

=====

littlehammer's
Weekly Tax Exempt Newsletter
with
Questions and Answers
and
Conference Call Reminder

Copyright (except quotations) © 2000, 2001 by Paul Leinthall

=====

Tuesday, October 30, 2001

- [1] Welcome: Getting Better and Better
- [2] Questions and Answers: Desires Direct Evidence that This Works
- [3] News Briefs & Comments: The Way of the Warrior
- [4] Conference Call Reminder: **Wed, October 31st, 9pm EST, 1-305-503-1874, Pin 940**
- [5] Contact Information, Legal Notice & Notice of Copyright explanation.

In this section (below), I explain why I use the bracketed phrases [THE COMPANY] and [THE FOUNDER] to refer to the founder and his company, who achieve the 100% effective results of having the IRS change their internal records to reflect the fact that each client is exempt from income taxes on any income, regardless of amount or source, unless the source of the income is the federal government itself or a trade or business under the sovereign jurisdiction of the government. [THE COMPANY] accomplishes this fully (and only) in accord with the Internal Revenue Code, and thus, none of their clients ever experience adverse IRS confrontation or court proceedings. (I also explain how to "unsubscribe" to this newsletter in this section).

=====

[1] Welcome

=====

Dear Friends,

As most of you know, [THE COMPANY] had their annual training meeting with [THE FOUNDER] two weeks ago. I wish I could convey the full flavor of those three days to you here, in the newsletter. There is no way I can give the seminar a fair treatment, so I'll just touch on a few things that stood out to me, as I sit to write this week's edition.

When I first heard of [THE COMPANY], the first impression I had was that they had a "silver bullet" which simply took care of the IRS. While what [THE COMPANY] does definitely does take care of the IRS, I realize more and more that it's not because what they do is a simple silver bullet. Even though a lot of what they do is "generic" (meaning it applies to everyone), it remains the case that what [THE COMPANY] does is unique to each single client, and this become much more the case when [THE COMPANY] has to engage in dialogue with the IRS regarding any client.

The processes [THE COMPANY] uses are ever evolving and changing; but they only change when EITHER the law, itself, changes, OR when the way the taxing agencies change the way they INTERPRET the law, but [THE COMPANY] only and always is dealing with the distinction of what the IRS' own law says a client's true tax status is.

The interesting thing, [THE FOUNDER] said, is that no court case has ever resolved the real issue of "taxpayer vs. non-taxpayer". While the courts render decisions in the cases that come before them, the actual decision in each income tax case is ALWAYS on some side issue, and has never been on the core issue.

I know I've had some folks in the past express concern about whether [THE COMPANY] actually has a certified mail return green card receipt in the case of every filing for every client. While it's obviously desirable to have the proper green card attached to each file, it's not always been the case. HOWEVER, not to worry, on two accounts: First, the IRS, by law, is held to the TIMING of the POSTMARK, and NOT when the IRS receives any document, even if the document took 20 years to get to them. This coincides with the information I've tried to occasionally convey in this newsletter, that it's the fact of LAW that the IRS deals with, and many of their supposed time-limits are simply to create fear and panic so people will respond, not because they carry any actual weight. Often, clients who receive some kind of notice, especially the "10-day" ones, wonder how [THE COMPANY] can respond "in time". I'm convinced now, more than ever, that it simply is NOT an issue.

On top of that, [THE FOUNDER], as a tax preparer, has an office in the IRS he can call to find out if a filing was received, although the IRS can NOT tell him where it is or its status in the process or whose "office" is handling it. I guess that's about the best you can hope for when the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing.

You'll see in my communication dialogue with one of my clients in the next section that I mention [THE COMPANY] services are only getting better and more powerful. For instance, [THE COMPANY] is making some subtle and gradual changes in what we call "the second pack."

One change is that they will no longer be preparing an "affidavit," but will be using a "declaration" instead.

"Why?", you may ask.

Because "technically" an affidavit can be used as grounds for a lawsuit if any mistakes are discovered therein, whereas such is not the case with a "declaration". Subtle and small legal distinction, wouldn't you say? A one word difference? But, it's just another layer of "protection".

Another change is the addition of a document called "Declaration and Notice", and I will not even begin to describe how powerful this "simple" one page document is. (We were told and sworn not to tell, at the expense of continuing to be representatives). Eventually, all clients will be receiving a "new" 2nd package. It just keeps getting better and better.

I promise anyone, that if they will simply READ (and, I grant, it may not be that "easy" for every person to simply read) what [THE COMPANY] files with the IRS and State Taxing Agencies on his behalf, he will begin to realize the POWER in LAW with what

[THE COMPANY] does. There is a REASON the IRS never pursues [THE COMPANY's] clients into the judicial arena.

