

=====

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

Copyright (except quotations) © 2000, 2001, 2002 by Paul Leinthall

=====

Tuesday, January 29, 2002

- [1] Welcome & Editorial: Freedom! Really? Contrast, too??
- [2] Questions and Answers: Attorney's On the Attack!
- [3] News Briefs & Comments: We The People...
- [4] Conference Call Reminders: **“Question & Answer “Call - for New Folks**
Wednesday NIGHTS - 9 pm EASTERN
1-620-584-8202, Pin 2974#
“*6” (Star 6) MUTES and UN-MUTES your line
ALSO
Corporation Sole (specific) Conference Call
Friday MORNINGS - 10:00 AM EASTERN
Same Number and Pin as Above
PLUS
A CLIENT'S ONLY CALL
Call Your Representative for Number and Time
- [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.

-----NOTICE-----

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

=====

To SUBSCRIBE/UNSUBSCRIBE, send an email to "taxexempt@primemail.com" with your preference in the subject heading. If you want, you can put your name in the body of the email, so I have a name to attach to the email address; I do NOT provide your private information to ANYONE ELSE.

[1] [Welcome & Editorial](#)

Dear Friends,

Let's face it. Underneath the myriad of various and sundry things we each desire in our lives, as we each view life from our unique perspective, there are some things we all desire, and even though the ways we choose to express those common desires may differ greatly, nevertheless, underneath, at the root of our being, the desires are pretty much the same.

Take the desire for FREEDOM, for example. Freedom to be what we want to be; freedom to have what we want to have; and freedom to do what we want to do - unrestricted and unfettered by anyone or anything, as long as we're not wanting to bring harm to others, and as long as we are willing to allow others the same quality of freedom. Isn't this what our forefathers wanted? Isn't this what still rings in our hearts and souls?

But it's sometimes difficult, isn't it, to really ALLOW others the freedom we so desire. We have come to believe we really can't be free when others are acting in ways with which we don't agree. And it was the struggle to achieve that balance between fulfilling one's own desires, while simultaneously allowing the various desires and preferences and ideas and beliefs and distinctions of others, that was at the foundation and root of this nation and the developing of various States of the Union.

It's really been part of the struggle of human history, don't you think? And in that struggle, we seem to have come to the conclusion that the way to achieve anything first requires that we lay down laws, in an attempt to identify and prevent certain actions (and those who would perpetrate them) from interfering with our own well-being or which might prevent us from our own happy advancing toward our own chosen goals. The problem with all that (other than the fact that it simply does NOT work very well, as you've no doubt noticed) is that we often end up spending a lot (often MOST) of our energy resisting and pushing against what others are doing or wanting to do, so that we have little energy or enthusiasm left for actually enjoying our lives the way we intended.

If I try to characterize what [THE COMPANY] and [THE FOUNDER] so well do for us, in relation to this huge pile of laws having so much to do with our freedom regarding money and property (the apparent adversary of which freedom is, for many people, the IRS or the federal government), I would have to say that [THE COMPANY] has found a way to effectively FREE us in this regard. Not just to enable us to be free to have and use our own money (I don't want to diminish the importance of what that is to most of us), but to be free from the conflict of having to push against the organization which formerly seemed to bind us and restrict our freedom.

It's interesting how my perspective changed when I first realized that what I wanted in regards to my money and the IRS was to actually FEEL FREE- to truly realize the essence of FREEDOM. I wanted "out" from the concern of always having to look over my shoulder.

Of course, I had put myself into the position of one who was always having to look over his shoulder because, although I had stopped filing tax returns for many years (which decision, itself, came from my desire for freedom), I still was not sure of myself. AND I certainly wasn't sure about the Law. I presumed the law to be on my side; but it was evident that MOST people did not agree with me. So, I was always having to be "on guard"; I was always having to be prepared for the day when the IRS would catch up with me; and when they did catch up, I had to enter the conflict and "take them on," so-to-speak.

Well, that's one way to do it. I definitely don't recommend it - certainly NOT from the perspective I have now, where I realize that taking on the IRS by yourself is NOT necessary - NOT IN THE SLIGHTEST BIT.

