

=====

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

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

=====

Tuesday, April 09, 2002

- [1] Welcome & Editorial: 100 Monkeys!
- [2] Questions and Answers: Next Steps, Moving Cash, and Other Questions
- [3] News Briefs & Comments: Gentle Audits?
- [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**: If you have received information DIRECTLY from the author (Paul Leinthall), you are already and automatically subscribed. If you are not already subscribed, you may send an email to "TaxExempt@primemail.com," with the word "subscribe" in the subject heading AND your name in the body of the email. I do NOT provide your private information to ANYONE else. To unsubscribe, simply put the word "unsubscribe" in the subject heading.

[1] [Welcome & Editorial](#)

Hi Friends!

I watched and listened to the "We The People" press conference broadcast over the internet from the National Press Club in Washington, DC, on Monday. This followed the "Truth in Taxation" hearings held in Washington, D.C. less than six weeks ago. The folks at "We The People" have got an ambitious plan to distribute to every member of congress (and others, too), by April 15, the results of the undisputed legal research that was the foundation of those hearings, and there's going to be quite a gathering of folks, from every congressional district in America, this coming Sunday, in Washington.

It's obvious to me that more and more people are waking up to the fact that something "screwy" is going on regarding the so-called "income tax". I don't know how long it will take - and I don't expect it to be overnight at any rate - but eventually the "100th Monkey Principle" will occur. The "100th Monkey Principle" (as I recall reading somewhere) comes from a scientific study with baboons on remote islands some time ago, in which it was discovered that if you teach the baboons on one island something new - (and I forget the particulars...as I recall, something about teaching them to wash potatoes before eating them) - EVENTUALLY the baboons on other islands begin picking up the same habit, even without formal or physical communication occurring between the monkey populations on the separate islands. No one knows at what point it occurs, just THAT it occurs at some point. Someone named it "the 100th Monkey Principle", presuming that when it get's to the magic moment, or point in time - described arbitrarily as "the 100th monkey" - suddenly it seems to be happening everywhere.

It's like an idea whose time has come, about which someone once said, "There is nothing so powerful as an idea whose time has come."

EVENTUALLY, the same thing will occur regarding income taxes. More and more people are getting the idea, held by our forefathers, that any government's taxation of a person's income is not co-incident with life and liberty or the pursuit of happiness.

I applaud the work that "The We The People Foundation" are doing. Sometime in the future - and I hope it's sooner rather than later - most people will not be able to ignore the truth. I sense it is occurring more rapidly at this point. I think it's also reflected in what appears to be an increased activity on the part of the IRS and State taxing agencies to propagate their doctrine in an ever more forceful and persuasive manner.

During the web-cast, I was particularly impressed with the "forensic accountant" from Colorado, who said that she and her husband have undisputed and documented proof that some IRS revenue agents and supervisors engage in an intentional manipulation of tax payer files, so that a person's Individual Master File (IMF) will then "trigger" the IRS computers to send out Notices of Lien, Levy, Seizure and Sale, with the person's IMF plainly giving that false authority. This was confirmed by a three other "witnesses", all former IRS employee's, one of whom had worked for the IRS's CID (Criminal Investigation Division).

Thankfully, one of the approaches [THE COMPANY] uses with each client is to request a copy of each client's IMF, and to use that in their work of rebutting the supposed

"evidence" the IRS thinks it has, which they place in code in a person's individual master file.

I'm also glad that folks are getting into the fray and doing the work and the research that is allowing for this information to become more widely known and appreciated by more and more people. At the same time, I'm more than happy to leave all that "work" to those who enjoy it.

And THAT is perhaps the thing I most appreciate about being a client of [THE COMPANY] - the fact that [THE COMPANY] does all the work. [THE FOUNDER's] network of professionals (which includes some of the more astute researchers affiliated with The We The People Foundation) are constantly digging and finding new ways to be effective in this arena. While there may one day be "no more IRS" as we know it, until that day comes, at least clients of [THE COMPANY] have the basic fruit of what everyone most desires, i.e. to be free from federal and State income taxes.

For lots of folks, of course, the whole arena of income taxation is a confusing arena. MOST of what is available in this complex world of taxes and taxation - specifically speaking here of income taxes - is, as you know, companies and individuals providing reading, research and study information, regarding which any interested person must read and study and be prepared to handle most of the details herself. Most companies charge for their information; fewer provide it for free, or on an "at cost" basis. The end result, either way, is that the purchaser, or client, is left pretty much on her own, although there are some companies who promise to provide expert help in letter writing or handling correspondence from the IRS (for a price, of course), and who even claim they have attorneys on staff in case the client gets in real trouble. (Although one would be hard pressed to actually find real hard "court case" evidence of their success at this point in time). Many of these individuals and companies talk about being able to handle the IRS at the administrative level, but when it comes right down to it, most of their administrative level "arguments" are, in fact, just that: arguments derived from, and in preparation for, dealing with the IRS in the Judicial arena, that is in the courts. Most folks, though, hope they'll never have to go that far. (I know. I used to be one who hoped I'd never have to go to court with what I "knew").

