

=====

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

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

=====

Tuesday, December 11, 2001

- [1] Welcome: Why Last Week's Conference Call Reminder
- [2] Questions and Answers: Loopholes - Fair Share - Special Fees
- [4] Conference Call Reminder: **Wed, December 12th, 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

=====

Hello Friends,

Last week's conference call reminder went out without a newsletter simply because I "ran out of time". Mondays are the day of the week I allow for the compilation of the newsletter, and since I never got off the phone a week ago Monday until 7 PM - at least not long enough to make any significant progress on the newsletter - I simply decided I did not have time to try to do justice to a full newsletter.

Saying that now brings another thought, in a similar vein, to mind. As most readers know, I write this newsletter because I have fun doing it. I enjoy interacting with people, answering questions and making comments. This didn't start out as a newsletter; it started out simply as a conference call reminder.

I started this practice because, in the beginning, as I first began representing [THE COMPANY], I soon realized how easy it is to get caught up in the details of one's own life and forget that the only one night for the conference call has come around again. I often heard the comment, "Oh - I forgot the call!"

Within several weeks, I was including a question and answer, or two, and, as it's turned out, the newsletter has become quite a source of information - quite similar in content to what one might hear on any Wednesday night's conference call - except that the delivery is obviously different, with a different "deliverer" doing the delivery. In any one newsletter, there are not as many questions answered as you will hear on just one conference call, but, using this medium, I can go into more detail on a particular question and often include supporting documentation, which would be almost impossible on the call.

HOWEVER - I continue to do this for my own fun more than from any altruistic motive. I did not perceive trying to bang out a full edition of the newsletter last week as being fun. That's why I said last week, "Due to personal circumstances..."

I had four people call me to ask if I was all right. One person even asked of [THE COMPANY] was all right. So, I thought I owed you all an explanation.

It's one advantage of providing a "free" newsletter. I'm not quite as likely to "feel obligated". I really don't like that feeling. Do you?

We've got some lengthy questions and answers - from three different people.

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

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

Hi XXXX,

Thanks for your note. It provides a good opportunity to respond.

You wrote:

I've been away and only skimmed your letter [information]. I certainly WANT to believe this (who wouldn't?) but, of course, I'll need some normal Joes who are unimpeachable witnesses who have done this. Plus documentation. Could the feds undo this? Why wouldn't the government long ago take care of this loophole? Is it now taking steps to close the hole?

Nevertheless, I am inclined to believe this. And foresee myself pursuing your services. Thanks, XXXX

"Normal Joes"? "Unimpeachable witnesses"? "Plus documentation"?

All of [THE COMPANY's] clients are normal Joes. I'm not sure what you mean by, or what your criteria is for, unimpeachable witnesses. PLUS documentation on top of all that? What kind of documentation?

"Loophole"? What loophole?

What [THE COMPANY] does is NOT a loophole; it is the LAW. Just because a person does not know the law, and therefore is not aware of how it is that what [THE COMPANY] does is actually based on the LAW THAT ALREADY IS, means only that any so-called "loophole" is on the side of the IRS, in that people are not aware of the law as it actually is. Don't feel bad, though, because "most people" have already been convinced that the "law that never was" (the loophole) is the "truth". They're not told that the loophole is that they entered a contract with the IRS, wherein they stated and AGREED they were "U.S. Individuals" and, were therefore, liable for paying "income taxes".

The process [THE COMPANY] uses has been used (that we know of) since the early seventies. The IRS has NEVER ONCE tried to challenge it or pursue a client into the judicial arena. They can't close a NON-EXISTENT hole - "loop" or otherwise.

And would we get billed plus penalties?

"Get billed plus penalties"? For what? Obeying the law? Besides, who you really ARE - and who you ALREADY are - by your natural free-born status under the law, is a "non (income) taxpayer". BUT, like most people did, you voluntarily elected to sign a form, which under the law, did not belong to YOU AS YOU ARE (as long as you are a Citizen, by birth or naturalization, and reside in one of the 50 States and NOT on federal ground [reservations, enclaves, districts or territories, etc., located within or without the 50 Sovereign States]).

In a similar fashion (and as an example of how it all works), a person today can voluntarily elect to sign another contract which differs from WHO a person naturally IS, namely, the contract to voluntarily join the military. AFTER signing the military contract, the person is seen by the law as someone other than WHO he naturally IS. DIFFERENT RULES apply to him than used to apply to him before signing, which rules do NOT APPLY to someone not having made the same election.

The exact same thing has happened regarding the "adhesion contract" with the IRS. Everyone who signs an IRS 1040 Form, enters into a relationship with the IRS regarding so-called "income taxes". That adhesion contract binds the person who signed it, to the fulfilling of the obligations inherent therein. All the conditions, regulations and obligations of that CONTRACT are spelled out in what we know of as The Internal Revenue Code, Title 26 of the United States Code.

The only way "out" is to revoke the contract itself in a manner consistent with the conditions (law) of the contract. THAT revocation, which [THE COMPANY] calls the "revocation of election process," is the primary service [THE COMPANY] performs for all their clients. It is that process which has NEVER failed, in anyone's case. In the completion of that process, the person is now free to enjoy his/her life, no longer being liable for paying income taxes (federal or State) in ALL but a few instances (those instances where he/she actually has "taxable income"), which translates to "NEVER" for most people. The times when income taxes might apply are delineated specifically in the Internal Revenue Code and I've covered them in a generic fashion in the material I have provided you. In any event, where those specific conditions apply, then, yes, a person may well be liable for paying taxes on his "taxable income".