You see, the way I had chosen at the time did NOT result in my being TRULY FREE. Yes, I didn't give the IRS any money for 23 years (now 25), so I had the free use of my money. BUT, that's not the same thing as a true FEELING of freedom. Having to constantly look over my shoulder did not FEEL FREE. Being afraid to use my social security number didn't feel like freedom. Having to "hide" my money in corporations and corporate bank accounts (some folks use trusts and other entities for this purpose) was always accompanied with the worrisome thought, "What if I get found out?" What I wanted, was BOTH the freedom of my own property and money AND the FEELING of CONFIDENT and JOYOUS freedom; and I wasn't experiencing that freedom while holding the contrary thought that I needed to hide.

In regards to this issue of money and the IRS, THAT feeling only came with my discovery of the TRUTH in the LAW, and [THE COMPANY] that was facilitating the actual results of being FREE WITHIN the Law. Now, I don't have to hide my social security number or spend time being afraid of being found out if I have a bank account in my name. Now I know that the same number that formerly identified me to the IRS, as a tax protester, now identifies me as an income tax exempt, FREE individual - within the very law I formerly thought I had to fear.

Yes, I know (I had people tell me all the time), I could have played the straight and narrow - as most people do - and just paid my taxes. Funny thing was - most of the folks who told me that, didn't seem like they really enjoyed it all that much, even though they preached it; some even "spiritualized" it, usually with some words about "rendering unto Caesar..." and paying my fair share. I still didn't get they were very happy with it all.

In fact, when most of these folks spoke honestly, they admitted they didn't like it. I have never actually met anybody who is positively thrilled about giving their private property (the money they make) to the government. And our founding fathers NEVER intended that it should be that way; in fact, they believed they were taking steps to ensure it would NOT EVER be that way, in THIS Country, the United States of America.

Which brings us back to the LAW - and the Constitution - and the numerous laws regarding this matter of taxes that have been passed all along the way, from the founding of this country, till now.

And, it brings me to the point of this weeks newsletter, as we'll see some examples of the contrast in the way different people approach this subject.

I talked earlier about "resisting" and "pushing against"? In that state of pushing against, seeing an adversary, having to be on guard and prepared for battle, there is, from my perspective, very little (if any) real sense of freedom; there is more the feeling of being not free. It's a painful way to go. From where I stand in my point of view NOW, as I write this newsletter - it is ABSOLUTELY unnecessary.

It's unnecessary, because there is a way to be free - to actually be free from the responsibility of paying income taxes - and to be free within the law, within the very law of that which USED to be perceived as the adversary (the IRS). Not only can you enjoy ALL your money, but you can do it, knowing that the IRS's own law, the law of the United States of America, the law of the Constitution, is ALREADY on your side; and you can ALREADY be enjoying that freedom. You don't have to wait for someone to be convinced (beyond yourself, in your own mind, as you come to understand what the law ALREADY says); you don't have to wait for anyone else's agreement, once you understand that this is the very law by which the IRS, itself, exists and lives and obeys.

If you've been reading this newsletter for any length of time, you know I often like to use CONTRAST to reveal and exemplify that of which I speak. This week, I'll revisit this subject, with some examples of contrast, even in the questions people ask, after I first answer a question about why I specifically use the brackets around [THE FOUNDER] and [THE COMPANY].

Enjoy!

Your Friend,
Paul Leinthall
661-822-7889, 9am-8pm, Mon-Fri., PACIFIC time
email: littlehammer@primemail.com

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

Hello, Paul,
After re-reading your newsletter, I did not see the reason for the brackets around 'the company' and 'the founder'. I understand the reason you don't mention the actual names, but not the brackets. It's probably a minor thing, yet I need to know my questions are answered - whatever they are concerning this - everything in life.
Thank you.

Hi XXXXX,

I use the bracket to "set off" or emphasize the distinction in specifically NOT providing the name of [THE COMPANY] or [THE FOUNDER]. Then I give the explanation in the last section of the newsletter. Since I have no control of where my newsletter may end up, as I will send it to anyone who requests and since I have no idea who passes it on to whom (and a lot of that happens), I designed it that way, as a total set-up, in an attempt to insulate [THE COMPANY] and [THE FOUNDER] from any possibility of recrimination arising from something I might write.

