

# ***THE TRUTH ABOUT “EFFECTIVELY CONNECTING”***



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2 Definition of “effectively connected” .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3 Overview of the Income Taxation Process .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4 Heart of the Income Tax FRAUD .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5 Historical significance and evolution of the legal term “trade or business” .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>6 It is ILLEGAL for the Average American to call their earnings “trade or business” earnings .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>7 The “treated as if” scam .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>8 What is CONSTITUTIONAL “income”? .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>9 ELECTIONS: When “gross income” includes MORE than “profit” .....</b>	<b>41</b>
9.1 “Effectively Connected” Trap .....	42
9.2 History of “effectively connecting” .....	44
9.3 “Effectively Connecting” expands STATUTORY “gross income” beyond CONSTITUTIONAL “income” .....	45
9.4 Types of income subject to taxation of TOTAL amount received, rather than just profit .....	46
<b>10 Who can “effectively connect”? .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>11 Implications of “effectively connecting” .....</b>	<b>47</b>
11.1 Implications upon the definition of “trade or business” and what it “includes” .....	47
11.2 Implications upon “gross income” .....	51
<b>12 When is “effectively connecting” Lawfully INVOLUNTARY? .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>13 If you are an American National and not a student or trainee in receipt of a privileged grant, then neither the IRS nor any judge can lawfully EFFECTIVELY CONNECT without your consent .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>14 HOW do you “effectively connect”? .....</b>	<b>54</b>
14.1 Filing a 1040-NR return and entering anything under “gross income” .....	54
14.2 Reductions in Liability: Graduated Rate of Tax, Deductions, and Earned Income Credits .....	56
14.3 Performing “personal services” in the “United States” federal corporation as an officer of that corporation .....	56
14.4 Using Government Identifying Numbers: SSN and TIN .....	58
14.5 Conclusions .....	59
<b>15 Why you NEVER want to “effectively connect” .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>16 Conclusions and summary .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>17 Resources for Further Study and Rebuttal .....</b>	<b>61</b>

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Rules for converting private property to a public use or a public office .....	18
Table 2: Constitutional v. Statutory "income" compared .....	38
Table 1: Rules for converting private property to a public use or a public office .....	43

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1: Revenue Act of 1862, 12 Stat. 453, Section 59 .....	27
Figure 2: 1040-NR Form, 2023, p. 1; SOURCE: <a href="https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/f1040nr.pdf">https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/f1040nr.pdf</a> .....	54
Figure 3: "Wages" block of 1040-NR Form, 2023, p. 1; SOURCE: <a href="https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/f1040nr.pdf">https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/f1040nr.pdf</a> .....	54
Figure 4: W-8BEN Form, Instructions .....	56

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### **Constitutional Provisions**

16th Amendment .....	60
Ark. Const. art. XVI, § 5 .....	25
Article 1, Section 8 .....	49
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 .....	38
Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 .....	17
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 .....	38
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution .....	35
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution .....	32
Clause 2, section 3, article 4, of the Constitution .....	49
Constitution .....	61
Declaration of Independence .....	37
Declaration of Independence, 1776 .....	14
Fifth Amend. ....	17
Fifth Amendment .....	16, 17, 19
Fifth Amendment "takings clause" .....	16
Fifth Amendment Takings Clause .....	10, 13, 35, 36
Fourteenth Amendment .....	16
Sixteenth Amendment .....	32, 38, 39, 41, 45
Thirteenth Amendment .....	50
U.S. Constitution, Article IV § 3 (2) .....	49

### **Statutes**

18 U.S. Code § 210 .....	25
18 U.S. Code §210 .....	36
18 U.S.C. §1581 .....	19
18 U.S.C. §4 .....	61
18 U.S.C. §654 .....	16, 61
18 U.S.C. §912 .....	13, 19, 30, 42, 50, 61
1923 Classification Act .....	51
1939 Internal Revenue Code (1939 IRC) .....	30
26 U.S.C. (Supp. V) §7701(b) .....	34
26 U.S.C. §1 .....	61
26 U.S.C. §1402 .....	61
26 U.S.C. §1461 .....	53
26 U.S.C. §162 .....	14, 23, 28, 42, 44, 46, 51, 56, 61
26 U.S.C. §22 (1939) .....	31
26 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A) .....	10
26 U.S.C. §3402(p) .....	35, 36
26 U.S.C. §6013(g) and (h) .....	44
26 U.S.C. §6013(g) or (h) .....	59
26 U.S.C. §6020(b) .....	36
26 U.S.C. §6041(a) .....	22
26 U.S.C. §61 .....	51, 56, 60
26 U.S.C. §61(a)(1) .....	61

26 U.S.C. §6331 .....	34, 35
26 U.S.C. §643 .....	39, 40
26 U.S.C. §6671(b) .....	10
26 U.S.C. §7206 .....	60
26 U.S.C. §7343 .....	10
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14) .....	20
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(16) .....	18
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) .....	13, 30, 35, 42, 43, 60
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30) .....	28, 41, 58, 60
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(31) .....	43
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) .....	44
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) .....	13, 33, 35, 58
26 U.S.C. §7701(b) .....	35
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B) .....	32, 33, 60
26 U.S.C. §7701(c) .....	44
26 U.S.C. §7702(a)(26) .....	22
26 U.S.C. §861(a)(8) .....	26
26 U.S.C. §864 .....	13
26 U.S.C. §864(a) .....	53
26 U.S.C. §864(c)(1)(A) .....	13
26 U.S.C. §864(c)(7) .....	52
26 U.S.C. §871(b) .....	13, 14, 42
26 U.S.C. §871(b)(2) .....	61
26 U.S.C. §871(c) .....	45
26 U.S.C. §871(d) .....	52
26 U.S.C. §872 .....	51, 55
26 U.S.C. §873 .....	44
26 U.S.C. §911 .....	35, 44
28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A) .....	13, 33, 60
31 U.S.C. §321 .....	19
4 U.S.C. §110(d) .....	31, 33, 35
42 U.S.C. §1994 .....	19
44 U.S.C. §1505(a)(1) .....	35
5 U.S.C. §301 .....	35, 49
5 U.S.C. §553(a)(1) .....	34
5 U.S.C. §553(a)(2) .....	35
62 Stat. 694 .....	36
76 Stat. 1125 .....	36
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) .....	32
8 U.S.C. §1401 .....	32, 60
8 U.S.C. §1408 .....	32
Corporation Tax Act of 1909 .....	38
Declaratory Judgments Act, 28 U.S.C. §2201(a) .....	20
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA), 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97 .....	35
I.R.C. Subtitle A .....	40
Internal Revenue Code .....	20, 32
Internal Revenue Code of 1986, §7428 .....	20
Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A .....	60
Investment Company Act of 1940 .....	59
Pub. L. 87–849, § 1(b) .....	36
Public Salary Tax Act .....	31
Title 26 .....	25
Title 26 Subtitle A .....	27
Title 5 of the U.S. Code .....	24
Title 50 of the U.S. Code .....	35
Uniform Code of Military Justice (U.C.M.J.), 10 U.S.C. Chapter 47 .....	35



## Regulations

26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(a).....	23
26 C.F.R. §1.61-2.....	51, 57, 60
26 C.F.R. §1.864-2.....	57
26 C.F.R. §1.871-1(b)(i).....	61
26 C.F.R. §1.871-10.....	52
26 C.F.R. §1.871-2(f).....	42
26 C.F.R. §1.871-7(a)(4).....	42, 51
26 C.F.R. §1.871-8.....	45, 47
26 C.F.R. §1.871-8(c)(1).....	32, 36
26 C.F.R. §1.871-9.....	45, 52, 61
26 C.F.R. §1.872-1 Gross income of nonresident alien individuals.....	47, 51
26 C.F.R. §1.872-2(f).....	42, 45, 61
26 C.F.R. §1.911-2(h).....	44
26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(b).....	28, 58
26 C.F.R. §301.6331-1.....	35
26 C.F.R. §301.6331-4.....	35
26 C.F.R. §301.7701(b)-2(b).....	44
26 C.F.R. §301.7701(b)-2(c).....	29
26 C.F.R. §301.7701-5.....	30
26 C.F.R. §31.3121(b)-3(c)(1).....	36
26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)(11)-1.....	61
26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)(6)-1.....	61
26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)(6)-1(b).....	36
26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3.....	20
26 C.F.R. §31.3402(p)-1.....	20
26 C.F.R. Part 1.....	34
5 C.F.R. §2635.101.....	40
Treasury Regulations.....	45, 61

## Rules

Federal Rule of Evidence 802.....	22
-----------------------------------	----

## Cases

Binns v. United States, 194 U.S. 486, 24 Sup.Ct. 816, 48 L.Ed. 1087.....	49
Blodgett v. Silberman, 277 U.S. 1.....	26
Budd v. People of State of New York, 143 U.S. 517 (1892).....	17, 43
Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325.....	48
C.I.R. v. Trustees of L. Inv. Ass'n, 100 F.2d. 18 (1939).....	21
Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398.....	21, 56
Cereghino v. State By and Through State Highway Commission, 230 Or. 439, 370 P.2d. 694, 697.....	15
Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452.....	30
Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc., 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181.....	29
City of Boerne v. Florez, Archbishop of San Antonio, 521 U.S. 507 (1997).....	13, 40
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10.....	49
Colorado River Commission v. Frohmiller, 46 Ariz. 413, 52 P.2d. 483, 486.....	23
Cook v. Tait, 265 U.S. 47 (1924).....	23, 44
Corbett v. Nutt, 10 Wall. 464.....	33
Davis v. Davis. TexCiv-App., 495 S.W.2d. 607. 611.....	15
Dennis v. Thomson, 43 S.W.2d 18, 240 Ky. 727 (1931).....	29
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244, 21 Sup.Ct. 770, 45 L.Ed. 1088.....	49
Doyle v. Mitchell Bros. Co., 247 U.S. 179, 185.....	41
Doyle v. Mitchell Bros. Co., 247 U.S. 179, 185, 38 S.Sup.Ct. 467, 469, 62 L.Ed. 1054.....	38
Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393, 508-509 (1856).....	16

Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S., 470 F.2d. 585 (1972).....	21
Educational Films Corp. v. Ward, 282 U.S. 379, 387 .....	26
Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 206-208 (1920).....	41
Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 207, 40 S.Ct. 189, 9 A.L.R. 1570 (1920) .....	38
Equitable Life Ins. Co. of Iowa v. Halsey, Stuart & Co., 312 U.S. 410, 61 S.Ct. 623, 85 L.Ed. 920 (1941) .....	29
Evans v. Gore, 253 U.S. 245, 40 S.Ct. 550, 64 L.Ed. 887, 11 A.L.R. 519 .....	31
Farmers Loan & Trust Co. v. Minnesota, 280 U.S. 204.....	26
Fidelity & Columbia Trust Co. v. Louisville, 245 U.S. 54, 58.....	26
First National Bank v. Maine, 284 U.S. 312 .....	26
Flora v. U.S., 362 U.S. 145 (1960).....	18
Foreign Held Bond Case, 15 Wall. 300, 319.....	26
Frick v. Pennsylvania, 268 U.S. 473, 488-489 .....	26
Fulton Light, Heat & Power Co. v. State, 65 Misc.Rep. 263, 121 N.Y.S. 536.....	15
Georgia Dep't of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524 .....	29
Great Cruz Bay, Inc., St. John v. Wheatley, 495 F.2d. 301, 307 (3d Cir. 1974) .....	33
Hanson v. Vernon, 27 Ia., 47.....	21
Hattiesburg Grocery Co. v. Robertson, 126 Miss. 34; 88 So. 4 .....	26
Hildebrand v. New Orleans, 549 So.2d.1218 (1989) .....	25
Housing Authority of Cherokee National of Oklahoma v. Langley, Okl., 555 P.2d. 1025, 1028 .....	17
Hughes v. United States, 953 F.2d. 531, 536-537 (9th Cir. 1991) .....	21
Indiana State Ethics Comm'n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172 .....	30
James v. Bowman, 190 U.S. 127, 139 (1903) .....	13, 40
Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.....	29
Katz v. Brandon, 156 Conn. 521, 245 A.2d. 579, 586 .....	16
Kirtland v. Hotchkiss, 100 U.S. 491, 498.....	26, 33
Knox v. Gulf, M. & N.R. Co., 138 Miss. 70; 104 So. 689 .....	26
Labberton v. General Cas. Co. of America, 53 Wash.2d. 180, 332 P.2d. 250, 252, 254.....	15
Lawrence v. State Tax Commission, 286 U.S. 276 (1932) .....	26, 33
Lawrence v. Wardell, Collector. 273 F. 405 (1921). Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.....	49
License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866) .....	28
Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874).....	21, 56
Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236 (1922).....	21
Madlener v. Finley, 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697 (1st Dist) .....	29
Maguire v. Trefry, 253 U.S. 12, 14, 17 .....	26, 33
Massie v. Watts, 6 Cranch, 148.....	33
Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11 Johns., 77 .....	21, 56
Milwaukee v. White, 296 U.S. 268 (1935).....	35
Montana Power Co. v. Bokma, Mont., 457 P.2d. 769, 772, 773 .....	15
Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1874) .....	23
Nairn v. Ewalt, 51 Kan. 355, 32 P. 1110 (1893) .....	29
Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100.....	48
Northern Liberties v. St. John's Church, 13 Pa.St. 104.....	21, 56
Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425, 442 (1886) .....	13
Ohio v. Helvering, 292 U. S. 360, 370; Georgia v. Evans, 316 U.S. 159, 161 .....	34
Pacific Co. v. Johnson, 285 U.S. 480 .....	26
Pack v. Southwestern Bell Tel. & Tel. Co., 215 Tenn. 503, 387 S.W.2d. 789, 794.....	16
Penn v. Lord Baltimore, 1 Ves. 444 .....	33
Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U.S. 714 (1878).....	33
Pershing Division of Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette Securities Corp. v. United States, 22 F.3d. 741 (7th Cir. 1994) .....	17
Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St. 69 .....	21, 56
Ricker's Petition, 66 N.H. 207 (1890) .....	25, 50
Ringe Co. v. Los Angeles County, 262 U.S. 700, 43 S.Ct. 689, 692, 67 L.Ed. 1186.....	15
Schock v. Jacka, 105 Ariz. 131, 460 P.2d. 185 (1969).....	29
Shaffer v. Carter, 252 U.S. 37, 50 .....	26, 33
Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon, 27 Ia., 47 .....	56
Sims v. United States, 359 U.S. 108, 112-113 (1959).....	34, 36
Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U.S. 700 (1878) .....	22

Smith v. Jackson, 246 U.S. 388.....	34
State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont. 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321 .....	29
State v. Coddington, 135 Ariz. 480, 662 P.2d 155 (Ariz.App.,1983).....	29
Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000) .....	49
Stratton’s Independence v. Howbert, 231 U.S. 399, 415, 34 S.Sup.Ct. 136, 140.....	38
Stratton's Independence v. Howbert, 231 U.S. 399, 415 .....	41
U.S. v. Sterling Salt Co., 200 F. 593, 597 (1912).....	29
Union Refrigerator Transit Co. v. Kentucky, 199 U.S. 194 .....	26
United States v. Boylan, 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223 (CA1 Mass) .....	30
United States v. Harris, 106 U.S. 629, 639 (1883) .....	13
United States v. Holzer, 816 F.2d. 304 (CA7 Ill) .....	29
United States v. Little, 889 F.2d. 1367 (CA5 Miss) .....	30
United States v. Reese, 92 U.S. 214, 218 (1876).....	13, 40
Walker v. Rich, 79 Cal.App. 139, 249 P. 56, 58 .....	23
Watkins v. Holman, 16 Pet. 25.....	33
Weiss v. McFadden, 353 Ark. 868 (2003) .....	25
Wilmette Park Dist. v. Campbell, 338 U.S. 411, 416.....	34

## Other Authorities

“U.S. Person” Position, Form #05.053 .....	28
1040 Form .....	55
1040 return .....	46
1040-NR .....	46
1040-NR Attachment, Form #09.077 .....	36, 62
1040-NR Attachment, Form #09.077, Section 11: Definitions .....	43
1040-NR Attachment, Form #09.077, Section 5 .....	42
1040NR Form.....	55
1040-NR Form, 2023, p. 1 .....	54
1040-NR Instructions, 2023, p. 16 .....	55
1040-NR return .....	45
2 Bouv. Inst. n. 2279, 2327 .....	15
26 Comp.Gen. 907, 912 (1947) .....	34
37 C.J.S. Fraud, § 16, p. 247 .....	29
63C American Jurisprudence 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247 (1999) .....	30
7 Bac.Abr. 280 .....	25
An Introduction to Sophistry Course, Form #12.042 .....	36
Are You “Playing the Harlot” with the Government?, SEDM.....	14
Authorities on Rights as Property, SEDM.....	24
Bing ChatGPT Artificial Intelligence Chatbot .....	22
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, p. 1095 .....	15
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, p. 470 .....	17
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, pp. 1086-1087.....	11
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1593 .....	11
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1231 .....	16
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1232.....	16
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581.....	49
Carth. 479 .....	25
Catalog of “Elections” in the Internal Revenue Code, FTSIG .....	61
Catalog of U.S. Supreme Court Doctrines, Litigation Tool #10.020 .....	45
Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union, Form #05.052 .....	29
Challenging Jurisdiction Workbook, Form #09.082 .....	36, 50
Citizenship Status v. Tax Status, Form #10.011, Section 15.....	35
Citizenship Status v. Tax Status, Form #10.011, Section 15.2: Geographical Definitions .....	23
Confucius .....	10
Congress .....	28
Congressional hearings, Calendar No. 591; Senate Report No. 558, at page 29 .....	30

Congressional Record, Vol. 50, August 28, 1913, p. 3843 .....	39
Constitutional Income, Phil Hart, ISBN 0-9711880-0-9 .....	41
Cook v. Tait, 265 U.S. 47 (1924), Citizenship of George W. Cook, SEDM Exhibit 01.025 .....	23
Cooley, Const. Lim., 479 .....	21
Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001 .....	62
Demand for Verified Evidence of "Trade or Business" Activity: Information Return, Form #04.007 .....	62
Department of Defense (DOD) .....	35
Department of Homeland Security (DHS) .....	35
Department of State (DOS) .....	35
Department of the Treasury .....	35, 50
Even RBG thought Roe v. Wade Went too far. We should learn from her incremental approach, America Magazine .....	38
Federal Courts and the IRS' Own IRM Say IRS is NOT RESPONSIBLE for Its Actions or its Words or For Following Its Own Written Procedures, Family Guardian Fellowship .....	12
First Amendment .....	43
For Ginsburg, Abortion is about Equality, ACLU .....	37
Foreign Investment in Real Property Transfer Act (FIRTA) .....	52
Foreign Tax Status Information Group (FTSIG) .....	61
Form #05.043 .....	35
Form #09.077 .....	36
Form 1040-NR .....	13
Form W-4 .....	35, 36
Form W-8 .....	36
Former President and Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court William Howard Taft .....	23
Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023 .....	14, 25
Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046 .....	36
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.6.16 .....	19
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Sections 3.8.11.2, 5.2.14.2, and 6.7.1 .....	23
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Sections 3.9.1.9 and 5.6.5 .....	41
Gross Income Worksheet, Form #09.080, Section 4 .....	41
Hierarchy of Sovereignty: The Power to Create is the Power to Tax, Family Guardian Fellowship .....	25, 30
Hot Issues: Invisible Consent*, SEDM .....	37
Hot Issues: Laws of Property, SEDM .....	24
House of Representatives, 70th Congress, 1st Session, Union Calendar No. 3, Report No. 2, at page 12, under the heading, "Technical and Administrative Provisions" .....	31
How American Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax, Form #08.024 .....	25, 30, 33, 50, 61
How the Government Defrauds You Out of Legitimate Exclusions for the Market Value of Your Labor, Form #05.026, Section 5.1 .....	38
How to File Returns, Form #09.074, Section 9.7 entitled "Effectively connected income" means PRIVATE earnings DONATED to Uncle Sam .....	54
How to Reject All Privileges in a Tax Return Filing, FTSIG .....	53
Includes and Including, FTSIG .....	14
Income Taxation of Real Estate Sales, Form #05.028** (Member Subscriptions) .....	52
Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A .....	10, 50
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.) .....	12, 40
Invisible Consent*, SEDM .....	11, 24
Invisible Consent, FTSIG .....	13
IRS Form 1040 .....	19, 23, 61
IRS Form 1040 return .....	23
IRS Form 1040NR .....	61
IRS Form 1040NR Instructions, Year 2007, p. 9 .....	59
IRS Form 1042-S Instructions (2006), p. 14 .....	59
IRS Form W-2 .....	18
IRS Forms W-2 and W-4 .....	18
IRS Forms W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099 .....	22
IRS Publication 519 (2005), p. 24 .....	56
IRS Publications .....	61
Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg of the U.S. Supreme Court .....	37



Laws of Property, Form #14.018.....	24
Mark Twain .....	24
Merriam-Webster Dictionary: nunc pro tunc, Downloaded 9/23/24 .....	11
Path to Freedom, Form #09.015, Sections 5.5-5.7 .....	13
Ponzi Scheme .....	53
President Ronald W. Reagan .....	10
Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017 .....	21
Private Right or Public Right? Course, Form #12.044 .....	14
PROOF OF FACTS: “State” in 26 U.S.C. 7701(a)(10) and “States” in 26 U.S.C. 7701(a)(9) do NOT include Constitutional States, FTSIG .....	44
PROOF OF FACTS: “U.S source” does NOT include anything but payments DIRECTLY from the government and excludes even payments from “taxpayers”, FTSIG.....	53
Property View of Income Taxation Course, Form #12.046 .....	22, 29, 61, 62
Public Rights Doctrine .....	45
Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007.....	24
Requirement for Reasonable Notice, Form #05.022 .....	49
Restatement (Second) of Torts, § 529 .....	29
Ruth Bader Ginsburg Wishes This Case Had Legalized Abortion instead of Roe v. Wade, Time .....	37
Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s Landmark Opinions on Women’s Rights, History Channel .....	37
Schedule NEC .....	46
Secretary of the Treasury .....	49
Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025 .....	37
Sixteenth Amendment Congressional Debates, Exhibit #02.007 .....	41
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: “effectively connected” .....	62
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: “gross income” .....	31
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: “Income” .....	41
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: “trade or business” .....	62
Tax Class 5: Estate and Gift Taxes.....	18
Tax Return History-Citizenship, Family Guardian Fellowship.....	44
The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001 .....	12, 41, 62
The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001, Section 1.5 .....	27
The “Trade or Business” Scam, Family Guardian Fellowship .....	62
The Information Return Scam, Family Guardian Fellowship .....	62
Third Rail Government Issues, Form #08.032 .....	12
Truth in Taxation Hearings, Family Guardian Fellowship, Section 13: 26 U.S.C. 6020(b): Substitute for Returns.....	36
U.S. Supreme Court .....	13
U.S.C.I.S. ....	35
Voltaire.....	10
W-2 gift statement.....	19
W-2CC, Form #04.304.....	36
W-4 Form .....	56
W-8BEN Form .....	56
Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002.....	26
Why Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises, Form #05.051 .....	53
Why the Federal Income Tax is a Privilege Tax Upon Government Property, Form #04.404 .....	24, 32, 62
Why the Government Can’t Lawfully Assess Human Beings With an Income Tax Liability Without Their Consent, Form #05.011 .....	19, 21
Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008.....	55

## Scriptures

1 Tim. 6:10.....	29
------------------	----

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

4                   *"In the matter of taxation, every privilege is an injustice."*  
5                   *[Voltaire]*

6                   *"The more you want [privileges], the more the world can hurt you."*  
7                   *[Confucius]*

## 8    1    Introduction

9    To "effectively connect" is a type of "election" in the Internal Revenue Code. The purpose of all "elections" is to convert  
10   yourself or your property from PRIVATE to PUBLIC, FOREIGN to DOMESTIC, and to thereby DONATE it to the national  
11   government. It is a "word of art" that sounds innocuous to the legally untrained eye but there is a MONSTER lurking behind  
12   its definition because they never describe in the definition:

- 13   1. It represents a tacit form of consent for most Americans.
- 14   2. YOU are the only one who can "effective connect" and therefore consent.
- 15   3. The REASON you can do it relates to your ABSOLUTE, PRIVATE ownership over the property affected by the  
16   election.
- 17   4. They government cannot penalize you for REFUSING to make the election, because they would be engaging in  
18   extortion to STEAL your private property and violate the Fifth Amendment Takings Clause.