For a couple weeks prior to my going to the seminar, I was responding to questions about how clients can handle financial institutions, either for mortgages or loans or for educational grants, when the institution wants to see a copy of the last two or three years tax returns. So, [THE COMPANY] has come up with a solution:

With at least two weeks notice, and with the client's providing the "other" information needed to prepare it, [THE COMPANY] will complete what is called a "Pro-forma 1040", which will satisfy the needs of the financial institution. How's that for service? I did not hear any mention of added fees for this service, so, unless I hear differently, I'm assuming this will be included in the client's fees. Of course, not every client will need or take advantage of this service. There really are financial institutions out there who aren't so persnickety about these things.

One of [THE COMPANY's] office addresses and phone numbers have changed, so anyone anticipating making an application and ALL EXISTING CLIENTS might want to get "fresh" applications or update their records. Contact your representative for this. The "old" address and phone number will continue to work for a time, but every CLIENT should have the proper address and phone number. IN ADDITION, when YOU change your address, REMEMBER to change it with [THE COMPANY]; how can they represent YOU when they don't know how to reach you?

The application itself will be changing. I don't know how quickly, but it's become quite clear lately, that some of the "instructions" need to be made clearer for all the needed and proper information to end up on the application.

Here's a question to ask yourself: How much of YOUR income tax liability do you want [THE COMPANY] to handle? If your answer is "all of it", or something similar to that, then [THE COMPANY] needs ALL your information to effectively accomplish that. This is where "each client is unique" comes in.

For all the folks I know who either have or contemplate soon having "offshore" income, we found out that while offshore income IS a reportable event, it is NOT taxable for non-taxpayers (including most of [THE COMPANY's] clients). I believe I promised an answer to this one before the end of the year; so there you have it.

However, with some of the current laws that are being passed in the "name of terrorism", it appears the government is looking to find ways to "track" our money. A Corporation Sole can transfer or have a penny short of \$10 Million dollars in an account without the IRS even thinking to ask a question. Over that, it might trigger a question, to which the answer can simply be a pleasant, "Have a nice day!" (They have no authority that requires any answer).

One of the seminar attendants asked [THE FOUNDER] why he chooses Corporation Sole over other "entities" (like trusts, LLC's, regular Corporations, etc)? He said, "Because it's the only 'entity' about which it can be said it has proven impenetrable to attack". Not bad for a "structure" that's been around much longer than the United States of America. A person can find them available "cheaper" than [THE COMPANY] provides them, but nowhere else will you get the legal expertise and three-solid years of research of how best to utilize them as [THE COMPANY] can provide. These are particularly valuable for people of means, as well as folks who tend to have

"complicated" structures for privacy and asset protection. With the new laws coming down, and regarding anyone coming into "money", a person may want to take a closer look at the Corporation Sole.

[THE COMPANY] is more closely examining the information provided by each applicant than they used to. This refers to what I was talking about earlier, when you ask yourself "How much of your tax liability do you want [THE COMPANY] to handle?". So, if there is an affirmative answer to any of the questions numbered 2 through 10 on page two of the application, the client will have to provide the background information for [THE COMPANY] to properly evaluate being certain they can viably and profitably represent that person.

And one more thing: When [THE COMPANY] requires copies - originals will NOT be returned - they must have CLEAN, CLEAR copies. If you can't read it, they will definitely not be able to read it, particularly after it's been faxed. You may have to go to a copy place, before faxing the document, and make a "darker" copy, so the contrast is greater and it can be read. And PLEASE, be sure your NAME is attached to whatever you fax; can you imagine how difficult it is for [THE COMPANY] to receive documents and not know what to do with them, because they don't know who they belong to, and they can't make the fax number jive with any information they have on file? All they can do is set them aside and wait till the client checks up to see how things are going.

I guess that's enough for now. I'm sure I'll recall other things as we move forward; but that will suffice for now.

Your Friend,
Paul Leinthall
661-822-7889, Noon-8pm Mon-Fri EASTERN time
email: littlehammer@primemail.com

=====
[2] Questions and Answers
=====

I've included just one dialogue with a client; it concerns a question that many folks have.

Hi XXXX,

I apologize for the delay in responding to you. I've been out of the office for most of the last two weeks.

Hi Paul,

[Thanks for the reminder last week. Whatever happened to primemail.com?](#)

You probably have the answer to this by now, given my "test" mailing last week. You should notice in this email, that my "primemail" address is still present, although the newsletters may not show that as the return address. The Primemail address is still good, however, and I prefer that people use that.

[Hope you are having a pleasant meeting with the \[THE COMPANY\] reps and \[THE FOUNDER\] this week.](#)

I have a problem that I was hoping you could help me with. About 6 weeks ago, I sent a letter to my accountant who normally does my tax returns in September, but this year of course won't be doing them. In this letter, I explained about [THE COMPANY], and told him he won't be doing my returns from now on. I consider him and his wife one of best friends, and most trusted advisors. He is very intelligent, but also somewhat blunt on occasion. (I will fax you a copy of this letter, if you can supply me a fax #.)

