

=====

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

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

=====

Tuesday, October 02, 2001

- [1] Welcome: A Special Bonus for "PDF" Viewers
- [2] Questions and Answers: Practical Issues While Tax Exempt
- [3] News Briefs & Comments: National ID Cards and LOA
- [4] Conference Call Reminder: **Wed, October 3rd, 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,

Those of you who are able to receive and open "PDF" files will find an EXTRA BONUS attached to this week's newsletter. It is a little gem entitled: "The Science of Getting Rich" by Wallace D. Wattles. You can easily read it in one sitting, although I venture to guess that many of you will want to read it more than once. Although it's 64 pages in the attached Acrobat Reader form, with the distributor's introduction and appendices, the author's actual writing is only 50 pages. It's easy reading; and it's powerful writing!

I imagine some of you have already read it. In recent weeks, a couple of friends have passed it on to me, and I expect that some of my readers may have come across it in similar fashion; but I wanted to be sure that no one I know misses the opportunity.

Actually, this is a book I read twenty or thirty years ago. I was impressed with it then; I'm even more impressed with it now. For whatever reason, at that time, I wasn't ready

to fully practice what it teaches. But NOW, I see it as one of the most potent books of it's kind; in fact, I will say it is the most powerful and efficient writing of it's kind, if only for the fact that the author expresses in a mere 50 pages what others take hundreds, or even thousands, of pages, to attempt to express.

Don't be fooled by it's title. What the author talks about applies to every area in a person's life, and it could just as well have been titled: "The Science of Getting Whatever You Want (or Don't Want)", whether it be health, wealth, happy and fulfilling relationships, success, job, career, or "all of the above"...or their opposites - whatever a person truly desires.

It is a book that speaks to people in all times and all places in all situations, including to people affected by circumstances as we've witnessed in the last three weeks.

Because it is not in a format other than this attached PDF file (unless you go to a bookstore like Barnes and Noble, or Amazon.com, where, in regular book form, the book is available for under \$12.00 in paperback), and because its electronic distribution in this manner carries an agreement to distribute it ONLY in the form you find it, I am not able to send it to my subscribers who either can not receive PDF files (i.e., WebTV users) or who are unable to access them. So, for those of you who actually might be able to receive and access PDF files (if you put your mind to it, to work with your computers a little bit and "learn" how to do some of the things of which your computer is capable if only the operator will get in gear), but who have not wanted to go through the little bit of "trouble" to learn how...maybe this can be your opportunity to "get up to speed". (Let me know, of course, when you know you can receive and access Acrobat Reader "pdf" files, so I can send it to you).

I believe everyone will enjoy the book. Let me know if you don't; I'd be really curious "why".

Now, for the usual purpose of this newsletter:

As more and more people become happily involved in the realities of being lawfully free from the liability for paying federal and State income taxes, more and more questions arise as a function of the ramifications of such freedom impacting in other areas. As is evident by some of the dialogues I've had with people this past week, as well as in the past, including one of the questions from last week's newsletter, various segments of the business arena have come to "depend" on the standard 1040 tax return for a lot more than what it was originally designed. Unfortunately, when an incorrect assumption regarding the law is made to begin with, that incorrect assumption can often color further assumptions down the road, and it becomes an interesting enterprise to simply get back to the truth and essence of what's really important NOW in our dealings with those businesses, particularly when their staff or their policies have come to depend on something which we can no longer easily provide, i.e., the "Form 1040, U.S. Individual Tax Return". We're going to take a further look at this subject in Section two.

Finally, before we move on, let me acknowledge that last week's conference call was a "technological disaster". Apparently only a half dozen people were able to get on the call. I know I couldn't get on, and I've heard that many others had similar problems. I'm not sure there's ever a satisfactory answer to why that type of thing ever happens; but rest assured, the conference call did take place, and will continue in the coming weeks. I'm sure if that kind of problem (whatever was the cause) occur's again (or on any

regular basis) something will have to be done. As it is, we know that sometimes, for whatever reason, certain long distance companies have trouble bridging to the call. The only solution I've found, which has NEVER failed (until last week), is to call using the wrap-around number "1010-220", before dialing the usual "1" plus the area code and phone number. There are other wrap around numbers that generally also work; e.g. "1010-636" will give you \$.05 cents a minute, billed directly to your phone bill, whereas the "1010-220" is \$.05 cents a minute for the first 20 minutes (can't you just hear former Steeler's Quarterback, Terry Bradshaw's voice saying, "A 20 minute call for just 99¢"?), and then it's \$.07 cents a minute for anything over 20 minutes.