While I will mention [THE COMPANY's] name or [THE FOUNDER's] name on the phone, I tend not to do that, except in very specific circumstances in my writing to specific clients, and NEVER in my newsletter. Other than for satisfying my own purposes, as I just explained, and as I also explain in the last section of each newsletter, there is no "reason". If I were the "official editor" of an "official Company publication", then the newsletter would be going out on [THE COMPANY's] letterhead, and I would only expect to be able to send it out with [THE FOUNDER's] prior approval. As it is, of course, [THE FOUNDER] reads each letter (but only after it goes out), because I send it to him at the same time as all the others on my list.

Also, because I'm in the marketing end of this business, and because [THE COMPANY] has procedures geared to prevent "end runs" by pre-clients who might want to contact either the home office or [THE FOUNDER] before the appropriate time has arrived for them to do that (other than speaking with [THE FOUNDER] on the conference calls, of course), this is my way to help accomplish that goal and still be able to disseminate the kind of information that a lot of folks want, and which many feel they need, before they get to a comfortable point of making a decision to become a client.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

.....

The following question comes from someone who had corresponded with another organization in the "tax honesty movement" prior to knowing that the "We The People" hearing in Washington, D.C. was not going to have either the IRS or the Department of Justice appearing at the hearing. This interchange, however, provides me a lead-in to what comes afterwards, in the next dialogue.

Paul,
I can't understand how someone in the patriot movement could have such divergent views. Do you see what he says about the 1040 not being a contract? That it is a myth? What would you say to him?
XXXX

----- Original Message -----

From: "INFORM AMERICA!"

To: XXXXX

Sent: Monday, January 14, 2002 11:13 AM

Subject: Wait to file -- the Income Tax is on trial

XXXXX write: Let's hope nothing happens to postpone this. I understand they had it planned before 9/11. We know there is no law, but people forget the law of contracts which is in our constitution and supersedes a lot of laws. That is what people do when they sign their first 1040. They enter into a contract to become a voluntary taxpayer. You've got to get out of that contract. That's what [THE COMPANY] does. They claim their method has been successful for over 30 years. XXXXX

The person responded: Bob Schulz knows next to nothing about the tax laws. The meeting will be used by the IRS to introduce a NST [national sales tax]

and destroy small business. The 1040 is not a contract (part of the vast patriot mythology). [Snipet]

[Technically, and more accurately, [THE FOUNDER] has been in the field of taxation for 32 years, at this point. He has been successful, with some of the technics [THE COMPANY] currently uses - I say "some" because the processes keep being refined and altered in accord with the changes in the law - for the last 10 years. Prior to that, [THE FOUNDER], in his continuing research and education, was gradually moving from "standard" tax return preparation, to processes that were more in harmony with the full intent of the Law and the Internal Revenue Code, as it applies to the distinctions between "taxpayers" and "non-taxpayers".]

Hi XXXX,

Contrast, in differing viewpoints, is what makes the world go 'round.

While this person is saying there is no contract, [THE COMPANY] is successfully recognizing the validity of the "adhesion" contract, in which the "adhesion" or "joining together" occurs via one's signature, under the penalty of perjury clause, on the 1040 Form. It doesn't matter whether, or not, the 1040 form IS the actual contract; in fact, how could it be, since all the terms and conditions [of the contract] are spelled out in the Internal Revenue Code. The WHOLE thing, in its jurisdiction over us, is what constitutes the "adhesion" contract.

From the name ("Inform America"), and not knowing anything about the person writing, I would guess he is "informing" - but, I would also guess that his "you know what" is not on the line. And if he's not putting his "you know what" on the line - in other words, if he's not actually performing the service for others, which he claims works - it's a little different (a LOT different, in my perception) than [THE FOUNDER] sticking his "you know what" on the line, a person, who is recognized by the IRS as a certified "tax preparer", and who has been representing people to the IRS for 32 years; and now, without the IRS taking [THE COMPANY's] clients to court. Granted, for at least half that time, he was playing the normal "tax preparer" game, whereas for the last ten years, he's been doing it from the perspective of having the IRS recognize who their own code actually defines as a "taxpayer".

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

.....

