses freedom advocates of practicing anarchy, but THEY, by trying to unlawfully expand statutory definitions through either the abuse of the word "[includes](#)" or through [PRESUMPTION](#), are the REAL anarchists. That anarchy is described and defined as follows:

Definition: Anarchy

The term "anarchy" implies any one or more of the following, and especially as regards so-called "governments". An important goal of this site is to eliminate all such "anarchy":

1. Are superior in any way to the people they govern UNDER THE LAW.
2. Are not directly accountable to the people or the law. They prohibit the PEOPLE from criminally prosecuting their own crimes, reserving the right to prosecute to their own fellow criminals. Who polices the police? THE CRIMINALS.
3. Enact laws that exempt themselves. This is a violation of the Constitutional requirement for equal protection and equal treatment and constitutes an unconstitutional Title of Nobility in violation of Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution.
4. Only enforce the law against others and NOT themselves, as a way to protect their own criminal activities by persecuting dissidents. This is called "selective enforcement". In the legal field it is also called "professional courtesy". Never kill the goose that lays the STOLEN golden eggs.
5. Break the laws with impunity. This happens most frequently when corrupt people in government engage in "selective enforcement", whereby they refuse to prosecute or interfere with the prosecution of anyone in government. The Department of Justice (D.O.J.) or the District Attorney are the most frequent perpetrators of this type of crime.
6. Are able to choose which laws they want to be subject to, and thus refuse to enforce laws against themselves. The most frequent method for this type of abuse is to assert sovereign, official, or judicial immunity as a defense in order to protect the

wrongdoers in government when they are acting outside their delegated authority, or outside what the definitions in the statutes EXPRESSLY allow.

7. Impute to themselves more rights or methods of acquiring rights than the people themselves have. In other words, who are the object of PAGAN IDOL WORSHIP because they possess "supernatural" powers. By "supernatural", we mean that which is superior to the "natural", which is ordinary human beings.

8. Claim and protect their own sovereign immunity, but refuse to recognize the same EQUAL immunity of the people from whom that power was delegated to begin with. Hypocrites.

9. Abuse sovereign immunity to exclude either the government or anyone working in the government from being subject to the laws they pass to regulate everyone ELSE'S behavior. In other words, they can choose WHEN they want to be a statutory "person" who is subject, and when they aren't. Anyone who has this kind of choice will ALWAYS corruptly exclude themselves and include everyone else, and thereby enforce and implement an unconstitutional "Title of Nobility" towards themself. On this subject, the U.S. Supreme Court has held the following:

"No man in this country [including legislators of the government as a legal person] is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy, and to observe the limitations which it imposes upon the exercise of the authority which it gives," 106 U.S., at 220. "Shall it be said... that the courts cannot give remedy when the Citizen has been deprived of his property by force, his estate seized and converted to the use of the government without any lawful authority, without any process of law, and without any compensation, because the president has ordered it and his officers are in possession? If such be the law of this country, it sanctions a tyranny which has no existence in the monarchies of Europe, nor in any other government which has a just claim to well-regulated liberty and the protection of personal rights," 106 U.S., at 220, 221.

[United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 1 S.Ct. 240 (1882)]

10. Have a monopoly on anything, INCLUDING "protection", and who turn that monopoly into a mechanism to force EVERYONE illegally to be treated as uncompensated public officers in exchange for the "privilege" of being able to even exist or earn a living to support oneself.

11. Can tax and spend any amount or percentage of the people's earnings over the OBJECTIONS of the people.

12. Can print, meaning illegally counterfeit, as much money as they want to fund their criminal enterprise, and thus to be completely free from accountability to the people.

13. Deceive and/or lie to the public with impunity by telling you that you can't trust anything they say, but force YOU to sign everything under penalty of perjury when you want to talk to them. 26 U.S.C. §6065.

[SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4: Meaning of Words; <https://sedm.org/disclaimer.htm>]

For further information on the Rules of Statutory Construction and Interpretation, also called "textualism", and their use in defending against the fraudulent tactics in this section, see the following, all of which are consistent with the analysis in this section:

1. [How Judges Unconstitutionally "Make Law"](http://sedm.org/Litigation/01-General/HowJudgesMakeLaw.pdf), Litigation Tool #01.009-how by VIOLATING the Rules of Statutory Construction and Interpretation, judges are acting in a POLITICAL rather than JUDICIAL capacity and unconstitutionally "making law". <http://sedm.org/Litigation/01-General/HowJudgesMakeLaw.pdf>
2. [Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/LegalDecPropFraud.pdf), Form #05.014, Section 13.9. Section 15 talks about how these rules are UNCONSTITUTIONALLY violated by corrupt judges with a criminal financial conflict of interest. <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/LegalDecPropFraud.pdf>
3. [Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts](https://www.amazon.com/Reading-Law-Interpretation-Legal-Texts/dp/031427555X), Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia and Bryan A Garner -book about statutory interpretation <https://www.amazon.com/Reading-Law-Interpretation-Legal-Texts/dp/031427555X>
4. [Statutory Interpretation](https://sedm.org/statutory-interpretation-justice-scalia/), Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia <https://sedm.org/statutory-interpretation-justice-scalia/>
5. [Collection of U.S. Supreme Court Legal Maxims](https://sedm.org/Litigation/10-PracticeGuides/USSupremeCourtMaxims_1993-1998-Governmentattic.org.pdf), Litigation Tool #10.216, U.S. Department of Justice https://sedm.org/Litigation/10-PracticeGuides/USSupremeCourtMaxims_1993-1998-Governmentattic.org.pdf
6. [Reinquist Court Canons of Statutory Construction](https://sedm.org/Litigation/10-PracticeGuides/Rehnquist_Court_Canons_citations.pdf), Litigation Tool #10.217 https://sedm.org/Litigation/10-PracticeGuides/Rehnquist_Court_Canons_citations.pdf
7. [Statutory Interpretation: General Principles and Recent Trends, Congressional Research Service Report 97-589](https://sedm.org/Litigation/10-PracticeGuides/Statutory%20Interpretation.General.Principles.MARCH.30.2006.CRS97-589.pdf), Litigation Tool #10.215 <https://sedm.org/Litigation/10-PracticeGuides/Statutory%20Interpretation.General.Principles.MARCH.30.2006.CRS97-589.pdf>
8. [Family Guardian Forum 6.5: Word Games that STEAL from and deceive people](https://famguardian.org/forums/forums/forum/6-issue-and-research-debates-anyone-can-read-only-members-can-post/65-word-games-that-steal-from-and-deceive-people/), Family Guardian Fellowship <https://famguardian.org/forums/forums/forum/6-issue-and-research-debates-anyone-can-read-only-members-can-post/65-word-games-that-steal-from-and-deceive-people/>

For a video that emphasizes the main point of this section, watch the following:

4 Legal Consequences of Adding to Statutory Definitions or Violating Those Provided

The legal consequences of adding to statutory definitions include the following:

1. Extortion if you deny me account for trying to read, respect, and obey the limits imposed by the law upon our relationship.
 - 1.1. As a “withholding agent”, you are an officer of the national government. See 18 U.S.C. §872.
 - 1.2. Since I am a “foreign official” of my state, where the constitutional state is legislatively but not constitutionally foreign, then you are engaging threatening me and intimidating me to pawn off your own income tax liability as a corporation by saying I can’t get an account without an illegal bribe or kickback. 18 U.S.C. 878.
2. Criminally impersonating a public officer. If private people exercise “the functions of a public office” who were not lawfully elected or appointed, then they are criminally impersonating a public officer in violation of 18 U.S.C. §912.
3. Bribing the IRS to look the other way with illegally withheld and paid withholdings. 18 U.S.C. §201.
4. Bribing the withholding agent to procure a de facto public office. 18 U.S.C. §210.
5. Accepting the bribe of illegal withholding to procure a de facto public office. 18 U.S.C. §211.
6. Acting with a financial conflict of interest so as to deflect income tax liability from national corporations where it ultimately and ONLY belongs onto the backs of innocent private people who just want to be left alone. 18 U.S.C. §208.
7. Money laundering. All amounts withheld from the earnings of accounts help by anyone not exercising a public office are stolen money that is being transferred illegally to those who are not entitled to it:

“The United States, we have held, cannot, as against the claim of an innocent party, hold his money which has gone into its treasury by means of the fraud of its agent. While here the money was taken through mistake without element of fraud, the unjust retention is immoral and amounts in law to a fraud of the taxpayer’s rights. What was said in the State Bank Case applies with equal force to this situation. ‘An action will lie whenever the defendant has received money which is the property of the plaintiff, and which the defendant is obligated by natural justice and equity to refund. The form of the indebtedness or the mode in which it was incurred is immaterial.’”

[*Bull v. United States*, 295 U.S. 247, 261, 55 S.Ct. 695, 700, 79 L.Ed. 1421]

“When the Government has illegally received money which is the property of an innocent citizen and when this money has gone into the Treasury of the United States, there arises an implied contract on the part of the Government to make restitution to the rightful owner under the Tucker Act and this court has jurisdiction to entertain the suit. 90 Ct.Cl. at 613, 31 F.Supp. at 769.”

[*Gordon v. U. S.*, 227 Ct.Cl. 328, 649 F.2d. 837 (Ct.Cl., 1981)]

*“A claim against the United States is a right to demand money from the United States. [1] Such claims are sometimes spoken of as gratuitous in that they cannot be enforced by suit without statutory consent. [2] **The general rule of non-liability of the United States does not mean that a citizen cannot be protected against the wrongful governmental acts that affect the citizen or his or her property.**[3] **If, for example, money or property of an innocent person goes into the federal treasury by fraud to which a government agent was a party, the United States cannot [lawfully] hold the money or property against the claim of the injured party.**[4]”*

[*American Jurisprudence 2d, United States*, §45 (1999)]

FOOTNOTES:

[1] *United States ex rel. Angarica v. Bayard*, 127 U.S. 251, 32 L.Ed. 159, 8 S.Ct. 1156, 4 AFTR 4628 (holding that a claim against the Secretary of State for money awarded under a treaty is a claim against the United States); *Hobbs v. McLean*, 117 U.S. 567, 29 L.Ed. 940, 6 S.Ct. 870; *Manning v. Leighton*, 65 Vt. 84, 26 A 258, motion dismd 66 Vt. 56, 28 A 630 and (disapproved on other grounds by *Button’s Estate v. Anderson*, 112 Vt. 531, 28 A.2d. 404, 143 A.L.R. 195).

[2] *Blagge v. Balch*, 162 U.S. 439, 40 L.Ed. 1032, 16 S.Ct. 853.

[3] *Wilson v. Shaw*, 204 U.S. 24, 51 L.Ed. 351, 27 S.Ct. 233.

[4] *Bull v. United States*, 295 U.S. 247, 79 L.Ed. 1421, 55 S.Ct. 695, 35-1 USTC ¶ 9346, 15 AFTR 1069; *United States v. State Bank*, 96 U.S. 30, 96 Otto 30, 24 L.Ed. 647.

8. Fraud, if they call amounts withheld a “tax”. “Taxes” must be collected from those who are SUBJECT to the Internal Revenue Code. To collect them from an innocent nonresident “nontaxpayer” is THEFT, not “taxation”. 18 U.S.C. §1001, §1005.

“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.

Coulter, J., in Northern Liberties v. St. John's Church, 13 Pa.St. 104 says, very forcibly, 'I think the common mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that taxes are a public imposition, levied by authority of the government for the purposes of carrying on the government in all its machinery and operations—that they are imposed for a public purpose.' See, also Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St. 69; Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11 Johns., 77; Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398; Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon, 27 Ia., 47; Whiting v. Fond du Lac, supra." [Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]

9. Conspiring across state lines to commit all of the above crimes, if the bank or acceptance agent serves a corporation registered in another state.