For those who tried to get on the call, but couldn't, I can only say: Try again tomorrow night.

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

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

From: XXXXXX
To: Paul Leinthall <littlehammer@primemail.com>
Subject: Re: Question

Hi Paul,

This is XXXX. XXX and I sent in our application and funds last week to become clients. I have a question on how we stand with regard to our child continuing to receive grants (based on income or lack of it, not academic) from XXXX University in XXXX.

We assumed a large loan back in xxx which was used as a direct payment to xxxx to start-up a new venture. The upshot of this is that we had a very large NOL (Net Operating Loss) which was enough to go back xx years and zero out the taxes owed and leave enough to go forward a few more years. We provided a copy of our tax returns to XXXX University and our child received a sizeable grant because we had a negative income. Now, the question I am going to ask has to do with future years grants for this child. If we file through your organization and have no way to show that we had no income or no tax liability, what are the chances of our child receiving these grants in the next two years? In other words, does this change our income so drastically that we now look like we can pay these fees (which, by the way, we cannot) because of the income we now would be experiencing since the NOL carry forward which we still have left would not be taken into consideration under your program (or would it?).

We do not want to be in a position of showing income, yet not taking advantage of the NOL, when we still have a considerable amount of the NOL to use against future income which, for our child's purposes, allows her to obtain substantial grants and loans from XXX University.

Does any of this make sense? Or do I need to call you and try to explain myself better?

Thanks so much for your help! We hope to be on the call tonight.

XXXXXX

Hi XXXXX,

Let me attempt to address your question based on what I understand from what you said. While I can't speak for any University as to the chances of a person receiving a grant, regardless of income or lack thereof, and while I can not tell you exactly what you will need to do in your situation, I'll offer some suggestions. Let me start with three general principal-concepts on how this works.

The contract you entered into with [THE COMPANY] is between you and [THE COMPANY] and ONLY regards [THE COMPANY's] filing and reporting of necessary details to the IRS, under law, and NOT to any other person, group, or agency. In their filings for clients, [THE COMPANY] does NOT provide income amounts to the IRS. The IRS, of course, already has whatever W-2's, or 1099's, etc. that have been sent to them.

Your "contract" (or your child's contract, based on "your" income or lack thereof) with the University is between you and them and has no direct relationship with the contract you have with either the IRS or (now) [THE COMPANY].

The IRS can not, by law, provide any details of your tax returns to any other party without your written permission (or a valid court order). Unless you have signed a form which gives the University permission to obtain copies of your tax returns, the tax returns the University has are copies provided by you. If that is "their" acceptable way for you to show "proof" of financial qualifications, so be it. Minus your written permission to verify it with the IRS, they have to go solely on what you have provided them.

The whole issue boils down to whether you actually have the income level to qualify for educational grants, which you say is still the case.

Your question is similar to the one asked this past Tuesday in my newsletter, where the questioner wanted to know how to prove income for refinancing a house, except that in your case, you want to prove "insufficient" income, rather than proving "sufficient" income.

Am I grasping the idea behind your question correctly?

If I can re-phrase your question, it would go something like this: "How do we continue proving our net loss income, so the grantor will continue providing the educational grants, since we won't be having the usual tax returns to provide as proof? In fact, if we provide proof of meeting our tax reporting requirements by providing copies of the statements [THE COMPANY] prepares, we still can't show our carried forward "net operating loss" since no amounts are used in the statements?"

You and your husband can put your creative minds to this for additional ideas, of course, but given the fact, as you say, that you still are not in a position to pay the normal University fees yourselves, the most immediate idea that pops into my mind is

similar to the one I suggested to the person wanting to refinance his home. If the University does not require you to sign a form that allows them to get copies of your actual tax returns from the IRS, you might have your CPA prepare a standard 1040 tax return, showing the loss carried forward, and even though you won't actually be filing the return with the IRS, you can provide a copy of it to the University. If you've always prepared your own tax returns, you can show them copies in the same manner. OR, have the CPA prepare a financial statement revealing your negative net income in regards to "school tuition purposes".