19   To avoid disclosing the above, the definition of "effectively connected" in the I.R.C. and regulations therefore mentions none  
20   of the above but does explain ONLY the "effect" it has on "gross income". In that sense, it's kind of like the pain killer the  
21   dentist injects in your gums before they start RIPPING your teeth out without you FEELING or being FULLY AWARE that  
22   is what he is doing.

23   The federal income tax under Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A behaves as an excise and franchise tax upon the use or  
24   consumption of property or services of the national government. The activity subject to tax is defined as follows:

### 25                   [26 U.S. Code § 7701 - Definitions](#)

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

#### 28                   (26) **TRADE OR BUSINESS**

29                   *The term "[trade or business](#)" includes the performance of the functions of a public office.*

30   The "public office" spoken of in the above definition is a position within or agent of the national government. Since the  
31   national government is a federal corporation under 26 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A), then RESIDENT (DOMESTIC) parties engaged  
32   in this activity or office are "officers of a corporation" and thus "persons" within the meaning of "person" for the purpose of  
33   CIVIL and CRIMINAL enforcement respectively:

34                   [TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 68](#) > [Subchapter B](#) > [PART I](#) > Sec. 6671.  
35                   Sec. 6671. - Rules for application of assessable penalties

#### 36                   (b) *Person defined*

37                   *The term "person", as used in this subchapter, includes an officer or employee of a corporation, **or a member or***  
38                   ***employee of a partnership**, who as such officer, employee, or member is under a duty to perform the act in respect*  
39                   *of which the violation occurs.*

40                   [TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 75](#) > [Subchapter D](#) > Sec. 7343.  
41                   [Sec. 7343. - Definition of term "person"](#)  
42

The term "person" as used in this chapter [Chapter 75] includes an officer or employee of a corporation, or a member or employee of a partnership, who as such officer, employee, or member is under a duty to perform the act in respect of which the violation occurs

If it is merely PRIVATE PROPERTY that is connected to a "trade or business", then the property in effect is PRIVATE property donated to a public use, a public purpose, and a public office to procure the "benefits" of a franchise. Thus, the property has been used to PROCURE a PRIVILEGE from the grantor of the franchise, which is the national government in what is called a "tacit procurement":

*"Procuration.. Agency; proxy; the act of constituting another one's attorney in fact. The act by which one person gives power to another to act in his place, as he could do himself. Action under a power of attorney or other constitution of agency. Indorsing a bill or note "by procuration" is doing it as proxy for another or by his authority. The use of the word procuration (usually, per procuracione, or abbreviated to per proc. or p. p.) on a promissory note by an agent is notice that the agent has but a limited authority to sign.*

**An express procuration is one made by the express consent of the parties. An implied or tacit procuration takes place when an individual sees another managing his affairs and does not interfere to prevent it.** *Procurations are also divided into those which contain absolute power, or a general authority, and those which give only a limited power. Also, the act or offence of procuring women for lewd purposes. See also Proctor."* [Black's Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, pp. 1086-1087]

We call it a "tacit procurement" because nearly everyone we have met who knows nothing about law isn't even aware that is what they are doing from a legal perspective. Hence, their CONSENT to the conversion was INVISIBLE and is called "sub silentio":

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

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

Once people become fully aware of this VOLUNTARY and CONSENSUAL conversion from PRIVATE to PUBLIC of either THEMSELVES or their property, they have a tendency to want to WITHDRAW that consent IMMEDIATELY and even RETROACTIVELY, in what is called "nunc pro tunc":

*Nunc pro tunc*

*'nəŋk-,prō-'təŋk, 'nūŋk-,prō-'tūŋk*

*: now for then —used in reference to a judicial or procedural act that corrects an omission in the record, has effect as of an earlier date, or takes place after a deadline has expired*

*a nunc pro tunc order*

*permitted to file the petition nunc pro tunc*

[Merriam-Webster Dictionary: nunc pro tunc, Downloaded 9/23/24; <https://www.merriam-webster.com/legal/nunc%20pro%20tunc>]

Like the leaky faucet that is wasting water, expense, and resources, people have a natural tendency to want to plug the leak of their valuable PRIVATE PROPERTY and resources to an unauthorized destination that usually involves efforts and agendas that are clearly in conflict with their own goals in life.

This document will prove that this leak:

1. Has the practical effect of making you appear AS IF you consented to the consequences of this leak even though you didn't know the leak existed. Thus, it produces evidence of your CONSENT which is INVISIBLE to you. See:

Invisible Consent\*, SEDM  
<https://sedm.org/invisible-consent/>

2. Was MALICIOUSLY ENGINEERED into the tax system by covetous public servants who want to DUPE you out of your property.
3. Has an innocuous name that no one understands that allows the leak to go UNDISCOVERED.
4. Is a Third Rail Issue that judges and government agents don't want to talk about. See:
- Third Rail Government Issues*, Form #08.032  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/ThirdRailIssues.pdf>
5. Produces a VAST river of wasted resources that has continued for decades.
6. Depends for its existence and continuation on your ignorance about the law.
7. Has the practical effect of indemnifying the creators of the leak with a plausible deniability defense if they are caught red handed protecting it and receiving the benefit of the unjust revenues it produces.

The IRS warned us it was going to try to deceive us about this deception by stating in its own Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.) that you can't rely upon any of its own publications. The federal courts warned us that the IRS was going to do this by telling us that we can't rely upon the phone or oral advice of anyone in the IRS, even if they signed their recommendation under penalty of perjury! Why didn't we listen to any of these warnings? See the surprising truth for yourself:

*Federal Courts and the IRS' Own IRM Say IRS is NOT RESPONSIBLE for Its Actions or its Words or For Following Its Own Written Procedures*, Family Guardian Fellowship  
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Articles/IRSNotResponsible.htm>

We must, however, remember what the Supreme Court said about false presumptions:

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

In treating this subject, we will not go into detail about the meaning of "trade or business". That subject is covered in:

*The "Trade or Business" Scam*, Form #05.001  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf>

This document instead will focus directly on the definitions, meaning, and application of the term "effectively connect" to the process of actually interacting with the IRS and employing it to lawfully free yourself from tax slavery. It is as short and sweet as possible so that it can be incorporated by reference into your own tax filings and correspondence to silence every attempt by courts, judges, tax professionals, and the IRS to challenge efforts to lawfully leave the tax system as a nonresident alien not engaged in a trade or business.

## **2 Definition of "effectively connected"**

"Effectively connected" is only used in the context of "nonresident aliens". The only position this site takes is the Nonresident Alien Position. The definition of "effectively connected" is as follows:

[26 U.S. Code § 864 – Definitions and special rules](#)

*(c)Effectively connected income, etc.*

*(1)General rule*

*For purposes of this title—*

*(A) In the case of a nonresident alien individual or a foreign corporation engaged in [trade or business within the United States](#) during the taxable year, the rules set forth in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8) shall apply in determining the income, gain, or loss which shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a [trade or business within the United States](#).*

*(B) Except as provided in paragraph (6) [\[1\]](#) (7), or (8) or in section 871(d) or sections 882(d) and (e), in the case of a nonresident alien individual or a foreign corporation not engaged in [trade or business within the United States](#) during the taxable year, no income, gain, or loss shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a [trade or business within the United States](#).*



The above statute describes how to determine what IS and is NOT only AFTER YOU AND ONLY YOU DECIDE that you are lawfully engaged in a “trade or business”, meaning “the functions of a public office” in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26). Once that happens, the earnings of the office become PUBLIC property owned and controlled by the government and not you. If this were not the case, congress would be unlawfully regulating and impairing the right of private property and violating the Fifth Amendment Takings Clause in doing so.

*The power to “legislate generally upon” life, liberty, and property, as opposed to the “power to provide modes of redress” against offensive state action, was “repugnant” to the Constitution. Id., at 15. See also United States v. Reese, 92 U.S. 214, 218 (1876); United States v. Harris, 106 U.S. 629, 639 (1883); James v. Bowman, 190 U.S. 127, 139 (1903). Although the specific holdings of these early cases might have been superseded or modified, see, e.g., Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States, 379 U.S. 241 (1964); United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745 (1966), their treatment of Congress’ §5 power as corrective or preventive, not definitional, has not been questioned.*  
[City of Boerne v. Flores, Archbishop of San Antonio, 521 U.S. 507 (1997)]

The above description of “effectively connected” in 26 U.S.C. §864 is not really a definition either, because it doesn’t explain the PURPOSE of “effectively connecting”. That purpose is to donate PRIVATE property to a PUBLIC use, a PUBLIC office, and a PUBLIC purpose through an election. **If they told you that was the purpose, you wouldn’t “effectively connect” ANYTHING called “income”!**

The above description also does not explain HOW a “nonresident alien” may determine whether they are in fact engaged in a “trade or business”. In fact, unless the nonresident alien is already lawfully elected or appointed into a public office in some OTHER title of the U.S. Code, they cannot unilaterally volunteer into or elect themselves into a public office in order to be so lawfully engaged for tax purposes. That would be the crime of impersonating a public office in violation of 18 U.S.C. §912. There is no provision of the Internal Revenue Code that in fact CREATES any new public offices. Filling out a tax form including a Form 1040-NR doesn’t do it either. BUT, making an ELECTION can ADD to the duties of an EXISTING public office. The U.S. Supreme Court hinted at these inferences when they held that CREATING offices by means OTHER than direct election or appointment can be unconstitutional:

*“An unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; it affords no protection; **it creates no office**; it is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.*  
[Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425, 442 (1886)]

“Effectively connected income” therefore means PRIVATE earnings DONATED to Uncle Sam. Your homework is to write this 1000 times until you get it:

*The phrase “effectively connected to a trade or business within the United States” means no ACTUAL office is required to exist, because it is the status of your PROPERTY and its connection to the GOVERNMENT, and not YOUR status. That “effectively connected” status is a result or “EFFECT” of your consent to convert your otherwise PRIVATE property from PRIVATE to PUBLIC, usually in pursuit of some kind of privilege or public property. Thus, you are PLEDGING your private property as security for public debt in exchange for the privilege sought.*

The phrase “trade or business” is also often followed by “in the United States” as in 26 U.S.C. §864(c)(1)(A) above. That “United States” is NEVER used in its geographical sense in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10), but in its LEGAL and CORPORATE sense or “United States\*\*\*\*”, because public offices exist within FICTIONAL governments and corporations, not within PHYSICAL geographies. That is why earnings under 26 U.S.C. §871(b) are taxable WORLD WIDE regardless of where they are EARNED: Because they came from the government ONLY or were at least CONSENSUALLY TREATED as such by you. To be “IN the United States\*\*\*\*\*” in this context in fact means PROPERTY or OFFICES within the U.S. Inc. federal corporation under 28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A). YOUR connection to the national government as its agent or officer or the connection of your PROPERTY to PUBLIC is created by:

1. Your act of consent, whether IMPLIED or EXPLICIT. See:

Invisible Consent, FTSIG

<https://ftsig.org/how-you-volunteer/invisible-consent/>

2. An act of contracting or engaging in commerce with the government. For instance, owners of stock in a privileged government sanctioned public corporation are considered CONTRACTORS of the government. See:

Path to Freedom, Form #09.015, Sections 5.5-5.7

<https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Pros/PathToFreedom.pdf>

3. The receipt of government/public property that gives rise to an equitable obligation to use it under the terms of a grant or loan and return it when called to do so by its owner. This includes all civil statutory public benefits, franchises, privileges, licenses, permits, etc. See:

*Private Right or Public Right? Course*, Form #12.044  
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/PrivateRightOrPublicRight.pdf>

4. Being voluntarily engaged in the “trade or business”/public office excise taxable franchise anywhere in the world. [26 U.S.C. §871](#)(b) income is NON-GEOGRAPHICAL and can be earned wherever a public office and the “trade or business” activity is exercised, because the officer is operating in a representative capacity and HIMSELF is a “source within the United States” federal corporation.

In a biblical sense, all the above are described as “playing the harlot”. See:

*Are You “Playing the Harlot” with the Government?*, SEDM  
<https://sedm.org/are-you-playing-the-harlot/>

"Trade or business" is defined and "United States" is defined. The phrase "connected to a trade or business" is not defined, but is self-explanatory. Adding the word "effectively" obviously would not be necessary where there is an ACTUAL connection to a trade or business. Keep in mind, the custom rule for construing a definition that uses the word "includes" DOES NOT allow the meaning of "trade or business" to be expanded beyond the literal performance of the functions of a public office, but does embrace anything in the same general class as a public office or the national government ITSELF. The word "effectively" seems to be added just to make clear that no the status results DIRECTLY from the EFFECT of your CONSENT and CHOICE. See:

*Includes and Including*, FTSIG  
<https://ftsig.org/special-language/includes-including/>

"Effectively connected" is used ONLY in relation to “nonresident aliens”. The term is not used with “United States persons”, because United States person itself IS a "trade or business". It still need not involve the performance of the functions of a LITERAL public office, though, if you CONSENT to CALL IT “effectively connected”.

People filing the 1040NR naively think that by entering “income” in the “effectively connected” portion of the 1040NR, they are obtaining the ability to REDUCE their tax liability by taking “trade or business” deductions under [26 U.S.C. §162](#). However, something much more sinister is happening here as you will learn later.

### **3 Overview of the Income Taxation Process**

This section provides basic background on how the income tax described in Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A functions. This will help you fit the explanation contained in this memorandum into the overall taxation process. Below is a summary of the taxation process:

1. The purpose for establishing governments is mainly to protect private property. The Declaration of Independence affirms this:

*“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,  
-”  
[Declaration of Independence, 1776]*

2. Government protects private rights by keeping “public [government] property” and “private property” separate and never allowing them to be joined together. This is the heart of the separation of powers doctrine: separation of what is private from what is public with the goal of protecting mainly what is private. See:

*Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers*, Form #05.023  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. All property BEGINS as private property. The only way to lawfully change it to public property is through the exercise of your unalienable constitutional right to contract. All franchises qualify as a type of contract, and therefore, franchises

are one of many methods to lawfully convert PRIVATE property to PUBLIC property. The exercise of the right to contract, in turn, is an act of consent that eliminates any possibility of a legal remedy of the donor against the donee:

*“Voluntis non fit injuria.*

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

*Consensus tollit errorem.*

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

*Melius est omnia mala pati quam malo concentire.*

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

*Nemo videtur fraudare eos qui sciunt, et consentiunt.*

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

*[Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856;*

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

#### 4. In law, all rights are “property”.

**Property.** *That which is peculiar or proper to any person; that which belongs exclusively to one. In the strict legal sense, **an aggregate of rights which are guaranteed and protected by the government.** Fulton Light, Heat & Power Co. v. State, 65 Misc.Rep. 263, 121 N.Y.S. 536. **The term is said to extend to every species of valuable right and interest.** More specifically, ownership; the unrestricted and exclusive right to a thing; the right to dispose of a thing in every legal way, to possess it, to use it, and to exclude every one else from interfering with it. That dominion or indefinite right of use or disposition which one may lawfully exercise over particular things or subjects. The exclusive right of possessing, enjoying, and disposing of a thing. The highest right a man can have to anything; being used to refer to that right which one has to lands or tenements, goods or chattels, which no way depends on another man’s courtesy.*

*The word is also commonly used to denote everything which is the subject of ownership, corporeal or incorporeal, tangible or intangible, visible or invisible, real or personal, everything that has an exchangeable value or which goes to make up wealth or estate. **It extends to every species of valuable right and interest, and includes real and personal property, easements, franchises, and incorporeal hereditaments, and includes every invasion of one’s property rights by actionable wrong.** Labberton v. General Cas. Co. of America, 53 Wash.2d. 180, 332 P.2d. 250, 252, 254.*

*Property embraces everything which is or may be the subject of ownership, whether a legal ownership. or whether beneficial, or a private ownership. Davis v. Davis. TexCiv-App., 495 S.W.2d. 607. 611. Term includes not only ownership and possession but also the right of use and enjoyment for lawful purposes. Hoffmann v. Kinealy, Mo., 389 S.W.2d. 745, 752.*

**Property, within constitutional protection, denotes group of rights inhering in citizen’s relation to physical thing, as right to possess, use and dispose of it.** Cereghino v. State By and Through State Highway Commission, 230 Or. 439, 370 P.2d. 694, 697.

*[Black’s Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, p. 1095]*

By protecting your constitutional rights, the government is protecting your PRIVATE property. Your rights are private property because they came from God, not from the government. Only what the government creates can become public property. An example is corporations, which are a public franchise that makes officers of the corporation into public officers.

#### 5. The process of taxation is the process of converting “private property” into a “public use” and a “public purpose”. Below are definitions of these terms for your enlightenment.

**Public use.** *Eminent domain. The constitutional and statutory basis for taking property by eminent domain. For condemnation purposes, “public use” is one which confers some benefit or advantage to the public; it is not confined to actual use by public. It is measured in terms of right of public to use proposed facilities for which condemnation is sought and, as long as public has right of use, whether exercised by one or many members of public, a “public advantage” or “public benefit” accrues sufficient to constitute a public use. Montana Power Co. v. Bokma, Mont., 457 P.2d. 769, 772, 773.*

*Public use, in constitutional provisions restricting the exercise of the right to take property in virtue of eminent domain, means a use concerning the whole community distinguished from particular individuals. But each and every member of society need not be equally interested in such use, or be personally and directly affected by it; if the object is to satisfy a great public want or exigency, that is sufficient. Ringe Co. v. Los Angeles County, 262 U.S. 700, 43 S.Ct. 689, 692, 67 L.Ed. 1186. The term may be said to mean public usefulness, utility, or advantage, or what is productive of general benefit. It may be limited to the inhabitants of a small or restricted locality, but*

must be in common, and not for a particular individual. The use must be a needful one for the public, which cannot be surrendered without obvious general loss and inconvenience. A "public use" for which land may be taken defies absolute definition for it changes with varying conditions of society, new appliances in the sciences, changing conceptions of scope and functions of government, and other differing circumstances brought about by an increase in population and new modes of communication and transportation. *Katz v. Brandon*, 156 Conn. 521, 245 A.2d. 579, 586.

See also *Condemnation; Eminent domain*.  
[*Black's Law Dictionary*, Sixth Edition, p. 1232]

**"Public purpose.** In the law of taxation, eminent domain, etc., this is a term of classification to distinguish the objects for which, according to settled usage, the government is to provide, from those which, by the like usage, are left to private interest, inclination, or liberality. **The constitutional requirement that the purpose of any tax, police regulation, or particular exertion of the power of eminent domain shall be the convenience, safety, or welfare of the entire community and not the welfare of a specific individual or class of persons [such as, for instance, federal benefit recipients as individuals].** "Public purpose" that will justify expenditure of public money generally means such an activity as will serve as benefit to community as a body and which at same time is directly related function of government. *Pack v. Southwestern Bell Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 215 Tenn. 503, 387 S.W.2d. 789, 794 .

The term is synonymous with governmental purpose. As employed to denote the objects for which taxes may be levied, it has no relation to the urgency of the public need or to the extent of the public benefit which is to follow; **the essential requisite being that a public service or use shall affect the inhabitants as a community, and not merely as individuals.** A public purpose or public business has for its objective the promotion of the public health, safety, morals, general welfare, security, prosperity, and contentment of all the inhabitants or residents within a given political division, as, for example, a state, the sovereign powers of which are exercised to promote such public purpose or public business."  
[*Black's Law Dictionary*, Sixth Edition, p. 1231, *Emphasis added*]

6. The federal government has no power of eminent domain within states of the Union. This means that they cannot lawfully convert private property to a public use or a public purpose within the exclusive jurisdiction of states of the Union:

**"The United States have no constitutional capacity to exercise municipal jurisdiction, sovereignty, or eminent domain, within the limits of a State or elsewhere, except in cases where it is delegated, and the court denies the faculty of the Federal Government to add to its powers by treaty or compact."**  
[*Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. 393, 508-509 (1856)]

7. The Fifth Amendment prohibits converting private property to a public use or a public purpose without just compensation if the owner does not consent, and this prohibition applies to the Federal government as well as states of the Union. It was made applicable to states of the Union by the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868.

*Fifth Amendment - Rights of Persons*

**No person shall** be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor **be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.**  
[*United States Constitution, Fifth Amendment*]

If the conversion of private property to public property is done without the express consent of the party affected by the conversion and without compensation, then the following violations have occurred:

- 7.1. Violation of the Fifth Amendment "takings clause" above.
  - 7.2. "Conversion" in violation of 18 U.S.C. §654.
  - 7.3. Theft.
8. Because taxation involves converting private property to a public use, public purpose, and public office, then it involves eminent domain if the owner of the property did not expressly consent to the taking:



**Eminent domain.** The power to take private property for public use by the state, municipalities, and private persons or corporations authorized to exercise functions of public character. *Housing Authority of Cherokee National of Oklahoma v. Langley, Okl., 555 P.2d. 1025, 1028. Fifth Amendment, U.S. Constitution.*

*In the United States, the power of eminent domain is founded in both the federal (Fifth Amend.) and state constitutions. **However, the Constitution limits the power to taking for a public purpose and prohibits the exercise of the power of eminent domain without just compensation to the owners of the property which is taken. The process of exercising the power of eminent domain is commonly referred to as “condemnation”, or, “expropriation”.***

*The right of eminent domain is the right of the state, through its regular organization, to reassert, either temporarily or permanently, its dominion over any portion of the soil of the state on account of public exigency and for the public good. Thus, in time of war or insurrection, the proper authorities may possess and hold any part of the territory of the state for the common safety; and in time of peace the legislature may authorize the appropriation of the same to public purposes, such as the opening of roads, construction of defenses, or providing channels for trade or travel. Eminent domain is the highest and most exact idea of property remaining in the government, or in the aggregate body of the people in their sovereign capacity. It gives a right to resume the possession of the property in the manner directed by the constitution and the laws of the state, whenever the public interest requires it.*

*See also Adequate compensation; Condemnation; Constructive taking; Damages; Expropriation; Fair market value; Just compensation; Larger parcel; Public use; Take.  
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, p. 470]*

9. The Fifth Amendment requires that any taking of private property without the consent of the owner ***must*** involve compensation. The Constitution must be consistent with itself. The taxation clauses found in Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 cannot conflict with the Fifth Amendment. The Fifth Amendment contains no exception to the requirement for just compensation upon conversion of private property to a public use, even in the case of taxation. This is why all taxes must be indirect excise taxes against people who provide their consent by applying for a license to engage in the taxed activity: The application for the license constitutes constructive consent to donate the fruits of the activity to a public use, public purpose, and public office.

*“Supreme Court’s decision in *Armstrong v. U.S.*, in which Court ruled that government could not assert sovereign immunity as defense to suit for recovery under takings clause, did not provide basis for district court to exercise subject matter jurisdiction over embezzlement victim’s claim to recover taxes paid by corporation on embezzled funds; decision did not question right of Congress to limit its waiver of immunity to suit to particular court, and Court of Federal Claims had exclusive jurisdiction over victim’s claim.”  
[*Pershing Division of Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette Securities Corp. v. United States*, 22 F.3d. 741 (7th Cir. 1994)]*

10. There is only ONE condition in which the conversion of private property to public property does NOT require compensation, which is when the owner donates the private property to a public use, public purpose, or public office. To wit:

*“Men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, -life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;’ and to ‘secure,’ not grant or create, these rights, governments are instituted. **That property [or income] which a man has honestly acquired he retains full control of, subject to these limitations: First, that he shall not use it to his neighbor’s injury, and that does not mean that he must use it for his neighbor’s benefit [e.g. SOCIAL SECURITY, Medicare, and every other public “benefit”]; second, that if he devotes it to a public use, he gives to the public a right to control that use; and third, that whenever the public needs require, the public may take it upon payment of due compensation.**”  
[*Budd v. People of State of New York*, 143 U.S. 517 (1892)]*

The above rules are summarized below:

**Table 1: Rules for converting private property to a public use or a public office**

#	Description	Requires consent of owner to be taken from owner?
1	The owner of property justly acquired enjoys full and exclusive use and control over the property. This right includes <u>the right to exclude government uses</u> or ownership of said property.	Yes
2	He may not use the property to injure the equal rights of his neighbor. For instance, when you murder someone, the government can take your liberty and labor from you by putting you in jail or your life from you by instituting the death penalty against you. Both your life and your labor are “property”. Therefore, the basis for the “taking” was violation of the equal rights of a fellow sovereign “neighbor”.	No
3	He cannot be compelled or required to use it to “benefit” his neighbor. That means he cannot be compelled to donate the property to any franchise that would “benefit” his neighbor such as Social Security, Medicare, etc.	Yes
4	If he donates it to a public use, he gives the public the right to control that use.	Yes
5	Whenever the public needs require, the public may take it without his consent upon payment of due compensation. E.g. “eminent domain”.	No

11. The following two methods are the ONLY methods involving consent of the owner that may be LAWFULLY employed to convert PRIVATE property into PUBLIC property. Anything else is unlawful and THEFT:

11.1. DIRECT CONVERSION: Owner donates the property by conveying title or possession to the government.<sup>1</sup>

11.2. INDIRECT CONVERSION: Owner assumes a PUBLIC status as a PUBLIC officer in the HOLDING of title to the property.<sup>2</sup> All such statuses and the rights that attach to them are creations and property of the government, the use of which is a privilege. The status and all PUBLIC RIGHTS that attach to it conveys a “benefit” for which the status user must pay an excise tax. The tax acts as a rental or use fee for the status, which is government property.