To put it mildly, I was severely chided and nearly scared witless by his letter. He says I am risking prison (and who is going to take care of my children while I and my wife are in prison), 50% penalties, etc. etc. The problem is, I don't have any direct evidence that [THE COMPANY's] program actually works, only from word of mouth and from my confidence in you and Joe Lansing.

Your CPA, in turn, has no direct evidence to the contrary regarding [THE COMPANY], and not understanding what [THE COMPANY] does or how it works, and having been schooled ONLY in the information which keeps him in business and playing the game the way most people have come to "believe" it is supposed to be played, he knows nothing else to do or say.

When you say you have no "direct evidence", what kind of "direct evidence" (other than the words of your CPA) did you EVER have that what you were doing prior to becoming a client was "right". I'd suggest that if you look at what is actually happening in your direct experience regarding the IRS, you still have the same "evidence" you've always had, which is that "nothing" appears to be happening.

Your CPA friend can only speak from his own knowledge and experience. I do not disregard the FACT that some people have gone to prison and had 50% penalties assessed. Will that happen TO YOU? Someone who has lawfully gone through the revocation of election process? If it did, you would be the very first, in almost thirty years. It's not even happening to [THE COMPANY's] clients who ARE already in "trouble" with the IRS. Why do you think it would happen to you?

Here is my question. Do you or [THE FOUNDER] know of a CPA or tax attorney that I could have my accountant call, who could explain the program and convince him that it works?

My experience has shown that you can't really convince anyone of anything about which they are not wanting to be convinced in the first place. It doesn't sound like your CPA friend fits in that category. [THE COMPANY] takes a very strong stand against ANY representative of the company trying to convince or force anyone into his own clear understanding of the law.

Because [THE COMPANY] is not in the "information peddling" business, but rather are actually taking the position of Power of Attorney for their clients, they are more "exposed" to possible charges of "enticing customers". They offer each client a money-back guarantee that if they do not produce the results in any client's case, which results are that the IRS will see the client AS HE IS in their own law, and change their internal records (available through a FOIA request) to reflect the fact that the client is a NON-taxpayer. Obviously, when you have THAT, your CPA friend might have a choice about what he wants to continue to believe; or certainly, at least, acknowledge that

however it happened, the doom and gloom that he predicted for you simply did not come forth.

Or, perhaps you could send me something like a copy of a cancelled refund check from one of your clients (With the name removed, of course), or even better a status determination letter from the IRS for one of your clients showing his status is exempt (again, with the name removed).

Of course some clients will, we expect, receive the actual "Status Determination" letter from the IRS. But we know some (perhaps many) will not. Almost every person, who has paid any amount of income taxes over the past ten years, should at least receive a "letter" saying the IRS has a "credit" to their account, once the Status Determination Process is complete. THERE ARE NO IRS regulations, however, that say the IRS "MUST" send out such letters. There's only the "law" that declares itself that the IRS must make the determination according to law; and the implications in that law mandate that "something" must change in the IRS records regarding how they used to see you and how they NOW see you, AS your truly ARE under the law, which is a person having the status of non-taxpayer, wherein he is not being liable for income taxes, except in the event he has federally sourced income or resides as a citizen of the federal government.

Of course, your CPA friend probably knows little to nothing about these matters. He received no training or knowledge relating to these facts of law. All he knows is what he was taught. If he even begins to look at what [THE COMPANY] does, he's going to face the same learning curve as anyone else, and that learning curve is often steep for someone who is steeped-in a way of tax practicing which does not take into account a person's true Tax Status; and it's nigh impossible for someone who is not interested in the first place.

Most folks don't realize that the real issues which [THE COMPANY] presents to the IRS regarding your true tax status have NEVER been ruled upon in Court. Any case which has come close to sounding similar to the language we use (some of which we have stopped using, because it contains red-flag words to the IRS), has gotten side-tracked in off-point issues, and the case either won or lost (usually lost) based on some technicality, but no case has been decided simply on the basis in law of what makes a person a "taxpayer" or a "non-taxpayer". The IRS doesn't want the simplicity of that law brought out in court, because on the actual ground of the law itself, they have no case. Obviously, [THE COMPANY] wants to keep their operation based ONLY on the law itself, so the IRS has no ground or jurisdiction to move adversely them or against a client.

As [THE COMPANY's] presentation, on behalf of their clients, is based so strongly in the basis of the Internal Revenue Code itself - and the REAL ISSUE therein - and because they do NOT get off-point in their presentation, the IRS has nothing that it can get it's hooks into for a judicial pursuit of any off-point technicality; and that explains mostly WHY no client of [THE COMPANY] has been pursued into court by the IRS; and the folks who are accepted as clients, who've had the IRS on their tail, find the IRS seems to lose interest in them, once everyone in the IRS actually gets the point. In some cases, that takes longer than others, but eventually, the IRS ALWAYS gets the point.