The possibility of providing personal financial records on your own (minus a certification from a CPA) is probably not as viable in a case of supporting a "negative" income, because they might consider (I know I might suspect, if I were in their shoes) that you're not providing ALL the information, whereas, in reality, you might actually have funds in other accounts sufficient to pay all tuition; whereas, when you're using personal bank records to qualify for a mortgage or loan, it's easily verified that the figures are valid, and if you have other accounts which you are not disclosing (and wouldn't be required to), that's all the better in that case.

Prior to doing anything and just as a way of information gathering, you might call the school (you don't have to reveal who you are or that your child goes there), and ask them something akin to: "What other forms of proof for grant qualification will you accept, minus a typical tax return? Our tax preparer files a statement each year, rather than a typical return". See what they say. You're probably going to need that information anyway, if the avenue of preparing (but not actually filing) a standard tax return and proving copies of it are not an option.

I hope that helps.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

.....

Although this next dialogue is specifically regarding my answer to a question in last week's newsletter, which question itself was in a similar vein as the dialogue above, this dialogue applies to the whole topic we're talking about here].

[As an aside, and as a way of explaining to folks who receive this newsletter in OTHER THAN the "pdf" format, which is the format in which the person writing these comments receives it, when this person refers in his message to finding my written words "on page 9", it's because in the PDF version, the pages are able to be numbered, and whether printed, or simply read "on screen", and regardless of the computer platform on which the PDF file is received, the appearance and pages ALWAYS remain exactly the same as I create them. This does NOT occur in the version I send to folks who receive this newsletter in "email format" via WebTV, or who, for whatever their reason's, have said they cannot access PDF files. Because of the idiosyncrasies of email itself, across various platforms and programs, I can not guarantee the uniform appearance of the email, whereas, with the PDF version, I can. Hence, "page numbers" don't make sense with regular email, and someone trying to go back to that edition of the newsletter, to find the particular quoted words, would have to manually search for them, either by reading until he finds them or, by performing a "find", if his email program supports "find" or "search" feature. Incidentally, the "find" feature is another benefit of the Acrobat Reader program.

From: XXXXXXX
To: Paul Leinthall <littlehammer@primemail.com>
Subject: Re: newsletter

Thanks Paul for the info contained in every newsletter you send out, very informative reading. Your latest(?) issue dated 09-25-2001, contained a passage on page 9 as follows:

"How about preparing "normal" tax returns, and showing them copies? (It's none of their business whether you actually filed them, or not; you're certainly not "lying" to them, because however you cut it, you actually have "more" income than any such "return" would indicate)."

(You were providing answers to someone who was asking what to do when the bank asks for tax returns to substantiate one's income).

One has to be very careful when "leaving" or "supplying" copies of any tax return, whether that return was filed or not (the bank will assume it was). The reason why I bring this up, Paul, is because I know of a man in Michigan who was convicted of willful failure to file and now sits in prison, the prosecution brought out the "tax returns" he submitted to the bank (but never filed) as part of the evidence to prove that the man's income was far greater than the threshold which triggers a "filing requirement". Granted, the man did not enjoy the protection of [THE COMPANY] and was totally off-point in his arguments before the judge, but I just wanted to make you aware that it may not be in anyone's best interest to show "tax forms" to a bank or bank employee in order to obtain a loan, or in relationship to any financial transaction.

Nothing but the best!

XXXXXX

Hi XXXXXX,

I appreciate your words to me. I'm aware of what you're talking about and, of course, I was not advocating any strategy that is not in harmony with the facts and the truth, as was apparently at issue in the case to which you referred about the man in Michigan.

I neglected to say in last week's newsletter, or the questioner, in the example to which you referred in my newsletter of September 25, that sometimes, a bank or mortgage company (or other financial grantor) may require written permission to verify a person's "tax returns" with the IRS. Without that written permission, (and minus a valid court order directing the release of those records), it's against the law for the IRS to share anyone's private tax information with anyone. Whether the law is actually obeyed in every case is another issue, of course.