There can be no real penalties or interest, nor the billing thereof, for taxes not owed in the first place. (That is NOT to say the IRS can't or won't send you a communication

saying you supposedly owe income taxes). A person can not owe income taxes, by law, on anything other than "taxable income", and a person can not have taxable income unless he has "gross income" from one of the revenue-taxable sources, as defined in the Code, which are all "federal sources", which you'll discover as you continue reading the material I've sent you.

At the same time, [THE COMPANY] strongly emphasizes that a person SHOULD definitely pay ANY income taxes for which he is LAWFULLY and LEGALLY Liabe. As I said, in most cases, being lawfully liable is hardly ever the case for ANY client of [THE COMPANY]. However, for any person who has NOT properly completed the revocation process, and who has signed his/her FIRST "IRS Form 1040 - U.S. Individual Tax Return", under penalty of perjury, THAT person IS, and continues to be, liable for paying income taxes on ALL his/her worldwide income.

I will repeat your question rhetorically: IF what [THE COMPANY] does is based on a loophole - "[Why wouldn't the government long ago take care of this loophole?](#)". My point exactly: there's no loophole to be taken care of.

Regarding your saying, "[I'll need some normal Joes who are unimpeachable witnesses who have done this](#)":

It is a violation of law and the power of attorney for [THE COMPANY] to provide any information regarding any client to anyone outside the IRS, other than the client himself. If the services [THE COMPANY] performs with the IRS on the behalf of each client were not done under power of attorney, or if [THE COMPANY] were simply peddling information, then it would only stand to reason that [THE COMPANY] might engage in "testimonial letters" or provide copies of client's refund checks and other proof, which some might consider unimpeachable. However, because [THE COMPANY] provides a service, and because all communications are signed by [THE FOUNDER] under power of attorney, in HIS relationship as a certified filer for client's tax matters, were [THE COMPANY] to promote their services, utilizing some of what might be considered "standard" marketing methods, it could engender liability against [THE COMPANY] for charges of "enticement" in their marketing methods. That would create an additional problem on top of the violation of law regarding client privacy.

It's sort of ironic that, while neither [THE COMPANY] itself, nor their representatives, can engage in some of the types of marketing practices that the commercial world has come to accept as necessary for engendering confidence and generating business, almost ALL of [THE COMPANY's] business comes from satisfied customers referring their friends and relatives.

For this reason, we encourage each person who is interested in what [THE COMPANY] does, to get the free material we provide, and to get on at least one Wednesday night conference call, and to do whatever other due diligence is necessary to come to an informed and clear decision that feels good - before applying for [THE COMPANY's] services. Even after a person has become a client, [THE COMPANY] will completely refund his money in the event they fail to produce the results. Of course, that's a fairly easy guarantee to give, when what you do never fails.

Remember, however, the guarantee does NOT apply to IRS refunds; although we expect the IRS will honor refunds, that is something completely in their domain and under their control. The IRS has not yet refused a refund to any client. Please understand that saying that is not the same as saying that every client has received a

refund; they will never be able to say that at any point in time as long as they continue taking clients, because there is always the unknown time-factor of "when" the IRS actually writes the checks - so, at any point in time, there will always be a certain number of clients who have not yet received refunds.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

=====

yes, my note does display a somewhat careless reading, doesn't it?. Thank you for your lengthy reply, considering how busy you must be, I am flattered. Paul, what about the down side? Wouldn't the government refuse services to us because we don't pay for them? Police protection, embassy services etc. There must be stories to consider.

As is true for many people, your question indicates that you've come to believe that income taxes pay for government services. Let me share with you a portion of my August 21, 2001 Newsletter, where I addressed this same question:

[Question]

I have heard on past calls people mention that not one cent of taxes is paid to the Federal Government, or to the Treasury of the United States of America. Again, how can this be confirmed. Does the company have documentation to support these claims made on the Wednesday night calls? Where can people get confirmation?

I'd really appreciate your response to this as I had several clients on calls in the past who did not believe any of these claims and decided not to use the company services. Had I known where they could verify these claims, it would have helped perhaps.

Best Regards,
XXXXX

President Reagan's Grace Commission is probably the most recent "authority" on this matter. You'll see a reference to that in just a moment.

...I've taken the following page (copied) directly from the "taxgate.com" web site. Here's the place to go find it, if you want to read it there:

<http://www.taxgate.com/docs/fair_share.htm>

[Since the TaxGate site re-edits the page occasionally, I've copied the latest edition for this December 11th, 2001 newsletter on the next page]:

Fair Share?

Last edited: December 05, 2001

THE GOVERNOR TOLD THE TRUTH...

"TAXES FOR REVENUE ARE OBSOLETE"

Have you ever stopped to ask yourself this simple question: If the government can print as much money as it needs, then why is there an income tax?

In 1946, Beardsley Ruml - then Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of NYC, told the truth in a speech titled "Taxes For Revenue Are Obsolete".

Mr. Ruml explained that, since a government can easily print all the paper money it needs, in any amount, and therefore does not need to tax anyone, an income tax is maintained to siphon excess paper out of circulation, to stabilize the purchasing power of paper money (i.e., regulate inflation) and prevent the hyperinflation that would ordinarily result from printing too much paper!

Now you know the truth behind the 'income tax'. Yet, not one American in a million heard Mr. Ruml's speech (And that is a good thing or they might have marched on Washington!).

Ample paper must continuously be taxed (siphoned) out of circulation to keep pace with the interest payments on the national debt, being made to the mostly foreign bankers who designed and control the Federal Reserve System.

In 1982, the prestigious, private-sector Grace Commission, in their cost-cutting report to President Reagan, confirmed the ineptness of the income tax to control inflation. The following quote by the Commission confirms that they do not even understand how the income tax functions, and that the present rate of taxation does not pay the interest for the use of the money printed by the Federal Reserve Bank and thus cannot even begin to affect the growth of the national debt... "100% [of income taxes] collected is absorbed solely by interest on the federal debt ... all income tax revenues are gone before one nickel is spent on the services taxpayers expect from the government."