Surely, this is a question you have run into before, because your clients are in fact facing the full ire and wrath of the IRS. And for the more affluent clients, that could be a significant risk including the risk of prison. Anything you can give me,

especially the number of a tax attorney that is familiar with the system would be most appreciated.

Yes, it's a question that comes up quite a bit. It's only natural that the question should come up, given the years of erroneous information (such as coming from your CPA friend) and the resultant brain-washing of most folks regarding what they really know and understand of the law.

I disagree, however, with your assessment that [THE COMPANY's] "clients are in fact facing the full ire and wrath of the IRS". Every client of [THE COMPANY] is, in fact, STANDING in a place which is outside the jurisdiction of the IRS. The IRS truly has no authority to do what you're suggesting every client faces. Given the way the Internal Revenue Code and the Laws of the United States are TODAY (and have been, since the Internal Revenue Service first began), your CPA friend will be waiting a long, long, long time with no evidence that his words have any meaning whatsoever in your life as a client of [THE COMPANY].

Even in the case of a person playing the IRS game the way your CPA suggests, the IRS can't simply throw someone in prison, regardless of his wealth. Admittedly, the new laws that Congress is so hastily passing in the "name of terrorism" may ultimately lead to an increased power to "shoot first, and ask questions later", or freeze someone's accounts - and that well might be something with which a very wealthy person might have more occasion to deal - but it won't be because the TAX LAWS give that power; and it won't be because there's actually increased ground or basis in law regarding income tax matters. In the normal case of pursuing true tax evaders, the IRS has a lawful process to which to adhere, and if they don't, THEY are the lawbreakers. I think they've learned their lessons, because the IRS has lost numerous cases regarding their disregard for proper legal procedure.

Joe Lansing gave me the number of a tax attorney in Florida who has done some work for [THE COMPANY] -- but the problem with that is, as [THE COMPANY] is his client he can't really give me any negative information about the program and embarrass his client. It would be much better to speak to someone who is familiar with the program and could explain it to a CPA, and is not involved contractually with [THE COMPANY] (to avoid any conflict of interest problems).

You might want to have another conversation with Joe regarding what he meant when he said the tax attorney had done some work for [THE COMPANY]. I would be surprised if that attorney was privy to [THE COMPANY's] processes, unless he was actually [THE COMPANY's] client (in distinction to [THE COMPANY] being his client). It may occur - and may have occurred - that a person would need services relating to taxes which would be outside the area of that with which [THE COMPANY] deals. For example, business people sometimes come to us who have "941 Tax Issues". Those are NOT income tax issues, and it might well be something needing the advice of a tax attorney. [THE COMPANY] can not get liens or levies removed, for instance, which are a result of 941 issues; but, as I said, they are not income tax issues to begin with. I think you will find that [THE COMPANY] does not employ tax attorney's to deal with income tax issues in the administrative arena; [THE COMPANY] actually practices what they preach.

What we're faced with here is what I referred to earlier. If [THE COMPANY], in its normal course of doing business, began to utilize testimonials, or professional references or blacked-out copies of refund/credit checks or letters, they open

themselves up to charges of doing business by "enticement". This might not be an issue if it did not potentially jeopardize [THE COMPANY's] services for their clients; but that's exactly the point: [THE COMPANY] provides a SERVICE, for which they give you back your money if they don't accomplish the results they promises. But, you may notice, this statement is NOT anywhere in [THE COMPANY's] "published" literature; that's simply their "attitude" and would be their actual practice in the event they failed to produce the promised results. I can't say it IS their practice, because they've never failed yet to produce those results; hence, they've never had to refund money. The fact is, if they even sniff the possibility that a potential client has been "dragged in", or tantalized or enticed in, they will return that client's check before even accepting her as a client. I think you'll see that attitude reflected on all [THE COMPANY's] conference calls; and I try to reflect that in my newsletters.

The other reason [THE COMPANY] would continue to not choose to give out specific information, including specific results in any particular client's case, is that they are required by law to NOT provide any financial details of any client to anyone outside the company/client/IRS relationship.

You're wanting some CPA, who is unknown to you and unknown to your friend, one who is aware of, who understands, and who is in agreement with what [THE COMPANY] does, to convince your CPA friend that what [THE COMPANY] does is "right," and that YOU are safe in your decision to have chosen to become a client. Even if the tax attorney Joe mentioned has [THE COMPANY] as his client, he would be prohibited from providing ANY information (good or bad) on the very same basis as [THE COMPANY] can not provide any of that information regarding their clients.