There is generally not any jeopardy as long as person is, himself, being truthful and honest and walking in harmony with the law. The cases I've been addressing have been those cases where it's not usually the "law" itself that's at issue; rather it's the regulations of the particular business and the procedures which that business has set up for gathering the "qualifying information" from the person applying for the loan, mortgage, or grant (as in the case an educational institution). Many people in those categories of

business have simply come to assume that the easiest way to get the "qualifying information" is from the standard 1040 tax return; more and more, their thinking seems to be limited to that "box", and what we're addressing here is first, our own requirement to "think outside the box", and then to see if we can assist those with whom we want to do business, to be willing to do the same.

It's an interesting exercise, sometimes, is it not, when we begin to bring things back into alignment with the law and the way it was originally designed to work, and then find ourselves confronted with a business that's not fully aligned with the truth as a result of the business having adapted to the original misalignment.

The main issue in these cases, of course, is the actual "qualifying" based on income itself, whether it be wanting to qualify with enough income, or wanting to qualify with insufficient income.

From my perspective, truth and honesty and fair dealing can bridge a lot of what may appear to be barriers in this regard, but I think it may sometimes require a willingness for creative thinking, if not creative interaction. I guess, to some degree, any person who decides to become involved with [THE COMPANY] and begins realizing his own freedom regarding income tax matters, may be required, at times, to become involved in re-educating his fellow friends and business associates as to the truth of the whole matter. That's a lot easier to do, of course, in the feeling of confidence that comes from knowing the truth upon which one stands.

Thanks again for your input.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

.....

One of the issues, with which some clients find themselves having to deal, is that of knowing how and when a particular communication with the IRS is actually handled by [THE COMPANY]. It's understandable, of course, for folks to be concerned. They would have been concerned anyway, of course, even without [THE COMPANY's] involvement; but when the actual response to the communication lies outside their own control, it's easy to understand a heightened sensitivity and an increased tendency to concern and worry about when and if it's being handled properly.

The concern itself, I think, comes primarily from the negative conditioning most of us have had regarding the IRS, and how we've learned to "fear" them. So, turning all these issues over to [THE COMPANY] to handle is more difficult for the folks who are already in a state of heightened concern, than for the client who has never heard a negative word or threat directly from the IRS or a State taxing agency.

What I'm trying to convey to folks in these situations, in my communication with them, as well as here in this newsletter, is that [THE COMPANY], and particularly [THE FOUNDER], have been dealing with these issues (many of them) for over thirty years; and regardless of media "hype", the great "fear" of the IRS is primarily based on misperception. Believe me, folks, the IRS just doesn't have it as "well together" as many folks think; they are made up primarily of tens of thousands of folks, just like you and me...(well, maybe not exactly just like you and me, but at least like some other folks you know)...who are simply trying to do their jobs as best they know

how. In the meanwhile, the law remains the law; and since what [THE COMPANY] does remains in harmony with that law, it remains that all these "issues" get handled, and no client gets a knock on the door, and they don't have to go to court or to jail.

Here's a sampling of two of my dialogues, the first one this past week; the second one occurred a couple months ago. I also had a couple of phone calls this week pertaining to issues like this:

I have a question concerning [THE COMPANY]. When we receive a letter from the IRS how long should it talk for [THE COMPANY] to respond. I have talked to Joe, but I would like your input.

It depends...

(How do you like that answer?)

...It depends on how quickly you get a copy of it to [THE COMPANY]; then it depends on the content of the letter, as to how really "critical" it is, meaning how urgently a response is actually needed. Sometimes (often) the IRS "says" a certain time limit is required when, in fact, the law itself, says something different. [THE COMPANY] obeys the law.

The important thing, is to simply let [THE COMPANY] handle it and let go of worrying and "fussing" over it; let [THE COMPANY] do what you're paying them to do. They haven't failed yet, and no client has EVER seen her situation get worse as a result of what [THE COMPANY] does.

.....

Dear Paul,

The (COMPANY) is handling my Revocation of Election Process. It is my understanding that if I get a letter from the IRS, anything at all, I am to fax it to the (COMPANY) ASAP.