12. You and ONLY you can authorize your private property to be donated to a public use, public purpose, and public office. No third party can lawfully convert or donate your private property to a public use, public purpose, or public office without your knowledge and express consent. If they do, they are guilty of theft and conversion, and especially if they are acting in a quasi-governmental capacity as a “withholding agent” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(16).

12.1. A withholding agent cannot file an information return connecting your earnings to a “trade or business” without you actually occupying a “public office” in the government BEFORE you filled out any tax form.

12.2. A withholding agent cannot file IRS Form W-2 against your earnings if you didn’t sign an IRS Form W-4 contract and thereby consent to donate your private property to a public office in the U.S. government and therefore a “public use”.

12.3. That donation process is accomplished by your own voluntary self-assessment and ONLY by that method. Before such a self-assessment, you are a “nontaxpayer” and a private person. After the assessment, you become a “taxpayer” and a public officer in the government engaged in the “trade or business” franchise.

12.4. In order to have an income tax liability, you must complete, sign, and “file” an income tax return and thereby assess yourself:

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

By assessing yourself, you implicitly give your consent to allow the public the right to control that use of the formerly PRIVATE property donated to a public use.

12.5. IRS Forms W-2 and W-4 are identified as Tax Class 5: Estate and Gift Taxes. Payroll withholdings are GIFTS, not “taxes” in a common law sense.

<sup>1</sup> An example of direct conversion would be the process of “registering” a vehicle with the Department of Motor Vehicles in your state. The act of registration constitutes consent by original ABSOLUTE owner to change the ownership of the property from ABSOLUTE to QUALIFIED and to convey legal title to the state and qualified title to himself.

<sup>2</sup> An example of a PUBLIC status is statutory “taxpayer” (public office called “trade or business”), statutory “citizen”, statutory “driver” (vehicle), statutory voter (registered voters are public officers).

(d)

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury may accept, hold, administer, and use gifts and bequests of property, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Department of the Treasury. Gifts and bequests of money and the proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts or bequests shall be deposited in the Treasury in a separate fund and shall be disbursed on order of the Secretary of the Treasury. Property accepted under this paragraph, and the proceeds thereof, shall be used as nearly as possible in accordance with the terms of the gift or bequest.

(2) For purposes of the Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, property accepted under paragraph (1) shall be considered as a gift or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

They don't become "taxes" and assessments until you attach the Form W-2 "gift statement" to an assessment called IRS Form 1040 and create a liability with your own self-assessment signature. IRS has no delegated authority to convert a "gift" into a "tax". That is why when you file the IRS Form 1040, you must attach the W-2 gift statement. See:

Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.6.16  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

12.6. The IRS cannot execute a lawful assessment without your knowledge and express consent because if they didn't have your consent, then it would be criminal conversion and theft. That is why every time they do an assessment, they have to call you into their office and present it to you to procure your consent in what is called an "examination". If you make it clear that you don't consent and hand them the following, they have to delete the assessment because it's only a proposal. See:

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

There is no way other than the above to lawfully create an income tax liability without violating the Fifth Amendment takings clause. If you assess yourself, you consent to become a "public officer" and thereby donate the fruits of your labor as such officer to a public use and a public purpose.

13. The IRS won't admit this, but this in fact is how the de facto unlawful system currently functions:

13.1. You can't unilaterally "elect" yourself into a "public office", even if you do consent.

13.2. No IRS form nor any provision in the Internal Revenue Code CREATES any new public offices in the government.

13.3. The I.R.C. only taxes EXISTING public offices lawfully exercised ONLY in the District of Columbia and in all places expressly authorized pursuant to 4 U.S.C. §72.

14. Information returns are being abused in effect as "federal election" forms.

14.1. Third parties in effect are nominating private persons into public offices in the government without their knowledge, without their consent, and without compensation. Thus, information returns are being used to impose the obligations of a public office upon people without compensation and thereby impose slavery in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment.

14.2. Anyone who files a false information return connecting a person to the "trade or business"/"public office" franchise who in fact does not ALREADY lawfully occupy a public office in the U.S. government is guilty of impersonating a public officer in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §912.

15. The IRS Form W-4 cannot and does not create an office in the U.S. government, but allows EXISTING public officers to elect to connect their private earnings to a public use, a public office, and a public purpose. The IRS abuses this form to unlawfully create public offices, and this abuse of the I.R.C. is the heart of the tax fraud: They are making a system that only applies to EXISTING public offices lawfully exercised in order to:

15.1. Unlawfully create new public offices in places where they are not authorized to exist.

15.2. Destroy the separation of powers between what is public and what is private.

15.3. Institute eminent domain over private labor using false third-party reports. Omission in preventing such fraud accomplishes involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment, 42 U.S.C. §1994, and 18 U.S.C. §1581.

15.4. Destroy the separation of powers between the federal and state governments. Any state employee who participates in the federal income tax is serving in TWO offices, which is a violation of most state constitutions.

15.5. Enslave innocent people to go to work for them without compensation, without recourse, and in violation of the thirteenth amendment prohibition against involuntary servitude. That prohibition, incidentally, applies EVERYWHERE, including on federal territory.

16. The right to control the use of private property donated to a public use to procure the benefits of a franchise is enforced through the Internal Revenue Code, which is the equivalent of the employment agreement for franchisees called “taxpayers”.

The above criteria explain why:

1. You cannot be subject to either employment tax withholding or employment tax reporting without voluntarily signing an IRS Form W-4.

Title 26: Internal Revenue  
PART 31—EMPLOYMENT TAXES AND COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT SOURCE  
Subpart E—Collection of Income Tax at Source  
Sec. 31.3402(p)-1 Voluntary withholding agreements.

(a) In general.

An employee and his employer may enter into an agreement under section 3402(b) to provide for the withholding of income tax upon payments of amounts described in paragraph (b)(1) of §31.3401(a)-3, made after December 31, 1970. An agreement may be entered into under this section only with respect to amounts which are includible in the gross income of the employee under section 61, and must be applicable to all such amounts paid by the employer to the employee. The amount to be withheld pursuant to an agreement under section 3402(p) shall be determined under the rules contained in section 3402 and the regulations thereunder. See §31.3405(c)-1, Q&A-3 concerning agreements to have more than 20-percent Federal income tax withheld from eligible rollover distributions within the meaning of section 402.

(b) Form and duration of agreement

(2) An agreement under section 3402 (p) shall be effective for such period as the employer and employee mutually agree upon. However, either the employer or the employee may terminate the agreement prior to the end of such period by furnishing a signed written notice to the other. Unless the employer and employee agree to an earlier termination date, the notice shall be effective with respect to the first payment of an amount in respect of which the agreement is in effect which is made on or after the first “status determination date” (January 1, May 1, July 1, and October 1 of each year) that occurs at least 30 days after the date on which the notice is furnished. If the employee executes a new Form W-4, the request upon which an agreement under section 3402 (p) is based shall be attached to, and constitute a part of, such new Form W-4.

---

26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3 Amounts deemed wages under voluntary withholding agreements

(a) In general.

Notwithstanding the exceptions to the definition of wages specified in section 3401(a) and the regulations thereunder, the term “wages” includes the amounts described in paragraph (b)(1) of this section with respect to which there is a voluntary withholding agreement in effect under section 3402(p). References in this chapter to the definition of wages contained in section 3401(a) shall be deemed to refer also to this section (§31.3401(a)-3).

(b) Remuneration for services.

(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, the amounts referred to in paragraph (a) of this section include any remuneration for services performed by an employee for an employer which, without regard to this section, does not constitute wages under section 3401(a). For example, remuneration for services performed by an agricultural worker or a domestic worker in a private home (amounts which are specifically excluded from the definition of wages by section 3401(a) (2) and (3), respectively) are amounts with respect to which a voluntary withholding agreement may be entered into under section 3402(p). See §§31.3401(c)-1 and 31.3401(d)-1 for the definitions of “employee” and “employer”.

2. The courts have no authority under the Declaratory Judgments Act, 28 U.S.C. §2201(a) to declare you a franchisee called a “taxpayer”. You own yourself.

Specifically, Rowen seeks a declaratory judgment against the United States of America with respect to “whether or not the plaintiff is a taxpayer pursuant to, and/or under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14).” (See Compl. at 2.) This Court lacks jurisdiction to issue a declaratory judgment “with respect to Federal taxes other than actions brought under section 7428 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986,” a code section that is not at issue in the



1 *instant action. See 28 U.S.C. § 2201; see also Hughes v. United States, 953 F.2d. 531, 536-537 (9th Cir. 1991)*  
2 *(affirming dismissal of claim for declaratory relief under § 2201 where claim concerned question of tax liability).*  
3 *Accordingly, defendant's motion to dismiss is hereby GRANTED, and the instant action is hereby DISMISSED.*  
4 *[Rowen v. U.S., 05-3766MMC. (N.D.Cal. 11/02/2005)]*

5 3. The revenue laws may not be cited or enforced against a person who is not a “taxpayer”:

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

11 *“Revenue Laws relate to taxpayers [officers, employees, instrumentalities, and elected officials of the Federal*  
12 *Government] and not to non-taxpayers [American Citizens/American Nationals not subject to the exclusive*  
13 *jurisdiction of the Federal Government and who did not volunteer to participate in the federal “trade or business”*  
14 *franchise]. The latter are without their scope. No procedures are prescribed for non-taxpayers and no attempt*  
15 *is made to annul any of their Rights or Remedies in due course of law.”*  
16 *[Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S., 470 F.2d. 585 (1972)]*

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

21 All of the above requirements have in common that violating them would result in the equivalent of exercising eminent  
22 domain over the private property of the private person without their consent and without just compensation, which the U.S.  
23 Supreme Court said violates the Fifth Amendment Takings Clause:

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

28 *Nor is it taxation. ‘A tax,’ says Webster’s Dictionary, ‘is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or*  
29 *property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.’ ‘Taxes are burdens or charges imposed*  
30 *by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.’ Cooley, Const. Lim., 479.*

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

38 As a consequence of the above considerations, any government officer or employee who does any of the following is  
39 unlawfully converting private property to a public use without the consent of the owner and without consideration:

- 40 1. Assuming or “presuming” you are a “taxpayer” without producing evidence that you consented to become one. In our  
41 system of jurisprudence, a person must be presumed innocent until proven guilty with court-admissible evidence.  
42 Presumptions are NOT evidence. That means they must be presumed to be a “nontaxpayer” until they are proven with  
43 admissible evidence to be a “taxpayer”. See:

*Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction*, Form #05.017  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 44 2. Performing a tax assessment or re-assessment if you haven’t first voluntarily assessed yourself by filing a tax return.  
45 See:

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

- 46 3. Citing provisions of the franchise agreement against those who never consented to participate. This is an abuse of law  
47 for political purposes and an attempt to exploit the innocent and the ignorant. The legislature cannot delegate authority

to the Executive Branch to convert innocent persons called “nontaxpayers” into franchisees called “taxpayers” without producing evidence of consent to become “taxpayers”.

*“In Calder v. Bull, which was here in 1798, **Mr. Justice Chase said, that there were acts which the Federal and State legislatures could not do without exceeding their authority, and among them he mentioned** a law which punished a citizen for an innocent act; a law that destroyed or impaired the lawful private [labor] contracts [and labor compensation, e.g. earnings from employment through compelled W-4 withholding] of citizens; a law that made a man judge in his own case; and **a law that took the property from A [the worker], and gave it to B [the government or another citizen, such as through social welfare programs]. 'It is against all reason and justice,' he added, 'for a people to intrust a legislature with such powers, and therefore it cannot be presumed that they have done it. They may command what is right and prohibit what is wrong; but they cannot change innocence into guilt, or punish innocence as a crime, or violate the right of an antecedent lawful private [employment] contract [by compelling W-4 withholding, for instance], or the right of private property. To maintain that a Federal or State legislature possesses such powers [of THEFT!] if they had not been expressly restrained, would, in my opinion, be a political heresy altogether inadmissible in all free republican governments.'** 3 Dall. 388.”*  
*[Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U.S. 700 (1878) ]*

4. Relying on third-party information returns that are unsigned as evidence supporting the conclusion that you are a “taxpayer”. These forms include IRS Forms W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099 and they are NOT signed and are inadmissible as evidence under Federal Rule of Evidence 802 because not signed under penalty of perjury. Furthermore, the submitters of these forms seldom have personal knowledge that you are in fact and in deed engaged in a “trade or business” as required by 26 U.S.C. §6041(a). Most people don’t know, for instance, that a “trade or business” includes ONLY “the functions of a public office”.

We have prepared a slide show that describes the laws of property indicated above and graphically shows how the above process works in various scenarios. It is VERY powerful and highly recommended:

Property View of Income Taxation Course, Form #12.046  
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/PropertyViewOfIncomeTax.pdf>

## 4 Heart of the Income Tax FRAUD

We asked the Bing ChatGPT Artificial Intelligence Chatbot the following question:

**QUESTION:** What are the various tests for whether income is connected with a trade or business in 26 U.S.C. §7702(a)(26)?

**BING CHAT GPT ANSWER:** The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and the U.S. [tax code provide several tests to determine whether income is effectively connected with a trade or business](#)<sup>12</sup>. Here are some of the key tests:

1. **Asset-Use Test:** The income must be associated with U.S. assets used in, or held for use in, the conduct of a U.S. [trade or business](#)<sup>1</sup>.

2. **Business Activities Test:** The activities of that trade or business conducted in the United States are a material factor in the realization of the income<sup>1</sup>.

[In general, you must be engaged in a trade or business during the tax year to be able to treat income received in that year as Effectively Connected Income \(ECI\)](#)<sup>1</sup>. You usually are considered to be engaged in a U.S. [trade or business when you perform personal services in the United States](#)<sup>1</sup>.

Please note that tax laws can be complex and change frequently, so it’s always a good idea to consult with a tax professional or legal advisor for your specific situation.

Learn more:

1. [irs.gov](https://irs.gov)
2. [law.cornell.edu](https://law.cornell.edu)
3. [uscode.house.gov](https://uscode.house.gov)
4. [law.cornell.edu](https://law.cornell.edu)

For the purposes of the above “U.S. assets” means GOVERNMENT property and NOT the geographical “United States”, So it is a synonym for PUBLIC property. How do we know this? Because if “U.S. assets” meant PRIVATE property, the legal

definition of justice itself (the right to be left alone) would mean that they would have to leave it alone and not tax or regulate it. Government has to own the property before they can tax or regulate it because if they didn't, it would be a common law trespass:

*"It is only where some right or privilege [which are BOTH public/government property granted to the recipient] is conferred by the government or municipality upon the owner, which he can use in connection with his property, or by means of which the use of his property is rendered more valuable to him, or he thereby enjoys an advantage over others, that the compensation to be received by him becomes a legitimate matter of regulation [or legislation or taxation]. Submission to the regulation of compensation in such cases is an implied condition of the grant, and the State, in exercising its power of prescribing the compensation, only determines the conditions upon which its concession [sale as a MERCHANT under the UCC with you as the Buyer!] shall be enjoyed. When the privilege ends, the power of regulation [or taxation] ceases."*  
*[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1874)]*

A "concession" is an act of SELLING PROPERTY and YOU are the buyer if you ask for that property. That property can consist of physical property, rights, services, "benefits", or civil statuses such as "person" that CONVEY these rights and privileges. These considerations are why the statutory "U.S. person", "U.S. citizen", or "U.S. resident" identified as parties "LIABLE TO" rather than "LIABLE FOR" the income tax in 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(a) are liable for tax on their worldwide earnings:

1. Everything that goes on the IRS Form 1040 return is subject to "trade or business" deductions under 26 U.S.C. §162.
2. The civil status of STATUTORY "citizen" and "resident" is a legislative creation of and therefore property of the national government on loan to those INVOKING its CIVIL STATUTORY PRIVILEGES granted by congress.
3. Former President and Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court William Howard Taft, in Cook v. Tait, 265 U.S. 47 (1924) acknowledged that the income tax upon Cook, who was domiciled abroad in Mexico, was upon the STATUS he invoked on the IRS Form 1040 tax return that he filed in 1922 that was the subject of the case. More on the President Taft SCAM at:
  - 3.1. Citizenship Status v. Tax Status, Form #10.011, Section 15.2: Geographical Definitions  
[https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitizenshipStatusVTaxStatus/CitizenshipVTaxStatus.htm#15.2\\_Geographical\\_definitions](https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitizenshipStatusVTaxStatus/CitizenshipVTaxStatus.htm#15.2_Geographical_definitions)
  - 3.2. Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Sections 3.8.11.2, 5.2.14.2, and 6.7.1  
<https://famguardian.org/Publications/GreatIRSHoax/GreatIRSHoax.htm>
4. The government's response to Cook's pleading challenging authority to collect a tax upon those domiciled abroad indicated that he could have filed as a nonresident alien and thus NOT invoked the civil statutory status of "citizen" on his IRS Form 1040, but that he didn't invoke that and was receiving the PRIVILEGE of a REDUCED rate that made him SUBJECT to the tax as a STATUTORY citizen, even though he claimed that he was NOT that kind of citizen on his IRS Form 1040 filed in 1922. The IRS and the court BOTH interpreted the type of citizen on his 1040 return as a STATUTORY citizen and NOT a constitutional citizen, even though he intended otherwise.

More on the Cook v. Tait case at:

Cook v. Tait, 265 U.S. 47 (1924), Citizenship of George W. Cook, SEDM Exhibit 01.025  
<https://sedm.org/Exhibits/EX01.025-CookVTait-Citizenship.pdf>

Property of the national government, public property, and "U.S. assets" are all synonymous in the I.R.C. Anyone who uses PUBLIC property is availing themselves of a PUBLIC GRANT and a PRIVILEGE and will be treated AS IF they are a public officer through IMPLIED consent in this case. The definition of "public office" confirms that a public officer is someone in charge of "THE PROPERTY OF THE PUBLIC":

*"Public office. The right, authority, and duty created and conferred by law, by which for a given period, either fixed by law or enduring at the pleasure of the creating power, an individual is invested with some portion of the sovereign functions of government for the benefit of the public. Walker v. Rich, 79 Cal.App. 139, 249 P. 56, 58. An agency for the state, the duties of which involve in their performance the exercise of some portion of the sovereign power, either great or small. Yaselli v. Goff, C.C.A., 12 F.2d. 396, 403, 56 A.L.R. 1239; Lacey v. State, 13 Ala.App. 212, 68 So. 706, 710; Curtin v. State, 61 Cal.App. 377, 214 P. 1030, 1035; Sheldadine v. City of Elkhart, 75 Ind.App. 493, 129 N.E. 878. State ex rel. Colorado River Commission v. Frohmiller, 46 Ariz. 413, 52 P.2d. 483, 486. Where, by virtue of law, a person is clothed, not as an incidental or transient authority, but for such time as de- notes duration and continuance, with Independent power to control the property of the public, or with public functions to be exercised in the supposed interest of the people, the service to be compensated by*

a stated yearly salary, and the occupant having a designation or title, the position so created is a public office.  
State v. Brennan, 49 Ohio.St. 33, 29 N.E. 593.  
[Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1235]

More on the laws of property and their application to the taxation process at:

1. Hot Issues: Laws of Property, SEDM  
<https://sedm.org/laws-of-property/>
2. Authorities on Rights as Property, SEDM  
<https://sedm.org/authorities-on-rights-as-property/>
3. Laws of Property, Form #14.018  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/14-PropProtection/LawsOfProperty.pdf>
4. Why the Federal Income Tax is a Privilege Tax Upon Government Property, Form #04.404  
<https://sedm.org/product/why-the-federal-income-tax-is-a-privilege-tax-on-government-property-form-04-404/>

We just love how the IRS website is cited so heavily in the above ChatGPT dialog and others. Of course, they say themselves we can't trust anything on their website. The courts repeat the same thing! See:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/ReasonableBelief.pdf>

We also love how the ChatGPT chatbot uses "trade or business" in the definitions they provide, as does the IRS when defining or describing anything having to do with "trade or business" as statutorily defined and not commonly understood. It's a tautology designed to deceive. All of the 'evidence' in support of these claims boils down to tautologies and circular reasoning.

IRS publications and websites are the exoteric. The code and regs the esoteric. IRS is counting on the fact that the average American doesn't read the statutes or the regulations and instead will rely on LIES on their website. The DECEPTION on the IRS website is designed to equivocate using the word "United States" to make the average reader falsely believe that "United States" includes the exclusive jurisdiction of states of the Union among those who don't CONSENT to anything the government offers them. "United States" can include ANYTHING one wants it to mean if the reader has already determined that they consent to pay the tax by volunteering for a public office in the "United States" federal corporation. Of course such volunteers are "in the United States" and even a "source within the United States" as a legal fiction and corporation. Public officers of the "United States" are, in fact SYNONYMOUS with that corporation while serving on official duty. But its ultimately a fraud because:

1. If they knew or were even ALLOWED TO LEARN that they were volunteering by shysters in what Mark Twain called "the District of Criminals", they would UNVOLUNTEER. It is literally and ABSURDITY to presume that someone can serve in a public office WITHOUT:
  - 1.1. Being informed that they have a right to refuse and how to manifest that lack of consent to volunteer. By that I mean recognizing on every tax form that you REMOVE consent to volunteer and offering a civil status block that recognizes you as in effect a "nonresident alien not engaged in a trade or business with no District of Columbia or governmental source income".
  - 1.2. Being permitted to know exactly what language or behavior it is that indicated their implied consent. Every aspect of how you volunteer is ALWAYS implied consent so you don't need to expressly consent. See:  
Invisible Consent\*, SEDM  
<https://sedm.org/invisible-consent/>
  - 1.3. At least a proper oath and appointment or even compensation for that matter as required by Title 5 of the U.S. Code.
2. It is unlawful to UNILATERALLY "elect" yourself into a public office without a proper oath or appointment as mandated by Title 5 of the U.S. Code. Any civil statutory status that has civil obligations attached to it is a public office:

*"The term office' has no legal or technical meaning attached to it, distinct from its ordinary acceptations. An office is a public charge or employment; but, as every employment is not an office, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between employments which are and those which are not offices.... A public officer is one who has some duty to perform concerning the public; and he is not the less a public officer when his duty is confined to*

1 *narrow limits, because it is the duty, and the nature of that duty, which makes him a public officer, and not the*  
2 *extent of his authority.' 7 Bac.Abr. 280; Carth. 479.... Where an employment or duty is a continuing [\*\*\*65] one,*  
3 *which is defined by rules prescribed by law and not by contract, such a charge or employment is an office, and*  
4 *the person who performs it is an officer...."*  
5 *[Ricker's Petition, 66 N.H. 207 (1890)]*

- 6 3. It is also a criminal offense to in effect BRIBE the government to treat you AS IF you lawfully occupy an appointed or  
7 elected public office and bribe them with "tax withholdings" or "tax paid" that is actually a donation to treat you AS IF  
8 you are a public officer called a STATUTORY "citizen", "resident", "taxpayer", "person", etc.

