
Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 10:05

<http://www.rushonline.com/visitors/16thamendment.htm>

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by penn cougar - 2008/02/08 10:23

I was first made aware of the illegality of income taxes from a crazy old guy on my mission, who had actually gone so far as to revoke his own citizenship and forfeit his social security number so the government couldn't track what he did.

I think a very small percentage of Americans are aware of this, and it is in my opinion, one of the great but necessary scams of our time. However, we are all sheep and although I understand the scam of it, I continue to pay out of fear of punishment more than anything. I would like to see someone challenge this amendment today but refusing to pay taxes and actually argue their point successfully and win. Until that happens, we all will continue to pay and will continue to abide by a system that, although necessary, doesn't correspond with what the constitution says.

Obviously when they wrote the constitution it wasn't perfect and they didn't foresee all the stupid freedom of speech bullcrap and other things that people push today. Others have challenged those aspects of the constitution to their benefit in recent years, so its time for someone to challenge the income tax portions

Thats my challenge to you wolfie. You talk a big game but back it up by not paying your taxes this year

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by penn cougar - 2008/02/08 10:24

Oh, and stop posting political bullcrap in the football section of the forum

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by PP3 - 2008/02/08 10:26

As an auditor I am very interested in that article.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by hamrdown - 2008/02/08 10:36

I want my \$3000 (married with 6 kids) rebate that the Congress just passed so I will file my taxes;) .

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by GoCougarPokes - 2008/02/08 10:40

penn cougar wrote:

Oh, and stop posting political bullcrap in the football section of the forum

I totally agree...this is for the "other" forum, or for Cougarboard.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by 97Alum - 2008/02/08 10:43

Give it a shot Airwolf; I'm pretty sure the Supreme Court has ruled on this a few times (based on cases brought by wingnuts trying to challenge the Constitutionality of the Federal Income Tax). Let us know if you can still post from Federal Prison when your case is finished.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by penncougar - 2008/02/08 10:45

97Alum wrote:

Give it a shot Airwolf; I'm pretty sure the Supreme Court has ruled on this a few times (based on cases brought by wingnuts trying to challenge the Constitutionality of the Federal Income Tax). Let us know if you can still post from Federal Prison when your case is finished.

Ifs thats the case he should definatly try to challenge it....and he may make some new lifelong friends in the process

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by snoscythe - 2008/02/08 10:48

penncougar wrote:

97Alum wrote:

Give it a shot Airwolf; I'm pretty sure the Supreme Court has ruled on this a few times (based on cases brought by wingnuts trying to challenge the Constitutionality of the Federal Income Tax). Let us know if you can still post from Federal Prison when your case is finished.

Ifs thats the case he should definatly try to challenge it....and he may make some new lifelong friends in the process

Like Wesley Snipes:

<http://www.cnn.com/2008/CRIME/02/01/snipes.verdict/index.html?iref=newssearch>

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by loopycoug - 2008/02/08 10:54

bla bla bla - so what? What is the alternative to taxation? Make a donation? The economic reality is that a government needs to tax its people to provide the common benefits and services the people demand. I am sure there are constitutional lawyers out there who would agree that the government has a right to tax the people. Excuse me if I choose to not take my legal and tax advice from Rush (gimme my pills!) Limbaugh.

Also having lived in several countries I know that US tax rates are among the lowest in the world. I think the no-tax freaks would make better use of their time working harder to earn more rather than complaining about the illegality of taxation.

Last I looked it was the face of a dead American president on each of the bills. I think the Lord's advice of "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's" is as applicable today. Complain all you want about the amount - I would like to see taxes lower too, but you have got to pay the man.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by 97Alum - 2008/02/08 10:57

loopycoug wrote:

bla bla bla - so what? What is the alternative to taxation? Make a donation? The economic reality is that a government needs to tax its people to provide the common benefits and services the people demand. I am sure there are constitutional lawyers out there who would agree that the government has a right to tax the people. Excuse me if I choose to not take my legal and tax advice from Rush (gimme my pills!) Limbaugh.

Also having lived in several countries I know that US tax rates are among the lowest in the world. I think the no-tax freaks would make better use of their time working harder to earn more rather than complaining about the illegality of taxation.

Last I looked it was the face of a dead American president on each of the bills. I think the Lord's advice of "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's" is as applicable today. Complain all you want about the amount - I would like to see taxes lower too, but you have got to pay the man.

Ummm...that's not Rush Limbaugh's official website. Don't know what that site is about, but that's not advice from Rush; not that it really matters to you (just for the record).

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/08 11:22

Airwolf84 wrote:

<http://www.rushonline.com/visitors/16thamendment.htm>

In rebuttal:

<http://www.irs.gov/taxpros/article/0,,id=159932,00.html>

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by etyotx - 2008/02/08 11:31

97Alum wrote:

Give it a shot Airwolf; I'm pretty sure the Supreme Court has ruled on this a few times (based on cases brought by wingnuts trying to challenge the Constitutionality of the Federal Income Tax). Let us know if you can still post from Federal Prison when your case is finished.

In my Criminal Law class last semester there were a couple of these cases. They were in the text book/lecture section entitled "MISTAKE OF LAW". (It doesn't end well for these kind of people; then again, the interest rates that the SC and lower courts have applied to Defendants' back taxes in these kind of cases is relatively reasonable)

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 12:20

97Alum wrote:

Give it a shot Airwolf; I'm pretty sure the Supreme Court has ruled on this a few times (based on cases brought by wingnuts trying to challenge the Constitutionality of the Federal Income Tax). Let us know if you can still post from Federal Prison when your case is finished.

Let me enlighten you:

Fact: The IRS is a fraudulent and illegally-created institution that is NOT a U.S. government agency, but rather a private entity owned and operated by the Central Bank, which was given control of our monetary system back in 1913 by Pres. Woodrow Wilson. Not long after this transfer of control of our money system to a bunch of private bankers, Pres. Wilson said that he had just destroyed his nation and indebted future generations to financial bondage.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 12:23

Fact: Many people have challenged the constitutionality of the income tax and were not convicted by a jury in our courts because it is unconstitutional and no law exists that says we are required to pay tax to the government on wages earned from labor.

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 12:26

What is up with the site cutting off half of posts?

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 12:28

Fact: The true definition of income, as stated by our Founding Fathers for the constitution, is

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by RogDog118 - 2008/02/08 12:35

Fact: There is no law that says that the government cannot tax the people. But Article 8 of the US Constitution does state, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." I would prefer a better tax system, but Congress clearly has a right to tax for three reasons: pay debts, common defense, and general welfare. That is pretty broad and you are not going to win a Supreme Court argument against that. Sorry Airwolf.

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by 97Alum - 2008/02/08 12:35

Fact: the Supreme Court of the United States disagrees with you Airwolf; but, again, by all means give it a try.

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by RogDog118 - 2008/02/08 12:38

Fact: The 16th Amendment of the Constitution explicitly allows for an income tax. If you are against an income tax, you are going to have to get rid of that constitution amendment... Which last I checked was binding law. Again... sorry, Airwolf, but you have to pay those taxes.

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by BoiseBYU - 2008/02/08 12:38

Give it a rest Airwolf....When Wyoming ratified the 16th Amendment, it authorized Congress to impose an income tax....The IRS was created by Congress and is housed within the Department of the Treasury. You and I may not like taxes, but it is how our government works and members of our church are taught and instructed to pay their taxes. Next you will tell us you agree with those wingnuts who actually deny courts' jurisdictions because the American flag in the court room has a yellow fringe around it....

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by jbar1221 - 2008/02/08 12:40

Airwolf84 wrote:

Not long after this transfer of control of our money system to a bunch of private bankers, Pres. Wilson said that he had just destroyed his nation and indebted future generations to financial bondage.

You have a source or a reference for that?

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 12:42

RogDog118 wrote:

Fact: There is no law that says that the government cannot tax the people. But Article 8 of the US Constitution does state, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." I would prefer a better tax system, but Congress clearly has a right to tax for three reasons: pay debts, common defense, and general welfare. That is pretty broad and you are not going to win a Supreme Court argument against that. Sorry Airwolf.