Hi Paul,

For the benefit of your newsletter readers, I would like to share more questions asked by my Attorney friend, and my responses to her.

She is viewing THE COMPANY procedure from a case history point of view. Here are a few more of her questions and comments you, or the FOUNDER, may want to tackle for the benefit of newsletter readers.

Her comment: The 14th Amendment defines the basis for United States citizenship, stating that (all) persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside". The claims that individuals are not citizens of the United States but are solely citizens of a sovereign state and not subject to federal taxation have been uniformly rejected by the courts.

My response: The KEY phrase in the law is (and subject to the jurisdiction thereof). This is where I believe the COMPANY makes the clarification.

The confusion arises in the minds of most people, including attorneys, because people think that the words, "United States" as used in the Constitution and the words "United States" as used in most parts of the Internal Revenue code, have the same meaning. When you look in Black's Law Dictionary, within the Sixth Edition, or earlier, you'll find THREE distinct meanings for the same two words, "United States". (I wonder BLACK'S left this distinction out of the Seventh Edition? Anybody got any suggestions? Might it have something to do with the "truth" tending to get buried as time progresses, or as people live longer in ignorance of the law?)

[THE COMPANY] talks about this distinction in the booklet I include with the information I electronically send (email or fax) to folks who want more information about what we do. The booklet, as you know, is entitled: "Do You Know Your True IRS Tax Status? Are You Sure?"

If, for example, a person doesn't realize there is a distinction in meanings of words in the Internal Revenue Code, particularly key words like "United States", which everyone takes so much for granted, then it's difficult for anyone (including attorneys who some people think "ought to know"), to begin to understand how [THE COMPANY] can be successful at the administrative level of the IRS, certainly to the degree that the IRS does not pursue an argument that has supposedly "been uniformly rejected by the courts" into the Judicial arena to have it settled, once and for all, in their favor, and against [THE COMPANY].

The real fact of the matter is, that the REAL ISSUE of who the Internal Revenue Code has in mind, has NEVER been adjudicated in the courts. Why? Because when an individual finds himself in the judicial arena, it is flat out evidence that he has NOT properly handled things in the Administrative arena; otherwise, he would NOT have ended up in court. Plus, when a person ends up defending himself against the IRS in a court of law, and because his attorney probably doesn't understand these distinctions (as seems to be true in the case of the attorney who has helped generate your questions), how can someone argue a point they don't first comprehend?

Most folks who end up facing the IRS in court - and this is particularly true when the person is being charged criminally - have, in fact, simply NOT COMMUNICATED with the IRS all along the way, including (usually) a failure to file as the law requires. Then, when the IRS starts hounding the person, he tries to run and hide (or at least hide). While he runs/hides, attempting to gather as much information as he can about how to get out of the situation, he is probably trying to avoid any confrontation, even via communication; and this only aggravates the situation. Finally, the person ends up in court, trying to argue some touted "truth" he's heard or read - maybe even the actual truth about not being born a federal citizen - but not fully comprehending the whole of the law, (and, often with an attorney in the same boat) - provides what is essentially an

off-point argument, which is what happens in ALL the court cases cited about these matters.

If, for example, presenting the truth that "joining the army is voluntary" doesn't work for the person who is going A.W.O.L, after he voluntarily elected to join the military, why does anyone think it will work when a person voluntarily elects to "JOIN" the income tax game, and then goes into court without having properly handed his responsibility for having joined in the first place, all they while arguing that filing tax returns is voluntary? But that's the whole point, isn't it. People don't realize they voluntarily JOINED the game. They were born football players, and somebody convinced them to join the baseball game, IN THE BASEBALL STADIUM.

After you've "adhered" yourself to the baseball game, you can't stand before the baseball umpire, and expect to prevail while arguing football rules.

That's why people often don't understand what we talk about when we talk about the "adhesion" contract. Some folks, who don't understand this, boldly state that the IRS Form 1040 is not a contract; they call it a "myth"; and technically, by itself, APART FROM THE WHOLE of the Internal Revenue Code, they would be correct. But the 1040 Form doesn't stand by itself, it's simply the way (the primary way, but not the only way) that people JOIN themselves to, and come under the jurisdiction of, the "adhesion" contract, which includes the major parts of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with the individual income tax.