In the last (3) three weeks, I have recieved two (2) letters from the State of XXXX, and two (2) letters from Ogden, Utah. All four were faxed to the (COMPANY) on the same morning I recieved them..

Q: How am I assured that these letters are answered within the Required time frame, so that I do not get into deeper "DOO-DOO" with the IRS, and the State of XXXX? I am sitting on pins and needles until I know for sure. I realize that the (COMPANY) is, to say the least, extremely busy, but I really do feel there should be a "relief" system in place, so that clients like myself, can "know" that "ALL IS WELL".

You know, as soon as the letter is responded to by the (COMPANY), they could send out a quik email to let me know that: "we have responded to the letter from the State of XXXX, that was faxed to us on 08-17-2001. This could be a standard form letter in email format that would only take 3 or 4 minutes to send, THAT I WOULD GLADLY PAY \$5.00 TO GET!!!! Is this something that makes sense to you? Makes a mega-lot of sense to me.

Since the (COMPANY) has had to make numerous changes, and mistakes could easily be made that would allow the IRS and the State of XXXX to move against me, if the response doesn't go out on time.

I have great respect for you, the (COMPANY), and all associated. I am confident that the (COMPANY) is very capable in handling any problem that might arise. I am concerned however, that if a mistake is made, and one of these letters is not answered in the time frame allowed, for whatever reason that could transpire, it would cause me irreparable damage that, at this point in time, could destroy me and the small business my wife and I have worked so hard to build up.

We still have not heard anything back about the Levy against our XXXXX, for personal taxes. The (COMPANY) is supposed to get it taken care of, since we are to pay the \$750.00 extra for the (COMPANY) to do so. The IRS caused us to lose 50 % of our income as we lost one of our largest labor accounts we had with a large company as a result. We had to close out the checking account and for 3 months we had to hassel with cash and checks made out to my name.

I know you said that the client will receive a copy of everything the (COMPANY) responds to, but my loss of sleep is over me "not knowing" that it will be done before the IRS and State of XXX move against me again, like they did twice already! I don't mind telling you, I am scared as hell!!

The Revenue Officer went ahead and levied our bank account, even after he had been notified that the (COMPANY) had Limited Power of Attorney. I had already referred the Revenue Officer to Mr. Scott Roberts and informed him that Mr. Roberts said that if he had any questions, to call him. The Revenue Officer went ahead and levied our bank account anyway!

You may answer this email in your next newsletter if you have time. Also, as soon as we receive the refund that we are intitled to, I will agree to talk to any one who is considering becoming a client.

Sincerely,
XXXXXXX

Hi XXXX,

You are not my client, and from the sound of what you're writing, I think you need to contact your representative particularly with regard to receiving copies of anything [THE COMPANY] has filed on your behalf. I say this because I do not know your personal details (such as the information regarding the timing of when you became a client, when you returned your signed and notarized paperwork to [THE COMPANY], when you were levied, etc), and since I tell all of my clients to NEVER communicate directly with the IRS and, then ONLY when an agent physically calls them, to tell that agent whom to call about your tax matters, and in every other event, as you indicated you know and do, to send ALL communication, regarding ANYTHING, directly to [THE COMPANY] so they can deal with it.

I will tell you this. The IRS (and some State Taxing Agencies) these days are doing everything they can to "rattle" the money tree. They are simply doing their job in sending out their typical forms and communication. And they presume that YOU (and any person) who lives in "fear" of them may be "scared" into responding; and if not that,

to justify your feeling more fear, and in the case of being a client of [THE COMPANY], to doubt [THE COMPANY] itself.

[By-the-way, did you know that the IRS, by law, is "supposed" to send all communication directly to [THE COMPANY] under the power of attorney? Just another little "point" to illustrate that they believe they can rattle YOUR cage (and composure) in distinction to [THE COMPANY's]. That's why the revenue officer didn't call the company, but just went ahead and did her/his thing.]

For example, I had a client who just last week received a second round of communication from the IRS which scared him. This most recent communication, however, was taking a totally different tactic from the communication they'd sent about six weeks ago, where they said, if he didn't respond in 10 days, they were going to lien his property.