We're talking income tax and the Founding Fathers defined income as 'corporate gains and profits resulting from business transactions', not 'wages earned from labor'. The 15% we pay to the bankers is a cleverly disguised swindling of our money. By the way, the courts have issued many not guilty verdicts on income tax evasion... you ought to rent the DVD "America: Freedom to Fascism"... it will open your eyes.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by RogDog118 - 2008/02/08 12:46

Also pay attention to the fact that Article 8 says tax. It does not lay qualifiers on it. It is the 16th Amendment that brings income into the discussion. Also, just because someone is criminally "not guilty," it does not mean that they or you or I do not have to pay taxes. It just means that their actions did not meet the criteria of criminal liability.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 12:48

RogDog118 wrote:

Fact: The 16th Amendment of the Constitution explicitly allows for an income tax. If you are against an income tax, you are going to have to get rid of that constitution amendment... Which last I checked was binding law. Again... sorry, Airwolf, but you have to pay those taxes.

The 16th amendment was fraudulently ratified. Research the whole thing and let me know what you find.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by 97Alum - 2008/02/08 12:54

Airwolf84 wrote:

RogDog118 wrote:

Fact: The 16th Amendment of the Constitution explicitly allows for an income tax. If you are against an income tax, you are going to have to get rid of that constitution amendment... Which last I checked was binding law. Again... sorry,

Airwolf, but you have to pay those taxes.

The 16th amendment was fraudulently ratified. Research the whole thing and let me know what you find.

Fraudulently ratified?! Now you are taking conspiracy theories to a whole new level! Again, give it a shot Airwolf since you are so confident. There's plenty of precedent in the courts on this, but maybe you can blaze a new trail.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/08 13:00

You didn't bother to read the rebuttal I provided did you.

Here it is again, with the title from the site. You jeopardize your liberty and your temple worthiness should you fail to pay your taxes and are convicted of evasion. I hope you don't let your pride get the best of you.

The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments

Airwolf84 wrote:

RogDog118 wrote:

Fact: The 16th Amendment of the Constitution explicitly allows for an income tax. If you are against an income tax, you are going to have to get rid of that constitution amendment... Which last I checked was binding law. Again... sorry, Airwolf, but you have to pay those taxes.

The 16th amendment was fraudulently ratified. Research the whole thing and let me know what you find.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 13:00

97Alum wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

RogDog118 wrote:

Fact: The 16th Amendment of the Constitution explicitly allows for an income tax. If you are against an income tax, you are going to have to get rid of that constitution amendment... Which last I checked was binding law. Again... sorry, Airwolf, but you have to pay those taxes.

The 16th amendment was fraudulently ratified. Research the whole thing and let me know what you find.

Fraudulently ratified?! Now you are taking conspiracy theories to a whole new level! Again, give it a shot Airwolf since you are so confident. There's plenty of precedent in the courts on this, but maybe you can blaze a new trail.

Again... research it... let me know what you find out. We've got a den of thieves masquerading as politicians running (or should I say ruining) the country. The term 'federal reserve' is hilarious because there is nothing federal about it and reserves? What reserves?

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by gordito - 2008/02/08 13:00

Fact: Bears eat beets.

(sorry, that's all I have to contribute to this matter)

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 13:06

CougarPeasant wrote:

You didn't bother to read the rebuttal I provided did you.

Here it is again, with the title from the site. You jeopardize your liberty and your temple worthiness should you fail to pay your taxes and are convicted of evasion. I hope you don't let your pride get the best of you.

The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments

Airwolf84 wrote:

RogDog118 wrote:

Fact: The 16th Amendment of the Constitution explicitly allows for an income tax. If you are against an income tax, you are going to have to get rid of that constitution amendment... Which last I checked was binding law. Again... sorry, Airwolf, but you have to pay those taxes.

The 16th amendment was fraudulently ratified. Research the whole thing and let me know what you find.

I did, but the IRS is NOT, I repeat... N O T a government agency... it is operated by the Central Bank, which steals your money, so any rule or law on their website mandating or authorizing the collection of a tax on our labor is not constitutional and null and void.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by 97Alum - 2008/02/08 13:21

Airwolf84 wrote:

97Alum wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

RogDog118 wrote:

Fact: The 16th Amendment of the Constitution explicitly allows for an income tax. If you are against an income tax, you are going to have to get rid of that constitution amendment... Which last I checked was binding law. Again... sorry, Airwolf, but you have to pay those taxes.

The 16th amendment was fraudulently ratified. Research the whole thing and let me know what you find.

Fraudulently ratified?! Now you are taking conspiracy theories to a whole new level! Again, give it a shot Airwolf since you are so confident. There's plenty of precedent in the courts on this, but maybe you can blaze a new trail.

Again... research it... let me know what you find out. We've got a den of thieves masquerading as politicians running (or should I say ruining) the country. The term 'federal reserve' is hilarious because there is nothing federal about it and reserves? What reserves?

Why don't you just give me the Reader's Digest version since you are, apparently, such the expert and so confident in your position.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by 97Alum - 2008/02/08 13:22

Airwolf84 wrote:

CougarPeasant wrote:

You didn't bother to read the rebuttal I provided did you.

Here it is again, with the title from the site. You jeopardize your liberty and your temple worthiness should you fail to pay your taxes and are convicted of evasion. I hope you don't let your pride get the best of you.

The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments

Airwolf84 wrote:

RogDog118 wrote:

Fact: The 16th Amendment of the Constitution explicitly allows for an income tax. If you are against an income tax, you are going to have to get rid of that constitution amendment... Which last I checked was binding law. Again... sorry, Airwolf, but you have to pay those taxes.

The 16th amendment was fraudulently ratified. Research the whole thing and let me know what you find.

I did, but the IRS is NOT, I repeat... N O T a government agency... it is operated by the Central Bank, which steals your money, so any rule or law on their website mandating or authorizing the collection of a tax on our labor is not constitutional and null and void.

Whether you like it or not, the regs and rules do have the force of law if the courts say so.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 13:23

Here's something else to think about... just don't tell Al Gore...

<http://ibdeditorial.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=287279412587175>

Any guess as to why governments are promoting the global warming hype?

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/08 13:26

Airwolf84 wrote:

I did, but the IRS is NOT, I repeat... N O T a government agency... it is operated by the Central Bank, which steals your money, so any rule or law on their website mandating or authorizing the collection of a tax on our labor is not constitutional and null and void.

You remind me of those types who believe anti's are the only ones who have the truth on the LDS church rather than the LDS church itself.

The IRS is not a private organization. It is part of the US Treasury department, which has full cabinet status. Also, the site I gave you provides CASE LAW, recognizing the proper legality of the 16th amendment and the US Govt's right to collect taxes on personal income. Ignore it at your peril.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 13:26

97Alum wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

CougarPeasant wrote:

You didn't bother to read the rebuttal I provided did you.

Here it is again, with the title from the site. You jeopardize your liberty and your temple worthiness should you fail to pay your taxes and are convicted of evasion. I hope you don't let your pride get the best of you.

The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments

Airwolf84 wrote:

RogDog118 wrote:

Fact: The 16th Amendment of the Constitution explicitly allows for an income tax. If you are against an income tax, you are going to have to get rid of that constitution amendment... Which last I checked was binding law. Again... sorry, Airwolf, but you have to pay those taxes.

The 16th amendment was fraudulently ratified. Research the whole thing and let me know what you find.

I did, but the IRS is NOT, I repeat... N O T a government agency... it is operated by the Central Bank, which steals your money, so any rule or law on their website mandating or authorizing the collection of a tax on our labor is not constitutional and null and void.

Whether you like it or not, the regs and rules do have the force of law if the courts say so.

Yes, I know... I'm just trying to point out that 90% of the public are unknowing victims of the greatest swindle in the history of government and politics with the collection of taxes on our labor in this country.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/08 13:28

Airwolf84 wrote:

I did, but the IRS is NOT, I repeat... N O T a government agency... it is operated by the Central Bank, which steals your money, so any rule or law on their website mandating or authorizing the collection of a tax on our labor is not constitutional and null and void.

Contention: The Internal Revenue Service is not an agency of the United States.

