

visited 4/6/2009

[Home](#)[The Man](#)[News & Events](#)[Letters](#)[IRS Loses!](#)[How Our
Laws are Made](#)[State
Constitutions](#)[IRS Pocket
Commission](#)[Buy BOOKS
& DISCS](#)[Contact Us](#)

On January 10, 2008, the Federal District Court in Chicago issued a [permanent injunction](#) against me on the grounds that I was falsely telling people the 16th Amendment was not ratified. The Court refused to look at the evidence of the non-ratification of the 16th Amendment, deciding that the facts necessary to prove my statement was true were "irrelevant." What has America come to when the government can accuse you of lying and prohibit you from presenting a defense in a so called court of law? My attorney, Jeffrey A. Dickstein, will be filing an appeal to the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals. I urge you to [review the pleadings](#) filed in this case so you can see for yourself the tyranny being practiced in our courts.

The Premise

The authority of the federal government to collect its income tax depends upon the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the federal income tax amendment, which was allegedly ratified in 1913. After a year of extensive research, [Bill Benson](#) discovered that the 16th Amendment was not ratified by the required 3/4 of the states, but

visited 4/6/2009

nevertheless Secretary of State Philander Knox fraudulently announced ratification.

Text of the 16th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America:

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



[Watch the Benson Video](#)

The ongoing litigation in U.S. v Benson is a fight for all of us, but it's a fight that's very expensive. Funds are desperately needed to carry the case to its conclusion, which could include an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Send a donation today to help with the overwhelming costs that fighting the federal government incurs. Click [here](#) to learn how.

Bill would like to thank those who've contributed or shown support in the fight against fraudulent taxation.

LISTEN TO THE BRILLIANCE OF ATTORNEY JEFFREY DICKSTEIN BEFORE THE 7TH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, IN U.S. v BENSON. PASS IT ON!

30 minutes of fascinating audio, click [here](#) to listen.

SHERRY JACKSON CONVICTED, UNDER WHAT LAW?

visited 4/6/2009

Sherry Jackson convicted, click [here](#) for the full story.

CHECK OUT ALL THESE TAX CHEATS!

Talk about the tax cheats and tax protestors. Here they are read and ask questions, write to these departments to find out why they believe that they are above the law. Click [here](#) for the list!

ALL OF THE BRIEFS FILED IN THE BENSON CASE!

Check out Jeffrey A Dickstein's website and make a donation for the on going historic litigation in Federal Court in Chicago, IL. www.JeffDickstein.com.

THE NEW BRIEF—BENSON'S REPLY. READ THE LATEST!

Jeffrey A Dickstein, counsel for Bill Benson, submits Benson's reply to the government's brief in opposition to his motion to strike. Read the brief by clicking [here](#).

THE BRIEF—BENSON'S MOVE TO STRIKE!

Jeffrey A Dickstein, counsel for Bill Benson, submits a new brief to strike down key government responses. Read the brief by clicking [here](#).

THE BRIEF—LOCAL RULE 56.1

The Government responds to Bill Benson's Local Rule 56.1

Statement of Material Facts. Read the brief by clicking [here](#).

THE BRIEF—LOCAL RULE 56

Benson's points and authorities in support of his motion to strike and motion to have facts deemed admitted.

Read the brief by clicking [here](#).

visited 4/6/2009

THE BRIEF—THE GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Read the brief by clicking [here](#).

THE ARTICLE—THE JUDGE!

Devyv Kidd writes how the Judge in the Benson case ignores the Seventh Circuit Ruling. Read the news article by clicking [here](#).

THE BRIEF—THE LAW OF OPPOSITION.

Jeffrey A Dickstein, counsel for Bill Benson, submits his memorandum of Law in Opposition to the United States. Read the brief by clicking [here](#).

[Click Here To Read More Briefs and Articles](#)

The Discovery

Article V of the U.S. Constitution specifies the ratification process, and requires 3/4 of the States to ratify any amendment proposed by Congress. There were 48 States in the American Union in 1913, meaning that affirmative action of 36 states was required for ratification. In February, 1913, Secretary of State Philander Knox issued a proclamation claiming that 38 states had ratified the amendment.

In 1984, William J. Benson began a research project, never before performed, to investigate the process of ratification of the 16th Amendment. After traveling to the capitols of the New England states, and reviewing the journals of the state legislative bodies, he saw that many states had not ratified the Amendment. Continuing his research at the National Archives in Washington, DC, Bill Benson discovered his [Golden](#)

visited 4/6/2009

[Key](#). This damning piece of evidence is a 16 page memorandum from the Solicitor of the Department of State, whose duty is the provision of legal opinions for the use of the Secretary of State. In this memorandum sent to the Secretary of State, the Solicitor of the Department of State lists the many errors he found in the ratification process!

The 4 states listed below are among the 38 states that Philander Knox claimed ratification from.

- The Kentucky Senate voted upon the resolution, but rejected it by a vote of 9 in favor and 22 opposed.
- The Oklahoma Senate amended the language of the 16th Amendment to have a precisely opposite meaning.
- The California legislative assembly never recorded any vote upon any proposal to adopt the amendment proposed by Congress.
- The State of Minnesota sent nothing to the Secretary of State in Washington.

When his year long project was finished at the end of 1984, Bill had visited every state capitol and knew that not a single state had actually and legally ratified the proposal to amend the Constitution. 33 states engaged in the unauthorized activity of amending the language of the amendment proposed by congress, a power the states do not possess. Since 36 states were needed for ratification, the failure of 13 to ratify would be fatal to the amendment, and this occurs within the major (first three) defects tabulated in [Defects in Ratification of the 16th Amendment](#). Even if we were to ignore defects of spelling, capitalization, and punctuation, we would still

visited 4/6/2009

have only 2 states which successfully ratified.

For technical problems with this site, contact: [Site Admin](#)
Copyright©1999-2006 Constitutional Research and Associates. All Rights Reserved.