It is not the voluntary signing a piece of paper to join the Army that causes the pain of boot camp, although without it, a person would probably not be in boot camp. A person doesn't see all the rules and code of conduct spelled out when he volunteers; he discovers most of that LATER. Can he then argue that he was lied to and deceived? Well, I guess he might try, but I don't think it works very often.

And, if it doesn't work there, then it even more doesn't work pertaining to what we got ourselves into when we joined ourselves to a bunch of rules and regulations that would not actually have applied to us had we not signed that first 1040 Form. Most of us have gone most of our lives, adhering ourselves to these various contracts, until what we see today, is a society where her people (and many attorneys) believe that the way it IS, actually IS the law. In many instances - and the area with which we deal is certainly one - that is simply NOT the case.

[What makes a Citizen subject to the jurisdiction? I told her the voluntary election to be treated as such. I further explained that it is clear there are two forms of citizen as defined by the Internal Revenue Code.](#)

[The issue is NOT the persons National Citizenship. The issue is which form of citizen for tax purposes the individual has elected to be viewed as.](#)

[She replies: Should a CLIENT of your company find themselves in court on criminal tax evasion, I can assure you THEY WILL LOSE if they bring up this argument. Even if you are technically correct in terms of how the tax code views the term citizen. The jury will not comprehend and will convict.](#)

[Case law supports this in: \[Solomon v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1993-509, 66 T.C.M. \(CCH\) 1202, 1202-03 \(1993\)\]](#)

[U.S. v. Gerads] 999 F.2d 1255

[U.S. v. Sileven] 985 F.2d 962

I agree with her, at least in part, don't you? Let me illustrate what I mean by asking you a question, or two: SHOULD a person LOSE, who brings up the argument that he is NOT in the Army, after he has voluntarily elected to join the Army and then evaded his duty? Would you also not advise such a person that HE WOULD LOSE if he brought up that argument in court?

This one caught my attention:

[U.S. v. Ward] 833 F.2d 1538, 1539. The court found Ward's contention that he was not an "individual" located within the jurisdiction of the United States for tax purposes to be "utterly without merit" and affirmed his conviction for tax evasion.

Go back to my last two questions (carrying forth the analogy of the Army) and answer these questions: Was the person in this case one who had already, and voluntarily, elected to join the Army? Do you think the courts made a mistake in their ruling? Upon reflection, I think you'll see my point.

My question to you Paul is this. I understand that the IRS has claimed that all disputes can be handled through an administrative process. But how does THE COMPANY assure its clients that this will always be the case?

Now, you're asking a totally different question. Maybe you can answer my question first: How can anyone "assure anyone" that "anything" will "always be the case"? What if, by some wild stretch of the imagination, Congress decided to change the Internal Revenue Code, at its core, which would necessitate reforming not only the Statutes at Large, but would also require going back and rewriting major parts of the United States Constitution, and not simply by amendment...what if that actually occurred? Who knows what the results would be? How can anyone assure anyone else that what IS NOW, will ALWAYS be the case?

You know what they say: "There's only TWO things certain in life...Death AND Ta..." OOPS!. There's only ONE thing certain in life...!

I realize the record thus far for the procedure has been without problems. But should the possibility arise where a client should find themselves in court, it appears they would not have a leg to stand on based on the mountain of case law in favor of IRS.

Should the possibility arise..." But isn't that the point. That possibility has already arisen! In fact, it already exists in the minds of most people. Isn't that what the IRS depends on - the "possibility" that you're bad and mean (and ugly, to boot!)? That possibility that continues to feed the fear and guilt of those who tend to remain ignorant of the great Constitution and the Laws that have allowed this Nation to become the greatest nation on the earth, and to have attained that status in the first 137 years of its 226 year history WITHOUT AN IRS or a so-called "income tax"?

Where do you get the idea that we have no leg to stand on? Particularly when the real case has never yet been heard? Do you think, possibly, that the reason (or at least one of

the main reasons) the real case has not been heard is because [THE COMPANY] already stands on the solid-foot-planted-legs of the law, and the reason the IRS doesn't pursue us into court is BECAUSE they recognize the same thing we recognize, and that it would be a lost cause (on their part) to begin with?