Some argue that the IRS is not an agency of the United States but rather a private corporation, because it was not created by positive law (i.e., an act of Congress) and that, therefore, the IRS does not have the authority to enforce the Internal Revenue Code.

The Law: There is a host of constitutional and statutory authority establishing that the IRS is an agency of the United States. The U.S. Supreme Court stated in *Donaldson v. United States*, 400 U.S. 517, 534 (1971), "e bear in mind that the Internal Revenue Service is organized to carry out the broad responsibilities of the Secretary of the Treasury under

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by bengel - 2008/02/08 13:30

I served as an Administrative Law Judge at the Utah State Tax Commission for over three years. In that time, I heard a lot of arguments about the tax system. However, I never heard one that was supported by a decision rendered by a court.

No court has ever ruled the 16th Amendment was not properly ratified, thus nullifying the validity of the income tax.

I agree that you ignore the tax system at your peril.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 13:34

CougarPeasant wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

I did, but the IRS is NOT, I repeat... N O T a government agency... it is operated by the Central Bank, which steals your money, so any rule or law on their website mandating or authorizing the collection of a tax on our labor is not constitutional and null and void.

You remind me of those types who believe anti's are the only ones who have the truth on the LDS church rather than the LDS church itself.

The IRS is not a private organization. It is part of the US Treasury department, which has full cabinet status. Also, the site I gave you provides CASE LAW, recognizing the proper legality of the 16th amendment and the US Gov't's right to collect taxes on personal income. Ignore it at your peril.

The U.S. Treasury is a branch of the federal reserve, which IS the Central Bank!!!:angry:

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 13:37

bengel wrote:

I served as an Administrative Law Judge at the Utah State Tax Commission for over three years. In that time, I heard a lot of arguments about the tax system. However, I never heard one that was supported by a decision rendered by a court.

No court has ever ruled the 16th Amendment was not properly ratified, thus nullifying the validity of the income tax.

I agree that you ignore the tax system at your peril.

Only 4 men in the history of our country have dared challenge the bankers and their 'operation'... Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Jackson, JFK and Ronald Reagan. What do all 4 have in common?

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/08 13:38

Airwolf84 wrote:The U.S. Treasury is a branch of the federal reserve, which IS the Central Bank!!!:angry:

Pursuant to section 7801, the Secretary of the Treasury has full authority to administer and enforce the internal revenue laws and has the power to create an agency to enforce such laws. Based upon this legislative grant, the IRS was created. Thus, the IRS is a body established by "positive law" because it was created through a congressionally mandated power. Moreover, section 7803(a) explicitly provides that there shall be a Commissioner of Internal Revenue who shall administer and supervise the execution and application of the internal revenue laws.

The IRS is legally entitled to execute the internal revenue laws. Your arguments are specious and only do a disservice to anyone here who might actually believe what you post has any validity. (I doubt anyone will believe you, but I had to add that exception.)

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by Ygridiron4ever - 2008/02/08 13:42

A quote from the US Department of Treasury website:

Statutory Authority

The IRS is organized to carry out the responsibilities of the secretary of the Treasury under section 7801 of the Internal Revenue Code. The secretary has full authority to administer and enforce the internal revenue laws and has the power to create an agency to enforce these laws. The IRS was created based on this legislative grant.

Section 7803 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for the appointment of a commissioner of Internal Revenue to administer and supervise the execution and application of the internal revenue laws.

Both my parents retired after many years of civil service as US department of treasury employees working at the Ogden Service Center of the IRS. Tell them they didn't actually work for the government! And take away their Federal Retirement while your at it!

Airwolf does it again - hijacks the board for an afternoon!

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by 97Alum - 2008/02/08 13:47

Airwolf84 wrote:

bengel wrote:

I served as an Administrative Law Judge at the Utah State Tax Commission for over three years. In that time, I heard a lot of arguments about the tax system. However, I never heard one that was supported by a decision rendered by a court.

No court has ever ruled the 16th Amendment was not properly ratified, thus nullifying the validity of the income tax.

I agree that you ignore the tax system at your peril.

Only 4 men in the history of our country have dared challenge the bankers and their 'operation'... Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Jackson, JFK and Ronald Reagan. What do all 4 have in common?

You're nuts, you know that?! Now you're saying that all four were assassinated (or an attempt was made) because they threatened to uncover the "truth" about these mysterious "bankers"! ROFL!!!! You give these people WAY TOO MUCH credit in the old smarts and creativity departments! These folks can't even balance the federal budget for a single year, let alone carry on a vast conspiracy of this nature and complexity for nearly a 100 years.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/08 13:50

PENALTIES FOR PURSUING FRIVOLOUS TAX ARGUMENTS

Those who act on frivolous positions risk a variety of civil and criminal penalties. Those who adopt these positions may face harsher consequences than those who merely promote them. As the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals noted in *United States v. Sloan*, 939 F.2d 499, 499-500 (7th Cir. 1991), "Like moths to a flame, some people find themselves irresistibly drawn to the tax protester movement's illusory claim that there is no legal requirement to pay federal income tax. And, like moths, these people sometimes get burned."

I hope you really don't believe these tax protesters.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by bengel - 2008/02/08 13:51

Airwolf84 wrote:

bengel wrote:

I served as an Administrative Law Judge at the Utah State Tax Commission for over three years. In that time, I heard a lot of arguments about the tax system. However, I never heard one that was supported by a decision rendered by a court.

No court has ever ruled the 16th Amendment was not properly ratified, thus nullifying the validity of the income tax.

I agree that you ignore the tax system at your peril.

Only 4 men in the history of our country have dared challenge the bankers and their 'operation'... Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Jackson, JFK and Ronald Reagan. What do all 4 have in common?

Sounds perilous to me.

I recommend the following if you wish to challenge the validity of the tax system. Pay your taxes under protest. Go to the courts with your arguments. Though I know of no court that has accepted any of the arguments of which I am aware, who knows, you might prevail.

This is the approach the LDS Church took on the question of polygamy. When it lost in the US Supreme Court, the court of last resort, and, on some occasions, ultimate error, the LDS Church ceased the practice.

You could also attempt using the political process, though the funding aspect of anything political makes that a nice theory, and not much more.

Of course, you can also refuse to pay your taxes, risking forfeiture of your assets, imprisonment, and, if LDS, Church discipline.

I hope you use your moral agency appropriately. It's not for me to say whether your choice is the morally correct one. To the best of my knowledge, evasion is not the legally correct one.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by bengel - 2008/02/08 13:54

CougarPeasant wrote:

PENALTIES FOR PURSUING FRIVOLOUS TAX ARGUMENTS

Those who act on frivolous positions risk a variety of civil and criminal penalties. Those who adopt these positions may face harsher consequences than those who merely promote them. As the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals noted in *United States v. Sloan*, 939 F.2d 499, 499-500 (7th Cir. 1991), "Like moths to a flame, some people find themselves irresistibly drawn to the tax protester movement's illusory claim that there is no legal requirement to pay federal income tax. And, like moths, these people sometimes get burned."

I hope you really don't believe these tax protesters.

Flutter . . . flutter . . . flutter . . . SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS!

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 14:03

CougarPeasant wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:The U.S. Treasury is a branch of the federal reserve, which IS the Central Bank!!!:angry:

Pursuant to section 7801, the Secretary of the Treasury has full authority to administer and enforce the internal revenue laws and has the power to create an agency to enforce such laws. Based upon this legislative grant, the IRS was created. Thus, the IRS is a body established by "positive law" because it was created through a congressionally mandated power. Moreover, section 7803(a) explicitly provides that there shall be a Commissioner of Internal Revenue who shall administer and supervise the execution and application of the internal revenue laws.

The IRS is legally entitled to execute the internal revenue laws. Your arguments are specious and only do a disservice to anyone here who might actually believe what you post has any validity. (I doubt anyone will believe you, but I had to add that exception.)