Let's take a closer look at your desire for certainty. What did you expect your CPA to say? His relationship with you, particularly regarding his business, depended on YOU staying the same in relation to him as a paying client. He LOST a client. What do you actually expect him to say, regardless of your friendship? Of course, from my perspective, if he were really a friend, he would at least trust you to be able to think for yourself; and would still be a friend as he allowed you to follow your own heart's desires; he also might - and this would not be a necessity, of course, for him to remain your friend - he could choose to be willing to open himself up to information that would challenge his pre-formed conclusions; the problem, regarding this information, is that if he TRULY knows and understands it, he will have to confront the undermining of his own present understanding, and he might truly experience a conflict in his own conscience, because it could certainly affect his career and livelihood. Do you want to give THAT to your friend, just so you can feel safe in your own decision?

On the other hand, you might say to your friend, that you'll keep your eyes and ears open, and if the time ever comes, where even the FIRST client of [THE COMPANY] gets in any trouble with the IRS, trouble which he did not have before becoming a client, that you'll let him know and, perhaps, have a further conversation with him at that time. You might also mention to him, that this process has been "tested and proven" for nearly thirty years without the FIRST person seeing the dire consequences he has predicted - so holding his breath would be inadvisable.

[Of course, I would be willing to pay this person for up to an hour of his or her time at their normal rate, assuming it is within reason \(say, \\$400 or less per hour\).](#)

[Thanks for any help you can provide,](#)

Best,
XXXX

I'm sure you're aware of the fact that BOTH sides in a lawsuit often PAY expert witnesses; one side ALWAYS loses, even though the losing side's experts were also paid. One of the reasons I've been doing my newsletter is to try to provide on-going information, which provides the opportunity for folks to sort of kick back and relax and begin working with this information, giving themselves the opportunity to get a "feel" for whether it's something that interests them, or not.

It might be said that some of the folks who ask questions are providing what might be interpreted to be IMPLIED "testimonials" of [THE COMPANY]; but you notice that I do everything I can to walk the fine line between being a representative of [THE COMPANY] and keeping [THE COMPANY] separate from my newsletter, so if there is a "problem", which might be interpreted as "enticement", anyone questioning it would be hard-pressed to say it came from [THE COMPANY].

It's also part of why [THE COMPANY] dropped their paid referral program (in addition to the confusion it generated); it could be "argued" that [THE COMPANY] was enticing people; whereas, when clients simply refer their friends, without money being attached to it, and since there is no profit motive coming into play, "enticement" would be a very difficult case to make.

I know the issue of feeling absolutely secure, in the light of years of intimidating, counter information from the IRS and their professional comrades, may be a difficult thing for some folks to acquire; and of course that doesn't come simply by paying the fee and becoming a client. But, I suggest, that as you continue, and as you notice the lack, or slowing down, of any IRS or State Taxing agency actions in your life...or, if you're the rare client who gets a "notice" of some kind from the IRS, and you notice that after fax it to [THE COMPANY] to handle, nothing of any substance ever comes of it from the IRS, except more "words" of implied threat - and eventually, you'll realize that the bear had a lot more growl than bite for those who are fully in accord with the law; which is actually the case for EVERY client of [THE COMPANY]. And it's also true because [THE COMPANY] continues to insist on NOT slapping the bear in the face simply to see his reaction.

So, I'd suggest you save your money. All is well in the world of [THE COMPANY] and the services they provide; and it's only getting better and more powerful. I realize it may sound funny to say "better and more powerful" regarding a process that already has a 100% success rate; but it keeps getting refined, and that makes it easier and more powerful with (we expect) quicker results.

As I often do, I'd like to use our dialogue in my newsletter for the benefit of others; I'll assume that's okay with you unless I hear differently.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

=====

Date: Mon, 29 Oct 2001 13:29:29 -0800 (PST)

Paul,

Thank you for your lengthy and lucid email. You really do have a gift for expressing the written (and spoken) word. I will do as you suggest, and I understand the reasons you have given for your answers. I agree completely that the IRS works mostly by intimidation and bluff. Look at the statistics -- last year they boast on their own web site that they sent something like 100 people to jail. But most of the people they send to jail are those who are selling foreign trusts to innocent victims (and advertising trusts as a "legal" means to avoid income taxes), and things like that. The people who fall for this kind of thing don't usually go to jail although they may get hit with interest and penalties.

Welcome home,
XXXX

[3] News Briefs & Comments

Here's the latest on the "We The People Foundation"/IRS Hearing:

WE THE PEOPLE FOUNDATION
FOR CONSTITUTIONAL EDUCATION

For Release
October 18, 2001

Citizens' Truth-in-Taxation Hearing Rescheduled

Washington: Congressman Bartlett Publicly Reaffirms His Support for Capitol Hill Hearing Challenging the Legal Authority of the IRS & DOJ.