But everybody wants a "Mike Tyson" in the tax arena, don't they? We just love to witness those battles, don't we. But who among YOU wants to lead the charge in that arena, to "prove" - as so many are want to see - that the IRS is "wrong".

[Is the fact that we are giving Power of attorney to the FOUNDER our ACE in the hole that keeps this process out of the courts? Or, is it the fact that the government has defaulted our position by not responding to our filings?](#)

In my mind, there is a definite advantage to having someone the IRS already recognizes, and whom they know they can't "BS", yet, who, in return, honors and respects them as human beings, doing their jobs, and who treats them with respect. You betcha! I think that is a tremendous advantage.

To say that the government has "defaulted our position by not responding" - I know you mean "responding by not pursuing into court". And there is no doubt, whatsoever, that from a legal perspective, in the judicial arena, their lack of response or denial over the years, would definitely not serve them well in court, particularly when they, themselves, make such a big deal about timely responses.

[I'd like to hear your opinion on these questions Paul. My attorney friend has some valid questions and I feel I have responded to them as best I can. But the question I cannot answer is what assures the CLIENTS of THE COMPANY they need not fear criminal prosecution for hiring the COMPANY?](#)

[In your opinion, what is our ACE in the hole?](#)

[Best Regards,
XXXXXXXX](#)

The IRS, or any State Taxing Agency, has certain, specific, lawful guidelines that THEY must follow in order to prosecute either criminally OR civilly. And before they can do EITHER, they must be dealing with "one who is liable under law for the tax" which they seek to impose. If a person is not first liable under the law for the tax, then not paying the tax is neither a civil or criminal offense. [THE COMPANY's] main basis is that the tax laws apply to tax payers, and NOT to "non-taxpayers". Until the IRS can make their law apply to someone to whom it does not apply, THEY would have the tough row to hoe in any attempt to go to court and with the expectation of prevailing.

Giving them a lot of credit (where perhaps many people don't think they're due), the IRS knows that of which I just spoke. The main reason the IRS prevails when they take anyone to court is because they know that what I spoke is not the case in those cases they pursue, because the person really has been avoiding communication and probably evading his own responsibility, AFTER he voluntarily elected to "join", and without having properly handled the revocation of his own election to be seen by the IRS as a "taxpayer" (one who IS liable under the law for paying income taxes).

And to this day, [THE COMPANY] and the Representatives will tell anyone that they SHOULD pay any tax for which they are lawfully liable.

=====

[3] News Briefs & Comments

=====

And this in from "We The People" last week (without comment, other than to say, this will be interesting, at least):

WTP Foundation Replies to Congressman Bartlett

Read the Full reply:

<<http://www.givemeliberty.org/bartlettresponse/bartlettfinal1-22-02.html>>

[January 22, 2002] Bob Schulz, Chairman of the We The People Foundation for Constitutional Education has replied to Congressman Bartlett's January 17 letter and press release, which announced Bartlett's decision to withdraw from the citizens' Truth-In-Taxation Hearing.

Foundation Sets The Record Straight

In its reply the Foundation makes public the details of what happened behind the scenes in the days leading up to the July 20, 2001 agreement with the government and the real reasons Congressman Bartlett decided to withdraw as the congressional sponsor of the citizen's Truth-in-Taxation hearing.

The chronology of events shows that soon after Schulz ended his hunger fast both IRS and DOJ began to renege on their formal commitments.

Although the Foundation's ongoing "Wait to File" campaign is undoubtedly troublesome to the government, the real reason Bartlett cancelled the hearings appears to be the communications Bartlett received months ago from DOJ and IRS (which were not disclosed to Schulz), telling Bartlett that DOJ and IRS would not show at the hearing, leaving Bartlett alone to face the expectations of the People.

"A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS HAS NOW DEVELOPED"

The constitutional requirement for the government to answer proper petitions from the People for redress of grievances is so clear and unambiguous that it leaves no room for interpretation. Congressman Bartlett, in his own words, has acknowledged that written responses to our particular inquiries would not suffice and would result in obfuscation and confusion and would lead the People's petition to ruin.