I'm just trying to make others aware of the deceit... whether or not they believe me is irrelevant... at least they can do the research for themselves and then draw their own conclusions.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 14:07

By the way, have I ever once advocated not paying your taxes? Personally, I have paid income taxes for the last 19 years and have filed a return every year. I just want others to be aware of the fraud and the deceit and then how they protest after that is their own business. My way is by informing others, writing letters to the editor, etc. A march on Washington, DC would be great also, but there is far too much apathy in this country for that to happen.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 14:13

97Alum wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

bengel wrote:

I served as an Administrative Law Judge at the Utah State Tax Commission for over three years. In that time, I heard a lot of arguments about the tax system. However, I never heard one that was supported by a decision rendered by a court.

No court has ever ruled the 16th Amendment was not properly ratified, thus nullifying the validity of the income tax.

I agree that you ignore the tax system at your peril.

Only 4 men in the history of our country have dared challenge the bankers and their 'operation'... Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Jackson, JFK and Ronald Reagan. What do all 4 have in common?

You're nuts, you know that?! Now you're saying that all four were assassinated (or an attempt was made) because they threatened to uncover the "truth" about these mysterious "bankers"! ROFL!!!! You give these people WAY TOO MUCH credit in the old smarts and creativity departments! These folks can't even balance the federal budget for a single year, let alone carry on a vast conspiracy of this nature and complexity for nearly a 100 years.

You're missing the boat here Alum... three of these presidents either had plans or were talking publicly about abolishing the federal reserve and IRS because they knew it was all a fraudulent scheme built to siphon money from people under the guise of a legal tax. Both Mike Huckabee and Ron Paul want to abolish the IRS and start anew with our currency and monetary system because of the massive fraud it is on the people, not to mention finally getting rid of what... 25,000 lines of tax code?:laugh:

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by bengel - 2008/02/08 14:15

Airwolf84 wrote:

By the way, have I ever once advocated not paying your taxes? Personally, I have paid income taxes for the last 19 years and have filed a return every year. I just want others to be aware of the fraud and the deceit and then how they protest after that is their own business. My way is by informing others, writing letters to the editor, etc. A march on Washington, DC would be great also, but there is far too much apathy in this country for that to happen.

I've heard that disclaimer before. "I never said don't pay your taxes. I just said the tax system was illegal." It's a fine thing to say as someones assets are forfeited and they are incarcerated.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by jbar1221 - 2008/02/08 14:19

jbar1221 wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

Not long after this transfer of control of our money system to a bunch of private bankers, Pres. Wilson said that he had just destroyed his nation and indebted future generations to financial bondage.

You have a source or a reference for that?

TeenWolf, does your silence indicate you have no source on this?? Its a pretty bold statement to suggest a US President told the country he "destroyed his Nation" especially with nothing to back it up.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by penn cougar - 2008/02/08 14:23

Airwolf84 wrote:

97Alum wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

bengel wrote:

I served as an Administrative Law Judge at the Utah State Tax Commission for over three years. In that time, I heard a lot of arguments about the tax system. However, I never heard one that was supported by a decision rendered by a court.

No court has ever ruled the 16th Amendment was not properly ratified, thus nullifying the validity of the income tax.

I agree that you ignore the tax system at your peril.

Only 4 men in the history of our country have dared challenge the bankers and their 'operation'... Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Jackson, JFK and Ronald Reagan. What do all 4 have in common?

You're nuts, you know that?! Now you're saying that all four were assassinated (or an attempt was made) because they threatened to uncover the "truth" about these mysterious "bankers"! ROFL!!!! You give these people WAY TOO MUCH credit in the old smarts and creativity departments! These folks can't even balance the federal budget for a single year, let alone carry on a vast conspiracy of this nature and complexity for nearly a 100 years.

You're missing the boat here Alum... three of these presidents either had plans or were talking publicly about abolishing the federal reserve and IRS because they knew it was all a fraudulent scheme built to siphon money from people under the guise of a legal tax. Both Mike Huckabee and Ron Paul want to abolish the IRS and start anew with our currency and monetary system because of the massive fraud it is on the people, not to mention finally getting rid of what... 25,000 lines of tax code?:laugh:

Yes, ron paul and mike huckabee are both full of wonderful ideas. Ideas that are so wonderful they should watch their backs because their both about to be assainated

Ron Paul wants to bring all our troops home. Which will intern bring all the terrorists home with them. The fight is going to happen, I would just rather it happen over there than here.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/08 14:24

Airwolf84 wrote:

CougarPeasant wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:The U.S. Treasury is a branch of the federal reserve, which IS the Central Bank!!!:angry:

Pursuant to section 7801, the Secretary of the Treasury has full authority to administer and enforce the internal revenue laws and has the power to create an agency to enforce such laws. Based upon this legislative grant, the IRS was created. Thus, the IRS is a body established by "positive law" because it was created through a congressionally mandated power. Moreover, section 7803(a) explicitly provides that there shall be a Commissioner of Internal Revenue who shall administer and supervise the execution and application of the internal revenue laws.

The IRS is legally entitled to execute the internal revenue laws. Your arguments are specious and only do a disservice to anyone here who might actually believe what you post has any validity. (I doubt anyone will believe you, but I had to add that exception.)

I'm just trying to make others aware of the deceit... whether or not they believe me is irrelevant... at least they can do the research for themselves and then draw their own conclusions.

That is a very weak reason. You are giving them information that if they follow could result in prison terms and heavy monetary fines. You don't offer full disclosure of how the IRS genuinely is legitimate through legislation and court

decisions. A one-sided view is not helping people.

You might as well be the spokesman for the tobacco companies. See how smoking is benign while hiding the truth elsewhere.

I am not a fan of taxes, I think only Bill Clinton and Warren Buffett actually want to pay MORE taxes. I think the system is ripe for an overhaul, but to tell people the system is fraudulent when it clearly isn't is reckless at best and deceitful at worst.

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/02/08 14:48

assainated???

Bet that really hurts if you are already sackless!!!

Here is a picture of my neighbor's horse after it was "assainated"!!!!

http://www.johnstun.org/images/funny/short_horse.gif

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by MajorCougar - 2008/02/08 14:54

Conosticator wrote:

assainated???

Bet that really hurts if you are already sackless!!!

Here is a picture of my neighbor's horse after it was "assainated"!!!!

http://www.johnstun.org/images/funny/short_horse.gif

Now THAT is freakin' hilarious! Karma to you, Conosticator, for bringing humor to this otherwise ass-anine thread...
:laugh:

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 15:57

Ygridiron4ever wrote:

A quote from the US Department of Treasury website:

Statutory Authority

The IRS is organized to carry out the responsibilities of the secretary of the Treasury under section 7801 of the Internal Revenue Code. The secretary has full authority to administer and enforce the internal revenue laws and has the power to create an agency to enforce these laws. The IRS was created based on this legislative grant.

Section 7803 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for the appointment of a commissioner of Internal Revenue to administer and supervise the execution and application of the internal revenue laws.

Both my parents retired after many years of civil service as US department of treasury employees working at the Ogden Service Center of the IRS. Tell them they didn't actually work for the government! And take away their Federal Retirement while your at it!

Airwolf does it again - hijacks the board for an afternoon!

Of course they're going to get a government reirement package... the government uses private banks to fund its operations, so even though the IRS is an illegally-created institution by the Central Bank, it is operating under the guise of a federal government agency. The 'Fed' and private bankers (Central Bank) are one of the same as far as operations

go, but the Central Bank is NOT a government agency! Allow me to introduce you to a few quotes:

"If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation, then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all property until their children wake up homeless on the continent their Fathers conquered

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by bengel - 2008/02/08 16:01

Airwolf84 wrote:

Ygridiron4ever wrote:

A quote from the US Department of Treasury website:

Statutory Authority

The IRS is organized to carry out the responsibilities of the secretary of the Treasury under section 7801 of the Internal Revenue Code. The secretary has full authority to administer and enforce the internal revenue laws and has the power to create an agency to enforce these laws. The IRS was created based on this legislative grant.

Section 7803 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for the appointment of a commissioner of Internal Revenue to administer and supervise the execution and application of the internal revenue laws.

Both my parents retired after many years of civil service as US department of treasury employees working at the Ogden Service Center of the IRS. Tell them they didn't actually work for the government! And take away their Federal Retirement while your at it!

Airwolf does it again - hijacks the board for an afternoon!

