INCOME TAX AMENDMENT (#16) Was Never Ratified!

August 30, 2016 – Statement of EDWARD C NOONAN, 2016 Presidential Candidate:

Donald Trump on his campaign webpage states that he will change the following:

**Tax reform**-
- Reduce dramatically the income tax.
- We will simplify the income tax from 7 brackets to 3 brackets.

This shows that Mr. Trump is unfamiliar with the 20 YEAR OLD PROOF that the 16th Amendment is totally corrupt and unconstitutional. The 16th Amendment (Income tax) supposedly completed the ratification process on Feb 3, 1913. However the 16th Amendment was never constitutionally ratified by 3/4th needed from the 48 states. Yet it magically achieved a "FINAL ratification" on February 8, 1913. (See Newspaper article next page.)

And on the following page, you will read where the original intent of the Democrats was to “tax the corporations” and the 16th Amendment was merely to pay for the war efforts. However, they could not get enough of the states to ratify it so they cheated and lied (as usual)!
BIG INCOMES TO BE TAXED.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ADDED TO CONSTITUTION.

With Ratification by 38 States, Sixteenth Extra Section is Now Part of Fundamental Law of the Land—It Provides for Direct Taxes on Earnings of Citizens of Any State, Without Reference to Population – Bill Embodying Proposal Will be Introducet at Special Session of Next Congress.

Washington, Feb 3. Direct taxes on the incomes of citizens of the United States, whether derived from idle capital or from the conduct of business, were made possible today by ratification of the 16th amendment to the federal constitution. Delaware Wyoming and New Mexico in endorsed the Income tax amendment through their respective legislatures, completing a list of 38 States that have approved it, two more than the three-fourths necessary for its final adoption. [big lie #1]

Following is the list of States which ratified the income tax amendment: Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine. Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Louisiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Wyoming. (NOTE: Only 37 states are listed here)

The following rejected it: Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Utah. No action, or only partial action, was taken in the eight other States.

Leaders in congress predicted tonight that through this authorization the law which will be passed to levy the tax upon American incomes will be introduced as soon as the extra session opens. Its exact terms have not been decided upon, but it is believed it will exempt all incomes below $4,000 or $5,000 and will provide a tax of 1 per cent upon the majority of personal incomes that do not run to an excessive figure.

Informal notice of the final adoption of the new amendment was given to the Senate by Senator Brown of Nebraska, who introduced the proposal for an income tax was submitted to the States. Drafting of the bill to put the tax in effect, it is expected, will fall to the lot of Representative Hull of Tennessee, a member of the house ways and means committee, who drew the excise tax bill proposed last year by the Democratic house, but which did not become law.

The following rejected it: Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Utah. No action, or only partial action, was taken in the eight other States.

Leaders in congress predicted tonight that through this authorization the law which will be passed to levy the tax upon American incomes will be introduced as soon as the extra session opens. Its exact terms have not been decided upon, but it is believed it will exempt all incomes below $4,000 or $5,000 and will provide a tax of 1 per cent upon the majority of personal incomes that do not run to an excessive figure.

Informal notice of the final adoption of the new amendment was given to the Senate by Senator Brown of Nebraska, who introduced the proposal for an income tax was submitted to the States. Drafting of the bill to put the tax in effect, it is expected, will fall to the lot of Representative Hull of Tennessee, a member of the house ways and means committee, who drew the excise tax bill proposed last year by the Democratic house, but which did not become law.

The income tax will be designed to supplant the present corporation tax and will apply to the incomes of incomes of individuals, firms and corporations. In a statement tonight, Representative Hull declared he favored making the new tax an integral part of the financial system of the United States to remain in full force without regard to the character of tariff bills that congress may enact from time to time.

One feature, which is believed will be included in the law, will be provision for “collecting at the source” of the income. This feature, now in operation in England, would require firms to certify to amounts they pay individuals in salaries or fees or pay the tax direct to the government it is believed this would remove much complaint that might be made if the government had to investigate every citizen’s income and would prevent evasion of law.