View Rep. Bartlett
VideoRead Letter from Rep. Bartlett
<http://www.bostonteparty2.org/bartlett/bartlett.html>

Congressman Roscoe Bartlett has rescheduled the citizens' Truth-in-Taxation hearing for February 27 and 28, 2002.

The hearing will be held at the nation's Capitol in the House Science and Technology Committee Hearing Room , (Rayburn House Office Building), beginning at 9 a.m. each day.

The IRS and Department of Justice will officially and publicly answer detailed legal allegations directly challenging the jurisdiction of the IRS and the unlawful enforcement and administration of U.S. income tax laws.

The hearing is in response to a formal petition to the government from Bob Schulz, Chairman of the We The People Foundation for Constitutional Education.

In a letter to Schulz dated October 12, 2001, Congressman Bartlett reaffirmed his belief that it is his duty as an elected member of Congress to ensure that our government timely and properly responds to a citizens' petition for a redress of grievances.

"Now it is critical for the Congress to resume its business," said Bartlett. "An important domestic matter to address is the alleged fraudulent and illegal operations of the federal income tax system. You have my word as an elected member of the United States Congress that I will do all within my power that this event go forward, the IRS and the DOJ attend as they have promised to do, and are compelled to do by the Constitution."

Congressman Bartlett also wrote, "Our country has labored under a federal income tax system that is inconsistent with the liberty of a free people. Quite simply, the government of a free people should not tax the labor of its citizensÖ."

Congressman Bartlett went on to say that most of Congress now agrees that the federal tax system is repugnant to the Constitution and its laws, and that the current income tax system should be abolished.

Well, if that's truly the case, it will be interesting to see what shows up, won't it? The question remains, of course, as to what would replace the current income tax system if the present one is abolished. Meanwhile, regardless of what happens, we, who are clients of [THE COMPANY], can enjoy the benefits of being already income tax free in almost every situation (except regarding federally sourced income or residing in federal territory).

Schulz concluded, "History shows us that it is during difficult moments that rights and freedoms are most at risk. Now is the time for Americans to defend not only our shores, but also our Constitution and the rule of law. If we fail to protect these rights, all we have fought for as a nation may perish as quickly as the crumbling of a building."

"Over several decades, there have been uncountable man-years of research that document the widespread abuse of our rights, our laws and our citizens at the hands of the IRS and DOJ. Until now, the government has refused to publicly answer its most vocal critics or respond to the irrefutable evidence. The income tax goes on trial February 27th."

View Rep. Bartlett Video
Read Letter from Rep. Bartlett
<http://www.bostonteparty2.org/bartlett/bartlett.html>



The only reason I include this article is because it revisits our conversation about not slapping the bear in the face, and sets the stage for what follows.

Subject: IRS Raids Home of Renaissance

*** IRS agents raid home Vehicles, computers and paperwork seized from home of man who heads Renaissance, The Tax People.

The Capital-Journal

About 30 federal agents wearing holstered guns raided the home Wednesday of Michael C. Cooper, president of a local firm accused of mail fraud, money laundering and running an illegal pyramid scheme.

Carrying a search warrant, agents from the Internal Revenue Service's Criminal Investigations Division and the U.S. Postal Inspection Service seized company vehicles, ranch equipment, lawn equipment, computers and paperwork, said Mary Cooper, Michael Cooper's wife. The items were loaded onto three flatbed trucks and two moving vans, she said.

Cooper operates an office from his home, 2635 N.W. 86th St., which also is referred to as Renaissance North. In October, federal agents raided Cooper's business, Renaissance, The Tax People, located inside a former mansion at S.W. 10th and Gage.

Cooper and his wife were at home during Wednesday's raid, which lasted about 4 1/2 hours.

"We chose to stay in our home while the search was conducted," Mary Cooper said. "We were held captive in a small room in our home. We were not allowed to go anywhere other than the restroom."

During the raid, Cooper phoned his attorneys, but they weren't allowed onto the property while the raid was under way, Mary Cooper said.

Scott French, spokesman for the IRS, confirmed that the agency was involved in an "action" at the Coopers' house, but he referred all other questions to the U.S. attorney's office.

Kena Rice, spokeswoman for U.S. attorney's office, said that office had no comment.

Mary Cooper described the agents as "cold."

"I couldn't go in the kitchen and see what they were taking from the kitchen. I couldn't go in my bedroom and see what they were rifling through there," she said.

Reading a prepared statement, Mary Cooper said:

"I am outraged by the invasion of my home today. The IRS and the Postal Service came with guns and attitude to search and seize. Because my husband and I refused to leave the premises while the government conducted their business, we were held under guard in a small room in our home. Their motto seems to be seize first, ask questions later, much later. It has been over six months since they raided our corporate offices and bank accounts, and we are still today awaiting a hearing before a judge.

