



## POLICE-STATE ASSAULT

WHERE IS OUR SENSE OF OUTRAGE?

By: Tom Rose

As I write, there is an on-going tragedy taking place. Heavily armed, camouflaged federal marshals, state police, and local police are laying siege on the home of Ed and Elaine Brown in Plainfield, New Hampshire.

A number of thoughts cross my mind:

Is this a microcosm replay of the mass police-state murder by the FBI at Waco, Texas (1993)? or of a similar Federal assault on Randy and Vicki Weaver's home in Ruby Ridge, Idaho (1992) in which Vicki was murdered? Or both? What is the *real* reason behind this assault? Is it true that Ed and Elaine Brown are really law breakers, as the Feds claim? Should they peacefully surrender as the federal marshal demands? Or, are Ed and Elaine bravely engaging in a battle for freedom that every red-blooded American should also be actively participating in?

If you are like the large majority of Americans, you no doubt suffer from an on-going, nation-wide problem – the problem of news blackout combined with official disinformation. In my home we don't subscribe to standard news media publications, nor do we listen to the so-called "news" broadcasted over the radio or television networks. We get most pertinent news over the as-yet uncontrolled internet and from carefully selected "politically incorrect" publications. The result is that we find ourselves always up to date on crucial issues, and we have factual information on which to make decisions. My purpose in writing about this on-going police-state assault at the Browns' home is to bring to light some very important facts that are unknown by most Americans.

When the Browns' case of "failure to pay income taxes" went to court, they did not have one chance in ten thousand of winning. Why? Because the cards were *already* stacked against them! How so? There are a number of reasons:

First of all, our American courts have been quietly *stolen* from the people because the people are no longer in control of them. Why not? Because jury members are now denied their historic right to judge *both* the facts and the law. This historic point of law, which came to America from Britain, is known as *Jury Nullification*. It reserves to juries the power to declare a defendant "innocent" if they believe the law is being applied unjustly or too harshly – or if the jury members during their deliberations find *any* reason to question the law. In effect, **with jury nullification, the law is always open for question:** Is

the law too complicated for ordinary citizens to understand? Is the law unfairly applied to ensnare "little fish" while the "big fish" are allowed to escape? And, in the particular case of the so-called "income tax law," was the Sixteenth Amendment *properly* ratified, as it was declared to be by Secretary of State Philander Knox in February of 1913? [Note: It was not! See: *The Law That Never Was*, by Bill Benson.]

Readers can very well understand that court judges especially, but also attorneys, who are subservient members of the court, are frightened by the very term *Jury Nullification*! Why? Because it threatens their monopoly control of what was meant to be the People's Court. I mention this because it is *very important* for us to understand something: Our American court system *belongs to the people*. *Judges only preside in court*. *It is much more important for the reign of freedom in America that the jury be in a position to judge the law than for the judge to do so!* Our once easy-to-understand system of Common Law has been insidiously wrested from the people through development of the Universal Commercial Code. Under the U.C.C. (with the "yellow fringed flag" that is posted in the courtroom), our court system has become a quagmire of complicated legalistic protocol that ordinary people cannot navigate in. The result is that most individuals are forced to hire high-priced attorneys who are trained in law school how to follow the complicated court procedures.

It is this kind of court that the Browns were ensnared in and which they refused to attend to receive their "sentencing" after being judged "guilty" by the jury. But remember this: The jury had been carefully instructed by the judge that they were limited to consider only "the facts" of the case; and only he was wise enough and smart enough to consider the all-important matter of "the law."

Let me digress to make a point: Not long ago I was invited to serve on the jury at the County Court House in Mercer, Pennsylvania. While the process of choosing /rejecting jurors was going on, the judge called me to the bench. I had written on my juror card that I believed that jurors have the right and duty to consider "both the facts and the law." Neither the judge nor the attorneys like that, so the judge asked if I would be willing to forego my claim. I stated that I would not, and that I would explain why if the judge was so inclined. He agreed, so this is what I told him:

Sir, we live in the State of Pennsylvania which was founded by William Penn. Years before William Penn came to America, he was arrested in Britain for preaching the Gospel of Christ, which at that time was an illegal act for an unlicensed person to do; and the penalty was death. But some members of the jury felt that the death penalty for preaching the Gospel was too severe, and they refused to render a "guilty" verdict, even though they were subjected to severe threats of punishment. In short, they applied the legal principle of "Jury Nullification." And the result was that William Penn survived the ordeal to found this State of Pennsylvania. Thus, for many, many years juries in America were recognized as having the power and the right to consider both the facts and the law in performing their court duties.

When I finished, the judge replied with a slight show of irritation, "Well, today in the State of Pennsylvania, it is the judge who considers the law, not the jury!" For the rest of the week, every time my name came up to serve on a jury, the judge smiled at me and pleasantly said, "Mr. Rose, we will excuse you!" Maxim: "Those also serve who stand and wait!"