(This position has no semblance of reality with the position of the Federal Reserve Bank. Anyone care to guess why?)

Shocked? You should be! The Commission's report was apparently written to make certain that most hard-working Americans will never know, or even believe, the hidden connection between fraudulent paper money and the taxes they pay on their own labor (fraudulently seized from their paychecks and bank accounts by the Federal Reserve Bank's "strong arm" collection agency, the IRS).

Read Ruml's full speech...

[<http://www.taxgate.com/docs/ruml.htm>](http://www.taxgate.com/docs/ruml.htm)

Also, as you assiduously avoid the federal mails; is it because The Company is afraid of mail fraud charges?

What do you mean when you say, "...as you assiduously avoid the federal mails..."? Are you suggesting that because "I" sent you all MY information via email that [THE COMPANY] avoids the U.S.Postal system? EVERYTHING [THE COMPANY] files with the IRS is via the U.S.Postal System!

There's a big difference between "avoiding" the federal mail system and "utilizing" electronic distribution of information (because it's faster and much less expensive).

I glanced at your sample check for payment and again the procedure does not encourage confidence.

Are you talking about the "check by fax" form, which is the last page of the application? If so, are you not aware that many companies these days will simply take your "check" information by phone or fax and "create" a computer check, which is a perfectly legal check and clears YOUR bank the same way as any other check you write. The only difference being, that you didn't actually have to send you physical check. Again - faster and less expensive - and just as effective. In fact, for many people, it's just plain simpler and easier.

Documentation: I am assuming the IRS sends us a notice confirming our change in status. And perhaps other letters. Can't we see what this looks like?

Why would you assume that the IRS sends a notice confirming your change of status. Did they EVER send you a notice explaining the law about what your actual status is, or whether you even had a choice? When you've been a good boy and paid your taxes every year, did you ever receive any kind of acknowledgement or confirmation from them?

On the contrary, the ONLY time people hear from the IRS is when the IRS considers that the filer has made an error of some sort.

The IRS operates from the premise that YOU are responsible for knowing the law and for complying with it. The fact that you've come to believe (albeit erroneously and ignorantly) that there was some law that required your participation in the income tax system is not really their fault, although they would have little interest in your discovering the truth. There is a reason that the United States Supreme Court has ruled numerous times that "Ignorance of the law is no excuse". It's not the IRS who is ignorant of the law, and it's a great mistake to assume that the IRS' job is to educate you as to the law itself.

Again, regarding ANY communication that a client receives from the IRS, it is "off limits" for [THE COMPANY] to share with anyone else. Now, if YOU get such a letter - and that's entirely possible as a result of the "Status Determination Request Process", YOU can share that with your friends; and we would expect you would. But neither [THE COMPANY] nor the representatives can do that without violating the law and opening up the possibility of charges of "enticement" relative to marketing methods.

So: I assume that the conference call is the only venue for listening to another who has gone through the process. I wanted to meet someone face to face.

"Someone"? Who? Me? Joe Lansing? That can be arranged by appointment. If by "someone" you mean an "unimpeachable client witness - and NOT a representative or company employee", then I'm afraid you'll have to pursue that on your own. Perhaps you know someone who is already a client - besides me, of course.

Time: How long from filing to Change of Status?

Exactly when any filing is done for any particular client (after becoming a client) depends solely on that client's circumstances and prior relationship history with the IRS. (What was filed? When was it filed? Did he file an extension? Does an extension have to be filed? Was the client a former "non-filer"? Etc.)

Because everything [THE COMPANY] does is based in harmony with the law itself, and because what [THE COMPANY] does in NO WAY AFFECTS (or Effects) WHO he IS (already), in relationship to the law itself, the client can consider that the law's effectiveness begins from the date he signs and notarizes the "second pack" documents, which second pack he receives for signatures and notarization within two to four weeks (generally) after sending in his application.

From the IRS' point of view, all correspondence with them is based on the POSTMARK date, even if the documents take 20 years to get to them. The primary assurance [THE COMPANY] uses, and the only one really available, is that [THE COMPANY] ALWAYS sends their communication to the IRS accompanied by a certified return receipt (sometimes referred to as the "green card" - not to be confused with the "Resident Alien Green Card"), just in case the IRS "loses" (or claims to have lost) the paperwork. In the event that loss occurs, [THE COMPANY] simply supplies them with another complete set of whatever they claim to have lost, along with the copy of the green card they signed as proof that they did receive the original filing.

How long to average receipt of funds from IRS?

As I've stated several times, [THE COMPANY] does NOT guarantee refunds. If we could guarantee them, we might have a good idea as to "how long". Some clients (a very few) have received a refund in four or five months; some clients have been clients for over two years, and have not yet received anything in the form of refund. NO CLIENT HAS EVER BEEN REFUSED a refund, but obviously, that statement does not equate to every client having received a refund. If the IRS is going to refuse a refund, they must do so, IN WRITING, with their REASONS for refusal. Given the Code and the Law, we really don't expect to see this type of thing anytime soon.

There appears to be neither rhyme nor reason to WHEN or HOW LONG it takes to receive a refund. We just know, that IF the IRS obeys their own law, we expect every client, who is due a refund, to eventually receive the refund.

Does the COMPANY interface with our employer (in my case The State of California) to insure state taxes are not deducted or is that interface up to us? If so what are the guidelines?