Of course they're going to get a government reirement package... the government uses private banks to fund its operations, so even though the IRS is an illegally-created institution by the Central Bank, it is operating under the guise of a federal government agency. The 'Fed' and private bankers (Central Bank) are one of the same as far as operations go, but the Central Bank is NOT a government agency! Allow me to introduce you to a few quotes:

"If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation, then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all property until their children wake up homeless on the continent their Fathers conquered

Only one incomplete quote, without attribution. Sorry, that doesn't cut it.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 16:07

What the heck is going on with these posts being cut off after submission???

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 16:14

TeenWolf, does your silence indicate you have no source on this?? Its a pretty bold statement to suggest a US President told the country he "destroyed his Nation" especially with nothing to back it up.

Wilson said in 1919, six years after signing the Federal Reserve Act "I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country. A great industrial system is now controlled by its system of credit. We are no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men."

Wilson went to his grave regretting the creation of the Federal Reserve Bank.

Ever hear of a search engine?

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 16:28

Wilson's quote can be found in the Senate Documents Co. 3, No. 23, 76th Congress, 1st session, 1939.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by snoscythe - 2008/02/08 16:29

Airwolf84 wrote:

TeenWolf, does your silence indicate you have no source on this?? Its a pretty bold statement to suggest a US President told the country he "destroyed his Nation" especially with nothing to back it up.

Wilson said in 1919, six years after signing the Federal Reserve Act "I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country. A great industrial system is now controlled by its system of credit. We are no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men."

Wilson went to his grave regretting the creation of the Federal Reserve Bank.

Ever hear of a search engine?

It's pretty sad when even wikipedia doubts the authenticity of a quote. Ever hear the one from President Packer about how a hush will fall over the hosts of heaven and they will bow to the generation of Gordon B. Hinckley?? Just another made up quote with a name attached to give it a bit more oomph....but they never really said it.

This "quote" is actually a hobbled together fabrication from two of Wilson's speeches.

The first, given in 1911:

A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is privately concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men who, even if their action be honest and intended for the public interest, are necessarily concentrated upon the great undertakings in which their own money is involved and who necessarily, by very reason of their own limitations, chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom.

And the second, given in 1913, 4 months prior his signature in question:

We are at the parting of the ways. We have, not one or two or three, but many, established and formidable monopolies in the United States. We have, not one or two, but many, fields of endeavor into which it is difficult, if not impossible, for the independent man to enter. We have restricted credit, we have restricted opportunity, we have controlled development, and we have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated, governments in the civilized world -- no longer a government by the opinion and the duress of small groups of dominant men.

Both speeches were given prior to his bringing the Federal Reserve to fruition, hence he could not have expressed regret for having done so. In actuality, both speeches were given as arguments FOR the Federal Reserve. It is also of note that in none of the known speeches of Woodrow Wilson at the Library of Congress has he ever uttered the phrase "I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country" in that form or any of its derivatives.

As for a source, John M. Cooper, widely regarded as the historian most familiar with Woodrow Wilson, has stated "I can tell you categorically that this is not a statement of regret for having created the Federal Reserve. Wilson never had any regrets for having done that. It was an accomplishment in which he took great pride."

Good luck finding your "quote" published by any reputable source Wolf-boy.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/08 16:30

Airwolf84 wrote:

TeenWolf, does your silence indicate you have no source on this?? Its a pretty bold statement to suggest a US President told the country he "destroyed his Nation" especially with nothing to back it up.

Wilson said in 1919, six years after signing the Federal Reserve Act "I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country. A great industrial system is now controlled by its system of credit. We are no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men."

Wilson went to his grave regretting the creation of the Federal Reserve Bank.

Ever hear of a search engine?

It doesn't work that way Airwolf, if you are going to make a bald faced lie errr statement about a historical figure, you better back it up. Telling someone else to prove what you said is true is just bad manners.

I think the phrase is: either put up or shut up.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/08 16:39

Airwolf84 wrote:

Wilson's quote can be found in the Senate Documents Co. 3, No. 23, 76th Congress, 1st session, 1939.

Your source is another chat board??? Seriously?!!!!!!!

snoscythe just rebuked the validity of the very quote you used. Further, the chatboard's cite of the quote lacks support as well.

For the record, you've been 'scythed. :laugh: :laugh: :laugh:

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by niqmadu - 2008/02/08 16:43

Not that I agree with airwolf, but I find the discussion enlightening having heard some of these claims unsupported before. It makes me appreciate the breadth and depth of the contributors here.

While I don't have evidence of any grand conspiracy, I don't put it past these people to be able to pull one off--especially with what the Clintons have been getting away with.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by craigocarson - 2008/02/08 16:45

Note to self: Don't argue with Snoscythe about American History...

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 16:46

snoscythe wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

TeenWolf, does your silence indicate you have no source on this?? Its a pretty bold statement to suggest a US President told the country he "destroyed his Nation" especially with nothing to back it up.

Wilson said in 1919, six years after signing the Federal Reserve Act "I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country. A great industrial system is now controlled by its system of credit. We are no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men."

Wilson went to his grave regretting the creation of the Federal Reserve Bank.

Ever hear of a search engine?

It's pretty sad when even wikipedia doubts the authenticity of a quote. Ever hear the one from President Packer about how a hush will fall over the hosts of heaven and they will bow to the generation of Gordon B. Hinckley?? Just another made up quote with a name attached to give it a bit more oomph....but they never really said it.

This "quote" is actually a hobbled together fabrication from two of Wilson's speeches.

The first, given in 1911:

A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is privately concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men who, even if their action be honest and intended for the public interest, are necessarily concentrated upon the great undertakings in which their own money is involved and who necessarily, by very reason of their own limitations, chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom.

And the second, given in 1913, 4 months prior his signature in question:

We are at the parting of the ways. We have, not one or two or three, but many, established and formidable monopolies in the United States. We have, not one or two, but many, fields of endeavor into which it is difficult, if not impossible, for the independent man to enter. We have restricted credit, we have restricted opportunity, we have controlled development, and we have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated, governments in the civilized world -- no longer a government by the opinion and the duress of small groups of dominant men.

Both speeches were given prior to his bringing the Federal Reserve to fruition, hence he could not have expressed regret for having done so. In actuality, both speeches were given as arguments FOR the Federal Reserve. It is also of note that in none of the known speeches of Woodrow Wilson at the Library of Congress has he ever uttered the phrase "I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country" in that form or any of its derivatives.

As for a source, John M. Cooper, widely regarded as the historian most familiar with Woodrow Wilson, has stated "I can tell you categorically that this is not a statement of regret for having created the Federal Reserve. Wilson never had any regrets for having done that. It was an accomplishment in which he took great pride."

Good luck finding your "quote" published by any reputable source Wolf-boy.

First off, didn't get the quote from wikipedia and second, I'm well aware of wikipedia not exactly being a reliable source of information like this. Don't patronize me pal.

By the way, you're right... just found the actual quote from Wilson and it appears that the "I have unwittingly ruined my country" part is inaccurate, however, I think the beef of this quote from him sums it up good enough (see next thread as posts are being cut off).

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by jbar1221 - 2008/02/08 17:01

Airwolf84 wrote:

TeenWolf, does your silence indicate you have no source on this?? Its a pretty bold statement to suggest a US President told the country he "destroyed his Nation" especially with nothing to back it up.

Wilson said in 1919, six years after signing the Federal Reserve Act "I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country. A great industrial system is now controlled by its system of credit. We are no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men."

Wilson went to his grave regretting the creation of the Federal Reserve Bank.

Ever hear of a search engine?

First of all the onus is not on me to find a source for your claim. As far as I can tell you have yet to present a reputable source that supports your claim that President Wilson "went to his grave regretting the creation of the Federal Reserve Bank."

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/08 17:22

Actual quote: "We are no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men".

Dominant men. And who could they be?

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/08 17:43

Airwolf84 wrote:

Actual quote: "We are no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men".

Dominant men. And who could they be?