Here's what I asked my client, and it's a good question for you to ponder: "Why did they not fulfill on their former promised threat to lien? Why, instead, do they simply send a different unsigned, form letter that seems to pose a different tactic, with a different implied threat?"

You obviously were in trouble before you came to [THE COMPANY], in contrast to the person I was just referencing. I don't know how long you've been a client, but the disclaimer page you signed, when you applied, states that [THE COMPANY] would not be going to work on your levy until AT LEAST 60 days after they received you signed and notarized documents, and that any action (particularly on your part prior to then) would cause additional delay. Even when they go to work, it can take from several months to a year, for the levy issue to be resolved. In the meantime, [THE COMPANY's] other processes continue, and you ultimately can expect to receive back the monies that were taken from you via the levy process, anyway, even though [THE COMPANY] is unable to guarantee something that lies exclusively within the jurisdiction of the IRS.

You should be receiving copies of everything [THE COMPANY] files on your behalf, including any correspondence with the IRS or any State taxing agency, and you should receive it within a week of it's having been sent to the particular agency - and if you've not received anything yet, you need to contact your representative to find out those details. The way [THE COMPANY] is doing it now, if it's anything requiring your signature (and, admittedly, some things don't), you will know when it goes to the IRS, because it will come to you first for your signature, and YOU will be the one putting it in the mail box (with postage attached by [THE COMPANY]).

As to your knowing that something was responded to within a certain time frame, particularly a time frame contained in any IRS or or State taxing agency communication, I promise you, that the LAWFUL and LEGAL time frames for response are often much different from what they've said in their communication to you. That's another tactic to try to get you to act in haste (and worry and be concerned); it's a similar tactic (I'll use an analogy with reverse psychology) to the infomercials that tell you, "If you all in the next 20 minutes, we'll send you TWO bottles, instead of just one." (Think about that: how does a national order desk, with commercials airing at all sorts of times, in various time zones around the country, on numerous stations, even begin to tally the clock to gage whether you've responded "in time"? In the case of the infomercial, I promise you, they will send you the "two bottles", regardless of when you call - as long as their still in business with that offer. It's all an attempt to get you to act quickly). The same idea

applies to many time schedules the IRS communicates to you, while there are very few communicated time schedules to which the IRS will adhere.

While you may think it a simple matter for [THE COMPANY] to simply send you an email saying something was responded to, the copy you receive of the actual response serves that purpose, and trying to send an email to every client would just add one more "labor intensive" task that has to be performed by a staff person, and really can't be automated, because many clients don't have email.

Let's for a moment, however, presume everyone had email, and [THE COMPANY] had to spend "only" three minutes for every IRS/State agency communication, to send an email to the client. Let's say that only half of [THE COMPANY's] now, nearly 1500 clients received what you received. How much "time" would be required? Let's calculate it: 750 clients each receive 4 communications (2 from the State and 2 from the IRS); that would be $750 \times 4 = 3000$ separate responses (keeping in mind, of course, that they already have to respond, regarding which the law requires you receive copies); $3000 \times 3\text{min each} = 9000$ minutes, divided by 60 minutes in each hour and we end up with 150 EXTRA Man-hours of work. That's almost FOUR WEEKS of work. I think you see my point.

In the meantime, I can tell you that you really have nothing to fear. It's easy for me to say, "Don't worry," but I'm afraid that my words alone may not be sufficient for you in that regard.

Here's the bottom line: NO CLIENT OF [THE COMPANY] HAS EVER HAD HIS SITUATION GET WORSE AS A RESULT OF SOMETHING [THE COMPANY] HAS DONE OR FAILED TO DO. In plain and simple words, the IRS or State agency will not come knocking on your door, especially if you fulfill your agreement with [THE COMPANY] to not contact them yourself in any way, since the IRS could use that as an excuse to void the power of attorney you granted [THE COMPANY], necessitating that [THE COMPANY] go through the processes all over again.