[THE COMPANY] is not party to your employment contract (agreement) with your employer. If an employer knows and understands AND OBEYS the law, we know he has no other lawful obligation BUT to HONOR the employee's W-4. As part of [THE COMPANY's] serviced for the client, they prepare a fresh, new W-4 for any client who

requests it (up to four times a year), with supplemental documentation to provide to the employer (in the event the employer appears to need it). Other than preparing the W-4 and supplemental documentation, [THE COMPANY] is NOT involved in the employer-employee relationship. The employee is the one who submits the new "exempt" W-4 to his employer.

We will be happy to speak with any employer who has questions, BUT, the employer must initiate the contact; [THE COMPANY] has no lawful basis or right to do so. Also, the issue of privacy under the power of attorney enters in, here, too.

Can [THE COMPANY] "insure" that the employer knows, understands AND obeys the law? No.

In MOST cases, especially in large companies that have a legal department, there is not any problem with a client's submitting an "exempt" W-4, once he is actually a client. [THE COMPANY] has a small number of clients who have had a problem, but whose W-4 problems PRECEDED their being a client, because they turned in "exempt" W-4's before they had become clients and completed the revocation process.

[THE COMPANY] has one client (my client, in fact), who submitted the "exempt" W-4, after becoming a client, and who enjoyed six weeks of receiving a FULL paycheck (no federal or State income taxes withheld), before he was notified by the IRS that they were instructing his employer not only to disallow his W-4, but to withhold "single/maximum", on top of which they imposed a \$500 Frivolous W-4 Filing penalty. The client has not paid that penalty, of course, and [THE COMPANY] has been corresponding with the IRS for most of this year (2001) regarding those "instructions". We expect that, EVENTUALLY, the IRS will correct their erroneous instructions to the employer. However, we also "suspect" that the IRS is singling out this employee because he is a policeman and his employer is the city's police department. It's almost like they're saying: "God forbid we should allow one who is responsible for enforcing the law to really know that not only is there no law requiring an employee to complete a W-4 to get or maintain a job, but even worse that he should know that the LAW requires the employer to HONOR WHATEVER the employee puts on his W-4." The problem is: try to get an employer to understand that if he, himself, lives in fear of the IRS or in fear of a law that doesn't even exist. And the truth of that matter is that the employer has broken the law, by not honoring what the employee submitted. The IRS has not broken any law by simply providing "instructions", but their instructions are NOT the law, nor are they in accord with the law. While the employee has grounds for a successful lawsuit, how many employees what to take-on their employer in court? If they do, will they have a job when it's all over?

Actually, in a case like this, the IRS is not even following their own instructions. To show you some of what I'm talking about, here are the pertinent paragraphs from the Form W-4 for 2001:

Form W-4 (2001)

Purpose. Complete Form W-4 so your employer can withhold the correct Federal income tax from your pay. Because your tax situation may change, you may want to refigure your withholding each year.

Exemption from withholding. If you are exempt, complete only lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7, and sign the form to validate it. Your exemption for 2001 expires February 18, 2002.

By-the-way, this illustrates the reason every client must complete a fresh Form W-4 each year. As you can see, the exemption for 2001 expires in the middle of February, 2002.

But they do make it clear - don't they? - that there is the distinct possibility that someone can be exempt from withholding

Now, we'll look at the "tricky" part.

Note: You cannot claim exemption from withholding if (1) your income exceeds \$750 and includes more than \$250 of unearned income (e.g., interest and dividends) and (2) another person can claim you as a dependent on their tax return.

The key to that paragraph is that ALL the "and's" (including #2) must be fulfilled BEFORE it's true that "You cannot claim exemption". Many folks simply see #1. On top of that, however, is the fact that these are INSTRUCTIONS, and instructions are NEVER the law itself.

Let's turn to the key lines from the actual Form W-4, which is submitted to the employer. This is the "legal" part of this form and it reflects the law. We'll look only at line 7.

7. I claim exemption from withholding for 2001, and I certify that I meet both of the following conditions for exemption:

- Last year I had a right to a refund of all Federal income tax withheld because I had no tax liability and
- This year I expect a refund of all Federal income tax withheld because I expect to have no tax liability.

If you meet both conditions, write "Exempt" here:

Let me ask a question: Is there any ambiguity in what you just read? When one understands the law, as to WHO a person is, AND when one has completed (signed/notarized) the forms that provide the basis for the revocation of election process, BOTH of those statements ARE TRUE. Not only did the person not have any tax liability last year, but he will not have any tax liability in this year (or years to come) - unless, of course, he chooses to have federally sourced income.

Does the W-4 Form, then, not clearly instruct the person to "write 'Exempt' here" if he meets BOTH conditions?

On what basis do they think they have grounds to imply a frivolous W-4 filing? How can they claim that no one is allowed to submit an "exempt" W-4 Form?

This also illustrates why it is important to understand that the services [THE COMPANY] performs do NOT CHANGE the person from one thing into another. The reason [THE COMPANY] can utilize the "Status Determination Request Process" - wherein [THE COMPANY] asks the IRS to make their own determination as to whether the client is, or is not, a "taxpayer", based on their own law (which is plainly laid out before them in the filing itself), is because the law ALREADY makes clear who is and who is not liable for income taxes. Based on who a Private State Citizen IS, by birth and residence, he is NOT a taxpayer of income taxes, because the law declares that certain characteristics apply to sovereign State Citizens which are not characteristic of a person who is NOT a State Citizen. However, the State Citizen is FREE to sign any contract he chooses, and when he does, he becomes bound by the law of contracts to fulfill the terms and conditions of the contract, until such time as he completely fulfills the terms of the contract (which never ends with the IRS) or properly revokes his election into the contract, which revocation removes the Private Citizen from the jurisdiction of the contract and the regulations enforcing it that no longer pertain. So, [THE COMPANY] is utilizing processes that deal with the contract in which the person obligated himself to something that was not required of him by law in the first place as a Person having the status of Private Citizen.

