

Clifford R. Eibeck

5885 SR 46 W. Harrison, IN. 47060-8328

Ph: 812-637-3978 • Fax: 812-637-0360 • e-mail: creibeck@fuse.net

March 7, 2005,

Hon. Connie Mack 111 Chairman
President's Advisor Panel on Tax Reform
C/o Shaw Pittman LLP
2300 N. Street NW
Washington, D. C. 20037-1128

Re: Income Tax Fraud

Dear Honorable Mr. Mack

In February of 1913, the then Secretary of State Philander Knox was not merely stating in Error, but was committing fraud when he falsely declared the 16th amendment had been ratified by the several states to the United States Congress. Not only did the present members of Congress commit perjury of their oath to defend and uphold the constitution of the United States, but every following empty suited hypocrite in the same office have made the mistakes

The Enormous size of the present code has been caused by Congresses over the years adding different paragraphs, trying to confuse every Judge, to rule in the I R S favor. But it didn't work in ten Cases. Copy of the ten cases attached.

Sincerely Yours



Clifford R. Eibeck

CC: Honorable Mike Pence Representative District 2, IN.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY
PANEL
ON FEDERAL TAX REFORM
2005 APR 21 A 10:44

The following are Court decisions which stand to this day



1. Our tax system is based on *voluntary* assessment and payment, not upon distraint (imposition of distress). Supreme Ct: *Flora v. U.S.* 362 U.S. 145, 4L ed 2nd 623, 80S Ct 630
2. Under our system, the people who are (in England) called subjects, are here the **sovereign**. (sovereign: having supreme rank, power, and authority, dominion above all others) U.S. v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196 at 208; and "The People of a State are entitled to all rights which formerly belonged to the King (of England) by his prerogative." *Lansing v. Smith*, (1829) 4 Wend. 9.20
3. The People, or the Sovereign are not bound by general words in Statutes, which would restrict prerogative right, title, or interest, unless expressly named. The People v. Herkimer 15 Am Dec 379, 4 Cowen (N.Y. 345, 348 (1825)
4. In common usage, the term "Person" does NOT include the sovereign. U.S. v. Fox, 94 U.S. 315
5. The government has no inherent sovereignty within the 50 union states... and Congress can exercise no power which the sovereign people have not entrusted to it: all else is excluded. *Julliard v. Greenman*, 110 U.S. 421
6. Prior to the adoption of the federal Constitution, states possessed unlimited and unrestricted sovereignty and retained the same ever afterward. *Blair v. Ridgely*, 97 D. 218,249. S.P.
7. Governments do not GRANT rights, for they are unalienable rights which cannot be bartered away, given away, or taken away... government can only secure those rights. *Butchers Union Co. v. Crescent City Co.*, 111 U.S. 746, at 756-757
8. The right to labor and to its protection from unlawful interference is a constitutional as well as a common-law right. 48 Am Jur 2d, sec. 2, pg 80
9. The property which every man has is his own labor, as it is the foundation of all other property, so it is the most sacred and inviolable (same as 7 above)
10. Legislature can name any *Privilege* a taxable privilege and tax it by any means **other than an income tax**, but legislature cannot name something to be a taxable privilege unless it is first a privilege(not a right). The right to receive income or earnings *is a right* belonging to every person, and realization and receipt of income is therefore NOT a "privilege that can be taxed". *Jack Cole Co. v. MacFarland*, 337 S.W.2d 453, Tenn. What has been said? That you are NOT one who is subject to the Internal Revenue Code, unless you choose to be and volunteer! When you do that, you step out from under your constitutionally protected rights, on to a whole new playing feild... one where you have no rights, only privileges