"This is what happens when a good company becomes successful helping the average American citizen pay their legitimate and fair share of income tax. You take on the IRS, they take you on."

Among the items confiscated, she said, was the personal computer of the couple's 11-year-old son. She said it contained only games and music.

Attorney General Carla Stovall has filed a lawsuit alleging Renaissance is operating an illegal pyramid scheme. A ruling hasn't yet been issued in a hearing held in February to determine whether to issue a temporary injunction against the company.

U.S. Attorney Jackie Williams filed a civil forfeiture complaint in December seeking control of almost \$9 million that was seized during the October raid. That complaint alleges Renaissance amassed about \$100 million through a mail fraud and money laundering scheme.

Following the raid last fall at the Fleming mansion, Renaissance moved its headquarters to Forbes Field.

.....

I received the link to the website referenced here in an email recently. In completely different words, the author espouses [THE COMPANY's] philosophy and way of doing things regarding the IRS.

I couldn't have said it better myself!

<http://www.stuartgoldsmith.com/warrior/lesson.html> (Stuart Goldsmith - Publisher/Writer UK)

The Warrior is low-profile. Looked for, he cannot be seen. Listened for, he cannot be heard, etc etc. In fact he's a sneaky sort of warrior. His battle-axe and armour are strictly mental weapons. Only a complete fool would dress up in all that gear and go 'over the top' wielding a battle-axe. That's the best way I know of being hacked into pieces by the enemy! All that foolish 'bravery' clap-trap is strictly for the birds, and the zealots who think they can change things by dashing themselves against the rocks. This is not the way of the warrior.

As a warrior, you wage strictly mental warfare against those who would seek to destroy you, or render you harmless and compliant. And you win - every time. Despite the 'warrior' logo in full armour with battle-axe swinging, you will endeavour to look, sound like and be more like Clark Kent than this mythical muscle-bound hero! But inside ahh now, that's a different matter entirely! Your 'poverty' renders opponents helpless.

You see, the cards are stacked against you by a very clever system. If you believe (for example) that you should be able to read any sort of sex magazine you choose, and that anti-pornography laws are ludicrous, then if you stand up and fight this ludicrous law, you have to effectively wave to everyone in your community and say "Hey everybody, I'm a pornographer !!" And, of course, you won't win anyway !

This is the direct equivalent of 'going over the top' with fixed bayonet, shouting 'AAAGGHHHH!' and being mowed-down in ten seconds by an enemy machine gun. A completely pointless exercise. An utterly futile and STUPID 'gesture'.

If you believe that taxation is punitive and a gross infringement of your civil liberties, then you would be crazy to start a campaign to try and get taxes reduced to a sensible level (say 10-15%). This would be like wearing a giant sweatshirt emblazoned with the logo: "I've got POTS of money and I'm trying to protect it from government theft. Please come and investigate my tax affairs!!!" You WILL NOT WIN if you insist on poking your head above the parapet and going "Nyah, nyah, nyah-nyah, nyah". Believe me, there are a dozen well-trained marksmen with telescopic sights just dying to use your head for target practice. Don't even peek!

Leave all that 'crusade' stuff for the idiots who think they can change things. If they do change things, then great - you can take the benefits without taking the risks (a fundamental warrior principle). But you know, and I know that they will rarely even ruffle the feathers of the great bird of state.

As a warrior, you will endeavour to become 'invisible' The ultimate in low-profile. The nadir of normality. You will be boring. You will be bland. You will be just another face in the crowd. You will melt into the surroundings. This, as I say, is your greatest protection, your most powerful weapon.

We sometimes refer to this as "hiding right out in plain sight". No fighting AGAINST the system; rather using it's energies to enhance our well being, which allows us greater freedom with both our time and our money.

=====
[4] Call Reminder
=====

The TAX EXEMPT Conference Call, takes place Wednesday night, October 31, 2001, (and every Wednesday) at 9 PM EASTERN time. The number is: 305-503-1874, pin code 940 (No # required).

I want to mention something to new readers and to folks who have never been on THIS conference call. This call is NOT what you may be expecting when I talk about a "conference call". A lot of people today are used to big sales-hype conference calls, with a lot of "Rah-Rah-Rah". This conference call is NOT a "sales" call. No one is trying to get you to enroll in something, or asking or suggesting that you try to get your friends to enroll. This is a TEACHING call. It consists almost entirely of questions and answers. It's a great place to hear other folks ask all sorts of questions, and get any questions of your own answered, and it provides you the opportunity to get a pretty well-rounded understanding of what this is all about in 45 to 90 minutes. I think you'll find it's one of the best \$3 to \$5 values you can find today. (The telephone long distance charges for most people).