First you state that Wilson went to the grave regretting he created the Federal Reserve. Now that you've been shown to be wrong, you change arguments and put out some spurious claim about 'Dominant men.' It's your argument, you tell us who the 'Dominant men' are supposed to be. Be warned, you need to keep it in historical perspective at the time President Wilson made his statements.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by etyotx - 2008/02/08 17:48

When Ron Paul wins the election with Airwolf as his VP, then maybe you guys can push this agenda.:dry:

Seriously, I would love for Airwolf to stop paying taxes. He'd be so busy with the subsequent trials that he wouldn't have the time to come on here and waste everyone's time.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/08 18:25

penncougar wrote:

I was first made aware of the illegality of income taxes from a crazy old guy on my mission, who had actually gone so far as to revoke his own citizenship and forfeit his social security number so the government couldn't track what he did.

I think a very small percentage of Americans are aware of this, and it is in my opinion, one of the great but necessary scams of our time. However, we are all sheep and although I understand the scam of it, I continue to pay out of fear of punishment more than anything. I would like to see someone challenge this amendment today but refusing to pay taxes and actually argue their point successfully and win. Until that happens, we all will continue to pay and will continue to abide by a system that, although necessary, doesn't correspond with what the constitution says.

Obviously when they wrote the constitution it wasn't perfect and they didn't foresee all the stupid freedom of speech bullcrap and other things that people push today. Others have challenged those aspects of the constitution to their benefit in recent years, so its time for someone to challenge the income tax portions

Thats my challenge to you wolfie. You talk a big game but back it up by not paying your taxes this year

I am aware of two people that have challenged the fed income tax and won. I don't recall at the moment the premise or argument the first used, but the second guy (I'm pretty sure he was a lawyer - actually IIRC they were both lawyers), argued the premise that income is the same as profit and that because we trade our time, efforts, and skills, we are not profitting or drawing an income. That we are just exchanging our sweat for money. He was able to convince the court and beat the IRS. I listened to an interview he gave and it was pretty interesting. A pretty convincing guy. As for taxes, there does not to be some sort of tax system else the government would then be forced to compete in industry, charge individuals for services rendered, or constantly print money. As you can see the first and the third choices are VERY bad for us. The first would lead to unfair business practices in whatever industry they decide to compete and the third would lead to hyperinflation. Go to work at 8am and by noon you would have made enough to pay for a loaf of bread, hopefully. The second option has its own pitfalls but could possibly be done. There is one other thought for income and that would be from the money brought in by the fed. As you know it loans money to banks and receives it back with interest. That interest is then turned over to the treasury without ever being put on the books. In otherwords it is not recorded as an income (profit ;)) to the fed or to the treasury.

So if you want to take the IRS to court go ahead. I figure their record is probably something like 2319283 wins and 2 losses.

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by loopycoug - 2008/02/08 18:53

And this thread has what to do with BYU sports?

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by etyotx - 2008/02/09 08:41

loopycoug wrote:

And this thread has what to do with BYU sports?

It's due to AW's inability to come up with any more anti-BYU smack. What's he got? Not a whole lot. If I were him, I'd say "The only reason Scout ranked BYU's class above several BCS schools is that those BCS schools really didn't want to be there-they didn't have anything to recruit for." Then I'd go live as a mountain man in the Uintahs and stop bothering everybody.

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/09 21:36

CougarPeasant wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

Actual quote: "We are no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men".

Dominant men. And who could they be?

First you state that Wilson went to the grave regretting he created the Federal Reserve. Now that you've been shown to

be wrong, you change arguments and put out some spurious claim about 'Dominant men.' It's your argument, you tell us who the 'Dominant men' are supposed to be. Be warned, you need to keep it in historical perspective at the time President Wilson made his statements.

If I were responsible for creating the federal reserve, I'd regret it going to my grave and be ashamed of it! I am aware that this part was also added incorrectly to his actual statement after researching his comments. Who do you think I was implying with my reference to 'dominant men'? Come on Peasant... you're a bright fellow. I'll give you a hint... it starts with ban and ends with kers (aka the wealthy elite or as I call them... the money-masters).

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/09 21:43

All you need to know about the federal reserve is that there is nothing federal about it and that there are only 10% in actual reserves in the banks. Ever hear of fractional reserve banking? This is what is going on and it is VERY illegal. It means that if a depositor has \$500 sitting in an account, the bank will loan out \$5,000 to someone. Furthermore, the 'Fed' and IRS are controlled by the Central Bank, with the IRS acting as a collection agency for it. It is a scam, a scheme and a fraud very cleverly disguised as a government-run agency. Our Founding Fathers are undoubtedly rolling in their graves over what has happened to this nation and government.

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/09 21:55

etyotx wrote:

When Ron Paul wins the election with Airwolf as his VP, then maybe you guys can push this agenda..dry:

Seriously, I would love for Airwolf to stop paying taxes. He'd be so busy with the subsequent trials that he wouldn't have the time to come on here and waste everyone's time.

So, tell me etyotx... what is your opinion of Ron Paul?

You really do need to see 'America: Freedom to Fascism' my friend... you'll ask yourself 'why am I voluntarily paying a tax to the 'Feds' on my labor'???

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/09 22:34

Airwolf84 wrote:

CougarPeasant wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

Actual quote: "We are no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men".

Dominant men. And who could they be?

First you state that Wilson went to the grave regretting he created the Federal Reserve. Now that you've been shown to be wrong, you change arguments and put out some spurious claim about 'Dominant men.' It's your argument, you tell us who the 'Dominant men' are supposed to be. Be warned, you need to keep it in historical perspective at the time President Wilson made his statements.

If I were responsible for creating the federal reserve, I'd regret it going to my grave and be ashamed of it! I am aware that this part was also added incorrectly to his actual statement after researching his comments. Who do you think I was implying with my reference to 'dominant men'? Come on Peasant... you're a bright fellow. I'll give you a hint... it starts with ban and ends with kers (aka the wealthy elite or as I call them... the money-masters).

Let's pretend for a moment I am not very bright, which isn't much of a stretch come to think of it: Explain this bankers'

conspiracy since after the formation of the Fed Reserve, we've had the Great Depression, WWII, the recession of the 70's, and the S&L fiasco, which all contributed to regulating the banking and finance industries more than any other industries with the exception of the medical profession.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by OLB - 2008/02/09 22:38

I home teach a guy in my ward. He must be Airwolf's cousin, cause the guy always brings up things like how the Federal Reserve is illegal, Kennedy was shot by more than one person, 9/11 was an inside job, etc.

This guy lives on half truths and third rate books by discredited authors.

I love it when he brings up the "evilness" of the Federal Reserve. I patiently listen to him ramble on about some 18th century German goldsmith that came up with the idea to control countries by controlling their debt (ya, like the Medici family wasn't doing that centuries before) and that the Rockerfellers are the American agents charged with bring this system to the U.S.

At the end, I ask him four questions 1) "Did God create the United States of America so that the Gospel could be restored?" He always answers yes, as well he should.

Then I ask him, 2) "Do you believe that God has created the American society so that LDS missionaries could have the resources (i.e. \$\$\$) to go all around the world and preach the gospel." He used to answer yes to this until I asked him question 3 a few times.

3) Why, then, would God generate wealth for his true believers through evil institutions like the Federal Reserve? At first he couldn't answer this question, now he just says that my "premise" is all wrong.

4) Then I say "maybe the Federal Reserve is unconstitutional. But it has, for the most part, worked over the past 90 plus years. We now live in the wealthiest society ever known to mankind." At this point he just talks about gay marriage and porn, and how they are indicators of a decaying society.

Airwolf, the fact is you are insane and should be committed to a mental health facility. This is not a joke. Anyone that believes in the North American Union, 9/11 conspiracies, etc. should be taken out of society. They have no net benefit or add anything of value to our society.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/09 22:52

CougarPeasant wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

CougarPeasant wrote:

Airwolf84 wrote:

Actual quote: "We are no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men".

Dominant men. And who could they be?

First you state that Wilson went to the grave regretting he created the Federal Reserve. Now that you've been shown to be wrong, you change arguments and put out some spurious claim about 'Dominant men.' It's your argument, you tell us who the 'Dominant men' are supposed to be. Be warned, you need to keep it in historical perspective at the time President Wilson made his statements.