Forgive me if I sound like a doubting Thomas but surely that cannot be new for you.

No forgiveness necessary, and yes, you're correct, "doubting Thomas's" are not new to me. In fact, we encourage it - or at least the inquiry into the law and the facts - until a person can reach a clean, clear, self-governing decision that feels good to him regarding these matters.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

=====

Hi XXXX,

I'll continue in my usual mode:

Once again I thank you for the time investment of your reply. Since I am "a normal Joe" as far as no monkey business with the IRS I am still wondering an average time period before a refund is sent. This has got to be a pretty normal question.

Normal question with no "normal" answer, except the one I've already given: Of the 40%+ of clients who've received refunds, a rare few have got them in four or five months, most of them in 8 to 18 months, and some clients have not yet received a refund in just three months short of three years. If you can compile or calculate from that an "average time period before a refund is sent", my congratulations.

That's part of why [THE COMPANY] does not guarantee refunds, and why we stress that a person should NOT become a client based on any expectations of "If", "When", "Whether, or not", or "How long", pertaining to refunds.

Also the documentation I requested need not disclose personal info, I just wanted to see what it is. (Also a very normal type of request).

Again. Perhaps a normal request, but, other than the documentation I've already sent you, the documentation that is filed by [THE COMPANY] on the behalf of any client is reserved for that client. At such time as you are a client, you will see ALL the documentation filed on your behalf; but you must realize, that except for what we might call the "standard" documentation, the documentation may differ in varying degrees between you and any other client.

If we were selling "do-it-yourself information", rather than the services which obviously include necessary documentation, but also the how's and when's and where's of any specific filing, then you would pay for the materials and be on your own. Given that a good proportion of the proprietary process is revealed in the documentation that is filed, [THE COMPANY] is not interested in revealing that process to anyone who is not a client. Obviously, as a client, I have the "standard" documentation, since it's been filed on my behalf; but as a representative, my first obligation is to [THE COMPANY] in not providing that to others, since it would create a conflict of interest as well as be a violation of my agreement with [THE COMPANY].

You see, you're dealing with a different "animal" here. Everyone else will sell you their information; [THE COMPANY] will not; and they still are, to the best of my knowledge, the ONLY company who money-back guarantees that their SERVICE (which includes the documentation) WILL produce the results of essentially removing a client away from income tax liability in accordance with the law.

How many people has THE COMPANY represented, since when?

AS A COMPANY taking clients "en mass" there are approximately 1500 clients since March, 1999, with 100% success and NO failures. The IRS has not pursued a single client into the judicial arena, and they have not refused a refund to any client. Since the IRS says that ALL issues can be resolved in the administrative arena, and since [THE FOUNDER] of [THE COMPANY] has been doing the "revocation process" for private clients since the mid-eighties, and since the man who passed the process on to him was doing it since the early seventies - in total almost 30 years with no adverse repercussions. So, it could lawfully be argued that the IRS has not fulfilled their own lawful duty, IF, in fact, they have seen something that's wrong and out of whack with their own code and have continued to "allow" it to go on for such a long time. And that has become even more critical for them over the past two+ years, because now they're allowing it, with filings coming from ONE source for 1500 people.

Are you incorporated?

[THE COMPANY]? Yes. An LLC. (Limited Liability Corporation)

I still haven't been able to study the points you make attentively but I concede it is logical and compelling. Will I be able to claim an exempt status BEFORE I receive a refund?

With due caution to the WORD "exempt" - yes. But, let me explain. TECHNICALLY, no one is categorically and completely exempt from taxes, including income taxes. For certain, anyone with the ability to observe, would realize she is not exempt from taxes, because NO one is totally exempt, as long as they are alive and purchase ANYTHING, because EVERYTHING that is sold has some kind of taxes associated with it, somewhere between when it is grown or manufactured and when it reaches your hands in exchange for your dollars. Most taxes, and the kind on which the government actually makes it's monies to support it's "services," come from excise taxes. So, NO ONE is completely exempt from taxes.

Even regarding the income tax, any client could STILL be liable for income taxes, WHEN or IF he has "taxable income". Most Americans really don't have taxable income (even though they might, if they have federally sourced income), but MOST Americans have elected to be "taxpayers," according to the Internal Revenue Code.

WHO the PERSON IS, however - WHO the PERSON always WAS (if he was born in one of the 50 States and still resides in any one of them) - using Internal Revenue Code terms, IS a Private State Citizen Nonresident Alien Individual, who CHOSE to be SEEN AS a "U.S.Individual" (for tax purposes), by signing his FIRST 1040 Tax Return. The person who thus signed the adherence contract, bound himself to the SAME terms and conditions and rules and regulations AS a legitimate "U.S.citizen" in the Code, but he did NOT "un-become" a Private State Citizen - Nonresident Alien in relation to the law. Under the force of Contract Law, however, and under the Constitutional support of any Private Citizen's right to engage in contracts, the contract he signed, supercedes his "normal" rights, until the contract itself is resolved.

Once you have SIGNED & NOTARIZED [THE COMPANY's] paperwork, you can consider yourself "exempt" (income tax exempt) for all practical purposes, because, by LAW, and by virtue of WHO YOU ARE, you never actually changed into a "resident alien" or "U.S. individual" (which is the way the IRS sees you, with legal "evidence" to prove it - your signed 1040 contract).

The term "resident alien individual" or "U.S. individual" is a description of a person with certain characteristics, DIFFERENT characteristics than a Private State Citizen - Nonresident alien individual". THE KIND of Citizen, WHO you ARE, is the "citizen/national of the United States (of America)" as indicated, for example, on your passport. The "resident alien" or "U.S. Individual" or "U.S. citizen" in the tax Code is something and some ONE else.