9 [18 U.S. Code § 210 - Offer to procure appointive public office](#)

10 *Whoever pays or offers or promises any money or thing of value, to any person, firm, or corporation in*  
11 *consideration of the use or promise to use any influence to procure any appointive office or place under the*  
12 *United States for any person, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.*  
13 *(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 694, § 210, formerly § 214; renumbered § 210, Pub. L. 87-849, § 1(b), Oct. 23,*  
14 *1962, 76 Stat. 1125; Pub. L. 103-322, title XXXIII, § 330016(1)(H), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 2147.)*

15 The tax code cannot and does not expressly authorize the creation of any new public offices that were not already  
16 lawfully elected or appointed somewhere ELSE in the U.S. Code BEFORE they became "taxpayers" under Title 26, in  
17 fact. The phrase "election" as frequently used in the Internal Revenue Code and Treasury Regulation is therefore  
18 LITERALLY indicating that you are "electing yourself into a public office", and doing so ILLEGALLY.

- 19 4. No one other than the Legislative Branch can add to the statutory definitions by presumption or consent. This would  
20 be an unconstitutional violation of the separation of powers, as described in:

[Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SeparationOfPowers.pdf), Form #05.023  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SeparationOfPowers.pdf>

21 That process of volunteering is extensively documented in:

[How American Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax](https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/HowYouVolForIncomeTax.pdf), Form #08.024  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/HowYouVolForIncomeTax.pdf>

22 Most courts, both state and federal, like to divert attention away from the subject of this section by saying that the income tax  
23 is NOT a tax on "property".

24 *"An inheritance tax is not a tax on property, but rather on the transmission of property upon the death of the*  
25 *decendent."*  
26 *[Hildebrand v. New Orleans, 549 So.2d.1218 (1989)]*

27 *"However, it has been well said that a tax on incomes is not a tax on property, and a tax on property does not*  
28 *embrace incomes. Hence "property," as the term is used in Ark. Const. art. XVI, § 5, means the property itself as*  
29 *distinguished from the annual gain or revenue from it."*  
30 *[Weiss v. McFadden, 353 Ark. 868 (2003)]*

31 We now know from this section, however, that this statement is NOT entirely correct because it uses the word "property" in  
32 only ONE context: That of the "taxpayer", and not "government" or PUBLIC property. In fact, in all cases where an income  
33 tax is levied, the ACTIVITY subject to excise tax always involves GOVERNMENT property in some form  
34 CONSENSUALLY consumed or used by the "taxpayer", such as:

- 35 1. Pursuing the privileges of a civil statutory office legislatively created by the government and therefore absolutely owned  
36 property of the government. This includes STATUTORY "citizen", "resident", "person", "driver", etc. All such  
37 offices have PUBLIC rights created and enforced by the government associated with them that cost money to deliver.  
38 EVERY ONE of the PUBLIC RIGHTS attached to said civil statutory offices are PROPERTY in a legal sense. ALL  
39 RIGHTS, in fact, are PROPERTY of one kind or another. See:

[Hierarchy of Sovereignty: The Power to Create is the Power to Tax](https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Remedies/PowerToCreate.htm), Family Guardian Fellowship  
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Remedies/PowerToCreate.htm>

- 40 2. Services provided by the government to the CONSENTING "taxpayer" in connection with the activity subject to  
41 income.



3. Monetary “benefits” or payments which are property, and often UNEARNED property, such as the tax upon Social Security in 26 U.S.C. §861(a)(8).

As an example of the above, domicile is the SOLE BASIS for the collection of state income taxes:

**The obligation of one domiciled within a state to pay taxes there, arises from unilateral action of the state government in the exercise of the most plenary of sovereign powers, that to raise revenue to defray the expenses of government and to distribute its burdens equably among those who enjoy its benefits. Hence, domicile in itself establishes a basis for taxation. Enjoyment of the privileges of residence within the state, and the attendant right to invoke the protection of its laws, are inseparable from the responsibility for sharing the costs of government. See *Fidelity & Columbia Trust Co. v. Louisville*, 245 U.S. 54, 58; *Maguire v. Trefry*, 253 U.S. 12, 14, 17; *Kirtland v. Hotchkiss*, 100 U.S. 491, 498; *Shaffer v. Carter*, 252 U.S. 37, 50.** The Federal Constitution imposes on the states no particular modes of taxation, and apart from the specific grant to the federal government of the exclusive 280\*280 power to levy certain limited classes of taxes and to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, it leaves the states unrestricted in their power to tax those domiciled within them, so long as the tax imposed is upon property within the state or on privileges enjoyed there, and is not so palpably arbitrary or unreasonable as to infringe the Fourteenth Amendment. *Kirtland v. Hotchkiss*, *supra*.

Taxation at the place of domicile of tangibles located elsewhere has been thought to be beyond the jurisdiction of the state, *Union Refrigerator Transit Co. v. Kentucky*, 199 U.S. 194; *Frick v. Pennsylvania*, 268 U.S. 473, 488-489; but considerations applicable to ownership of physical objects located outside the taxing jurisdiction, which have led to that conclusion, are obviously inapplicable to the taxation of intangibles at the place of domicile or of privileges which may be enjoyed there. See *Foreign Held Bond Case*, 15 Wall. 300, 319; *Frick v. Pennsylvania*, *supra*, p. 494. And the taxation of both by the state of the domicile has been uniformly upheld. *Kirtland v. Hotchkiss*, *supra*; *Fidelity & Columbia Trust Co. v. Louisville*, *supra*; *Blodgett v. Silberman*, 277 U.S. 1; *Maguire v. Trefry*, *supra*; compare *Farmers Loan & Trust Co. v. Minnesota*, 280 U.S. 204; *First National Bank v. Maine*, 284 U.S. 312.

The present tax has been defined by the Supreme Court of Mississippi as an excise and not a property tax, *Hattiesburg Grocery Co. v. Robertson*, 126 Miss. 34; 88 So. 4; *Knox v. Gulf, M. & N.R. Co.*, 138 Miss. 70; 104 So. 689, but in passing on its constitutionality we are concerned only with its practical operation, not its definition or the precise form of descriptive words which may be applied to it. See *Educational Films Corp. v. Ward*, 282 U.S. 379, 387; *Pacific Co. v. Johnson*, 285 U.S. 480; *Shaffer v. Carter*, *supra*, pp. 54-55. [*Lawrence v. State Tax Commission*, 286 U.S. 276 (1932); SOURCE: [https://scholar.google.com/scholar\\_case?case=10241277000101996613](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=10241277000101996613)]

And what is the criteria for establishing what amounts to a CIVIL STATUTORY domicile? Quite simply, either you participated in the government as a public officer called a CIVIL STATUTORY “citizen”, “resident”, or “person” that is their legislatively created property, or you VOLUNTARILY and CONSENSUALLY consumed government services of some kind that cost money to deliver. Thus, you have an equitable obligation to reimburse the government and if you don’t, you are engaging in “unjust enrichment”. Don’t believe us? See:

[Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf), Form #05.002  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>

The issues discussed here are the HEART of the fraud that is protected with silence, equivocation, and deception to ensure it is never discovered. They are all THIRD RAIL issues NO ONE in the government can ever talk about without committing commercial suicide. Now do you know why our best President honestly said the following:

The taxpayer - that's  
someone who works for  
the federal government  
but doesn't have to take  
the civil service  
examination.

Ronald Reagan

BrainyQuote®

## 5 Historical significance and evolution of the legal term “trade or business”<sup>3</sup>

The term “trade or business” was in the Revenue Act of 1862 at 12 Stat. 453, Section 59.<sup>4</sup> Taxes to fund the Civil war mainly consisted of excise or franchise taxes upon “trades and occupations”, “trades or professions”, and a “trade or business”, meaning a public office. To wit:

Figure 1: Revenue Act of 1862, 12 Stat. 453, Section 59

Privileges of the  
license may be  
transferred in cer-  
tain cases.

Post, p. 727.

SEC. 63. *And be it further enacted*, That upon the death of any person or persons licensed under or by virtue of this act, or upon the removal of any such person or persons from the house or premises at which he, she, or they were authorized by such license to exercise or carry on the trade or business mentioned in such license, it shall and may be lawful for the person or persons authorized to grant licenses to authorize and empower, by indorsement on such license, or otherwise, as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall direct, the executors or administrators, or the wife or child of such deceased person, or the assignee or assigns of such person or persons so removing as aforesaid, who shall be possessed of and occupy the house or premises before used for such purpose as aforesaid, in like

As you might expect even to this day, the entire Title 26 Subtitle A is an excise tax upon a “trade or business” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26). The geographical definition of “United States” in the Internal Revenue Code limits itself to federal territory and the federal zone:

*“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*

<sup>3</sup> Source: *The “Trade or Business” Scam*, Form #05.001, Section 1.5; <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> To view this act yourself online, see: <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llsl&fileName=012/llsl012.db&recNum=463>

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

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

[ . . . ]

"Upon the whole, we conclude

1. That licenses under the act of 1864, and the amendatory acts, conveyed to the licensee no authority to carry on the licensed business within a State.

2. That the requirement of payment for such licenses is only a mode of imposing taxes on the licensed business, and that the prohibition, under penalties, against carrying on the business without license is only a mode of enforcing the payment of such taxes.

3. That the provisions of the acts of Congress requiring such licenses, and imposing penalties for not taking out and paying for them, are not contrary to the Constitution or to public policy.

4. That the provisions in the act of 1866 for the imposing of special taxes, in lieu of requiring payment for licenses, removes whatever ambiguity existed in the previous laws, and are in harmony with the Constitution and public policy.

5. That the recognition by the acts of Congress of the power and right of the States to tax, control, or regulate any business carried on within its limits, is entirely consistent with an intention on the part of Congress to tax such business for National purposes."

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

It therefore appears to us that the national government can license, but not AUTHORIZE a "trade or businesses" within states of the Union in order to tax it. The main if not only thing they were saying in the License Tax Cases is that by doing so they are not authorizing people to engage in that activity in cases where that activity has been made criminal by a particular state such as gambling. The licensed (but not AUTHORIZED) activity they are taxing is the VOLUNTARY "trade or business". There are only TWO ways to engage in the activity:

1. U.S. Person Election by Filing a 1040 or RESIDENT Tax Return: Making a voluntary "election" to become a "U.S. person" under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30).

1.1. This is done by filing the 1040 U.S. Individual tax return.

1.2. This makes you a full-time public officer everywhere you go in the world. The OFFICE of "U.S. person" is a creation of and PROPERTY of the national government. To invoke that status is to REQUEST and USE PUBLIC/GOVERNMENT property.

1.3. EVERYTHING on that return is connected to a "trade or business" because it is subject to deductions under 26 U.S.C. §162. All "U.S. person" public officers MUST use their "SSN license" number in connection with EVERYTHING they do. See:

"U.S. Person" Position, Form #05.053

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/USPersonPosition.pdf>

2. Effectively Connecting your PRIVATE PROPERTY on a 1040-NR return: "Effectively connecting" your PROPERTY on a 1040-NR return if you file as a "foreign person" or a "nonresident alien".

2.1. Everything on the 1040-NR return is "effectively connected".

2.2. "Nonresident alien" is NOT a privileged status.

2.3. Nonresident aliens must use the SSN license number whenever they engage in PRIVILEGED activities, which is what "trade or business" is a synonym for, per 26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(b).

The above two methods of VOLUNTEERING through the use of the laws of property are exhaustively explored further in:

***The Truth About "Effectively Connecting"***

28 of 62

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>  
Form 05.056, Rev. 9-23-2024

EXHIBIT: \_\_\_\_\_

Regardless of which of the above methods you use to EFFECTIVELY VOLUNTEER, the Social Security Number behaves as the functional equivalent of a “license” to consume, use, or handle PUBLIC property of the national government for all intents and purposes. We can see that based on the above two items. All licenses imply that those engaging in them are officers of the state. At the same time, it is currently UNLAWFUL to engage in said offices OUTSIDE the District of Columbia without EXPRESS statutory authorization per 4 U.S.C. §72. We’ll give you a hint: That express statutory geographical authorization has NEVER been given by Congress. We prove this in:

The way that Congress got around the above restriction is that the OFFICE is domiciled in the District of Columbia but the VOLUNTEER officer is a “resident agent” of the office and has a foreign domicile of their own per 26 C.F.R. §301.7701(b)-2(c).

If people were honestly and fully informed that both of the above methods are voluntary, then almost NONE of them would volunteer! The fact that they are never told this in the IRS publications or by the courts is the biggest SCAM in the history of the world, folks! It’s a supreme violation of the oath that all public officers take to NOT disclose that this is voluntary. That is a breach of fiduciary duty to the public they are supposed to serve executed primarily for FINANCIAL and personal self interest.

*“For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil, for which some have strayed from the faith in their greediness, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”*  
[1 Tim. 6:10, Bible, NKJV]

*A misrepresentation may consist of the concealment of what is true as well as the assertion of what is false. Nairn v. Ewalt, 51 Kan. 355, 32 P. 1110 (1893); U.S. v. Sterling Salt Co., 200 F. 593, 597 (1912). Where failure to disclose a material fact is calculated to induce a false belief, the distinction between concealment and affirmative misrepresentation is tenuous. Schock v. Jacka, 105 Ariz. 131, 460 P.2d. 185 (1969).*

*When one conveys a false impression by the disclosure of some facts and the concealment of others, such concealment is in effect a false representation that what is disclosed is the whole truth. Equitable Life Ins. Co. of Iowa v. Halsey, Stuart & Co., 312 U.S. 410, 61 S.Ct. 623, 85 L.Ed. 920 (1941); \*482 \*\*157 Dennis v. Thomson, 43 S.W.2d 18, 240 Ky. 727 (1931); 37 C.J.S. Fraud, § 16, p. 247; Restatement (Second) of Torts, § 529.*  
[State v. Coddington, 135 Ariz. 480, 662 P.2d 155 (Ariz.App.,1983)]

Why is it a violation of the oath of all public officers in the government to remain SILENT about the fact that people have to VOLUNTEER for the income tax by DONATING their private property to a public purpose using the “trade or business” scam? Because the purpose of the oath is to protect PRIVATE property, and deceiving people into converting it to PUBLIC property by donating without even knowing that is what they are doing directly contradicts the purpose of their oath:

*“As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer.”<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal financial gain from a discharge of their trusts.<sup>6</sup> That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or she serves.<sup>7</sup> and owes a fiduciary duty to the public.<sup>8</sup> It has been said that the*

<sup>5</sup> State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont. 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321; Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.

<sup>6</sup> Georgia Dep’t of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524. A public official is held in public trust. Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697, app gr 117 Ill.Dec. 226, 520 N.E.2d. 387 and revd on other grounds 128 Ill.2d. 147, 131 Ill.Dec. 145, 538 N.E.2d. 520.

<sup>7</sup> Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc., 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181, appeal after remand (1st Dist) 107 Ill.App.3d. 222, 63 Ill.Dec. 134, 437 N.E.2d. 783.

<sup>8</sup> United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304 and vacated, remanded on other grounds 484 U.S. 807, 98 L.Ed. 2d 18, 108 S.Ct. 53, on remand (CA7 Ill) 840 F.2d. 1343, cert den 486 U.S. 1035, 100 L.Ed. 2d 608, 108 S.Ct. 2022 and (criticized on other grounds by United States v. Osser (CA3 Pa) 864



*fiduciary responsibilities of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, it has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official which tends to weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual [PRIVATE] rights is against public policy.<sup>10</sup>* [63C American Jurisprudence 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247 (1999)]

For proof it's all voluntary, see:

*How American Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax*, Form #08.024  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/HowYouVolForIncomeTax.pdf>

The term “trade or business” has always referred to those WITHIN the United States federal corporation and acting as officers of said corporation and not private humans protected by the Constitution. Those WITHIN the corporation called “United States” are “domestic”, while those WITHOUT it are “foreign”. A “source within the United States” therefore refers to payments from the United States government or its agents or instrumentalities:

26 C.F.R. §301.7701-5: Domestic, foreign, resident, and nonresident persons. (4-1-2004 Edition)

*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. 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. 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. A partnership engaged in trade or business within the United States is referred to in the regulations in this chapter as a resident partnership, and a partnership not engaged in trade or business within the United States, as a nonresident partnership. Whether a partnership is to be regarded as resident or nonresident is not determined by the nationality or residence of its members or by the place in which it was **created or organized**. The term "nonresident alien," as used in the regulations in this chapter, includes a nonresident alien individual and a nonresident alien fiduciary.*

The key word is “created”. Congress can only tax what it creates, as is proven in the following:

*Hierarchy of Sovereignty: The Power to Create is the Power to Tax, Family* Guardian Fellowship  
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Remedies/PowerToCreate.htm>

The current definition of the term “trade or business” is found below:

26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) *Trade or business.*

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

The statutory “individual” who is in the performance of “the functions of a public office” is not a private human protected by the Constitution, and yet is an “individual” whose trade or business was created or organized in the United States or under the law of the United States or of any State. It is a CRIME for PRIVATE people to act in the capacity of a public office without a specific election or appointment per 18 U.S.C. §912 and they cannot unilaterally “elect” themselves into said office by merely filling out a tax form.

The history of 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) appeared in the 1939 Internal Revenue Code (1939 IRC), under statute Sec. 48(a)(d) Definitions; Trade or Business. The Congressional hearings, Calendar No. 591; Senate Report No. 558, at page 29, stated that,

*"This amendment [to the 1939 code] is declaratory of existing law."*

F.2d. 1056) and (superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in United States v. Little (CA5 Miss) 889 F.2d. 1367) and (among conflicting authorities on other grounds noted in United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass), 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223).

<sup>9</sup> Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452, later proceeding (1st Dist) 105 Ill.App.3d. 298, 61 Ill.Dec. 172, 434 N.E.2d. 325.

<sup>10</sup> Indiana State Ethics Comm'n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172, reh gr (Ind App) 659 N.E.2d. 260, reh den (Jan 24, 1996) and transfer den (May 28, 1996).



Legislative history shows the change was made because of the additions as made to Section 213, see as follows:

*Internal Revenue Acts 1918 - 1928*  
*Title II - Income Tax - Gross Income Defined [Statutes at Large] 1918 - 1928*  
*SEC. 213 For the purposes of this title, except as otherwise provided in section 233-[corporation]*

(a) The term "gross income" includes gains, profits, and income derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for the personal service (including) in the case of the President of the United States, the judges of the Supreme and inferior courts of the United States, and all other officers and employees, whether elected or appointed, of the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, the compensation received as such), of whatever kind and in whatever form paid, or from professions, vocations, trades, businesses, commerce, or sales, or dealings in property, whether real or personal, growing out of the ownership or use of or interest in such property; also from interest, rent, dividends, securities, or the transaction of any business carried on for gain or profit, or gains or profits and income derived from any source whatever. \*

[Source: *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "gross income"; <https://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/GrossIncome.htm>]

The above "Gross Income" definition of the public employee or officer is in effect today, as it was never repealed nor amended, the words or terms pertaining to the public employee or officer were omitted from the IRC of 1928 only as "surplusage" as explained in the report of the House of Representatives, 70th Congress, 1st Session, Union Calendar No. 3, Report No. 2, at page 12, under the heading, "Technical and Administrative Provisions". Again, these individuals were not private individuals. After the Supreme Court decided the case of *Evans v. Gore*, 253 U.S. 245, 40 S.Ct. 550, 64 L.Ed. 887, 11 A.L.R. 519; in the year 1930 the definition of gross income was amended once again, see as follows:

*Internal Revenue Title (IRC 1939)*  
*Chapter I - Income Tax - Subchapter B - Part II - Computation of Net Income*  
*26 U.S.C. Sec. 22. GROSS INCOME.*

(a) GENERAL DEFINITION.

"Gross income" includes gains, profits, and income derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for personal service, of whatever kind and in whatever form paid, or from professions, vocations, trades, businesses, commerce, or sales, or dealings in property, whether real or personal, growing out of the ownership or use of or interest in such property; also from interest, rent, dividends, securities or the transaction of any business carried on for gain or profit, or gains or profits and income derived from any source whatever. In the case of Presidents of the United States and judges of courts of the United States taking office after June 6, 1932, the compensation received as such shall be included in gross income; and all Acts fixing the compensation of such Presidents and judges are hereby amended accordingly."

[Source: *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "gross income"; <https://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/GrossIncome.htm>]

Later during the same year of 1939, the Public Salary Tax Act was passed, and as such, the definition of Gross Income again changed by adding STATUTORY State officers or employees to the text. By "State" we mean TERRITORIAL states and not Constitutional states of the Union, as defined in 4 U.S.C. §110(d). This definition remains in effect to this date, as the statutory language pertaining to "and income derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for personal service", has never been repealed nor amended, see as follows:

*26 U.S.C. § 22. Gross income*

(a) General definition.

"Gross income" includes gains, profits, and income derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for personal service (including [meaning] personal service as an officer or employee of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing), of whatever kind and in whatever form paid, or from professions, vocations, trades, businesses, commerce, or sales, or dealings in property, whether real or personal, growing out of the ownership or use of or interest in such property; also from interest, rent, dividends, securities, or the transaction of any business carried on for gain or profit, or gains or profits and income derived from any source whatever. In the case of Presidents of the United States and judges of courts of the United States taking office after June 6, 1932, the compensation received as such shall be included in gross income; and all Acts fixing the compensation of such Presidents and judges are hereby amended accordingly. In the case of judges of courts of the United States who took office on or before June 6, 1932, the compensation

received as such shall be included in gross income. (As amended April 12, 1939, c. 59, Title I, § 1, 3, 53 Stat. 574, 575).

If you would like more information on the nature of the federal income tax as an excise and a franchise tax upon public offices, property, and activities WITHIN the U.S. Inc. federal corporation and its territories and possessions under Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution RATHER than the Sixteenth Amendment, see:

[Why the Federal Income Tax is a Privilege Tax Upon Government Property](https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #04.404  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

## **6 It is ILLEGAL for the Average American to call their earnings “trade or business” earnings**

*“The American president Abraham Lincoln liked to engage with his audiences and would often use riddles and humor when he spoke. One story goes that he asked an audience how many legs a dog would have if the tail were counted as a leg. When they said five, he responded that the answer was four, because calling the tail a leg did not make it so.”*  
[Anonymous]

Throughout our site, we prove that the average American is:

1. A common law “national” under 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21).
2. Nonresident to federal government exclusive jurisdiction.
3. A “nonresident alien” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B).
4. NOT:
  - 4.1. A statutory “citizen” under 8 U.S.C. §1401.
  - 4.2. A statutory “non-citizen national of the United States[\*\*] at birth” under 8 U.S.C. §1408.

This section will also prove that it is ILLEGAL for the Average American “nonresident alien” to call their PRIVATE earnings “trade or business” earnings if they are NOT, IN FACT ALREADY lawfully occupying a public office or agency OUTSIDE of the Internal Revenue Code.

The proof is provided by the following regulation:

[26 C.F.R. §1.871-8\(c\)\(1\) Taxation of nonresident alien individuals engaged in U.S. business or treated as having effectively connected income.](#)

*“... Income, gain, or loss of a nonresident alien individual is not treated as being effectively connected for the taxable year with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States if he is not engaged in trade or business within the United States during such year, . . .”*

The above excerpt is incontrovertible evidence that the phrase “conduct of a trade or business” is a term of art and is statutorily defined and restricted to the performance of a REAL public office lawfully created under another title of the U.S. code.

The regulation itself admits that the distinct possibility that a nonresident alien could earn and receive income, gain, or losses, WITHOUT being engaged in the conduct of a trade or business.

Now, if the term “trade or business” as used in the above regulation meant it’s ordinary definition, it would be IMPOSSIBLE for a nonresident alien to earn or receive any income, gain, or loss unless they were employed or engaged in the conduct of a trade or business in an ACTUAL, lawfully created public office within the U.S. government!!

This is also a good section of regulation for another reason. The fact that they vacillate between “in the United States” and “within the United States” in the same sentence is very telling. One could definitely be construed as geographical where the other one is clear not otherwise there would be no need to be redundant. Also, they often use “a” in regards to “engaged in ‘a’ trade or business in”, in juxtaposition to “engaged in trade or business within”. In this scenario, it therefore appears that:

1. “A trade or business” means a REAL lawfully created, elected or appointed public office.

2. “Engaged in trade or business within” means the office is LAWFULLY EXERCISED WITHIN the LEGAL FICTION “United States” as a federal corporation under 28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A).