If I were responsible for creating the federal reserve, I'd regret it going to my grave and be ashamed of it! I am aware that this part was also added incorrectly to his actual statement after researching his comments. Who do you think I was implying with my reference to 'dominant men'? Come on Peasant... you're a bright fellow. I'll give you a hint... it starts with ban and ends with kers (aka the wealthy elite or as I call them... the money-masters).

Let's pretend for a moment I am not very bright, which isn't much of a stretch come to think of it: Explain this bankers'

conspiracy since after the formation of the Fed Reserve, we've had the Great Depression, WWII, the recession of the 70's, and the S&L fiasco, which all contributed to regulating the banking and finance industries more than any other industries with the exception of the medical profession.

The great depression was manufactured in order to consolidate the wealth of many mom & pop banks into the bigger and more powerful ones. Do you know or have any idea how many small banks failed as a result of the great depression? Thousands! World war II? How do invasions that took place in Asia and Europe factor into the regulation of banks? The recession of the '70's was primarily brought on by the oil crisis, not banking institutions and if banks were more heavily regulated after that, then so be it. The S&L scandal did result in increased regulations for banks, but how many smaller banking institutions went under because of it? Over 1,000. Like Thomas Jefferson said: "I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to liberty and freedom than standing armies".

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/09 23:03

OLB wrote:

I home teach a guy in my ward. He must be Airwolf's cousin, cause the guy always brings up things like how the Federal Reserve is illegal, Kennedy was shot by more than one person, 9/11 was an inside job, etc.

This guy lives on half truths and third rate books by discredited authors.

I love it when he brings up the "evilness" of the Federal Reserve. I patiently listen to him ramble on about some 18th century German goldsmith that came up with the idea to control countries by controlling their debt (ya, like the Medici family wasn't doing that centuries before) and that the Rockerfellers are the American agents charged with bring this system to the U.S.

At the end, I ask him four questions 1) "Did God create the United States of America so that the Gospel could be restored?" He always answers yes, as well he should.

Then I ask him, 2) "Do you believe that God has created the American society so that LDS missionaries could have the resources (i.e. \$\$\$) to go all around the world and preach the gospel." He used to answer yes to this until I asked him question 3 a few times.

3) Why, then, would God generate wealth for his true believers through evil institutions like the Federal Reserve? At first he couldn't answer this question, now he just says that my "premise" is all wrong.

4) Then I say "maybe the Federal Reserve is unconstitutional. But it has, for the most part, worked over the past 90 plus years. We now live in the wealthiest society ever known to mankind." At this point he just talks about gay marriage and porn, and how they are indicators of a decaying society.

Airwolf, the fact is you are insane and should be committed to a mental health facility. This is not a joke. Anyone that believes in the North American Union, 9/11 conspiracies, etc. should be taken out of society. They have no net benefit or add anything of value to our society.

Do you honestly think that the Lord interferes with the financial health or well-being of the United States?:laugh:

By the way, the plan for a North American Union is real (look it up for crying out loud - even Lou Dobbs on CNN is outraged about it) and yes, 9/11 was much more than an old man in a cave on dialysis and 19 Arabs (8 of whom are still alive) with boxcutters... sorry, but you have to be a complete idiot to believe the government's fairy tale.

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by bengel - 2008/02/09 23:26

imuakahuku wrote:

penncougar wrote:

I was first made aware of the illegality of income taxes from a crazy old guy on my mission, who had actually gone so far as to revoke his own citizenship and forfeit his social security number so the government couldn't track what he did.

I think a very small percentage of Americans are aware of this, and it is in my opinion, one of the great but necessary scams of our time. However, we are all sheep and although I understand the scam of it, I continue to pay out of fear of punishment more than anything. I would like to see someone challenge this amendment today but refusing to pay taxes and actually argue their point successfully and win. Until that happens, we all will continue to pay and will continue to abide by a system that, although necessary, doesn't correspond with what the constitution says.

Obviously when they wrote the constitution it wasn't perfect and they didn't foresee all the stupid freedom of speech bullcrap and other things that people push today. Others have challenged those aspects of the constitution to their benefit in recent years, so its time for someone to challenge the income tax portions

Thats my challenge to you wolfie. You talk a big game but back it up by not paying your taxes this year

I am aware of two people that have challenged the fed income tax and won. I don't recall at the moment the premise or argument the first used, but the second guy (I'm pretty sure he was a lawyer - actually IIRC they were both lawyers), argued the premise that income is the same as profit and that because we trade our time, efforts, and skills, we are not profiting or drawing an income. That we are just exchanging our sweat for money. He was able to convince the court and beat the IRS. I listened to an interview he gave and it was pretty interesting. A pretty convincing guy. As for taxes, there does not to be some sort of tax system else the government would then be forced to compete in industry, charge individuals for services rendered, or constantly print money. As you can see the first and the third choices are VERY bad for us. The first would lead to unfair business practices in whatever industry they decide to compete and the third would lead to hyperinflation. Go to work at 8am and by noon you would have made enough to pay for a loaf of bread, hopefully. The second option has its own pitfalls but could possibly be done. There is one other thought for income and that would be from the money brought in by the fed. As you know it loans money to banks and receives it back with interest. That interest is then turned over to the treasury without ever being put on the books. In otherwords it is not recorded as an income (profit ;)) to the fed or to the treasury.

So if you want to take the IRS to court go ahead. I figure their record is probably something like 2319283 wins and 2 losses.

As an Administrative Law Judge at the Utah State Tax Commission, I often heard pronouncements like this. However, I never found a single opinion from any court in the United States upholding any such argument. The cases I found held the opposite.

I left the employ of the Tax Commission last September. Thinking things might have changed since then, I have just done an on-line search. Every case I pulled up holds the exact opposite. Things have not changed since last September.

Please, provide me a citation, or at least the name of the person who prevailed and the court ruling in his favor. I will be happy to take on a case against the IRS if I know I have case law to support me. I could become a very wealthy retired lawyer. However, I'm more likely to win the Publishers' Clearing House \$5,000 per week prize. The odds there are 1 in more than 505 million.

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/02/10 17:04

bengel wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

penncougar wrote:

I was first made aware of the illegality of income taxes from a crazy old guy on my mission, who had actually gone so far as to revoke his own citizenship and forfeit his social security number so the government couldn't track what he did.

I think a very small percentage of Americans are aware of this, and it is in my opinion, one of the great but necessary scams of our time. However, we are all sheep and although I understand the scam of it, I continue to pay out of fear of punishment more than anything. I would like to see someone challenge this amendment today but refusing to pay taxes and actually argue their point successfully and win. Until that happens, we all will continue to pay and will continue to abide by a system that, although necessary, doesn't correspond with what the constitution says.

Obviously when they wrote the constitution it wasn't perfect and they didn't foresee all the stupid freedom of speech bullcrap and other things that people push today. Others have challenged those aspects of the constitution to their benefit in recent years, so its time for someone to challenge the income tax portions

Thats my challenge to you wolfie. You talk a big game but back it up by not paying your taxes this year

I am aware of two people that have challenged the fed income tax and won. I don't recall at the moment the premise or argument the first used, but the second guy (I'm pretty sure he was a lawyer - actually IIRC they were both lawyers), argued the premise that income is the same as profit and that because we trade our time, efforts, and skills, we are not profiting or drawing an income. That we are just exchanging our sweat for money. He was able to convince the court and beat the IRS. I listened to an interview he gave and it was pretty interesting. A pretty convincing guy. As for taxes, there does not to be some sort of tax system else the government would then be forced to compete in industry, charge individuals for services rendered, or constantly print money. As you can see the first and the third choices are VERY bad for us. The first would lead to unfair business practices in whatever industry they decide to compete and the third would lead to hyperinflation. Go to work at 8am and by noon you would have made enough to pay for a loaf of bread, hopefully. The second option has its own pitfalls but could possibly be done. There is one other thought for income and that would be from the money brought in by the fed. As you know it loans money to banks and receives it back with interest. That interest is then turned over to the treasury without ever being put on the books. In otherwords it is not recorded as an income (profit ;) to the fed or to the treasury.

So if you want to take the IRS to court go ahead. I figure their record is probably something like 2319283 wins and 2 losses.