The annual amount that the government may realize under the income tax is estimated by Democratic leaders in congress at approximately $100,000,000. This would include the $20,000,000 collected under the present corporation tax.
“One of the important results of an income tax,” said Representative Hull, “will be the curbing of unnecessary federal expenditures. When a great part of the government’s income is derived by a direct tax upon the citizens of the nation they will scrutinize more carefully the appropriations made by congress.”

Probably it will remain for President-elect Wilson to make official announcement of the Income tax amendment to the constitution.

To date the State department has received notices of approval by the legislatures of only 14 States. West Virginia, Delaware, Wyoming and New Mexico not having reported on their action. The department can not act upon anything less than the official certificate of the governors and secretary of State.

Even when all of the certificates are at hand, the executive will not be in a position formally to announce that fact. In a matter of this importance, it is necessary to move with extreme caution and Secretary Knox, the custodian of the certificates, will refer them to the solicitor of the department of state for examination as to their sufficiency.

Already some questions have been raised as to the legality of the returns. One was in the case of Kentucky, where the legislature initially adopted the amendment. In advance of the receipt from Secretary Knox of the formal communication which should serve as a basis for a State’s action, In consequence of this haste, and the use of a newspaper clipping, the language of the enacting resolution was slightly erroneous. As soon as the error was discovered an attempt was made to correct it by reenaction, in consequence of this haste, which had raised the issue, it is recalled that Secretary Seward In 1868 practically referred to congress the question whether the 14th amendment had been properly ratified by the States because of some such irregularity.

It is probable that Secretary Knox will not announce the ratification of the amendment upon the basis of the returns but will await the receipt of certificates from some of the States which have not yet acted on the amendment, but are reasonably certain to do so favorably. In this case and allowing for the time required for a painstaking examination by the solicitor, it probably will be after the fourth of March before the president’s notice can issue of the addition of the income tax amendment. (end article)

As you can read from the news article above, the Democrats in 1909-1913 were as devious as they are now. Did you note that only 14 states had submitted papers?

Mr. Soetoro (aka BHO) (the illegal alien who occupies the white house) has set into motion plans to raise the total federal revenues to increase over $40 trillion over 10 years. The national debt when Soetoro became the illegal-alien-in-chief in January 2009, stood at $10.6 trillion. That means the debt will have very nearly doubled during his eight years in office, and there is much more debt ahead with the abandonment of “sequestration” spending caps enacted in 2011.

And it is clear that the Democrats of 1909-1913 also scammed the 16th Amendment before the States properly ratified the legislation. The nationallibertyalliance.org states: “The only record of the 16th Amendment having been confirmed was a proclamation made by the Secretary of State Philander Knox on February 25, 1913, wherein he simply declared it to be “in effect”, but never stating it was lawfully ratified.” And they say, Even if the 16th Amendment were properly ratified, according to Article 1, Section 9 of the Constitution, it has always been unconstitutional for the U.S. Federal Government to directly tax We the People in their property, wages, salaries, or earnings. The judges of the U.S. Supreme Court rejected any claims that the 16th Amendment changed the constitutional limits on direct taxes in Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R. Co., 240 U.S. 1, when they ruled that it “created no new power of taxation” and that it “did not change the constitutional limitations which forbid any direct taxation of individuals”.

The next news article show the courts only considered it to be a corporate tax:
COURT CLEARS PATH
RAISING INCOME TAX

DECIDES UNDERWOOD-SIMMONS LAW VALID.

Ruling of Highest Tribunal will Enable Country to Draw More Heavily on Fortunes of Very Rich.

Washington, Jan. 24...The income tax was declared constitutional today by the supreme court in a unanimous decision which swept aside every contention raised against it and, in contention the, opinion of congressional leaders, the way for increasing the tax rate on great fortunes to help pay for national defense.

Proposals are pending in congress to tax incomes of more than $1,000,000 as high as 50 per cent. Leaders on all sides agree that out of the impetus which the decision today will give such proposals is likely to come a definite, movement to levy on the revenues from great private fortunes for some of the millions the government must raise to carry out the army and navy increases.