Note that the above regulation restricts itself to nonresident aliens ONLY, meaning people over whom the IRS has no “personal jurisdiction”:

*“In the case of the federal government where the individual is either a United States citizen or an alien residing in the taxing jurisdiction, the tax under section 1 of the Code is based upon jurisdiction over the person; where the individual is an alien [LEGISLATIVELY OR CONSTITUTIONALLY “foreign”, INCLUDING states of the Union] not residing in the taxing jurisdiction [the “geographical United States”, meaning the District of Columbia per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) and 4 U.S.C. §110(d)], the tax under section 871 of the Code is based upon jurisdiction over the [PUBLIC] property or income of the nonresident individual [GEOGRAPHICALLY and PHYSICALLY] located or earned in the taxing jurisdiction”*  
*[Great Cruz Bay, Inc., St. John v. Wheatley, 495 F.2d. 301, 307 (3d Cir. 1974)]*

The SOLE BASIS for income taxation, according to the U.S. Supreme Court, is domicile within the forum, which is ALWAYS geographical. The civil statutory office of “taxpayer” is domiciled in the District of Columbia under the Internal Revenue Code, while the human being who VOLUNTEERED for the office need not be.<sup>11</sup> “Nonresident aliens” are not domiciled in the statutory geographical “United States” (federal zone), which is why they are “nonresident”. STATUTORY “citizens” and “residents” ARE domiciled within the statutory geographical “United States” and a “nonresident alien” is defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B) as OTHER than these two things:

*“The obligation of one domiciled within a state to pay taxes there, arises from unilateral action of the state government in the exercise of the most plenary of sovereign powers, that to raise revenue to defray the expenses of government and to distribute its burdens equably among those who enjoy its benefits. Hence, domicile in itself establishes a basis for taxation. Enjoyment of the privileges of residence within the state, and the attendant right to invoke the protection of its laws, are inseparable from the responsibility for sharing the costs of government. See *Fidelity & Columbia Trust Co. v. Louisville*, 245 U.S. 54, 58; *Maguire v. Trefry*, 253 U.S. 12, 14, 17; *Kirtland v. Hotchkiss*, 100 U.S. 491, 498; *Shaffer v. Carter*, 252 U.S. 37, 50. The Federal Constitution imposes on the states no particular modes of taxation, and apart from the specific grant to the federal government of the exclusive 280\*280 power to levy certain limited classes of taxes and to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, it leaves the states unrestricted in their power to tax those domiciled within them, so long as the tax imposed is upon property within the state or on privileges enjoyed there, and is not so palpably arbitrary or unreasonable as to infringe the Fourteenth Amendment. *Kirtland v. Hotchkiss*, *supra*. *[Lawrence v. State Tax Commission*, 286 U.S. 276 (1932); SOURCE: [https://scholar.google.com/scholar\\_case?case=10241277000101996613](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=10241277000101996613)]*

The implication of the Great Cruz Bay case above is that IRS can’t reach the PERSON filling the office of “taxpayer”, but they can reach their PROPERTY. That property MUST be geographically situated in the statutory geographical “United States” in order to be reachable by a court or an Executive Branch agency or bureau such as the IRS. Otherwise, there is no method of enforcement:

*“Thus the State, through its tribunals, may compel persons domiciled within its limits to execute, in pursuance of their contracts respecting property elsewhere situated, instruments in such form and with such solemnities as to transfer the title, so far as such formalities can be complied with; and the exercise of this jurisdiction in no manner interferes with the supreme control over the property by the State within which it is situated. *Penn v. Lord Baltimore*, 1 Ves. 444; *Massie v. Watts*, 6 Cranch, 148; *Watkins v. Holman*, 16 Pet. 25; *Corbett v. Nutt*, 10 Wall. 464.”*

*So the State, through its tribunals, may subject property situated within its limits owned by non-residents to the payment of the demand of its own citizens against them; and the exercise of this jurisdiction in no respect infringes upon the sovereignty of the State where the owners are domiciled. Every State owes protection to its own citizens; and, when non-residents deal with them, it is a legitimate and just exercise of authority to hold and appropriate any property owned by such non-residents to satisfy the claims of its citizens. It is in virtue of the State’s jurisdiction over the property of the non-resident situated within its limits that its tribunals can inquire into that non-resident’s obligations to its own citizens, and the inquiry can then be carried only to the extent necessary to control the disposition of the property. If the non-resident 724\*724 have no property in the State, there is nothing upon which the tribunals can adjudicate.”*  
*[Pembrey v. Neff, 95 U.S. 714 (1878)]*

<sup>11</sup> For proof that you volunteered, see: *How American Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax*, Form #08.024; <https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/HowYouVolForIncomeTax.pdf>.

If the “nonresident alien” is NOT lawfully engaged in a public office, which itself is PROPERTY of the national government legislatively created and granted by the national government, there is no property that the national government can reach or adjudicate in order to satisfy judgements against the nonresident alien. That is why they must state in the regulation that the OWNER of the earnings must occupy a REAL civil statutory public office in order to claim the “benefits” of “electing” to treat earnings as connected with the office. If they didn’t, they would have no jurisdiction to enforce! If there were no REAL lawfully created public office, for instance, they couldn’t lien or levy the owner of the income, because 26 U.S.C. §6331 limits ENFORCEMENT/distrain to INSTRUMENTALITIES of the national government, of which a PRIVATE human being is NOT!

26 U.S. Code § 6331 - Levy and distraint

(a) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY

If any person liable to pay any tax neglects or refuses to pay the same within 10 days after notice and demand, it shall be lawful for the Secretary to collect such tax (and such further sum as shall be sufficient to cover the expenses of the levy) by levy upon all property and rights to property (except such property as is exempt under section 6334) belonging to such person or on which there is a lien provided in this chapter for the payment of such tax. Levy may be made upon the accrued salary or wages of any officer, employee, or elected official, of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of the United States or the District of Columbia, by serving a notice of levy on the employer (as defined in section 3401(d)) of such officer, employee, or elected official. If the Secretary makes a finding that the collection of such tax is in jeopardy, notice and demand for immediate payment of such tax may be made by the Secretary and, upon failure or refusal to pay such tax, collection thereof by levy shall be lawful without regard to the 10-day period provided in this section.

The U.S. Supreme Court in *Sims v. United States*, 359 U.S. 108 (1959) addressed the reach of the above statute as follows:

*Though the definition of "person" in § 6332 does not mention States or any sovereign or political entity or their officers among those it "includes" (Note 3), it is equally clear that it does not exclude them. This is made certain by the provisions of § 7701 (b) of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code that "The terms 'includes' and 'including' when used in a definition contained in this title shall not be deemed to exclude other things otherwise within the meaning of the term defined." 26 U.S.C. (Supp. V) §7701(b). Whether the term "person" when used in a federal statute includes a State cannot be abstractly declared, but depends upon its legislative environment, Ohio v. Helvering, 292 U.S. 360, 370; Georgia v. Evans, 316 U.S. 159, 161. It is clear that § 6332 is stated in all-inclusive terms of general application. "In interpreting federal revenue measures expressed in terms of general application, this Court has ordinarily found them operative in the case of state activities even though States were not expressly indicated as subjects of tax." Wilmette Park Dist. v. Campbell, 338 U.S. 411, 416, and cases cited. We think that the subject matter, the context, the legislative history, and the executive interpretation, i. e., the legislative environment, of § 6332 make it plain that Congress intended to and did include States within the term "person" as used in § 6332.*

*Nor is there merit in petitioner's contention that Congress, by specifically providing in § 6331 for levy upon the accrued salaries of federal employees, but not mentioning state employees, evinced an intention to exclude the latter from levy. The explanation of that action by Congress appears quite clearly to be that this Court had held in Smith v. Jackson, 246 U.S. 388, that a federal disbursing officer might not, in the absence of express congressional authorization, set off an indebtedness of a federal employee 113\*113 to the Government against the employee's salary, and, pursuant to that opinion, the Comptroller General ruled that an "administrative official served with [notices of levy] would be without authority to withhold any portion of the current salary of such employee in satisfaction of the notices of levy and distraint." 26 Comp.Gen. 907, 912 (1947). It is evident that § 6331 was enacted to overcome that difficulty and to subject the salaries of federal employees to the same collection procedures as are available against all other taxpayers, including employees of a State.*

*Accordingly we hold that §§ 6331 and 6332 authorize levy upon the accrued salaries of state employees for the collection of any federal tax.  
[Sims v. United States, 359 U.S. 108, 112-113 (1959)]*

The above case, however, dealt with a federal franchisee and “employee” and not a private party protected by constitution by virtue of the following facts:

1. There are no implementing regulations for 26 U.S.C. §6331 and never have been applying the 26 C.F.R. Part 1 income tax. See for yourself:  
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/26/part-1>
2. Because there are not implementing regulations, enforcement authority is limited to the following subject matters:
  - 2.1. A military or foreign affairs function of the United States. 5 U.S.C. §553(a)(1). This includes:

- 2.1.1. Making or executing war. This is the [Department of Defense \(DOD\)](#), [Title 50 of the U.S. Code](#), and the [Uniform Code of Military Justice \(U.C.M.J.\)](#), 10 U.S.C. Chapter 47.
- 2.1.2. Regulating aliens within the country. The presence test at [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)](#) implements the tax aspect of this.
- 2.1.3. Protecting VOLUNTARY STATUTORY citizens (not constitutional citizens) abroad. This is done through passports, [26 U.S.C. §911](#) which pays for the protection, the [Department of State \(DOS\)](#), and the military.
- 2.1.4. International commerce with foreign nations. This is done through the [Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act \(FSIA\)](#), [28 U.S.C. Chapter 97](#), [U.S.C.I.S.](#), [Department of Homeland Security \(DHS\)](#), and the foreign affairs supervision of the federal courts.
- 2.1.5. Economic sanctions on foreign countries and political rulers imposed by the [Department of the Treasury](#).
- 2.2. A matter relating to agency management or personnel or to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts. [5 U.S.C. §553\(a\)\(2\)](#). Note that:
- 2.2.1. "Taxes" do NOT fall in the category of "public property, loans, grants, or benefits" , but the U.S. supreme court identified them as a "quasi-contract" in [Milwaukee v. White, 296 U.S. 268 \(1935\)](#)<sup>12</sup>.
- 2.2.2. In the case of "agency management or personnel", they are talking about public officers serving within the national government as EXPRESSLY GEOGRAPHICALLY authorized by 4 U.S.C. §72 and NOT elsewhere. We'll give you a HINT, there IS no "express legislative authorization" for "taxpayer" offices to be exercised outside the District of Columbia as required, so all those serving in such an office extraterritorially are [DE FACTO officers \(Form #05.043\)](#). The income tax is an excise tax upon the "trade or business" franchise, which is defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) as "the functions of a public office", but those offices may not lawfully be exercised outside the District of Columbia. That is why the statutory geographical "United States" defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\)](#) and (a)(10) is defined as the District of Columbia and NOWHERE expressly extended outside the District of Columbia or the Federal statutory "State" defined in [4 U.S.C. §110\(d\)](#).
- 2.2.3. Civil statutory statuses such as "taxpayer", "citizen", "resident", and "person" AND the PUBLIC RIGHTS and privileges that attach to them are PROPERTY legislatively created and therefore owned by the national government. Those claiming these statuses are in receipt, custody, or "benefit" of federal privileges no matter where they physically are, and thus are subject to Congress power to "make all needful rules respecting the Territory and other property" granted by [Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution](#).
- 2.3. Federal agencies or persons in their capacity as officers, agents, or employees thereof. [44 U.S.C. §1505\(a\)\(1\)](#).
- More on the above at:
- [Citizenship Status v. Tax Status](#), Form #10.011, Section 15  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitizenshipStatusVTaxStatus/CitizenshipVTaxStatus.htm>
3. The party subject to levy did not fall into any of the groups listed in the previous step, because he worked for the state government as an American.
4. There are implementing regulations for levy under 26 U.S.C. §6331 found in 26 C.F.R. §301.6331-1 through 26 C.F.R. §301.6331-4.
5. Implementing regulations under 26 C.F.R. Part 301 are enacted under the authority of 5 U.S.C. §301 by the Secretary of the Treasury.
6. The Secretary's authority under 5 U.S.C. §301 is limited to personnel and property WITHIN the Department of the Treasury. It may not affect property OUTSIDE his department or PRIVATE property for that matter, such as the earnings of someone working for a state government OUTSIDE the "United States", both geographically and corporately.
7. At some point, the earnings subject to levy under 26 U.S.C. §6331 therefore had to be VOLUNTARILY converted from PRIVATE to PUBLIC property by the person who earned it so that the Secretary could in fact make "needful rules" to levy it such as those in 26 U.S.C. §6331 found in 26 C.F.R. §301.6331-1 through 26 C.F.R. §301.6331-4. Otherwise, the levy would have been a taking of private property in violation of the Fifth Amendment Takings Clause. Chances are the conversion was unknowingly done by the work filling out a Form W-4 and thereby invoking 26 U.S.C. §3402(p). That is how most people do it, usually by mistake.
8. The court deliberately didn't say how the PRIVATE earnings as property were CONSENSUALLY converted from PRIVATE to PUBLIC or how the civil status of the OWNER of the earnings was converted from PRIVATE to PUBLIC.
- 8.1. Thus, they made it falsely APPEAR that EVERYONE can be levied as a method to illegally expand the enforcement of the income tax.



8.2. This case was thus probably cherry picked by the court so they could “grandstand” to expand their authority and that of the Secretary beyond its lawful or Constitutional limits by failing to completely define the CONTEXT of why and how the property subject to tax was voluntarily converted from PRIVATE to PUBLIC.

8.3. They were thus practicing sophistry and sophistry always involves equivocation, compartmentalizing, or otherwise obfuscating the context of definitions. See:

*An Introduction to Sophistry Course*, Form #12.042

<https://sedm.org/an-introduction-to-sophistry/>

9. This case would have had the opposite result if:

9.1. The worker had NOT filed a Form W-4 under 26 U.S.C. §3402(p) converting their earnings from PRIVATE to PUBLIC.

9.2. The worker had filed a Form W-8 for withholding instead as a foreign person and invoked [26 C.F.R. §31.3401\(a\)\(6\)-1\(b\)](#) and [26 C.F.R. §31.3121\(b\)-3\(c\)\(1\)](#), the earnings would have REMAINED PRIVATE, never have been converted to PUBLIC, and thus could not lawfully be subject to levy because they would be protected by the Fifth Amendment Takings Clause as PRIVATE property.

9.3. The worker had indicated duress in being FORCED to file a Form W-4 instead of the more proper Form W-8 and filed a tax return zeroing out all earnings as a result using our Form #09.077. See:

*W-2CC*, Form #04.304

<https://sedm.org/Forms/04-Tax/3-Reporting/FormW-2CC-Cust/FormW-2CC.pdf>

9.4. The worker had challenged the tax assessment as illegal. Substitute for Returns on human beings that are executed as part of the Notice of Deficiency process are ILLEGAL under 26 U.S.C. §6020(b). See:

*Truth in Taxation Hearings*, Family Guardian Fellowship, Section 13: 26 U.S.C. 6020(b): Substitute for Returns

<https://truthintaxationhearings.famguardian.org>

9.5. The Plaintiff in the suit had raised any of the issues above to challenge enforcement jurisdiction.

The above approaches, by the way, are the position taken by SEDM 1040-NR filing procedures at:

*1040-NR Attachment*, Form #09.077

<https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/1040NR-Attachment.pdf>

10. If you would like to see an explanation of the analysis of the administrative enforcement authority of the Secretary consistent with the above, see:

*Challenging Jurisdiction Workbook*, Form #09.082

<https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/ChalJurWorkbook.pdf>

So as usual, the *Sims v. United States*, 359 U.S. 108, 112-113 (1959) case is just another case of government identity theft to make either the person who earned the money or the earnings themselves PUBLIC through duress, omission, and equivocation as described in:

*Government Identity Theft*, Form #05.046

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/GovernmentIdentityTheft.pdf>

Thus, this regulation at 26 C.F.R. §1.871-8(c)(1) COMPLETELY OBLITERATES the idea that you as a PRIVATE human being can lawfully "effectively connect" that which is NOT connected to a "trade or business" and a REAL lawfully created public office to that which IS. Why? Because it is a CRIME to bribe ANOTHER public officer such as an IRS agent to treat YOU as a public officer if you aren't already lawfully elected or appointed in ANOTHER title of the U.S. code!

[18 U.S. Code §210 - Offer to procure appointive public office](#)

*Whoever pays or offers or promises any money or thing of value, to any person, firm, or corporation in consideration of the use or promise to use any influence to procure any appointive office or place under the United States for any person, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.*

*(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 694, § 210, formerly § 214; renumbered § 210, Pub. L. 87-849, § 1(b), Oct. 23, 1962, 76 Stat. 1125; Pub. L. 103-322, title XXXIII, § 330016(l)(H), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 2147.)*

To put it another way, government's HIGHEST DUTY under the Declaration of Independence is to protect EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE property. The first step in that protection is to protect PRIVATE property from being connected to PUBLIC property, public offices, or public control without the express consent of the owner, and vice versa. A failure to do that is a denial of the MAIN “benefit” of the Constitution, which PRIVATE property and the “pursuit of Happiness” that it produces

as described in the Declaration of Independence. Thus, their MAIN job is to PERPETUALLY maintain an inviolable wall of LEGAL separation between PRIVATE and PUBLIC, as this regulation tries to recognize, and which is exhaustively explored in the following document on our site:

*Separation Between Public and Private Course*, Form #12.025  
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>

They buried the MANDATORY constitutional separation between PUBLIC and PRIVATE SO DEEP in this regulation that the average American would certainly never recognize it. This is because if they DID recognize it, they could opt out of the system and withdraw their consent and cooperation. The legalese is designed to literally make your consent to convert PRIVATE to PUBLIC invisible so that you will not know how to withdraw it:

*Hot Issues: Invisible Consent\**, SEDM  
<https://sedm.org/invisible-consent/>

We learned a long time ago, that often times when we examine a problem, that we discover truth. And we came to understand that the problem is never apart from the answer.

We came to realize that if one invests the time and effort into studying that tax code and the treasury regulations, we acquired a deep understanding of both, and we understood that the PROBLEM is the ANSWER. Understanding the problem dissolves the problem.

The problem - in this case - Understanding the complexity of the tax code and regulations, is greatly simplified, when one realizes that the problem is the answer. Understanding the problem will dissolve that problem.

Our research pivots off of “The Trade or Business Scam”. Responsible American citizens and newbies to the sites, must understand and know the truth about the term “trade or business”.

## **7 The “treated as if” scam**

Every corruption of the tax code relies on an “election” that results in:

1. **A human being “treated as” something that they are not.** In this case treating a PRIVATE human being as an OFFICER of the state, whether they even realize it or not.
2. **Their PROPERTY that is PRIVATE by default being treated as something that it is not.** In this case treating it as PUBLIC property. This is so in SPITE of the fact that the purpose of establishing government is to protect PRIVATE PROPERTY, and that the first step in providing that protection is to keep it from being converted to PUBLIC property without the consent of the owner. Would you hire a security guard for your property who made their main profession that of STEALING or CONVERTING the property without your knowledge or express consent?

Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg of the U.S. Supreme Court often emphasized the importance of how laws and government actions treat individuals. In her rulings and opinions, she highlighted that when the government controls certain decisions for individuals, it effectively treats them as less than fully autonomous adults. For instance, in her discussions on reproductive rights, she stated that when the government controls a woman’s decision to bear a child, it treats her as less than a fully adult human responsible for her own choices. See:

1. *For Ginsburg, Abortion is about Equality*, ACLU  
<https://www.aclu.org/news/reproductive-freedom/for-justice-ginsburg-abortion-was-about-equality>
2. *Ruth Bader Ginsburg Wishes This Case Had Legalized Abortion instead of Roe v. Wade*, Time  
<https://time.com/5354490/ruth-bader-ginsburg-roe-v-wade/>

This principle can be extended to other contexts where she argued that treating individuals “as if” they are something they are not (e.g., treating women as less capable than men) violates their rights to equal protection and autonomy. See:

1. *Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s Landmark Opinions on Women’s Rights*, History Channel  
<https://www.history.com/news/ruth-bader-ginsburgs-landmark-opinions-womens-rights-supreme-court>

- 1 2. Even RBG thought Roe v. Wade Went too far. We should learn from her incremental approach, America Magazine  
2 <https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2020/09/24/ruth-bader-ginsburg-abortion-roe-v-wade-catholic>

3 Although Ginsburg's comments on the "treated as" scam relate mainly to women's rights, they apply universally to every  
4 area of life, and especially in the area of taxation, where government tends to act paternalistically rather than respectfully as  
5 an equal to the individual. In a society based on equal protection and equal treatment, such paternalism is anathema.

## 6 **8 What is CONSTITUTIONAL "income"?<sup>13</sup>**

7 Like any legal term, there are TWO separate contexts in which "income" may be defined: 1. Statutory; 2. Constitutional.  
8 The statutory and constitutional contexts are mutually exclusive and non-overlapping. All "income" must fit in one but not  
9 both of these categories. Below is a breakdown of these two contexts:

10 **Table 2: Constitutional v. Statutory "income" compared**

#	Characteristic	Constitutional context	Statutory context
1	Source of authority to tax	Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution	1. Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution. 2. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution.
2	Geographic applicability	states of the Union	Federal territories and possessions
3	Activities included in the definition of "income" based on current law	1. Profit of a federal and not state corporation from foreign commerce. OR 2. Earnings connected with federally privileged activities such as a "trade or business".	Public offices in the United States government
4	Nature of tax upon "income"	Excise tax on foreign commerce under Const. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1	Statutory franchises within the United States government
5	Statutory definition of "income" allowed	No. Constitution defines it.	Yes. Not constrained by the Constitution.
6	Who can define it	The courts	The legislature.

11 Acts or statutes enacted by the United States Congress such as the Internal Revenue Code fall in the right column above and  
12 limit themselves to federal territory not protected by the Constitution. Hence, "income" within the I.R.C. Subtitle A is not  
13 constrained by the United States Constitution, because the definitions within the I.R.C. and the Constitution both limit its  
14 operation to federal territory and the national government itself.

15 The U.S. Supreme Court has held that the Constitutional context on the left, Congress is WITHOUT any lawful authority to  
16 define the word "income":

17 *"In order, therefore, that the [apportionment] clauses cited from article 1 [\$2, cl. 3 and \$9, cl. 4] of the*  
18 *Constitution may have proper force and effect ...[I]t becomes essential to distinguish between what is an what is*  
19 *not 'income,' ...according to truth and substance, without regard to form. **Congress cannot by any definition it***  
20 ***may adopt conclude the matter, since it cannot by legislation alter the Constitution, from which alone, it derives***  
21 ***its power to legislate, and within those limitations alone that power can be lawfully exercised...** [pg.*  
22 *207]...After examining dictionaries in common use we find little to add to the succinct definition adopted in two*  
23 *cases arising under the Corporation Tax Act of 1909, *Stratton's Independence v. Howbert*, 231 U.S. 399, 415, 34*  
24 *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*  
25 *L.Ed. 1054..."*  
26 *[Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 207, 40 S.Ct. 189, 9 A.L.R. 1570 (1920)]*

27 Congress itself admitted it could not statutorily define the word "income" in the Constitutional context or within states of the  
28 Union shortly after the Sixteenth Amendment was ratified in 1913 in the case where they were contemplating how to write  
29 the first income tax law. The Congressional Record says the following on August 28, 1913 on this subject:

<sup>13</sup> SOURCE: *How the Government Defrauds You Out of Legitimate Exclusions for the Market Value of Your Labor*, Form #05.026, Section 5.1;  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/DefraudLabor.pdf>.

Mr. CUMMINS [. . .]