So, [THE COMPANY] does NOT change who you ARE; they simply get the IRS to see you AS YOU ARE, not as you have voluntarily elected to have them mistakenly see you, which, I presume, has cause you ALL your income tax issues up till now.

[Did you receive notification that your original tax exempt status had been re-instated?](#)

No. Why? Because the law was the law before I became a client. The law itself, is my notification and verification. This is why "ignorance of the law" is the failing of most folks, while it remains "no excuse" for you're having got yourself into a contract, the terms of which and with which you may only now be coming to grasp.

Your fervor is palpable, if slightly intimidating. Its a crusader spirit. It makes me speculate on what such zeal could do in my church.

Yes, that is no doubt true - certainly regarding the way some folks perceive me more than others. One might try to account for it by saying I'm a Sagittarian, with Leo Rising - a double fire (fervor) sign. I would more likely say it is WHO I AM speaking from the conviction of my heart and belief, that we are "lived" by the Spirit of FREEDOM, which some refer to as the Spirit of God/Creator. I would suggest to you that this is the same Spirit (although you may choose different words to describe it) IN YOU who finds this "logical and compelling," as you said earlier.

I do not wish to impune your honesty, I am merely dashing off my observations (mail, check) which have flashed up warning flags, rightly or not. You never mentioned a down side.

If there is a "down side", it is that the truth has been buried for so long that most people perceive the lie to be the truth, so much so, that when they hear something like this for the first time, it appears as "too good to be true". Add on top of that the supposedly wise statement that says, "If it's too good to be true, it probably is" - and you've got the right conditioning for the continued ground of giving credence to the lie, which they've convinced you is the truth, while doubting the truth, which they've convinced you is a lie.

But, that again, is WHY, when you go to the law itself, you find your verification. For most folks, it's too much bother to go to the law itself, and they choose to let the "professionals" handle that for them. And then they wonder why they don't feel the freedom that is inherent in their being, because even the professionals can only teach what they know, and they really are NOT taught the law, itself, so much, as they are the PROCEDURES for finessing the legal paperwork through the courts. The rare ones get to be good trial lawyers, who can actually articulate the law. But even there, in EVERY court trial, one of those professionals wins and the other loses. It is, in most instances, the re-embodiment of "The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil".

There was (and IS) an other Tree - the Tree of Life. MANY folks miss that.

Until you FEEL GOOD, and have done your own "due diligence" to the point of the conviction of your own desire and belief, we would strongly suggest you NOT become a client. My fervor is not intended to be a suggestion that a person not listen to his own inner voice and guidance.

You might think its bad press but its absence makes me uneasy.

The absence of the downside makes you uneasy? You've already GOT the downside; you've been living with it for years, have you not?

Of course, if by "the downside," you mean something similar to what Jesus spoke of as the "downside" attached to following him, I can tell you, that the "lack of having the majority of public opinion, acceptance and good will" would be the downside, here. Regarding the law itself, from my perspective, there is no downside. The only downside is running contrary to the way the water of public opinion is flowing.

Perhaps we could take some lessons from the salmon.

I sorta get the idea that people who have already been in trouble may have a difficult time with this process.

Actually, most of the people who have experienced being in trouble with the IRS (myself included) before becoming clients have found this to be a breath of fresh air; and when the IRS "goes away" from a client that they had been pursuing up till now, these folks are our best "witnesses". Think about it. I was a "non-filer" for over 23 years. Now, as a result of [THE COMPANY's] services, I stand with my filing status CURRENT with the IRS, without having had to pay ANY income taxes for ANY of those 23 years. Obviously, I won't experience the thrill of seeing the IRS refund any money, but I surely can speak with conviction about their lack of pursuit of me, since they PRIORLY had been in open pursuit of me and of the income tax dollars I supposedly owed under the contract.

I have no such history. I am in San Francisco, is there anyone I can meet with here?

I'm sure [THE COMPANY] has some clients in the San Francisco Bay area; I'm aware of at least a half dozen, because they're my clients. However, for reasons I've already explained, neither [THE COMPANY] nor the representatives would be adhering to the law were they to divulge specific client information. I'm in Tehachapi, California, if you want to drive down to meet me. [THE COMPANY's] main marketing offices are open to the public as well.

I hope my answers and responses are assisting you in your thought process. I often use my dialogue with folks in my newsletter, preserving each person's anonymity, of course; so don't be surprised if you see our dialogue again.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall



Paul, could you please explain this IRS form 56? I heard on the short wave radio, that if you properly fill this form out, and file it with the IRS you can "recapture" the "strawman" that the government created for you, and thus become the "holder in due course of your rights and property"? Haave you ever heard of this? The person said in order to fill it properly to look aat Blacks law dictionary and the definitions of agent, and principle. Any information on this would be helpful.

Thank you, XXXX

Hi XXXX,

While I've heard of the "strawman" concept, I don't know much about it. I know some folks believe it is valid. I'm also aware that some folks have got themselves into trouble with the IRS and the courts trying to apply it. At the same time, it appears to work for others (at least for a time). When you use the strawman concept, you're pretty much on your own, even though I understand that at least one of the groups claims to have attorneys who can help you if you get into trouble. That's just the problem, though; If you get into trouble, you have to PAY an attorney, PLUS your in the domain where you're almost doomed before you start.

The IRS Form 56 is used for either creating or terminating a fiduciary ("held in trust for another") relationship.

"Agent," in Black's, is defined as:

"A person authorized by another (principal) to act for or in place of him; one intrusted with another's business. One who represents and acts for another under the contract or relation of agency (q.v.). A business representative, whose function is to bring about, modify, affect, accept performance of, or terminate contractual obligations between principal and third persons. One who undertakes to transact some business, or to manage some affair, for another, by the authority and on account of the latter, and to render an account of it...(etc.)"