A preliminary list of the 299 Questions, at:

<<http://www.givemeliberty.org/bartlettresponse/draftquestions01-22-02.html>>,

is being provided to DOJ and IRS and is being released to the public. The People now demand, not request that the IRS and DOJ officials answer the questions in public. Their presence is demanded at the hearing, which will take place in Washington, DC as planned on Feb 27 and 28.

A Plan of Action is Set Forth

Bob's letter goes on to inform Congressman Bartlett that due to the seriousness of the decision by DOJ and IRS, the Foundation intends to undertake a six-point plan of action (a pro-active, non-violent, mass-movement):

1. Bob has asked Bartlett to reconsider his decision to withdraw from the hearing;
2. The Foundation will proceed with a recorded public hearing on February 27 and 28, using the Marriott Hotel if the Science and Technology Committee Hearing Room is no longer available because neither Congressman Bartlett nor any other Congressman is willing to reserve the room for the hearing;
3. The Foundation will immediately release the initial set of (299) questions that it wants DOJ and IRS to answer in a public forum on February 27 and 28;
4. The Foundation has posted the questions on this web site and is inviting any and all learned persons to answer any question at the February hearing after first contacting the Foundation using a prepared form;
<<http://www.givemeliberty.org/bartlettresponse/draftquestions01-22-02.html>>
5. The Foundation is extending an invitation to the February 27 and 28 event to each and every organization that is concerned about the protection, preservation and enhancement of human liberty, and that is interested in limited government;
6. The Foundation is calling on all patriots to demand that DOJ and IRS attend the February hearing, wait to file their tax returns until February 27 and if DOJ and the IRS fail to appear, to defer filing their tax returns and suspend employee withholding, and stand together at the mall in Washington DC on Sunday, March 31 and peacefully protest the unlawful income tax by filing their blank 1040 forms in metal waste drums.

Read the Full Reply:

<<http://www.givemeliberty.org/bartlettresponse/bartlettfinal1-22-02.html>>

Also, if this message was forwarded to you by a friend and you would like us to send you updates, you may use the form at the page above to subscribe to our mailing list as well. This message was sent to address littlehammer@primemail.com

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

The TAX EXEMPT Conference Call, for "new" folks, takes place EVERY Wednesday NIGHT at 9 PM EASTERN time. The number is: 620-584-8202, pin 2974#.

The CORPORATION SOLE (specific) Conference Call, is on Friday MORNINGS, at 10 AM EASTERN time. The number is the same as above

Also, there is a [CLIENT'S ONLY Conference Call](#) available (obviously) for Clients Only. If you're already a client, and you would like to be on that call, **CALL YOUR REPRESENTATIVE for the phone number and time,]**

I want to mention something to new readers and to folks who have never been on the [THE COMPANY] Conference Calls. The calls are NOT what you may be expecting from a typical "conference call" these days. A lot of people are used to big sales-hype conference calls, with a lot of "Rah-Rah-Rah". The conference calls are NOT "sales" calls. No one is trying to get you to enroll in something, or asking or suggesting that you try to get your friends to enroll. These are ALL TEACHING calls. They consist almost entirely of questions and answers, after a brief introduction. They're a great place to hear other folks ask all sorts of questions and get any questions of your own answered, and they provide you the opportunity to get a pretty well-rounded understanding of what this is all about in 60 to 90 minutes. I think you'll find they're one of the best \$3 to \$5 values you can find today. (The telephone long distance charges for most people).

Pressing "*6" (Star 6) 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 "*6" again to go off mute. If you're having a hard time hearing, with various noises in the background from other folk's lines, such as: conversations, kids-playing, dishes clanging, and phones & faxes ringing, then be assured, everyone else can hear the ambient sounds from your environment. It simply makes it much more difficult to hear whoever is speaking at the moment. Thanks for your consideration in this regard.

May I suggest, if possible, that when you call, you use a regular "connected-to-the-wall telephone", rather than a cellular phone (particularly when driving), or even a cordless phone. Also, please, not a speaker phone, either, unless it has a "mute" button, because speaker phones amplify the ambient sounds in your environment. And PARTICULARLY NOT an Internet phone, a true "killer" of conference call Quality.

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. 9 AM to 5, PM (Pacific)
Email: littlehammer@primemail.com

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 follows 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.

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.