It ought not to be forgotten, however-and I am now speaking to the lawyers on the other side; I want to make a lawyer's argument and not to raise at this moment any question of policy-that the authority of the Congress of the United States with regard to this subject is not unlimited. Our power is not like the power which Great Britain exercises over the subject. It is not like the power which the several States exercise over the subject. It is a power granted in article 16 of the Constitution, and I will read it:

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

Our authority is to levy a tax upon incomes. I take it that every lawyer will agree with me in the conclusion that we cannot levy under this amendment a tax upon anything but an income. I assume that every lawyer will agree with me that we can not legislatively interpret the meaning of the word "income." **That is purely a judicial matter.** We can not enlarge the meaning of the word "income." We need not levy our tax upon the entire income. We may levy it upon part of an income, but we cannot levy it upon anything but an income; **and what is income must be determined by the courts of the country when the question is submitted to them.**

I think there can be no controversy with regard to those propositions. I am very anxious that when this bill shall have passed it may be effective, that its operation may not be suspended or delayed through a resort to legal tribunals.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to inquire whether the Senator means to state that Congress can not by statute define what shall be regarded as an income tax?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think so, Mr. President. The word "income" had a well-defined meaning before the amendment of the Constitution was adopted. It has been defined in all the courts of this country. When the people of the country granted to Congress the right to levy a tax on incomes, that right was granted with reference to the legal meaning and interpretation of the word "income" as it was then or as it might thereafter be defined or understood in legal procedure. If we could call anything income that we pleased, we could obliterate all the distinctions between income and principal. Whenever this law tested in the courts of the country, it will be found that the courts will undertake to declare whether the thing upon which we levy the tax is income or whether it is something else, and therefore we ought to be in the highest degree careful in endeavoring to interpret the Constitution through a statutory enactment.

[Congressional Record, Vol. 50, August 28, 1913, p. 3843  
SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/History/Congress/1909-16thAmendCongrRecord.pdf>]

A very important implication of Eisner and the Congressional Record above and the preceding section are that:

1. Congress cannot statutorily define "income" in a state of the Union or in a Constitutional context. Only the judicial branch can define "income" within the context of the Constitution of the United States and the Sixteenth Amendment.
2. The U.S. Supreme Court and lower courts have consistently held that the word "income" as used within the Constitutional and not statutory context, includes only "profit", as we covered in the preceding section.
3. If Congress cannot statutorily define the word "income" in a Constitutional context or within a state of the Union, then the IRS cannot have any delegated authority to define it in their publications or the Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.) either.
4. Since the term "income" is statutorily defined in [26 U.S.C. §643](#), then the "income" they mean cannot include anything earned within a state of the Union. Therefore, the only "income" that Congress can be referring to is "profit" in connection with taxable activities occurring on federal territory.

[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.

5. The IRS' own Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.) admits that not only it, but every IRS form and publication is UNTRUSTWORTHY and should NOT be cited or used as a basis for good faith belief.

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

Based on the above, those protected by the Constitution and physically present within a constitutional and not statutory State of the Union should not be relying on IRS publications to define "income" and the only thing we can consistently rely upon for a definition is the enacted positive law itself. By "positive law", we mean enactments of Congress that are legally admissible as evidence in a court of law of an obligation.

The other thing we should notice from the statutory definition of "income" found in 26 U.S.C. §643 above is that it expressly includes ONLY earnings of an estate or trust. Hence, even on federal territory, you must be a trustee or executor of a trust to even earn statutory "income". The only type of trust or estate they can be talking about is a public and not private trust or estate, because the ability to regulate PRIVATE conduct is "repugnant to the constitution".

"The power to 'legislate generally upon' life, liberty, and property, as opposed to the 'power to provide modes of redress' against offensive state action, was 'repugnant' to the Constitution. *Id.*, at 15. See also *United States v. Reese*, 92 U.S. 214, 218 (1876); *United States v. Harris*, 106 U.S. 629, 639 (1883); *James v. Bowman*, 190 U.S. 127, 139 (1903). Although the specific holdings of these early cases might have been superseded or modified, see, e.g., *Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States*, 379 U.S. 241 (1964); *United States v. Guest*, 383 U.S. 745 (1966), their treatment of Congress' §5 power as corrective or preventive, not definitional, has not been questioned."  
[*City of Boerne v. Flores*, *Archbishop of San Antonio*, 521 U.S. 507 (1997)]

What "public trust" might they be talking about? The government! Government is a "public trust":

Executive Order 12731  
"Part I -- PRINCIPLES OF ETHICAL CONDUCT

"Section 101. Principles of Ethical Conduct. To ensure that every citizen can have complete confidence in the integrity of the Federal Government, each Federal employee shall respect and adhere to the fundamental principles of ethical service as implemented in regulations promulgated under sections 201 and 301 of this order:

**"(a) Public service is a public trust, requiring employees to place loyalty to the Constitution, the laws, and ethical principles above private gain.**

TITLE 5--ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL  
CHAPTER XVI--OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS  
PART 2635--STANDARDS OF ETHICAL CONDUCT FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH--  
Table of Contents  
Subpart A--General Provisions  
Sec. 2635.101 Basic obligation of public service.

(a) Public service is a public trust.

Each employee has a responsibility to the United States Government and its citizens to place loyalty to the Constitution, laws and ethical principles above private gain. To ensure that every citizen can have complete confidence in the integrity of the Federal Government, each employee shall respect and adhere to the principles of ethical conduct set forth in this section, as well as the implementing standards contained in this part and in supplemental agency regulations.

All those working in the national and not state government as public officers are therefore trustees of the public trust. Any earnings they have in the capacity of public officers are therefore the only proper subject of taxes upon "income" within the national and not state government. These conclusions are completely consistent with the definitions found in the Internal Revenue Code limiting taxes upon "income" under Subtitle A of the I.R.C. The I.R.C. Subtitle A is, in fact, an excise tax upon public offices in the U.S. government and not state government. That excise tax is NEITHER "direct" nor "indirect",



because these two terms only have meaning within the Constitutional context, and the I.R.C. Subtitle A is a statutory and NOT constitutional context. For further details see:

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

If you would like to investigate further the meaning of “income”, the following resources should prove very useful:

1. Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Sections 3.9.1.9 and 5.6.5.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: “Income”.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
3. Sixteenth Amendment Congressional Debates, Exhibit #02.007.  
<http://sedm.org/Exhibits/ExhibitIndex.htm>
4. Constitutional Income, Phil Hart, ISBN 0-9711880-0-9. SOURCE: <http://www.constitutionalincome.com>.

## **9 ELECTIONS: When “gross income” includes MORE than “profit”<sup>14</sup>**

The Sixteenth Amendment limits the term “income” and therefore STATUTORY “gross income” to “profit”.

*After examining dictionaries in common use (Bouv. L.D.; Standard Dict.; Webster's Internat. Dict.; Century Dict.), 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; Doyle v. Mitchell Bros. Co., 247 U.S. 179, 185) — “Income may be defined as the gain derived from capital, from labor, or from both combined,” provided it be understood to include profit gained through a sale or conversion of capital assets, to which it was applied in the Doyle Case (pp. 183, 185).*

*Brief as it is, it indicates the characteristic and distinguishing attribute of income essential for a correct solution of the present controversy. The Government, although basing its argument upon the definition as quoted, placed chief emphasis upon the word “gain,” which was extended to include a variety of meanings; while the significance of the next three words was either overlooked or misconceived. “Derived — from — capital;” — “the gain — derived — from — capital,” etc. Here we have the essential matter: not a gain accruing to capital, not a growth or increment of value in the investment; but a gain, a profit, something of exchangeable value proceeding from the property, severed from the capital however invested or employed, and coming in, being “derived,” that is, received or drawn by the recipient (the taxpayer) for his separate use, benefit and disposal; — that is income derived from property. Nothing else answers the description.  
[Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 206-208 (1920); SOURCE:  
[https://scholar.google.com/scholar\\_case?case=6666969430777270424](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=6666969430777270424)]*

However, there are occasions where an ELECTION of some kind can EXPAND the definition of “gross income” in 26 U.S.C. §61 beyond mere PROFIT to encompass MORE than mere “profit”, such as “GROSS RECEIPTS”. That election happens by one of two methods:

1. Electing U.S. person status under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30), which makes YOUR status PUBLIC rather than private. This has the effect of making all property connected to you by the franchise mark PUBLIC as well, since a Social Security Number is mandatory for all U.S. persons.
2. “Effectively connecting” your earnings by entering them on the 1040-NR return.

Since item 1 is forbidden to Compliant Members, the following subsections will delve into item 2 above.

This subject is EXTREMELY important because it permits you to EXCLUDE from entering ANYTHING on the 1040-NR return as “income” if you don’t CONSENT to effectively connect that amount. We account for this option recognized by law to EXCLUDE earnings from the 1040-NR return with the following language in our 1040-NR Attachment:

### **5. Blocks 1 to 15: INCOME EFFECTIVELY CONNECTED WITH U.S. TRADE/BUSINESS**

1. See definition of “effectively connected” later in section 11.

<sup>14</sup> Source: Gross Income Worksheet, Form #09.080, Section 4; <https://sedm.org/product/gross-income-worksheet-nonresident-alien-form-09-080/>.

2. This section contains earnings described in [26 U.S.C. §871\(b\)](#) from “sources within the United States” and is limited to earnings voluntarily associated with the “[trade or business](#)” [excise taxable franchise](#) defined as “the functions of a public office” in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#). Everything listed in this section is subject to “trade or business” deductions under [26 U.S.C. §162](#). “United States” in this context means the government as a corporation, and not a geography. [26 C.F.R. §1.871-2\(f\)](#) indicates that I am the only one who can “effectively connect” earnings in this section (“by that individual”). Thus, you have no authority to add ANYTHING to this section that I myself did not add, and certainly no type of “income”.

3. Values listed in this section are all zero, because:

3.1. The 1040-NR Instructions relating to Block 1a (wages) state: “Don’t include any income on line 1a Form 1040-NR that isn’t treated as effectively connected”. Thus, I can’t include any earnings from labor that I don’t consent to donate to a public use in order to procure the “benefit” of “deductions” under [26 U.S.C. §162](#) in connection with a “trade or business”.

3.2. There is no place on the Schedule NEC to enter earnings from my personal labor, thus recognizing that I can only put it on a tax return if I donate it to a public use by “effectively connecting” it.

3.3. Submitter does not consent and has no delegated authority or lawful authority to consent to “effectively connect” his/her earnings or him/her self to a statutory “trade or business” or public office either by entering it on the 1040-NR form or associating it with a statutory SSN/TIN franchise mark. He/she as the absolute owner of both is the only one authorized by law to do so as required by [26 C.F.R. §1.872-2\(f\)](#) and as required by the Bill of Rights protecting all his/her private property.

3.4. Earnings are therefore expressly excluded from “gross income” under [26 C.F.R. §1.871-7\(a\)\(4\)](#) in this section. It would constitute fraud and possibly a violation of [18 U.S.C. §912](#) for me to claim otherwise, as proven by: *The Trade or Business Scam*, <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf>.

[1040-NR Attachment, Form #09.077, Section 5; <https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/1040NR-Attachment.pdf>]

## 9.1 “Effectively Connected” Trap

“Effectively connected” is defined below:

[26 U.S. Code § 864 - Definitions and special rules](#)

(c) Effectively connected income, etc.

(1) General rule

For purposes of this title—

(A) In the case of a nonresident alien individual or a foreign corporation engaged in [trade or business within the United States](#) during the taxable year, the rules set forth in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8) shall apply in determining the income, gain, or loss which shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a [trade or business within the United States](#).

(B) Except as provided in paragraph (6) [\[1\]](#) (7), or (8) or in section 871(d) or sections 882(d) and (e), in the case of a nonresident alien individual or a foreign corporation not engaged in [trade or business within the United States](#) during the taxable year, no income, gain, or loss shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a [trade or business within the United States](#).

The above is not a definition, because it merely describes how to IMPLEMENT it but not WHY it exists. The WHY is answered by the more complete definition of “Effectively connected” below:

**Effectively connected:** Earnings from WITHOUT the “United States” (government) donated to a public use, a public purpose, and a public office to procure the benefits of a franchise privilege such as deductions under 26 U.S.C. §162 and 26 U.S.C. §873.

Our 1040-NR attachment defines “effectively connected” as:

### 11. Definitions

5. “Effectively connected” means otherwise private property CONSENSUALLY donated by its original owner to a public use, a public purpose, or a public office within the national and not state government, and thus connected

to the statutory “trade or business” defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) as “the functions of a public office”. None of God’s entirely private property under my stewardship falls into this category. All of God’s property is absolutely owned private property protected by the constitution and defined as a “foreign estate” under [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(31\)](#) and the First Amendment separation of church and state. Ownership of “trade or business” property, on the other hand, is QUALIFIED (shared) rather than ABSOLUTE (singular). “Trade or business” property ownership or control is shared by the owner and its government parens patriae, Creator, and owner. A portion of the shared ownership becomes a kickback (called a return) to compensate its trustee for his or her services.

[1040-NR Attachment, Form #09.077, Section 11: Definitions; <https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/1040NR-Attachment.pdf>]

Note that there are TWO methods to volunteer to owe tax:

1. ELECT to change YOUR status from private “nonresident alien” to PUBLIC “U.S. person”.
2. Elect to convert your PRIVATE property from PRIVATE to PUBLIC by “effectively connecting” it.

“Effectively connecting” implements item 2 above, by converting your PROPERTY rather than YOURSELF from PRIVATE to PUBLIC.

“Effectively connecting” is an implementation of the rules for converting private to public recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court:

*“Men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, -life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;’ and to ‘secure,’ not grant or create, these rights, governments are instituted. **That property [or income] which a man has honestly acquired he retains full control of, subject to these limitations: First, that he shall not use it to his neighbor’s injury, and that does not mean that he must use it for his neighbor’s benefit [e.g. SOCIAL SECURITY, Medicare, and every other public “benefit”]; second, that if he devotes it to a public use, he gives to the public a right to control that use; and third, that whenever the public needs require, the public may take it upon payment of due compensation.**”*

[Budd v. People of State of New York, 143 U.S. 517 (1892) ]

The above rules are summarized below:

**Table 1: Rules for converting private property to a public use or a public office**

#	Description	Requires consent of owner to be taken from owner?
1	The owner of property justly acquired enjoys full and exclusive use and control over the property. This right includes <b><u>the right to exclude government uses</u></b> or ownership of said property.	Yes
2	He may not use the property to injure the equal rights of his neighbor. For instance, when you murder someone, the government can take your liberty and labor from you by putting you in jail or your life from you by instituting the death penalty against you. Both your life and your labor are “property”. Therefore, the basis for the “taking” was violation of the equal rights of a fellow sovereign “neighbor”.	No
3	He cannot be compelled or required to use it to “benefit” his neighbor. That means he cannot be compelled to donate the property to any franchise that would “benefit” his neighbor such as Social Security, Medicare, etc.	Yes
4	If he donates it to a public use, he gives the public the right to control that use.	Yes
5	Whenever the public needs require, the public may take it without his consent upon payment of due compensation. E.g. “eminent domain”.	No

Rule 4 above is implemented by the “effectively connected” scam.

## 9.2 History of “effectively connecting”

The 1966 Tax Act added "effectively connected" income to the definition of "gross income" for a nonresident aliens. This was the same year they rolled out the 1040-NR tax return form. Before that, they only had the 1040 return and nonresident aliens used that form and didn't check the box that asked "Are you a citizen or resident of the United States?". See:

*Tax Return History-Citizenship*, Family Guardian Fellowship

<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Citizenship/TaxReturnHistory-Citizenship/TaxReturnHistory-Citizenship.htm>

Before this, ONLY income that was ACTUALLY from a source within the United States would be "gross income" to a nonresident alien. Such income today would go on the Schedule NEC. Uncle Sam recognized that all Americans are nonresident aliens every year by default (unless they file 1040 for that year). So, by creating this "effectively connected" nexus it allows for a purely CONTRACTUAL/CONSENSUAL liability to be created. Before that it was just mistake of law if a nonresident alien filed as a U.S. person and declared all his income as "gross income".

By introducing this "effectively connected" nexus, the liability is created quasi-contractually through your consent (even if done by mistake) and therefore it is more solidly legal because there is from that point a basis in the Code for liability to arise that way. As if to further cover their asses, they added "national of the United States" to the Code in 1972 in a provision under with Public Law 92-580 for nonresident aliens that allowed for privileged deductions. That provision is now found in 26 U.S.C. §873.

Then later, in 1986, the "election to be treated as a resident alien" in 26 U.S.C. §6013(g) and (h) created a quasi-contractual basis for "U.S. person" whereas before that it would just have been purely mistake of law on the part of the nonresident alien filer. Even to this day, however, there is no statutory provision in the I.R.C. for a "national of the United States" who is a "nonresident alien" (state citizen) to elect to be treated as a "resident alien" or U.S. person if they are not married to one.

The U.S. Supreme court DID, however, recognize the right of an American national abroad under 26 U.S.C. §911 to ELECT "U.S. person" status by filing the 1040 when "abroad" in a "foreign country". This happened in *Cook v. Tait*, 265 U.S. 47 (1924). In that case, Cook ELECTED U.S. person status by filing a 1040 instead of a 1040-NR. Since the definition of "foreign country" found in both 26 C.F.R. §301.7701(b)-2(b) and 26 C.F.R. §1.911-2(h) could reasonably include states of the Union, which constitutionally are legislatively foreign, then the provisions of 26 U.S.C. §911 could conceivably be the main authority for a state citizen or state national to make an election to be treated AS IF they are "U.S. persons" and thus owe tax on their worldwide earnings. Since everything a "U.S. person" makes is subject to privileged "trade or business" deductions under 26 U.S.C. §162, then making the "election" to file as a "U.S. person" has the practical effect of "effectively connecting" everything they earn to "the functions of a public office" and thus converting it from PRIVATE to PUBLIC to make it taxable.

26 C.F.R. §301.7701(b)-2(b) and 26 C.F.R. §1.911-2(h) provide strong evidence to conclude that states of the Union are "foreign countries" and that that the term "United States" as geographically defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) is in fact the District of Columbia and federal enclaves. Federal enclaves are in the same "general class" of things as the District of Columbia under the definition of "includes" and "including" found in 26 U.S.C. §7701(c). This fact is also confirmed by the following analysis:

*PROOF OF FACTS: "State" in 26 U.S.C. 7701(a)(10) and "States" in 26 U.S.C. 7701(a)(9) do NOT include Constitutional States*, FTSIG

<https://ftsig.org/state-in-7701a10-and-states-in-26-u-s-c-7701a10-includes-constitutional-states/>

Further, it is a violation of the separation of powers to ENLARGE statutory definitions by consent. Only CONGRESS as a legislative body may define statutory terms. Neither judges nor individuals may ENLARGE those definitions either by consent or comity. If they are allowed to do so, the following will be the result, which accurately describes the DEPRAVED state of legal affairs in America today:

**"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."**

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

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

8 [...]

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

13 [The Spirit of Laws, Charles de Montesquieu, Book XI, Section 6, 1758;  
14 SOURCE: [http://famguardian.org/Publications/SpiritOfLaws/sol\\_11.htm/](http://famguardian.org/Publications/SpiritOfLaws/sol_11.htm/)]

15 Uncle Sam knew since 1919 (if not before that) they were relying on deception to DUPE 1040 filers into liability based on  
16 the filer's MISTAKES OF LAW. They wanted tax liability to be more legally solid, so they added these provisions to the  
17 Code in 1966, 1972 and in 1986 respectively that would transform what had been up to that point a reliance on duping  
18 Americans into pure mistakes of law into these quasi-contractual devices for American nonresident aliens to effectively "opt  
19 in" to being liable. This gave everyone running the SCAM more plausible deniability than they had before.

### 20 **9.3 "Effectively Connecting" expands STATUTORY "gross income" beyond** 21 **CONSTITUTIONAL "income"**

22 All waivers of constitutional protections and rights begin with consent, which we call an "election" in this document. Among  
23 those waivers are the protections of the Sixteenth Amendment limitation upon "income" as including only PROFIT. Once  
24 that consent is given, the Public Rights Doctrine and the Constitutional Avoidance Doctrine of the U.S. Supreme Court kick  
25 in, which recognize a waiver of constitutional and Sixteenth Amendment protections. You can learn more about these  
26 doctrines in:

<p><i>Catalog of U.S. Supreme Court Doctrines</i>, Litigation Tool #10.020 <a href="https://sedm.org/Litigation/10-PracticeGuides/SCDoctrines.pdf">https://sedm.org/Litigation/10-PracticeGuides/SCDoctrines.pdf</a></p>
--

27 In order for an amount to be taxable as more than just profit as required by the Sixteenth Amendment, there must be a  
28 voluntary election to "effectively connect" the earning by placing it in the "effectively connected" section of the 1040-NR  
29 return. The Treasury Regulations recognize TWO types of "effective connection":

- 30 1. Voluntary "effective connection" by the taxpayer for income from sources WITHOUT the "United States".  
31 1.1. This is described in 26 C.F.R. §1.872-2(f).

32 26 C.F.R. §1.872-2 - Exclusions from gross income of nonresident alien individuals.

33 (f) Other exclusions.

34 Income which is from sources without the United States, as determined under the provisions of sections 861  
35 through 863, and the regulations thereunder, is not included in the gross income of a nonresident alien individual  
36 unless such income is effectively connected for the taxable year with the conduct of a trade or business in the  
37 United States by that individual.

- 38 1.2. Notice the phrase "by that individual", meaning you CHOOSE it rather than have it determined by someone else  
39 unilaterally.  
40 2. "Deemed effectively connected" without any choice or action by the taxpayer.  
41 2.1. This is found in 26 C.F.R. §1.871-8.  
42 2.2. It includes a nonresident alien student or trainee who is deemed under 26 U.S.C. §871(c) and 26 C.F.R. §1.871-9  
43 to be engaged in trade or business in the United States.



## **9.4 Types of income subject to taxation of TOTAL amount received, rather than just profit**

Income subject to taxation on TOTAL amount received appears ONLY on the “effectively connected” section of the 1040-NR or the 1040 returns. Everything on the 1040 return is “trade or business” earnings because it is subject to “deductions” under 26 U.S.C. §162 and is earned by the “U.S. person” fiction and office, rather than the human officer consensually occupying said office. These types of income include:

1. Interest income:
  - 1.1. Interest from savings accounts
  - 1.2. Bond interest (e.g., municipal bonds, corporate bonds)
  - 1.3. Interest from certificates of deposit (CDs)
2. Dividend income:
  - 2.1. Qualified dividends (e.g., from stocks)
  - 2.2. Non-qualified dividends (e.g., from real estate investment trusts)
3. Rent and royalty income:
  - 3.1. Rental income from properties
  - 3.2. Royalties from intellectual property (e.g., patents, copyrights)
  - 3.3. Royalties from natural resources (e.g., oil, gas)
4. Business income:
  - 4.1. Self-employment income (e.g., freelance work)
  - 4.2. Business income from pass-through entities (e.g., partnerships, S corporations)
5. Retirement income:
  - 5.1. Pension income
  - 5.2. Annuity income
  - 5.3. Distributions from retirement accounts (e.g., 401(k), IRA)
6. Prize and award income:
  - 6.1. Lottery winnings
  - 6.2. Contest prizes
  - 6.3. Awards (e.g., Pulitzer Prize)
7. Unemployment compensation:
  - 7.1. State unemployment benefits
8. Social Security benefits:
  - 8.1. Partially taxable above certain income thresholds
9. Alimony:
  - 9.1. Received alimony (note: changed by Tax Cuts and Jobs Act)

Note that the above types of income do NOT appear on the Schedule NEC, because they must be voluntarily connected to the “trade or business” excise taxable franchise by the nonresident alien who owns them by simply entering them on the 1040-NR return.

## **10 Who can “effectively connect”?**

The person who EARNED it is the ONLY one who can make it “effectively connected”. That requirement would be necessary if it was voluntary. Consent is given through express or tacit consent. Therefore, “effectively connected” is just a fancy synonym for “donated to uncle”.

In one of the nonresident alien provisions, it actually says “effectively connected to a trade or business” BY THAT INDIVIDUAL (RECIPIENT):

[\*26 CFR § 1.872-2 - Exclusions from gross income of nonresident alien individuals.\*](#)

*§ 1.872-2 Exclusions from gross income of nonresident alien individuals.*

*(f) Other exclusions.*

Income which is from sources without the United States, as determined under the provisions of sections 861 through 863, and the regulations thereunder, is not included in the gross income of a nonresident alien individual unless such income is effectively connected for the taxable year with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States by that individual. To determine specific exclusions in the case of other items which are from sources within the United States, see the applicable sections of the Code. For special rules under a tax convention for determining the sources of income and for excluding, from gross income, income from sources without the United States which is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States, see the applicable tax convention. For determining which income from sources without the United States is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States, see section 864(c)(4) and § 1.864-5.