But the matter of "Jury Nullification" isn't all that we need to be concerned about!:

The fact that the Sixteenth Amendment was *not* properly ratified, and is therefore not legally in force, has been proven by Mr. Benson's masterly research in the 48 contiguous State Capitals which made up the Union in 1913; but the courts refuse to consider "the facts." Instead, they declare the issue to be a *political* matter for *the Congress* to handle. But our evasive politicians say that the Amendment question is something the Judicial Department should handle. This confusing "merry-go-round" thus opens the door to yet *another confusing matter* about which the large majority of Americans are completely uninformed:

Here we come across the indisputable fact that the IRS Code is purposely riddled through with dubiously confusing terms in different sections of the code concerning *who is legally subject to filing a 1040 tax return*, and *who is legally subject to paying the alleged income tax*! Confusing? You bet! I have attended "income tax seminars" in which lecturers have meticulously shown conflicting and confusing terms contained in the IRS Codes. One lecturer, whom I will not name, successfully defended many clients in court against IRS "judgments" by explaining to juries the internal contradictions in the IRS Codes. He was able to "best" the IRS agents every time!\* But since then judges now make a standard practice of refusing to allow such pertinent testimony in court. Questions: How can a person get a fair trial in a tax court if such factual information is perniciously disallowed by tyrannical [law-breaking] judges? Does this help us to understand why the Browns refused to appear at court for sentencing? You bet it does! When our courts become lawless, what else is to be done? [\*Note: The gentleman I referred to above is now in a federal prison on what clearly appears to be trumped-up charges, which is reminiscent of the trumped-up charges made against Congressman George Hansen of Idaho, who was elected to serve seven terms, in office. Vindictive treatment of Mr. Hansen by federal marshals who illegally and unconstitutionally forced him on a constant series of "diesel runs" from prison to prison destroyed his health. He was later declared innocent by the U.S. Supreme Court! Yes, we are dealing with nasty people!]

But, there is still more!:

Few Americans are aware of the disturbing fact that the IRS has secret off-budget "slush funds" that IRS agents can use to make "cash awards" to certain entities who assist the IRS in securing court judgments against IRS targets! How many judges, juries, and others have been "bought off" by the IRS, and what amounts of money have been illicitly paid to such crooked judges and other persons will never be known! But this brings us to this all-important question: How is it possible, in the face of such systemic corruption in our income tax system, our legal system, and our judicial system, for a person to get a fair trial in America today?

Answer: It's almost impossible!

Turning back to the Brown case. Ed and Elaine Brown say, "Show us the law, and we will pay!" But the IRS has *not* shown them the alleged law that supposedly requires the Browns to file and pay an income tax. So the court will not force the IRS to do so because the judge knows that the IRS is *incapable* of doing so. This explains why the Browns claim the Feds have no legal jurisdiction to charge them regarding a law that does not exist. I, for one, believe they are right!

Has the judge been bought off? Who knows? Cash funds are hard to trace. "*Who knows what evil lurks in the hearts of men? The Shadow knows!*" was the introductory opening of a scary evening radio show [before television] that we used to listen to when I was a little boy. If the Shadow were alive

**BLOCKBUSTER Online™**

**THE LATEST DVDS**

DELIVERED RIGHT TO YOUR MAILBOX



- NO LATE FEES
- NO DUE DATES
- MORE THAN 40,000 TITLES
- FREE SHIPPING

**\$9.99**

for the first month

▶ Try it NOW!

today, what well-hidden truths might he reveal today? The Browns claim that they are fighting for the rights of all Americans, and I believe this too! The question is: When will enough stalwart Americans join them in the fight for freedom so that freedom can be restored in our once-great republic?

In closing, let me quote the following which came to me via [www.infowars.com](http://www.infowars.com):

While Proud US citizens and New Hampshire residents Ed and Elaine Brown, who have refused to pay unlawful incomes taxes, currently have federal SWAT teams hiding in the woods around their property with armored vehicles and helicopters ready to conduct a military style raid on them, 12 million illegal aliens who have already violated the law are set to be given a total tax amnesty.

If US citizens do not pay taxes, which are unlawful anyway, an amnesty might enable them to avoid penalties and interest. However, they still have to pay any amount due in back axes. By contrast, the immigration reform bill [now in Congress] rewards each and every illegal alien with permanent US residence and totally erases any back payments.

The Feds can use guns, tanks, planes and drones against a peaceful, self-sustaining elderly couple who simply want to be left alone but they can't manage to protect the borders and are getting ready to grant tax amnesty to millions of illegal aliens [Steve Watson].

### **What to do:**

Think on these things, fellow Americans, and follow your heart! Also, ask God to protect the Browns and others who are fighting to restore freedom in America!

"Published originally at EtherZone.com : republication allowed with this notice and hyperlink intact."

**[Mail this article to a friend\(s\) in two clicks!](#)**

---

Tom Rose is retired professor of Economics at Grove City College, PA. He is author of eight books and hundreds of articles on free-market economics. He is a regular columnist for Ether Zone.

Tom Rose may be reached at: [tomgrose@embarqmail.com](mailto:tomgrose@embarqmail.com).

We invite you to visit his website at: [www.biblicaleconomics.com](http://www.biblicaleconomics.com).

Published in the June 13, 2007 issue of Ether Zone.

Copyright © 1997 - 2007 [Ether Zone](#).

**[We invite your comments on this article in our forum!](#)**