"The supreme court's decision has absolutely unfettered the income tax as a source of revenue," said Representative Hull of Tennessee, author of the law. "All doubt is removed and congress left much, freer to act. I believe congress will take advantage of the opportunity to amend the law materially. Without any unusual or unjust changes it can be made to yield $185,000,000 to $195,000,000 a year, as against $85,000,000 or $90,000,000 at present."

To Increase Taxes.

Representative Hull is preparing amendments to carry the tax to incomes below $3 000 and make graded increases in surtaxes on incomes exceeding $20,000 a year.

So far the problem of raising the revenue for national defense, although approached from many angles has not been carried toward any definite solution because with the constitutionality of the income tax undecided administration leaders were reluctant to place too much dependence on it.

In its decision the supreme court construed for the first time the 16th amendment to the constitution, under which the tax is levied, and gave it the broadest interpretation possible.

The decision was announced by Chief Justice White. It was rendered in the appeal of Frank R. Brushaber from the action of the New York federal court in refusing to enjoin the Southern Pacific, of which Brushaber was a stockholder, from paying the tax.

The case raised substantially every point involved in all the five income tax cases before the court with the exception of the effect of the provision allowing mining corporations to make a 5 per cent deduction annually from gross income for depletion of mines.

This provision is regarded as being an amendment to the old corporation tax.

Within the Law.

The basic error of those who attacked the constitutionality of the tax, Chief Justice White held, was in regarding the 16th amendment as empowering the United States to levy a direct tax without apportionment among the states according to population. In substance the court held that the 16th amendment had not empowered the federal government to levy a new tax, but that "the whole purpose
of the amendment was to relieve all income taxes from a consideration of the source whence the income was derived."

Those opposing the tax had urged that the 16th amendment provided that income from "whatever source derived" should be taxed without regard to the apportionment among the States.

They argued that the Underwood-Simmons income tax provision by reason of exemptions of certain incomes from taxation had not come within the meaning of the amendment.

Chief Justice White said the power of the federal government to levy an income tax had never been questioned.[?]

Quoting at length from the famous tax decisions of 1895, he declared income that the court then recognized the fact that "taxation on income was in the nature of an excise entitled to be enforced as such unless and until it was concluded that to enforce it would amount to accomplishing the result which the requirement as to the apportionment of direct taxation was adopted to prevent, in which case the need would arise to disregard the form and consider the substance alone and hence subject the tax to regulation as to apportionment which as an excise would not apply to it." [SUPER SUPREME COURT GIBBERISH!!]

To Avoid Trouble.

The court then decided, he added, that the effect of the tax on the income from real estate was then as if a direct tax had been levied on the real estate and that it was with a view of obviating such questions that the amendment had been adopted.

Inasmuch as the amendment had not conferred the power to levy an income tax, said the chief justice, it could not be interpreted as embracing limitations as to the nature and character of income to be taxed. To consider it as embracing limitations, such as not authoring a progressive tax, he related, was irreconcilable with the purpose of the amendment. He explained that the uniformity of excise taxes required by the constitution was geographical uniformity of application as to classes.

The chief justice further held that the tax did not violate the "due process provision of the constitution" by imposing a higher rate of taxation on incomes above $20,000 than on those below that figure or by other provisions.

BILL BENTION VIDEOS: “THE 16TH AMENDMENT NEVER WAS RATIFIED!”

The Law That Never Was Interview with Author Bill Benson Part 1 of 6 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KR43liyeBjQ

The Law That Never Was Interview with Author Bill Benson Part 2 of 6 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hlwW4EjztxY

The Law That Never Was Interview with Author Bill Benson Part 3 of 6 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4eyN-WciNps

The Law That Never Was Interview with Author Bill Benson Part 4 of 6 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QiomI6A2680

The Law That Never Was Interview with Author Bill Benson Part 5 of 6 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t-fnUa9D3OQ

The Law That Never Was Interview with Author Bill Benson Part 6 of 6 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vmd_rMYW44U

The American Resistance Party has hereby proved that the 16th Amendment has never been properly ratified. And note please, that they attempted to count Ohio as a state, even though it was not actually part of the Union until 1953 (when President Dwight Eisenhower made it so, which is ex post facto, and unconstitutional).
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