The same language “by that individual” is also again found in 26 C.F.R. §1.871-8:

26 CFR § 1.871-8 - Taxation of nonresident alien individuals engaged in U.S. business or treated as having effectively connected income.

§ 1.871-8 Taxation of **nonresident alien individuals** engaged in U.S. business or treated as having **effectively connected income**.

(a) Segregation of income.

This section applies for purposes of determining the tax of a **nonresident alien** individual who at any time during the **taxable year** is engaged in **trade or business** in the **United States**. It also applies for purposes of determining the tax of a **nonresident alien** student or trainee who is deemed under section 871(c) and § 1.871-9 to be engaged in **trade or business** in the **United States** or of a **nonresident alien** individual who at no time during the **taxable year** is engaged in **trade or business** in the **United States** but has an election in effect for the **taxable year** under section 871(d) and § 1.871-10 in respect to **real property income**. A **nonresident alien** individual to whom this section applies must segregate his gross income for the **taxable year** into two categories, namely **(1) the income which is effectively connected for the taxable year with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States by that individual, and (2) the income which is not effectively connected for the taxable year with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States by that individual.** A separate tax shall then be determined upon each such category of **income**, as provided in paragraph (b) of this section. The determination of whether **income** or **gain** is or is not effectively connected for the **taxable year** with the conduct of a **trade or business** in the **United States** by the **nonresident alien** individual shall be made in accordance with section 864(c) and §§ 1.864-3 through 1.864-7. For purposes of this section **income** which is effectively connected for the **taxable year** with the conduct of a **trade or business** in the **United States** includes all **income** which is treated under section 871 (c) or (d) and § 1.871-9 or § 1.871-10 as **income** which is effectively connected for such year with the conduct of a **trade or business** in the **United States** by the **nonresident alien** individual.

The language again appears in another regulation:

26 C.F.R. §1.872-1 Gross income of nonresident alien individuals.

(a) In general -

(1) Inclusions. The gross income of a nonresident alien individual for any taxable year includes only

(i) the gross income which is derived from sources within the United States and which is not effectively connected for the taxable year with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States **by that individual** and

(ii) the gross income, irrespective of whether such income is derived from sources within or without the United States, which is effectively connected for the taxable year with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States **by that individual.**

They say "by that individual" TWICE in the above provision. There is NO NEED for the words "by that individual" to be there except to make it clear WHO has the power to make the gross income "effectively connected".

## **11 Implications of “effectively connecting”**

### **11.1 Implications upon the definition of “trade or business” and what it “includes”**

The definition of “trade or business” invokes the word “includes”:

26 U.S. Code § 7701 - Definitions

(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.

The word “includes” is then defined as follows:

26 U.S. Code § 7701 - Definitions

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

(c) Includes and including

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

The purpose for the above provision is to create the false appearance that the READER of the definition can add ANYTHING they want to the definition of “trade or business”, including (no pun intended) things not EXPRESSLY included in the definition of “trade or business” anywhere in the context that it is employed or even meaning from ordinary speech. Thus, in effect the READER then becomes a legislator who can add ANYTHING they subjectively want to a definition so that anything they want can be included there.

We know that permitting such a subjective and loose definition of a term has as its main audience the legally uniformed sitting on a jury, so that they can be convinced that you have a tax liability that you actually don’t. We also know that the separation of powers does NOT permit YOU or anyone in the Executive Branch to appoint themselves as a LEGISLATOR in the Legislative Branch, because this would be a criminal impersonation of a Legislator by a private human or Executive Branch employee respectively. Below is the effect that would have:

“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, Book XI, Section 6, 1758;  
SOURCE: [http://famguardian.org/Publications/SpiritOfLaws/sol\\_11.htm](http://famguardian.org/Publications/SpiritOfLaws/sol_11.htm)]

Allowing the reader, a judge, or an executive Branch employee such as an IRS agent to add anything they want to the definition of “trade or business” is clearly a violation of due process of law, given that the purpose of law is to NOTIFY the reader of everything that falls within the meaning of the term with the idea of purposefully excluding everything that is not expressly stated:

“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 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 purpose of law is to limit power and to give REASONABLE notice of what is expected to its target audience. This is proven in:

<p><u>Requirement for Reasonable Notice</u>, Form #05.022 <a href="https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/ReasonableNotice.pdf">https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/ReasonableNotice.pdf</a></p>
---

A definition that does not therefore SPECIFY ALL the things that are included in the definition fails the REASONABLE notice requirement, violates due process, and thus destroys the separation of powers between the branches of government and the main and most important separation between PUBLIC and PRIVATE.

What a corrupt judge or prosecutor or IRS agent might want to do is in effect use the word “includes” to imply in effect that they can include anything they want in the definition to create the false appearance that anything you do is a “trade or business” and that you are lying about whether you are engaged in the activity. We must remember, however, that the statutes recognize that ONLY YOU can “effectively connect” yourself or your earnings to a “trade or business”, REGARDLESS of what they want to include in the term. So only YOU can make YOUR STATUS or that of YOUR PROPERTY PUBLIC, DOMESTIC, and therefore TAXABLE.

The other important thing to remember is that the main reason for connecting something to a “public office” or “trade or business” is to convert its OWNERSHIP from PRIVATE to PUBLIC, meaning from YOU being the owner to the GOVERNMENT being the OWNER. The only thing Congress can logically write definitions for is PUBLIC property they own and therefore CONTROL. The purpose of the definitions, in fact, IS to exercise that control. The authority to write such definitions derives from the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article IV § 3 (2).

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States [\*\*\*]

---

“[1] The power of Congress, in the imposition of taxes and providing for the collection thereof in the possessions of the United States, is not restricted by constitutional provision (section 8, article 1), which may limit its general power of taxation as to uniformity and apportionment when legislating for the mainland or United States proper, for it acts in the premises under the authority of clause 2, section 3, article 4, of the Constitution, which clothes Congress with power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. Binns v. United States, 194 U.S. 486, 24 Sup.Ct. 816, 48 L.Ed. 1087; Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244, 21 Sup.Ct. 770, 45 L.Ed. 1088.”  
[Lawrence v. Wardell, Collector. 273 F. 405 (1921). Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals]

Likewise, the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to write ALL the regulations to implement the Internal Revenue Code and the definitions within those regulations SIMILARLY depends on the fact that ALL the property that might be affected by those definitions are owned EXCLUSIVELY by Him as PUBLIC property and managed by his agents and officers within the Treasury Department:

5 U.S. Code § 301 - Departmental regulations

1                   The head of an Executive department or military department may prescribe regulations for the government of his  
2 department, the conduct of its employees, the distribution and performance of its business, and the custody, use,  
3 and preservation of its records, papers, and property. This section does not authorize withholding information  
4 from the public or limiting the availability of records to the public.

5                   (Pub. L. 89-554, Sept. 6, 1966, 80 Stat. 379.)

6       There is NO LEGAL authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to write “all needful rules and regulations” that might affect  
7 people OUTSIDE his own department or even PRIVATE people such as yourself. The Internal Revenue Code commits to  
8 the Secretary all authority to write said rules and enforce them.

9                   [26 U.S. Code § 7805 - Rules and regulations](#)

10                  (a) AUTHORIZATION

11                 Except where such authority is expressly given by this title to any person other than an officer or employee of the  
12 Treasury Department, the Secretary shall prescribe all needful rules and regulations for the enforcement of this  
13 title, including all rules and regulations as may be necessary by reason of any alteration of law in relation to  
14 internal revenue.

15       The discussion in this section inevitably leads to the following rational inferences:

- 16       1. Even WITH your consent by “effectively connecting” your own status or that of your property and thus converting  
17 yourself or your property from PRIVATE to PUBLIC, you can’t act as a legislator to add yourself to the definition of  
18 “trade or business” or to in effect ELECT yourself into a public office. That’s a crime in violation of 18 U.S.C. §912.
- 19       2. If the Secretary attempts to impose an obligation upon either you or your property, he is operating under the  
20 presumption that the affected property was lawfully converted by its original owner from PRIVATE to PUBLIC.  
21 Otherwise, exercising said control would be a taking in violation of the Fifth Amendment Takings Clause.
- 22       3. If the Secretary by regulation attempts to impose an obligation upon either you or your property that did NOT originate  
23 in the statute it implements, then he can only be acting on his own agents and officers WITHIN his own department  
24 and NEVER upon the general public.
- 25       4. If a statute has no implementing regulations, then its enforcement is CONSTITUTIONALLY limited to officers of the  
26 government. This is the case, by the way for ALL the enforcement provisions of Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A.  
27       See:

28                 [Challenging Jurisdiction Workbook](#), Form #09.082  
29                 <https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/ChalJurWorkbook.pdf>

- 30       5. If the Secretary claims the authority to impose duties upon you by regulation, then you must be his agent or officer  
31 within the Department of the Treasury and NOT a private human outside his control.
- 32       6. Because you owe a duty to him, then you are a public officer:

33                 “A public officer is one who has some duty to perform concerning the public; and he is not the less a public  
34 officer when his duty is confined to narrow limits, because it is the duty, and the nature of that duty, which makes  
35 him a public officer, and not the extent of his authority.” 7 Bac. Abr. 280; Carth. 479.... Where an employment or  
36 duty is a continuing [\*\*\*65] one, which is defined by rules prescribed by law and not by contract, such a charge  
37 or employment is an office, and the person who performs it is an officer....”

38                 [Ricker’s                 Petition,                 66                 N.H.                 207                 (1890);                 SOURCE:  
                  [https://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/PublicOffice-  
Ricker\\_s%20Petition\\_%2066%20N.H.%20207.pdf](https://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/PublicOffice-Ricker_s%20Petition_%2066%20N.H.%20207.pdf)]

- 39       7. Since involuntary servitude is prohibited by the Thirteenth Amendment, you must have VOLUNTEERED for the  
40 position or office that he regulates and supervises with the regulations he writes.
- 41       8. Games with the word “includes” are employed to CIRCUMVENT the above mechanism and legitimize THEFT by the  
42 Secretary and his agents in the IRS.

43       If you would like EXHAUSTIVE proof that the above is true, read the following:

[How American Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax](#), Form #08.024  
                  <https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/HowYouVolForIncomeTax.pdf>



## 11.2 Implications upon “gross income”

26 C.F.R. §1.872-1 describes the implications and effects of “effectively connecting” to the taxability of the income that becomes “effectively connected”:

*26 C.F.R. §1.872-1 Gross income of nonresident alien individuals.*

*(a) In general -*

*(1) Inclusions. The gross income of a nonresident alien individual for any taxable year includes only*

*(i) the gross income which is derived from sources within the United States and which is not effectively connected for the taxable year with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States by that individual and*

*(ii) the gross income, irrespective of whether such income is derived from sources within or without the United States, which is effectively connected for the taxable year with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States by that individual.*

Note that it says the gross income of a nonresident alien individual includes only:

*(i) the "gross income" which is derived from..." and*

*(ii) the "gross income"...which is effectively connected to...*

Why the use of the words "gross income" in the definition and not just the word "income"? We are after all defining what is "gross income" for nonresident aliens. Our guess is: they use the words "gross income" to make it abundantly clear that the Code does NOT purport to tax a nonresident alien on "everything that came in".

Contrast this with how "gross income" is defined a 26 U.S.C. §61 for anyone NOT a nonresident alien i.e. a United States person: the word "income" is used in that definition (not "gross income"). the regulations at 26 C.F.R. §1.61-2 indicate that "wages and salary...are income TO THE RECIPIENTS unless excluded by law (by the recipients). The individual is the one with the power to make an item EFFECTIVELY connected "gross income". By the same token, the recipient of a wage or salary is the one who does the EXCLUDING of that wage or salary from his income and thus from his "gross income" as an item must FIRST be income in order to qualify as "gross income". Such exclusion must be BY LAW. The recipient cannot exclude an item from income contrary to law.

Back to 26 U.S.C. §61, which lists "compensation for services" as an item of "gross income". "Compensation for services" is a statutory term created by Congress in the 1923 Classification Act and refers to GOVERNMENT service.

Some of you might ask:

*So on the 1040NR, the U.S. business section, even for THAT, you don't have to put all the things listed there in that section? You can stick it in the NEC section if you don't consent?*

This is true. The NEC section is for items not connected to a “trade or business” but which nonetheless are included in your "gross income" under 26 U.S.C. §871(a) and 26 U.S.C. §872. It is a placeholder for everything originating from the STATUTORY GEOGRAPHICAL “United States” (DC and Territories) that you decide NOT to “Elect” to be treated as “effectively connected”.

Those who do not ELECT to treat earnings as “effectively connected” in the NEC section of form 1040NR are penalized for doing so because they are not able to take 26 U.S.C. §162 “trade or business” deductions on the amounts listed there.

## 12 When is “effectively connecting” Lawfully INVOLUNTARY?

There are cases where no choice is given about whether to “effectively connect” income. People who fall in this category are called “deemed effectively connected” and the person doing the “deeming” is the IRS and not the part who is the party of the “deeming”. These people, even if they DO NOT think they are engaged in a “trade or business” will be DEEMED to be. This subject is covered in 26 C.F.R. §1.871-7(a)(4) below:

26 CFR § 1.871-7 - Taxation of nonresident alien individuals not engaged in U.S. business.

§ 1.871-7 Taxation of **nonresident alien individuals** not engaged in U.S. business.

**(a) Imposition of tax.**

(4) Except as provided in §§ 1.871-9 and 1.871-10, a **nonresident alien** individual not engaged in **trade or business** in the **United States** during the **taxable year** has no **income**, gain, or **loss** for the **taxable year** which is effectively connected for the **taxable year** with the conduct of a **trade or business** in the **United States**. See section 864(c)(1)(B) and § 1.864-3.

The nonresident aliens described above are further described in 26 C.F.R. §1.871-9:

26 C.F.R. §1.871-9 - Nonresident alien students or trainees deemed to be engaged in U.S. business.

§ 1.871-9 **Nonresident alien students or trainees** **deemed to be engaged in U.S. business.**

**(a) Participants in certain exchange or training programs.**

For purposes of §§ 1.871-7 and 1.871-8 a **nonresident alien** individual who is temporarily present in the **United States** during the **taxable year** as a nonimmigrant under subparagraph (F) (relating to the admission of students into the **United States**) or subparagraph (J) (relating to the admission of teachers, trainees, specialists, etc., into the **United States**) of section 101(a)(15) of the **Immigration and Nationality Act** (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15) (F) or (J)), and who without regard to this paragraph is not engaged in **trade or business** in the **United States** during such year, shall be deemed to be engaged in **trade or business** in the **United States** during the **taxable year**. For purposes of determining whether an alien who is present in the **United States** on an F visa or a J visa is a resident of the **United States**, see §§ 301.7701(b)-1 through 301.7701(b)-9 of this chapter.

**(b) Income treated as effectively connected with U.S. business.**

Any **income** described in paragraph (1) (relating to the nonexcluded portion of certain **scholarship** or fellowship grants) or paragraph (2) (relating to certain nonexcluded expenses incident to such grants) of section 1441(b) which is received during the **taxable year** from sources within the **United States** by a **nonresident alien** individual described in paragraph (a) of this section is to be treated for purposes of §§ 1.871-7, 1.871-8, 1.872-1, and 1.873-1 as **income** which is effectively connected for the **taxable year** with the conduct of a **trade or business** in the **United States** by that individual. However, such **income** is not to be treated as effectively connected for the **taxable year** with the conduct of a **trade or business** in the **United States** for purposes of section 1441(c)(1) and paragraph (a) of § 1.1441-4. For exclusion relating to compensation paid to such individual by a foreign employer, see paragraph (b) of § 1.872-2.

The nonresident alien students or trainees people described above therefore HAVE to include earnings described above on their 1040-NR in the “effectively connected” section whether they want to or not. If they file a 1040-NR and DON’T do this, the IRS has the authority to do it FOR THEM and reassess their liability. The income that is treated as “effectively connected” is PRIVILEGED scholarship or fellowship grants from the national government.

The other regulation mentioned above that APPEARS INVOLUNTARY is 26 C.F.R. §1.871-10 relating to Foreign Investment in Real Property Transfer Act (FIRTA) elections. This mechanism is entirely voluntary and need not be made by EITHER an American national or an alien. It requires the owner of the property being sold to VOLUNTARILY CONSENT to “effectively connect” the property located outside the statutory geographical “United States\*\*\*” to the “trade or business” excise taxable franchise. You don’t HAVE to do so, and thus this is not a LAWFULLY INVOLUNTARY mechanism to “effectively connect”. We describe how to avoid such a voluntary election in:

*Income Taxation of Real Estate Sales*, Form #05.028\*\* (Member Subscriptions)  
<https://sedm.org/product/income-taxation-of-real-estate-sales-form-05-028/>

26 U.S.C. §864(c)(7) requires that those who previously elected to connect real property to the “trade or business” franchise under 26 U.S.C. §871(d) must include profit from the sale of said property up to ten years from the last date AFTER they ceased to effectively connect it. The purpose of these provisions are to take OUT OF YOUR HANDS the decision of whether you want to treat specific earnings as Effectively Connected Income and put it under the control of Uncle Sam as PUBLIC property. The underlying presumption in listing all the above is that everything listed constitutes a privilege and consideration that has commercial value, which happened in the past, and that you have a DUTY to “Effectively Connect” FUTURE earnings to pay for delivering the privilege. In other words, pursuing those privileges created a FUTURE debt that allegedly

1 applies LONG AFTER you abandon “U.S. person” status. That obligation does not attach to the “nonresident alien” status,  
2 but to the “nonresident alien INDIVIDUAL” status under [26 U.S.C. §864\(a\)](#), which you have a right not to adopt if you are  
3 not PRESENTLY pursuing privileges.

4 In reality, however, there is no NET or REAL CONSIDERATION or privilege involved that you should feel a duty to pay  
5 for because:

- 6 1. There is no liability statute for anything but withholding agents on ALIENS in [26 U.S.C. §1461](#), which you are not, at  
7 least within a constitutional state.
- 8 2. The entire Internal Revenue Code in actuality:
  - 9 2.1. Delivers no “PRIVILEGES” but only OBLIGATIONS. Deductions reduce taxable income, but there is not such  
10 thing as income for an American national not receiving government payments.
  - 11 2.2. Doesn’t apply within the exclusive jurisdiction of constitutional states to American nationals who make no  
12 “elections”.
  - 13 2.3. Is implemented as a taxable franchise using the SSN as a de facto license, which the U.S. Supreme Court said  
14 cannot even lawfully be offered in a constitutional state per the License Tax Cases.
- 15 3. Even if you thought you had “taxable income”, nearly all of it was excluded and actually nontaxable anyway.
- 16 4. Because you had no real taxable income, you didn’t need privileged “trade or business” deductions or Effectively  
17 Connected Income (ECI) anyway.

18 So the idea that you are receiving REAL, MEASURABLE consideration or commercial benefit from the government through  
19 the Internal Revenue Code that you must reimburse them for is all a ruse, at least in the case of American nationals who are  
20 nonresident aliens not receiving government payments. It might be useful for a resident alien who has a duty to pay regardless,  
21 but not for an American national. In fact:

- 22 1. If you put the government on the spot and MANDATED that they had the burden of proving that they IN  
23 ACTUALITY delivered REAL QANTIFIABLE consideration of an EQUAL value to what you paid them, they would  
24 fail miserably if all things on this website were taken into account.
  - 25 1.1. They avoid this burden of proof by shifting it to YOU to prove you DIDN’T receive consideration. They do this  
26 by calling the income tax a “quasi-contract”.
  - 27 1.2. That puts YOU in the position of proving a NEGATIVE, which is that you DIDN’T receive consideration in  
28 order to prove that you are NOT a party to that “quasi-contract”. This is called “failure of consideration”.
- 29 2. The GOVERNMENT are therefore the only ones who in actuality are PRIVILEGED, because they deceived you out of  
30 donating your private property without providing EQUAL consideration as mandated by the Fifth Amendment. See:

*Why Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises*, Form #05.051

<https://sedm.org/product/why-the-government-is-the-only-real-beneficiary-of-all-government-franchises-form-05-051/>

- 31 3. Government is the only real beneficiary of everything they do. They pay money ONLY to their offices, and not to the  
32 private people occupying them. Paying private people would be an abuse of their taxing power in fact.
- 33 4. Income from “U.S. source” includes only the government, and most people don’t earn this anyway. See:

*PROOF OF FACTS: “U.S source” does NOT include anything but payments DIRECTLY from the government and  
excludes even payments from “taxpayers”*, FTSIG

<https://ftsig.org/proof-of-facts-u-s-source-does-not-include-anything-but-payments-directly-from-the-government-and-excludes-even-payments-from-taxpayers/>

34 The way OUT of this Ponzi Scheme scam is simply to reject any and all privileges, and use your property to make them  
35 privileged like they do to you. If you don’t, they’ll just keep pretending they are helping you and charge as much as they want  
36 in the process and thereby eventually STEAL everything you have and give you nothing you really want in return. Below is  
37 an example of how to do that in a tax return filing:

*How to Reject All Privileges in a Tax Return Filing*, FTSIG

<https://ftsig.org/how-to-reject-all-privileges-in-a-tax-return-filing/>

**13 If you are an American National and not a student or trainee in receipt of a**  
**privileged grant, then neither the IRS nor any judge can lawfully**  
**EFFECTIVELY CONNECT without your consent**

If you aren't in the "deemed effectively connected" group, then you are the only one who gets to decide if you are engaged in a "trade or business". No judge can do it. The reason is that by connecting your otherwise PRIVATE property or earnings to a "trade or business", you as the absolute owner are CONSENSUALLY converting it from PRIVATE to PUBLIC and thereby donating it to a public use, a public purpose, and a public office to procure the "benefits" of a government franchise. If anyone else tries to do that, they are STEALING your private property.

**14 HOW do you "effectively connect"? <sup>15</sup>**

The following subsections deal with HOW you actually "effectively connect".

**14.1 Filing a 1040-NR return and entering anything under "gross income"**

The entire 1040-NR form area for entering "gross income" is labelled "effectively connected":

Figure 2: 1040-NR Form, 2023, p. 1; SOURCE: <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/f1040nr.pdf>

<b>Income Effectively Connected With U.S. Trade or Business</b>	<b>1a</b>	Total amount from Form(s) W-2, box 1 (see instructions)		<b>1a</b>		
	<b>b</b>	Household employee wages not reported on Form(s) W-2		<b>1b</b>		
	<b>c</b>	Tip income not reported on line 1a (see instructions)		<b>1c</b>		
	<b>d</b>	Medicaid waiver payments not reported on Form(s) W-2 (see instructions)		<b>1d</b>		
	<b>e</b>	Taxable dependent care benefits from Form 2441, line 26		<b>1e</b>		
	<b>f</b>	Employer-provided adoption benefits from Form 8839, line 29		<b>1f</b>		
	<b>g</b>	Wages from Form 8919, line 6		<b>1g</b>		
	<b>h</b>	Other earned income (see instructions)		<b>1h</b>		
	<b>i</b>	Reserved for future use	<b>1i</b>			
	<b>j</b>	Reserved for future use		<b>1j</b>		
	<b>k</b>	Total income exempt by a treaty from Schedule OI (Form 1040-NR), item L, line 1(e)	<b>1k</b>			
	<b>z</b>	Add lines 1a through 1h		<b>1z</b>		
	<b>2a</b>	Tax-exempt interest	<b>2a</b>		<b>2b</b>	Taxable interest
	<b>3a</b>	Qualified dividends	<b>3a</b>		<b>3b</b>	Ordinary dividends
<b>4a</b>	IRA distributions	<b>4a</b>		<b>4b</b>	Taxable amount	
<b>5a</b>	Pensions and annuities	<b>5a</b>		<b>5b</b>	Taxable amount	
<b>6</b>	Reserved for future use		<b>6</b>			
<b>7</b>	Capital gain or (loss). Attach Schedule D (Form 1040) if required. If not required, check here	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>7</b>			
<b>8</b>	Additional income from Schedule 1 (Form 1040), line 10		<b>8</b>			
<b>9</b>	Add lines 1a, 2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, 7, and 8. This is your total effectively connected income		<b>9</b>			

The 1040-NR also has a place to enter amounts from your W-2 as follows:

Figure 3: "Wages" block of 1040-NR Form, 2023, p. 1; SOURCE: <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/f1040nr.pdf>

<b>Income Effectively Connected With U.S. Trade or Business</b>	<b>1a</b>	Total amount from Form(s) W-2, box 1 (see instructions)	<b>1a</b>	
	<b>b</b>	Household employee wages not reported on Form(s) W-2	<b>1b</b>	
	<b>c</b>	Tip income not reported on line 1a (see instructions)	<b>1c</b>	
	<b>d</b>	Medicaid waiver payments not reported on Form(s) W-2 (see instructions)	<b>1d</b>	
	<b>e</b>	Taxable dependent care benefits from Form 2441, line 26	<b>1e</b>	
	<b>f</b>	Employer-provided adoption benefits from Form 8839, line 29	<b>1f</b>	

IRS warns filers of the 1040-NR tax returns in the 1040-NR Instructions to ONLY enter income that is "treated as effectively connected":

<sup>15</sup> Source: [How to File Returns](https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/f1040nr.pdf), Form #09.074, Section 9.7 entitled "Effectively connected income" means PRIVATE earnings DONATED to Uncle Sam; <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

even if it is listed in *Line 1a* of the Instructions for Form 1040.