"Principal" in Black's, under Law of Agency, means:

"The term "principal" describes one who has permitted or directed another (i.e. agent or servant) to act for his benefit and subject to his direction and control, such that the acts of the agent become binding on the principal. Principal includes in its meaning the term "master", a species of principal who, in addition to other control, has a right to control the physical conduct of the species of agents known as servants, as to whom special rules are applicable with reference to harm caused by their physical acts..."

Reading between the lines (while still acknowledging that I do NOT know specifically how it is intended to be applied by those who foster the straw man concept), I would venture to "guess" that you'll find some clues to what they may "think" is supposed to happen, when you look at the language of "master" and "servant", and this might be really handy language for people who believe that government agencies and personnel are "servants" and we're supposed to be the "masters". It sounds good, doesn't it? Unfortunately, I think probably the IRS has not been informed of this; and I find it nowhere specifically evident in the Internal Revenue Code. Besides, even though the IRS is a collection "agency", I doubt that most folks think of ANY collection agency as being servant to the debtor, who indebted himself, via voluntary election into a contract. That would be like a person signing a contract for a credit card, running up a pile of bills, and then saying he was not obligated because the collection agency is "his" servant.

Other than the temporary confusion it may cause for some IRS agent(s) to get that form, I wouldn't be surprised to learn that the reason folks get into trouble using it is because it simply can't be construed under law in the manner that the people believe who are advocating it's use. I don't know why the folks who advocate the straw man concept might use this form...perhaps because it speaks of terminating a fiduciary relationship as well as creating one. However, the word "fiduciary" means "holding something, like money, in trust for an OTHER", so, I don't know how they're applying it. I also suspect it's because it's an idealistic notion that there is one, simple form--a magic bullet--that handles it all.

To all of which I say, "To each his own and different strokes for different folks."

[THE COMPANY] does not use anything like this, since their philosophy and practice is based on meeting the requirements of the law regarding contracts and their rescission, while still meeting the remnants of the contract (like annual filing) which keep all clients

in harmony with the WHOLE Code, and which prevents the IRS from using "failure to file" as an excuse to pursue clients.

Knowing [THE FOUNDER] of [THE COMPANY] as I do, I have to say that if a simple form, like Form 56, would easily and simply accomplish what they do, [THE COMPANY] wouldn't be doing what they're doing; they'd simply be using this form.

=====

"Supposedly" that is exactly what happened, the "de facto" government "created" a trust, with "them" as the fiduciary, or the "holder in due course" of our rights and property. So supposedly when you properly fill out and file an IRS form 56 you recapture the fiduciary, ie strawman, that was created for you by them, and now you are the holder in due course of your property and rights, and you can now have standing in "their" courts. That is how it was explained to me. Any thoughts?

Yes, and now the IRS comes after you and takes you to court for failure to file a tax return; and you're standing there with a form 56 in your hand, trying to explain to the judge that somebody told you this was a magic bullet that would end all your contractual headaches. Have you ever stood in court and tried to tell a judge what the law says? It's fine to have a standing; it's quite something else to be able to articulate your reason or cause for being there.

Go try that sometime - like on a speeding ticket. Try to explain to "His Honor" that to even bring you into court, the "law" demands that there FIRST be a sworn affidavit in front of a judge BEFORE a summons can be issued. How was the police officer, who wrote you the ticket/summons, able to give you a valid summons without going through the proper legal procedure of presenting a sworn affidavit to the judge before he could give you the ticket/summons? If you can convince the judge that the law says THAT (which it does), THEN maybe you'll have a chance to explain how the form 56 magically gets you out of a contract you voluntarily elected to sign. Of course, if what you're led to believe is actually true and if it really is the magic bullet, then, from my perspective, you shouldn't even have any problems like this, to begin with.

In the meanwhile, it's completely at YOUR expense that you're in court; if you hire an attorney to represent you, that attorney is a servant of the court, NOT your servant, and you're going to hope he can explain what you were unable or unwilling to explain; in which event, your costs, with the attorney's fees, will even be greater.

Then there's the loss of sleep due to worry and concern for how it will all turn out, in addition to all the filings and delays and paperwork.

There is an inherent "problem" with trying to operate with the law when the folks responsible for administering it aren't aware of the truth, as you see it. People who work in an administrative capacity - and I don't care what company or agency you apply this to - the "average" workers have a pre-inclination to see and hear what they EXPECT to see and hear. Most people in these agencies are simply "people"; in many cases (if not most) they are as ignorant of the law as anyone else. All they really know is the procedures they were taught, and they follow those procedures in order to be good employees and keep their jobs. When a person comes to them with something that is outside the parameters of their procedures (and probably even more outside the

parameters of their own thinking), does it surprise you if they don't immediately (or ever) accept it?

What they generally do, instead, is to begin instituting other procedures they've defined to correct the problem of YOUR not following THEIR proper procedures. For them, the Form 56, is probably NOT in their procedural guidelines. So, there you stand, with your Form 56 in your hand, trying to convince them that this is valid; they're pressing you for adherence to the "law". You stand your ground. They take you to court. Now you get to explain it to the judge, and we're right back in that "tough row to hoe" judicial arena.

What [THE COMPANY] does, is to apply the CORRECT law, in their administrative arena, in harmony with the procedures the taxing agencies have set up. In other words, [THE COMPANY] works WITHIN the system to achieve what the system itself already makes room for; but, because [THE COMPANY] does it in a format and manner that's more in adherence with their way of doing things, it meets with a lot less resistance.

We don't particularly care if the government is a de facto government or just the government. We don't have to worry about what they supposedly DID or did not do. We don't care (particularly) whether, or not, the 16th Amendment was properly (legally) ratified. We only care that both they and WE know THEIR proper procedures for getting issues handled.