Oh, yes; and if it should ever occur again (although highly unlikely, at this point) that the IRS moves to levy a bank account, why not sit down with your banker before it occurs (since you generally receive advanced notice of the IRS' "Intent to Levy", and have him show you the "law" that authorizes him to turn any money over to anyone (including the IRS) without a valid COURT ORDER. See what he says when you offer to sue him if he disobeys the law; and have him check with his legal department. I promise you, in the event you mentioned, he turned over your money without the proper authority the law requires. You could probably sue him now and win; although I tend to think that any lawsuit after the fact (in fact, any involvement in the adversarial court arena) simply keeps your attention on something you don't like and don't want, and keeps your mind and energy focused in such a way as to only increase your aggravation; in addition, law of attraction, which is ALWAYS matching your vibration of "feeling and belief" always give you more of what you're focusing on...

[You'll see that the book I included as a bonus also talks about this aspect of things, although it uses different "words" than the phrase "law of attraction".]

...Much better to have the conversation with the banker BEFORE he breaks the law.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

=====
[3] News Briefs & Comments
=====

Obviously the news, these days, continues to be dominated with the occurrences on 9/11 and what has been occurring since then. That being the case, I thought I'd use this correspondence to talk about one of the things that's been in the news.

From: XXXX

To: Paul Leinthall <littlehammer@primemail.com>

There is a lot of talk in the press that the Gov't is pushing hard to get a national ID card instituted as an anti terrorist measure. You and I know what this really means! Complete control of citizens. I am concerned that if we are forced to get one of these cards that it will identify us as US citizens and make us liable for US taxes? Something to think about. Regards, XXXX

Hi XXXX,

Why would a "national" ID card tie one into the tax system anymore than the similar words ("citizen/national") on your passport?

It might provide problems and issues for someone who is a law "breaker", perhaps; but why should it present a problem to someone who is obeying the law?

What I'll be curious about will be the "requirements" of "law" that may be attached to the "ID card" and what they mean in their own right; but it's hard to imagine they could even begin to invalidate the "law" regarding income taxes without changing MAJOR parts of the Statues at Large going all the way back to, and including, the Constitution itself (and the change to the Constitution would have to be by some other means than an amendment).

The issue of "privacy", of course, is an entirely different matter, and my guess is, there will be quite a "rise" from people if they begin to realize they are "surrendering" too much of their freedom and privacy in the "name of security"; and from my perspective, putting one's attention on what he doesn't want" (even with the idea of eliminating it) NEVER works in actually eliminating what is not desired. Law of Attraction doesn't care "why" we put attention on something; it ALWAYS answer's "yes", and it interprets "attention on" as "desire for". The Universe doesn't "hear" the words of "NO! I Don't want THAT"; it only responds to our vibration, and vibration "in us" comes from where our attention is. Attention on what we don't want gets us more of "it," just as surely as focused attention on what we do want brings us and "it" together.

Unfortunately, more people are focused on what they DON'T want; so there tend to be a lot more examples of people not really having what they want. This occurs even on a national scale. As an example, the "war on drugs" has resulted in "drugs" being at least 10 times more a problem now than when we started the "war". If we put as much attention on the "war against terrorists" as we have the "war against drugs" (and from the sounds of it, "they're" attempting to prepare use for as long and drawn out a war as that), I can promise you, THOSE results will be as much in line with the law of increase as anything else upon which we put our attention.

The nice thing is, "we" (each person) is the arbiter of his own thinking, and "we" can put as much, or as little, attention on anything we choose; and particularly if we're noticing how we're feeling as our thoughts turn to an subject, we can quickly "decide" in each moment whether, or not, we want to remain in that "mode". Some folks, no doubt, will choose to continue to think about and be afraid of terrorists (and "terror" itself). They will probably experience "proof" that they should continue to be afraid. Others of us will not give it hardly a second thought, and we'll be amazed (if we even notice) at how the closest that terrorists (or "terror") get to us is on our TV sets; and even then, we control that switch, too, don't we?

The really neat thing about it all is that the Universe matches EACH person's vibration, regardless of what anyone else is vibrating. There were some folks, for example (not many, I agree) who "should" have been dead as a result of the WTC bombing, but who "miraculously" escaped what their co-workers did not. On 9/11, I heard one report of a man who "rode" the collapse down 82 floors, and walked away. I've not heard a word about that since (perhaps it was a "miss-report"; or maybe it's more about "Don't you feel guilty talking about being the only one who survived THAT, when everybody else perished?"), but "with God - all things are possible".