*If you received scholarship or fellowship grants that weren't reported to you on Form W-2, you will now report these amounts on Schedule 1, line 8r. See the instructions for Schedule 1, line 8r, later.*

### **Line 1a—Total Amount From Form(s) W-2, Box 1**

See *Line 1a—Total Amount From Form(s) W-2, Box 1*, in the Instructions for Form 1040 for the types of income includible on line 1a of Form 1040-NR.

**Exception.** Enter on line 1a of Form 1040-NR only the wages, salaries, tips, and other compensation reported in box 1 of Form(s) W-2 **effectively connected with a U.S. trade or business**. Only U.S. source income is included on line 1a as effectively connected wages. Don't include any income on line 1a of Form 1040-NR that isn't treated as effectively connected to a U.S. trade or business

### **Instructions for Form 1040-NR (2023)**

[1040-NR Instructions, 2023, p. 16; SOURCE: <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1040nr.pdf>]

The above block 1a identifies these statutory “wage” earnings as “Income Effectively Connected With U.S. Trade or Business”, which means DONATED to a public use, a public office, and a public purpose by the OWNER, which is you. YOU, not the PAYER, are the one who effectively connects such earnings under 26 U.S.C. §872. As the ABSOLUTE OWNER of the earnings from your own human labor, ONLY YOU can determine the CIVIL STATUS of your property or connect or classify it as a privilege rather than a RIGHT by connecting it to a “trade or business”. See:

*Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status*, Form #13.008  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf>

The big mistake most state nationals would make if they had to fill out a CORRECT 1040NR Form instead of the INCORRECT 1040 Form is to put all their earnings NOT from the U.S. government and NOT from the geographical “United States” ANYPLACE on the return. It doesn't belong there and is exclusively private, not reportable, not “gross income”. Once they make the mistake of putting private unreportable earnings from within a constitutional state (a “foreign state” in



relation to the national government) in there, now they have to figure out how to reduce their taxable income, which then coerces them to elect to treat it as “effectively connected” so they can claim deductions to reduce taxable net income.

## 14.2 Reductions in Liability: Graduated Rate of Tax, Deductions, and Earned Income Credits

All attempts to reduce one’s assumed tax liability require the person filing the tax return to be engaged in the “trade or business” excise taxable franchise. This includes:

1. Applying the graduated rate of tax found in 26 U.S.C. §1. Without the graduated rate of tax, the flat 30% tax applies to “nonresident alien individuals” found in 26 U.S.C. §871(a). The Section 1 rate usually starts lower than 30%.
2. Applying for earned income credits in 26 U.S.C. §32.
3. Taking “trade or business” deductions found in 26 U.S.C. §162:

[TITLE 26 > Subtitle A > CHAPTER 1 > Subchapter B](#)  
Part VI-Itemized deductions for Individuals and Corporations  
[Sec. 162.](#) - Trade or business expenses

(a) In general

There shall be allowed as a deduction all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business, including –

(1) a reasonable allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered;

Why must you be engaged in a “trade or business” in order to reduce your liability as a “taxpayer”? Because this is a commercial “benefit” and only those who work for the government can receive any commercial benefit from the government. Otherwise, the government is abusing its taxing power to transfer wealth among private individuals:

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)]

IRS Publication 519 confirms the above by saying the following:

### ***Nonresident Aliens***

You can claim deductions to figure your effectively connected taxable income. You generally cannot claim deductions related to income that is not connected with your U.S. business activities. Except for personal exemptions, and certain itemized deductions, discussed later, you can claim deductions only to the extent they are connected with your effectively connected income.  
[IRS Publication 519 (2005), p. 24]

## 14.3 Performing “personal services” in the “United States” federal corporation as an officer of that corporation

The W-8BEN Form makes it clear that a W-4 Form is predicated on the payee receiving "compensation for services in the United States" which is the actual meaning of "compensation for services" at 26 U.S.C. §61.

### **Figure 4: W-8BEN Form, Instructions**

Form <b>W-8BEN</b> (Rev. July 2017) Department of the Treasury Internal Revenue Service	<b>Certificate of Foreign Status of Beneficial Owner for United States Tax Withholding and Reporting (Individuals)</b> ▶ For use by individuals. Entities must use Form W-8BEN-E. ▶ Go to <a href="http://www.irs.gov/FormW8BEN">www.irs.gov/FormW8BEN</a> for instructions and the latest information. ▶ Give this form to the withholding agent or payer. Do not send to the IRS.	OMB No. 1545-1621
<b>Do NOT use this form if:</b> • You are NOT an individual • You are a U.S. citizen or other U.S. person, including a resident alien individual • You are a beneficial owner claiming that income is effectively connected with the conduct of trade or business within the U.S. (other than personal services) • You are a beneficial owner who is receiving compensation for personal services performed in the United States • You are a person acting as an intermediary		<b>Instead, use Form:</b> W-8BEN-E W-9 W-8ECI 8233 or W-4 W-8IMY
<b>Note:</b> If you are resident in a FATCA partner jurisdiction (i.e., a Model 1 IGA jurisdiction with reciprocity), certain tax account information may be provided to your jurisdiction of residence.		
<b>Part I Identification of Beneficial Owner</b> (see instructions)		

Performing STATUTORY “personal services” in the United States (federal corporation) as a STATUTORY federal “employee” is deemed a “trade or business”. The statute below proves this:

26 C.F.R. §1.864-2 Trade or business within the United States.

(a) In general. As used in part I (section 861 and following) and part II (section 871 and following), subchapter N, chapter 1 of the Code, and chapter 3 (section 1441 and following) of the Code, and the regulations thereunder, the term “engaged in trade or business within the United States” does not include the activities described in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section, but includes the performance of personal services within the United States [federal corporation, not geography] at any time within the taxable year except to the extent otherwise provided in this section.

Note the phrase: “includes the performance of personal services within the United States at any time within the taxable year”. The term “engaged in trade or business within the United States”...includes the performance of personal services within the United States federal corporation at any time within the taxable year.

26 C.F.R. §1.864-2 Trade or business within the United States.

(b) Performance of personal services for foreign employer -

(1) Excepted services.

For purposes of paragraph (a) of this section, the term “engaged in trade or business within the United States” does not include the performance of personal services -

(i) For a nonresident alien individual, foreign partnership, or foreign corporation, not engaged in trade or business within the United States at any time during the taxable year, or

(ii) For an office or place of business maintained in a foreign country or in a possession of the United States by an individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States or by a domestic partnership or a domestic corporation, by a nonresident alien individual who is temporarily present in the United States for a period or periods not exceeding a total of 90 days during the taxable year and whose compensation for such services does not exceed in the aggregate gross amount of \$3,000.

Everything a statutory citizen fiction does, apparently, is “personal services” because it’s a franchise office or privilege. The United States is your employer you are performing services “within” the legal but not geographical United States as a federal corporation. The position of “taxpayer” or “person”, in that case, is an office within the corporation. Technically, the OFFICE is performing the services and you are volunteering to animate it by calling what you earn “effectively connected”.

Everything a statutory citizen or even statutory resident (alien) fictions do, apparently, are “personal services” because they are fictions of law created by Congress and therefore function as franchise offices. More precisely, an individual “United States person” (“citizen or resident alien”) has effectively elected to have ALL wages and salary TREATED as though it is “income” under 26 C.F.R. §1.61-2. By “electing” the STATUS of STATUTORY “U.S. person” they elected to treat ALL their earnings as “connected to a trade or business”. The STATUTORY “U.S. person” status is the “trade or business” and all otherwise PRIVATE earnings are therefore treated as STATUTORY “wages” and “salaries” and “income from a trade or business” and thus included by law in “gross income” for such a party.

## 14.4 Using Government Identifying Numbers: SSN and TIN

Whenever you put a government-issued identifying number on any document, you are implicitly establishing that you are engaged in the “trade or business” franchise. This fact is easily discerned by examining the following:

- 26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(b) indicates that in the case of a foreign person, identifying numbers are only required if that person is engaged in a “trade or business” or if they made an election to be a “U.S. person”, meaning public officer in the government.

*TITLE 26--INTERNAL REVENUE  
CHAPTER I--INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY  
PART 301 \_PROCEDURE AND ADMINISTRATION--Table of Contents  
Information and Returns  
Sec. 301.6109-1 Identifying numbers.*

*(b) Requirement to furnish one's own number—*

*(1) U.S. [GOVERNMENT] persons.*

***Every U.S. [federal government public officer] person** who makes under this title a return, statement, or other document must furnish its own taxpayer identifying number as required by the forms and the accompanying instructions. A U.S. person whose number must be included on a document filed by another person must give the taxpayer identifying number so required to the other person on request.*

*For penalties for failure to supply taxpayer identifying numbers, see sections 6721 through 6724. For provisions dealing specifically with the duty of employees with respect to their social security numbers, see Sec. 31.6011(b)-2 (a) and (b) of this chapter (Employment Tax Regulations). For provisions dealing specifically with the duty of employers with respect to employer identification numbers, see Sec. 31.6011(b)-1 of this chapter (Employment Tax Regulations).*

*(2) Foreign persons.*

*The provisions of paragraph (b)(1) of this section regarding the furnishing of one's own number shall apply to the following foreign persons--*

*(i) A **foreign person that has income effectively connected with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business** at any time during the taxable year;*

*(ii) A foreign person that has a U.S. office or place of business or a U.S. fiscal or paying agent at any time during the taxable year;*

*(iii) A nonresident alien treated as a resident under section 6013(g) or (h);*

*(iv) A foreign person that makes a return of tax (including income, estate, and gift tax returns), an amended return, or a refund claim under this title but excluding information returns, statements, or documents;*

*(v) A foreign person that makes an election under Sec. 301.7701-3(c);*

*(vi) A foreign person that furnishes a withholding certificate described in Sec. 1.1441-1(e)(2) or (3) of this chapter or Sec. 1.1441-5(c)(2)(iv) or (3)(iii) of this chapter to the extent required under Sec. 1.1441-1(e)(4)(vii) of this chapter;*

*(vii) A foreign person whose taxpayer identifying number is required to be furnished on any return, statement, or other document as required by the income tax regulations under section 897 or 1445. This paragraph (b)(2)(vii) applies as of November 3, 2003; and*

*(viii) A foreign person that furnishes a withholding certificate described in Sec. 1.1446-1(c)(2) or (3) of this chapter or whose taxpayer identification number is required to be furnished on any return, statement, or other document as required by the income tax regulations under section 1446. This paragraph (b)(2)(viii) shall apply to partnership taxable years beginning after May 18, 2005, or such earlier time as the regulations under Sec. 1.1446-1 through 1.1446-5 of this chapter apply by reason of an election under Sec. 1.1446-7 of this chapter.*

- 1.1. The statutory “U.S. person” they are describing above is defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30) and it means a civil person in the “U.S.” defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10), which means a government public officer.

Everything that public officer makes that originates from the government is “trade or business” earnings. This is also confirmed by 26 U.S.C. §864(c)(3), which says that everything originating from the “U.S.” described is “trade or business” earnings.

26 U.S. Code § 864 - Definitions and special rules

(c) Effectively connected income, etc.

(3) Other income from sources within United States

All income, gain, or loss from sources within the United States (other than income, gain, or loss to which paragraph (2) applies) shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States.

1.2. Notice also that the “foreign person” described above is only required to provide the number if they are engaged in the “trade or business” franchise or if they made an election under 26 U.S.C. §6013(g) or (h) to be treated as a resident alien. Such an election would be ILLEGAL for those who are nationals but not aliens, such as those domiciled in a state of the Union. Only foreign nationals can make such an election.

2. IRS Form 1042-S Instructions (2006), p. 14. What all of the circumstances below have in common is that they involve a “benefit” that is usually financial or tangible to the recipient, and therefore require a franchisee license number called a Taxpayer Identification Number:

*Box 14, Recipient’s U.S. Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN)*

**You must obtain a U.S. taxpayer identification number (TIN) for:**

- Any recipient whose income is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States.  
*Note.* For these recipients, exemption code 01 should be entered in box 6.
- Any foreign person claiming a reduced rate of, or exemption from, tax under a tax treaty between a foreign country and the United States, unless the income is an unexpected payment (as described in Regulations section 1.1441-6(g)) or consists of dividends and interest from stocks and debt obligations that are actively traded; dividends from any redeemable security issued by an investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (mutual fund); dividends, interest, or royalties from units of beneficial interest in a unit investment trust that are (or were, upon issuance) publicly offered and are registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities Act of 1933; and amounts paid with respect to loans of any of the above securities.
- Any nonresident alien individual claiming exemption from tax under section 871(f) for certain annuities received under qualified plans.
- A foreign organization claiming an exemption from tax solely because of its status as a tax-exempt organization under section 501(c ) or as a private foundation.
- Any QI.
- Any WP or WT.
- Any nonresident alien individual claiming exemption from withholding on compensation for independent personal services [services connected with a “trade or business”].
- Any foreign grantor trust with five or fewer grantors.
- Any branch of a foreign bank or foreign insurance company that is treated as a U.S. person.

*If a foreign person provides a TIN on a Form W-8, but is not required to do so, the withholding agent must include the TIN on Form 1042-S.*

3. IRS Form 1040NR Instructions, Year 2007, p. 9. You can’t avail yourself of the “benefits” of the franchise without providing your franchisee license number.

*Line 7c, Column (2)*

*You must enter each dependent’s identifying number (SSN, ITIN, or adoption taxpayer identification number (ATIN)). If you do not enter the correct identifying number, at the time we process your return we may disallow the exemption claimed (such as the child tax credit) based on the dependent.*

## 14.5 Conclusions

Therefore, one’s PRIVATE earnings are converted from PRIVATE to PUBLIC by one of TWO ways:

1. As a “nonresident alien” under 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B): By calling it “effectively connected” on a tax return. This would be state nationals and foreign nationals.
2. As a “U.S. person” under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30): By ELECTING to be treated AS IF you are a STATUTORY citizen under 8 U.S.C. §1401 or a STATUTORY “resident alien” under 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A) even though you are NEITHER if you are domiciled within and physically present within a constitutional state or a state national.

Whatever the above method of conversion, the “election” transmutes or converts NON-INCOME to statutory “income” under 26 C.F.R. §1.61-2 to make it “reportable” under 26 U.S.C. §6041. If you didn't elect to convert it from PRIVATE to PUBLIC and thereby make it "reportable" and "trade or business", it remains PRIVATE and not "income" within the meaning of the 16th Amendment.

The conversion therefore has to occur at some point with consent, whether tacit in the case of electing (falsely claiming, in most cases under penalty of perjury no less) to be a “U.S. person” or directly by calling it “effectively connected” as a “nonresident alien”. Thus, one way or another, to earn “gross income” as a private human, you MUST consent in some form to call the earnings “gross income” and “trade or business” earnings BEFORE it becomes taxable or reportable. This is compatible with the main purpose of government itself is to ensure that conversion is always CONSENSUAL.

In that context, "United States" is the corporation, and the OFFICE is WITHIN that corporation. More simply, the act of performing services within the United States (the corporate body) even if you are nonresident alien = engaged in a trade or business. The "compensation for services" one would receive from that is "gross income" per 26 U.S.C. §61.

The NONCONSENTING NRA status connected to a REAL office/trade or business is the only real liable party. Otherwise, its private and nonreportable. But connecting to an ACTUAL federal public office = consent to the terms and conditions.

## **15 Why you NEVER want to “effectively connect”**

No one in their right mind would “effectively connect” anything if the term was accurately named as “consensually donate to the government”. Obviously, this is a Third Rail Issue that has to be hidden in legalese so that people can be deceived into CONSENTING to donate their property without actually KNOWING that is what they are doing or becoming a problem for the IRS by forcing them to recognize the right to NOT consent.

## **16 Conclusions and summary**

This section summarizes everything we learned in this article and also ties this information in with everything else found on this website:

1. Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A describes an excise tax upon a privileged activity called a “trade or business“. All excise taxes involve franchises of one form or another and all franchises make those who participate into officers, agents, and instrumentalities of the government that granted the franchise. See:

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

2. A “trade or business” is statutorily defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) as “the functions of a public office”. A “public office“ consists of employment or agency of the federal government in carrying out the sovereign and lawfully authorized functions of the government.
3. Those engaged in a “trade or business” are acting in a representative capacity as “public officers”, and as such, take on the legal character of the U.S. government, who they represent in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b). All corporations are “citizens” under the laws they were created. The U.S. government is statutorily defined as a “federal corporation” in 28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A). Therefore, those engaged in a “trade or business“, while on official duty, become statutory “U.S. citizens“, regardless of what they started out as.
4. No one can lawfully connect your private property, such as your labor or financial assets, to a “public office” or a “public use” without your consent. The very nature of the word “property” implies exclusive use and control, which implies the right to exclude control over it by anyone but you. Therefore, any third party who files a false information return that connects your earnings or your labor to a “public office” or a “public use” without your explicit consent is violating the following laws and others not mentioned:
  - 4.1. 26 U.S.C. §7434: Civil damages for fraudulent filing of information returns
  - 4.2. 26 U.S.C. §7206: Fraud and false statements



- 4.3. [26 U.S.C. §7207](#): Fraudulent returns, statements, or other documents
- 4.4. [18 U.S.C. §912](#): Impersonating a public officer.
- 4.5. [18 U.S.C. §4](#): Misprision of felony in connection with all the above.
- 4.6. [18 U.S.C. §654](#): Officer or employee of the United States converting property of another.
5. Everything that goes on an IRS Form 1040 represents government revenue in connection with a “trade or business” because:
- 5.1. The IRS Form 1040 is for the tax imposed in [26 U.S.C. §1](#).
- 5.2. Everything on the IRS Form 1040 is subject to deductions authorized under [26 U.S.C. §162](#) and the only income subject to such deductions, according to [26 U.S.C. §162](#) is “trade or business” income.
- 5.3. [26 U.S.C. §871](#)(b)(2) says that all taxes imposed in section 1 are connected with a “trade or business”.
6. Those not engaged in a “trade or business” cannot truthfully file an IRS Form 1040. The only proper form for them to file is the IRS Form 1040NR, because this is the only form that includes a block for earnings not connected with a “trade or business”.
7. Nonresident aliens not engaged in a “trade or business” as defined in [26 C.F.R. §1.871-1](#)(b)(i) cannot earn:
- 7.1. “Self-employment income”, in accordance with [26 U.S.C. §1402](#).
- 7.2. “personal services” income, in accordance with [26 C.F.R. §1.469-9](#) and [26 U.S.C. §861](#)(a)(3)(C)(i). Note that “compensation for personal services” is the only type of labor taxable under [26 U.S.C. §61](#)(a)(1).
- 7.3. “wages” in connection with any work performed outside the “United States” (government), in accordance with [26 C.F.R. §31.3401\(a\)\(6\)-1](#)
- 7.4. “gross income” pursuant to 26 C.F.R. §1.872-2(f).
- 7.5. “gross income” in connection with all compensation *not* paid in cash, in accordance with [26 C.F.R. §31.3401\(a\)\(11\)-1](#). In other words, if you are paid in goods and not cash, such as paying in gold or silver, you can't earn “gross income” even if you are engaged in a “trade or business”.
8. So long as you are not in receipt of any government privilege, no one can connect you to the “trade or business” excise taxable franchise without your consent. The Treasury Regulations call this process “deemed to be engaged in U.S. business” in 26 C.F.R. §1.871-9.
9. The HONEST and correct name for “effectively connected” should be “donate private property to a public use, public purpose, and public office and therefore consensually convert from PRIVATE to PUBLIC”.
10. Since all “gross income” entered on the 1040-NR is “effectively connected”, then entering any “income” to the form constitutes a DONATION.
11. Once DONATED, the earnings become PUBLIC property and those in custody of said property IMPLICITLY consent to be regulated and taxed under the authority of Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the constitution and 5 U.S.C. 301.
12. Every CIVIL/STATUTORY citizen, resident, and “nonresident alien individual” in the Internal Revenue Code is a volunteer in some way for fashion. How they volunteer is documented in:
- [How American Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax](#), Form #08.024  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/HowYouVolForIncomeTax.pdf>
13. For a simplified slide show the describes the above in graphical form suitable as a “jury entertainment package” at your next tax trial, see:
- [Property View of Income Taxation Course](#), Form #12.046  
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/PropertyViewOfIncomeTax.pdf>

## 17 Resources for Further Study and Rebuttal

Understanding the “trade or business” scam fits together all the pieces of the puzzle scattered throughout this chapter and explains them in such a cohesive way that it is impossible to argue with. It is far more than simply a “theory”, but a fact you can verify yourself by reading the IRS Publications, the code, the Constitution, and the Treasury Regulations. All of them agree with the content of this section. If you would like to learn more about the “trade of business” scam, the following resources may be helpful:

1. [Foreign Tax Status Information Group \(FTSIG\)](#) -high level introduction of how to maintain a tax status in which you make NO “elections” and “effectively connect” NOTHING.  
<https://ftsig.org>
2. [Catalog of “Elections” in the Internal Revenue Code](#), FTSIG-“effectively connecting” is only one of many types of “elections”. The purpose of ALL elections is to convert some type of property from PRIVATE to PUBLIC so that it can be taxed or regulated. Otherwise, “justice” requires that they have to leave your PRIVATE property ALONE.  
<https://ftsig.org/catalog-of-elections-in-the-internal-revenue-code/>

3. 1040-NR Attachment, Form #09.077 -how to file a nonresident alien return in which you lawfully “effectively connect” nothing and owe very little to no income tax.  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/1040NR-Attachment.pdf>
4. Property View of Income Taxation Course, Form #12.046- how the laws of property apply to income taxation and why YOU are the only one who can “effectively connect” yourself or your private property and thereby convert the civil status from PRIVATE to PUBLIC.  
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/PropertyViewOfIncomeTax.pdf>
5. Why the Federal Income Tax is a Privilege Tax Upon Government Property, Form #04.404\*\* (Member Subscriptions)- a much more detailed investigation into the subjects covered in Form #12.046 above.  
<https://sedm.org/product/why-the-federal-income-tax-is-a-privilege-tax-on-government-property-form-04-404/>
6. The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001-Detailed background on the phrase “trade or business”.  
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf>
7. The “Trade or Business” Scam-Family Guardian Website. HTML version of this article with several additional research links  
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Remedies/TradeOrBusinessScam.htm>
8. Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: “effectively connected” -Sovereignty Forms and Instructions, Cites by Topic, Family Guardian Website  
<https://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/EffectivelyConnected.htm>
9. Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: “trade or business” -Sovereignty Forms and Instructions, Cites by Topic, Family Guardian Website  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/TradeOrBusiness.htm>
10. The Information Return Scam, Family Guardian Fellowship  
<http://familyguardian.tax-tactics.com/Subjects/Taxes/Remedies/InformationReturnScam.htm>
11. Demand for Verified Evidence of “Trade or Business” Activity: Information Return, Form #04.007- Present this to private employers to educate them about why they can’t file information returns, including W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099 against a person who does not consent to engage in the voluntary excise taxable, privileged “trade or business” activity because they don’t want to act as a “public official” and “trustee” of the “public trust”.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
12. Demand for Verified Evidence of “Trade or Business” Activity: Currency Transaction Report, Form #04.008-Present this to financial institutions when they attempt to illegally connect you with a “trade or business” in the process of withdrawing \$10,000 or more from a bank account.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
13. Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001- Consolidates the next four documents into one.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>