Regarding the companies that espouse the information about which you're asking - I think I'd probably give them a lot more credibility if they were putting their necks on the line and handling this all FOR their clients, since they're apparently so sure that it's as fail-safe as they claim.

Admittedly and supposedly it seems to work for some people - at least from what I hear. It "worked" for me to not file tax returns, too - until they finally caught up with me after 15 years. When push came to shove, I found out that the information I'd read really didn't simply and magically handle the problem, and it certainly did NOT prevent me from having to deal with something which I'd come to believe I was never going to have to deal.

If what you're asking about feels good to you and seems right to do - go for it. See how it turns out. If you're feeling good and confident about your actions, those actions taken from that confident, feeling-good place, will serve you well. If, on the other hand, you're not clear and not feeling good and confident, THAT is your own indication, from your own Inner Being, that you have not yet found the course of action that will satisfy what you're really wanting.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall



Paul, question for you..Is there any exception on the fees for going back 3 year average to figure the 2nd year fee and the 1/3 recovery fee ? Heres the issue: My wife and I both had exceptional items of income due to her closing out a 401k and I cashed out my retirement when I left my previous employer. These were fairly large sums added to regular income. We're very interested in contracting with the company, but the fees due to these exceptional circumstances may be

prohibitive. Might it be possible to base fees on regular "income" as opposed to including these large items ? Thanks in advance, XXXX

ps..we enjoyed the conference call, I brought 3 friends along and they are very interested also.

Hi XXXX,

The FEES are based primarily on the previous years' line 22 of the 1040s, unless "creative" accountants have arrived at a figure on that line showing zero or negative income, in which case we look to "straight" 1099s, W2s, Net Business Profit ("gross" to the individual), etc. If you look at the 1040, you'll see that Line 22 reflects TOTAL income, including pension and retirement plans, since those entries come BEFORE line 22. In some cases, the pension/retirement income is divided into "tax paid/tax deferred" portions, in which case, only the "tax deferred" or "gain" portion is considered income. MOST retirement plans are ONLY tax deferred income, so it is income for which there is a potential tax liability, and, in [THE COMPANY's] case, an increased 2nd year's fee for that particular client.

Bottom line: there is no "break" on fees because clients had some good (or exceptional) income years among the prior three years. Clients have the choice of continuing with the IRS and paying taxes, or becoming virtually tax free and paying a small percentage of their tax savings in fees, to enjoy both the financial freedom and the looking-over-the-shoulder freedom from the IRS.

For example: let's take \$100,000 in "extra" (but tax deferred up to the point of withdrawal) retirement income for ONE of the years in calculation for the 2nd years fees. You would already be calculating fees on "regular" income, so we'll disregard that for this consideration. For this example, then, you would have had an additional \$100,000, received as income by you in one of the prior three years. BUT, for 2nd year's fee calculation purposes, that ONE YEAR's extra income is divided by THREE, to get the AVERAGE for the prior three years (see page 7 of the application). Consequently, for the calculation, the \$100k becomes \$33,333.33 AVERAGE income for the past THREE years. Then, you multiply that amount by 6.25%, and you get \$2083.33 additional 2nd year fees.

If, on the other hand, you stay with the IRS, and your Taxes averaged 25% per year, you would pay (or would have paid) an additional \$25,000 in taxes on that income. Even at HALF that tax rate, it would be a far cry from, and almost six times MORE than the \$2083.33 for the additional 2nd year fees.

Let me talk about two other points regarding your question: First, IF you collected the retirement money - the above normal amount of money - in 2001, and IF your application is dated prior to NEXT year, OR if you collected your retirement monies in a year prior to the oldest of the three prior years used in the second year's fee calculation, the extra monies would not even be calculated in the 2nd year's fee, since only the PRIOR THREE years' income is used in the calculation, and then that total income is divided by three for an AVERAGE annual income.

Second, if you collected that money in 1998, 1999, or 2000, AND IF you filed tax returns, your line 22 for those years will have the proper figure for 2nd year fee calculation purposes, which will include your retirement income. While you may have already paid taxes on that money, and while you will be obligating yourselves to paying a 2nd year's

fee based on this higher income, we know that, as long as the IRS obeys their own laws, you'll be getting that money back; and yes, upon that recovery, you'll owe a one-third recovery fee on the money you would never have expected to recover.

[THE COMPANY] had to "draw a line" somewhere, rather than to have to try to figure out a subjective level of "fairness" - and that's the way the line is drawn. You heard Joe say on the call last night that he's aware that some folks who have had large capital gains, for instance, in the last three years, obviously have a "higher than normal" 2nd year's fee, compared to that particular client's "normal" income for those years, but that's what occurs when a line has to be drawn somewhere.

The Truth, of course, is that you will make a decision that's in YOUR best interest, given the options as they stand; and we encourage everyone to do what they perceive is in their own best interest, regardless of whether, or not, the decision would lead a person to being a client.

Even though [THE COMPANY] does not anticipate fiddling with the fee structure they have in place, you will always see them operating in a manner beneficial to the client, even at monetary "loss" to themselves. For example, you may recall that Joe Lansing, in his answer to the question on last night's conference call about why it might be better to become a client this year in distinction to waiting till next year, mentioned in the converse of that answer that, if a potential client is looking at getting a significant amount of money back from the IRS, were he to wait and file his normal 1040 next year, he might want to go ahead and do that and then become a client afterwards. He mentioned the first reason for that, which is that a person will get back from the IRS whatever he's going to get back more quickly than he would using our processes. I'll add a second reason, which is that whatever he gets back in that manner, will not be subject to the one-third recovery fee going to [THE COMPANY].

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

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

The TAX EXEMPT Conference Call, takes place Wednesday night, December 12, 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.