I know there's lots of talk - there has been for years, actually - about some sort of tracking number (perhaps even an implanted computer "chip"), as part of a "new world order" that would totally invade everyone's privacy were it to be a universal occurrence.

But there is already a magnificent "tracking mechanism" which no person alive can "escape" and no person can wiggle out of or around. That mechanism, from when time began, already keeps track of, and exactly matches to each person, his own thinking/feeling/belief. I (and others) call it "Law of Attraction".

I promise you, a person can be a whole lot more effective by utilizing the "contrast" that shows up in the form of ideas and circumstances that one spontaneously "knows" are not what he wants, to come to a conclusion about what he/she really wants (which, in most cases, would be the opposite of whatever is showing up), and then choose to focus SOLELY upon the chosen desire, RATHER THAN to focus on, push against, resist, and wage war against those ideas (or the people putting them forth) that are not in harmony with what one wants.

I know lots of people think they can not have what they really, really want until they first abolish anything that appears to threaten what they want. But the way the Universe works (the way God works, if you will) is to give to each according to his faith/belief. Lots of people "say" they want something, but their normal belief and feeling about it is that "they don't have it, can't get it, don't deserve it, or have to work too hard to get it, or it only comes to people with "rich Uncles", etc". On the other hand, there are plenty of folks who spend a lot of their time shouting "NO!" at what they don't want, and who are afraid even at the possibility of something "bad" showing up, who constantly see circumstances and events in their lives show up with which they are displeased; their actual "feeling belief" is that what they don't want IS, at least, a "real" possibility and must be focused on; and they continue to see and experience unfortunate events, as law of attraction fulfills its function in bringing them those results in harmony with their beliefs; which only fortifies them in their belief that they need to resist, push against, and keep their attention on it a guarded fashion; and when unfortunate events happen to them, they're often the first to ask, "Why me?"

One of the keys to life is to treat it like a smorgasbord, where everything is available. The lesson from the smorgasbord, of course, is that you don't spend any time "disallowing" all the possible choices of food that don't interest you; you just happily choose what you want, and let all other folks choose what they want; and you know there's enough for you without shorting someone else; and you know you don't have to put any time or attention on eliminating what you don't like from the contrast the smorgasbord presents to you. And, if in your process, you put something on your plate you find you don't like, you simply put it to the side and go on enjoying what you enjoy.

Life really is that simple; unfortunately, most of us make "LIFE" a whole lot more serious, and we "make" it difficult and hard and full of struggle. The fact remains, however, it is quite simple.

And it remains that we each receive what we think about - positive or negative - in accord with our "feeling faith/belief" in it, whatever it is or whatever it represents to us. The things, circumstances, events and people who "show up" in our lives are ALWAYS a vibrational match to our own thoughts and feelings (keeping in mind that it doesn't matter whether those thoughts and feelings are positive - about which we feel good when we're thinking about them, or negative - about which we don't feel good even as we "only think" about them); either way, what shows up is always a match.

Based on this principle, ONE PERSON, in touch with WHO he/she IS, and utilizing his/her ability to practice in harmony with THIS LAW, is more effective than a million people who are not so in touch. Just imagine if it were two people. Maybe that's what Jesus had in mind when he said, "If two of you shall agree on Earth as touching ANY THING that they shall ask, it shall be done for them..." (Matthew 18:19).

Well Being abounds on this planet and in this Universe, regardless of what the media reports. Each person can have whatever she wants, and it will not take one iota away from another person having whatever he wants. But whatever actually "shows up" in one's life will be according to one's own faith and belief.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

Again, the book I've included as an extra attachment to this week's "PDF" version of the newsletter talks about the exact same thing, using different words and, from my perspective, meaning the same thing. The Bible and the reports in the Bible of what Jesus said in different words say the same thing, too. For example: "According to your faith, so be it unto you"; "The rain falls on the just and on the unjust"; "Whatever you desire...believe you (already) have it, and you shall have it"; (that works the same in reverse, too). "The thing which I greatly feared has come upon me"; "Those that live by the sword shall die by the sword"; "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he", "You reap what you sow" (you reap in your life experience what you sow in your thinking, feeling, and believing); etc.

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

The TAX EXEMPT Conference Call, takes place Wednesday night, October 03, 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.