As an Administrative Law Judge at the Utah State Tax Commission, I often heard pronouncements like this. However, I never found a single opinion from any court in the United States upholding any such argument. The cases I found held the opposite.

I left the employ of the Tax Commission last September. Thinking things might have changed since then, I have just done an on-line search. Every case I pulled up holds the exact opposite. Things have not changed since last September.

Please, provide me a citation, or at least the name of the person who prevailed and the court ruling in his favor. I will be happy to take on a case against the IRS if I know I have case law to support me. I could become a very wealthy retired lawyer. However, I'm more likely to win the Publishers' Clearing House \$5,000 per week prize. The odds there are 1 in more than 505 million.

Rent the DVD 'America: Freedom to Fascism' and you'll see just who's challenged the constitutionality of the income tax... and won. I don't believe any of the victors in the cases where juries found the defendant not guilty were publicized. I can tell you this much... many IRS employees quit working for the agency when they discovered the unconstitutionality and fraud that is the tax on our labor and the fact that it is ultimately controlled and regulated by the Central Bank. As a matter of fact, a few of these former IRS employees are the very ones who ended up with a not guilty verdict for not filing their income taxes. I'm not kidding... watch this DVD and you'll learn that the IRS considers it a 'voluntary contribution':.laugh:

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of you

Posted by kiwibacon - 2008/02/11 19:37

Airwolf84 wrote:

OLB wrote:

I home teach a guy in my ward. He must be Airwolf's cousin, cause the guy always brings up things like how the Federal Reserve is illegal, Kennedy was shot by more than one person, 9/11 was an inside job, etc.

This guy lives on half truths and third rate books by discredited authors.

I love it when he brings up the "evilness" of the Federal Reserve. I patiently listen to him ramble on about some 18th century German goldsmith that came up with the idea to control countries by controlling their debt (ya, like the Medici family wasn't doing that centuries before) and that the Rockefeller's are the American agents charged with bring this system to the U.S.

At the end, I ask him four questions 1) "Did God create the United States of America so that the Gospel could be restored?" He always answers yes, as well he should.

Then I ask him, 2) "Do you believe that God has created the American society so that LDS missionaries could have the resources (i.e. \$\$\$) to go all around the world and preach the gospel." He used to answer yes to this until I asked him question 3 a few times.

3) Why, then, would God generate wealth for his true believers through evil institutions like the Federal Reserve? At first

he couldn't answer this question, now he just says that my "premise" is all wrong.

4) Then I say "maybe the Federal Reserve is unconstitutional. But it has, for the most part, worked over the past 90 plus years. We now live in the wealthiest society ever known to mankind." At this point he just talks about gay marriage and porn, and how they are indicators of a decaying society.

Airwolf, the fact is you are insane and should be committed to a mental health facility. This is not a joke. Anyone that believes in the North American Union, 9/11 conspiracies, etc. should be taken out of society. They have no net benefit or add anything of value to our society.

Do you honestly think that the Lord interferes with the financial health or well-being of the United States?:laugh:I do and here is my thought process. (Mind you if you are not a practicing member of the Church you will think like airwolf that God has no interest in the "physical,emotional,and spiritual" well being of those that possess the land we live in. God has promised over and over again that the people that possess "the land of promise", as referred to in the Book of Mormon, will prosper in the land as long as they live the commandments of God. The recorded history that we have will reflect this really well. Both religious and secular records.

It is actually a common theme in the Book of Mormon. Whoever lives in the "promised land" will "prosper in the land" as long as they live by certain standards.

..."And inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments, ye shall prosper, and shall be led to a land of promise; yea, even a land which I have prepared for you; yea, a land which is choice above all other lands."...

..."And now, when I, Nephi, had heard these words, I remembered the words of the Lord which he spake unto me in the wilderness, saying that: Inasmuch as thy seed shall keep my commandments, they shall prosper in the land of promise."...

If you want to be stupid and argue that "prosper" in the context of the Book of Mormon in those scriptures does not mean financial/monetary or material gain then I will quote the following:

..."And the Lord began again to take the curse from off the land, and the house of Emer did prosper exceedingly under the reign of Emer; and in the space of sixty and two years they had become exceedingly strong, insomuch that they became exceedingly rich having all manner of fruit, and of grain, and of silks, and of fine linen, and of gold, and of silver, and of precious things"...

..."and they have been prospered until they are rich in all manner of things. And they did prosper exceedingly, and they became exceedingly rich, yea, and they did multiply and wax strong in the land"...

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by Oakley-ite - 2008/02/11 20:00

Please, Please, Please.... TALK ABOUT FOOTBALL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by BreedDud - 2008/02/12 08:01

Oakley-ite wrote:

Please, Please, Please.... TALK ABOUT FOOTBALL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!...on the football forum that is what is happening...if you don't want to read this then don't. No one is forcing you to read this thread.:dry:

=====

Re:Thought this might be of interest to some of yo

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 08:56

bengel wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

penncougar wrote:

I was first made aware of the illegality of income taxes from a crazy old guy on my mission, who had actually gone so far as to revoke his own citizenship and forfeit his social security number so the government couldn't track what he did.

I think a very small percentage of Americans are aware of this, and it is in my opinion, one of the great but necessary scams of our time. However, we are all sheep and although I understand the scam of it, I continue to pay out of fear of punishment more than anything. I would like to see someone challenge this amendment today but refusing to pay taxes and actually argue their point successfully and win. Until that happens, we all will continue to pay and will continue to abide by a system that, although necessary, doesn't correspond with what the constitution says.

Obviously when they wrote the constitution it wasn't perfect and they didn't foresee all the stupid freedom of speech bullcrap and other things that people push today. Others have challenged those aspects of the constitution to their benefit in recent years, so its time for someone to challenge the income tax portions

Thats my challenge to you wolfie. You talk a big game but back it up by not paying your taxes this year

I am aware of two people that have challenged the fed income tax and won. I don't recall at the moment the premise or argument the first used, but the second guy (I'm pretty sure he was a lawyer - actually IIRC they were both lawyers), argued the premise that income is the same as profit and that because we trade our time, efforts, and skills, we are not profitting or drawing an income. That we are just exchanging our sweat for money. He was able to convince the court and beat the IRS. I listened to an interview he gave and it was pretty interesting. A pretty convincing guy. As for taxes, there does not to be some sort of tax system else the government would then be forced to compete in industry, charge individuals for services rendered, or constantly print money. As you can see the first and the third choices are VERY bad for us. The first would lead to unfair business practices in whatever industry they decide to compete and the third would lead to hyperinflation. Go to work at 8am and by noon you would have made enough to pay for a loaf of bread, hopefully. The second option has its own pitfalls but could possibly be done. There is one other thought for income and that would be from the money brought in by the fed. As you know it loans money to banks and receives it back with interest. That interest is then turned over to the treasury without ever being put on the books. In otherwords it is not recorded as an income (profit ;)) to the fed or to the treasury.

So if you want to take the IRS to court go ahead. I figure their record is probably something like 2319283 wins and 2 losses.

As an Administrative Law Judge at the Utah State Tax Commission, I often heard pronouncements like this. However, I never found a single opinion from any court in the United States upholding any such argument. The cases I found held the opposite.

I left the employ of the Tax Commission last September. Thinking things might have changed since then, I have just done an on-line search. Every case I pulled up holds the exact opposite. Things have not changed since last September.

Please, provide me a citation, or at least the name of the person who prevailed and the court ruling in his favor. I will be happy to take on a case against the IRS if I know I have case law to support me. I could become a very wealthy retired lawyer. However, I'm more likely to win the Publishers' Clearing House \$5,000 per week prize. The odds there are 1 in more than 505 million.

His arguments were

"There are three points that are important," he told WND. "There's no law making the average working man liable , there's no law or regulation that allows the IRS to contend that earnings are 100 percent profit received in exchange for nothing, and the right to earn a living through any lawful occupation is a constitutionally protected fundamental right, and it is exempt from taxation.

How about

Tom Cryer

http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=59515

http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=56855

Here is his brief

http://www.truthattack.org/cryer_MEMORANDUM.pdf

Maybe you can make a buck or two from it's arguements. Good luck!

=====