May I ask, that when you call, you use a regular "connected-to-the-wall telephone", not an internet phone, a cellular phone, or even a cordless phone. Also, please, not a speaker phone, either, because often speaker phones seem to disrupt the quality of the call. Pressing the number 5 on your phone will mute your end of the line, so everyone can hear better; then, when you want to ask a question, you can press the number 4 to go off mute. If you can hear the noises, conversations, kids-playing, dishes clanging, and phones & faxes ringing where you are, we can hear it, too, and it makes it much

more difficult to hear whoever is speaking at the moment. Thanks for your consideration.

If you like what you hear on the call, and you want to talk further to someone (including the call presenter) or ask more "personal" questions, remember how you heard about the call. No contact numbers are given out on the call, not because anyone is trying to hide anything, but because various representatives of [THE COMPANY] bring folks to the call. The call itself is not a "sales" forum and doesn't get involved in the sales "hierarchy".

See you on the call. Tell your friends about it, too.

=====
[5] Contact Information
=====

Paul Leinthall
Phone: 661-822-7889, Mon. - Fri. NOON to 8 PM (Eastern)
Email: littlehammer@primemail.com

-----NOTICE-----

In compliance with Title 17 U.S.C. section 107, this material is distributed free without profit or payment for non-profit research and educational purposes only.

=====

To SUBSCRIBE to this newsletter: Simply send an email to "taxexempt@primemail.com" (minus quotation marks) with the word "SUBSCRIBE" in the subject heading. If you want, you can put your name in the body of the email, so I have have a name to attach to the email address; but I do NOT provide this private information to ANYONE ELSE.

You can remove your e-mail address from this list by submitting an e-mail to: "Taxexempt@primemail.com" (minus quotation marks). Put the word "UNSUBSCRIBE" in the subject heading.

You may notice that I refer to [THE COMPANY] or to the founder of the company [THE FOUNDER] in various places throughout the Newsletter. I choose those expressions, instead of providing the actual names of the company or it's founder, for a couple of reasons...reasons which you'll also find reflected in my explanation of the copyright notice (below). I want to insulate [THE COMPANY] and [THE FOUNDER] from undue and unwarranted attention (especially negative attention or reaction), whether from a casual reader or from any taxing agency or authority, their attorneys, or representatives. Therefore, it is my desire that the reader be absolutely clear who is responsible for what appears in this newsletter. This newsletter is NOT sponsored directly by [THE COMPANY] or [THE FOUNDER], and while I believe I am being representative of [THE COMPANY's] and [THE FOUNDER's] philosophy, goals, ideals and the truth in law and in fact on which [THE COMPANY] stands to perform its valuable service for its clients (of which I am one), and while I may quote [THE FOUNDER], or someone else, I always seek to maintain each person's privacy, unless their words are already in the public (published) domain; thus I will take the heat for any negative attention, response or reaction.

Also, this allows anyone, including other representatives of [THE COMPANY], who find this information valuable, and who want to share it with others, to substitute their name and contact information for mine, and not have to worry about potential clients of the company going over their heads and bypassing them. Since [THE COMPANY] sponsored conference call and Joe

Lansing, the conference call presenter, follow this same philosophy of client protection for their representatives, the information in this newsletter can, then, be more widely disseminated for the value and education of others. In the newsletter, I may occasionally use the name of the conference call presenter, Joe Lansing; but that's because he is also out in the public forum with his conference call.

About the copyright notice: The copyright notice covers all the contents herein, except quotations, if any. I value my (and the reader's) freedom, integrity and responsibility, and I desire to maintain an environment where I (and the reader) can utilize and distribute this written material. From the point of view of copyright law, if I don't first copyright this material, someone else could; and then, by law, they could disallow me (and the reader) from using or distributing it. Given that fact, copyright is the best avenue I know to continue allowing freedom for all of us regarding this matter.

Therefore, the reader is free to copy, print, use and distribute this material by personal email, fax, or handout (including substituting her own contact information), as long as BOTH the copyright notice AND this explanation of the copyright notice remain in the material. **However, I do NOT, nor does [THE COMPANY], in its own philosophy and ideals, authorize or condone ANY mass media distribution of COMPANY writing or materials, including (and especially) posting to any web sit. However, material written solely by the herein named copyright owner MAY be posted to a web site or some other media - but ONLY with the copyright owner's express, written, prior permission, in each instance.** The responsibility for the words contained herein resides with the copyright owner. The copyright notice makes absolutely clear who is responsible for what appears here; that way, the buck stops with me, should anyone question or challenge what is written herein.

This material is not intended to be interpreted as legal or financial advice. The copyright owner is neither an attorney nor CPA and has no license to offer legal and financial advise. I encourage the reader to study and think for herself and to make her own informed decisions, based on her own desires and beliefs, in harmony with her own inner sense and self-interested, positive and comfortable, good-gut feeling. For THAT, each reader is, himself/herself, entirely responsible.