As you probably know, [THE COMPANY] I talk about in this newsletter communicates and deals with the IRS solely on the Administrative level. WHY? Because the IRS has made it quite clear that EVERY ISSUE and EVERY PROBLEM can be dealt with AT THAT LEVEL; in fact, if it's not dealt with at that level, there is a slim-to-nothing chance of being successful beyond that level, going into either Tax Court (which some people claim is part of the Administrative level, but which [THE COMPANY] never touches) or some District or Federal Court, even up to the Supreme Court. When you get into that arena, I think estimating a 5% success rate is probably generous.

Eventually, however, I think we'll even see some significant court cases begin to reveal that all the research a lot of folks are doing has not been in vain. At that point, I believe, things will begin to turn around for lots of folks, certainly in their thoughts and believes about what is right and proper (or NOT) about the income tax.

In the meantime, while all this is occurring, I'm glad we have some answers that work effectively NOW, so we don't have to wait for that 100th monkey to get with the program.

Paul Leinthall, 661-822-7889, 9-5m, Mon-Fri., PST; ["littlehammer@primemail.com"](mailto:littlehammer@primemail.com)

=====

[2] Questions and Answers

=====

Hi Paul,

I forwarded my notarized documents, etc. to Alaska a couple weeks ago. I was wondering what the next step in the process is? Do I receive a copy of everything that is filed on my behalf? Thanks for all your help with me and XXXX XXXX!

XXXXXX XXXX

Hi XXXXXX,

Depending on a client's prior tax situation - which varies from person to person - what occurs next for any one client can be one of several things. So there is not "a" next step; there are any number of possible next steps.

The next step almost always involves some sort of filing, reporting, or corresponding with either the IRS or a person's State taxing agency. EVERY item or document or report filed with either the IRS or State agencies is always triggered by something the taxing agency is expecting.

For example, what the IRS is "expecting" at this time of year, from almost everyone, is a filing of a "return" - which most of us (as well as the IRS) have come to think will be a Form 1040. Their own law, however states, "a return or statement". Therefore, except for the folks who may have other things going on, (i.e., some other type of correspondence, where the taxing agency is expecting some other kind of response), [THE COMPANY] is busy sending annual statements for each client. This is what MOST tax preparers in the country are doing at the present time.

A lot of [THE COMPANY's] client's in the past had expected that the "revocation process" involves some special filing - like a special rocket, armed with an "income-tax-destroying" warhead - that would cause the IRS or State agency to disappear in their lives. What actually occurs is not quite that dramatic - although the bottom line of not having to pay State or federal income taxes is dramatic enough for most of us.

The revocation paperwork is always "attached" to some sort of filing that the IRS expects. So, in place of a 1040 return, [THE COMPANY] files an "annual statement and declaration of material facts". You'll know what that is when you receive your copy.

Sometime later - but it can be sooner, or even what is filed first in some instances, and it also depends on the time of year a person becomes a client - a "Request for Determination of Status" will be filed. (You will receive a copy of that, too, since you're supposed to receive a copy of everything that is filed on your behalf with the IRS or any State taxing agency).

If a client has had prior issues with the IRS, some other kind of response may be made (first, or later), depending on which agency is involved and what response was being requested. In those cases, some other appropriate filing or response may be made either first, or long ahead of any typical filing.

The important thing is this: Once a client has returned her "second set" to the home office (the documents she had to sign and notarize), she can go about her life as an "income tax free" individual. In the meantime, and at each appropriate point in time and the processes, [THE COMPANY] will continue filing, reporting and responding in harmony with the law regarding her's and each client's particular tax situation.

Sincerely,

Paul Leinthall

.....

Paul,

I have been reading your newsletters and listened to several conference calls. I still am having a little trouble understanding your service. What might clear things up for me is a dollars and cents question. Suppose I have \$100,000 sitting in an offshore account, such as an Evocash account. What would be the "normal" process of bring that money back into this country, first without your services, and then with your services? Please compare the two for me. Secondly, how does the corporaton sole fit in to this picture.

Thank you,
XXX XXXXXX

Hi XXX,

Money generated or earned OFFshore creates an "income taxable event" WHEN it is brought into the country (by whatever means) - UNLESS, it is brought into the accounts of some entity over which the IRS has no legal "tax" jurisdiction. The corporation sole is the only "out-of-the-box" entity over which the IRS has no jurisdiction and which entity does not have to get IRS approval or sanction to be "tax exempt". (The corporation sole does not come "in-a-box," but I think you understand that I mean to say, which is that the corporation sole, BY LAW, has no accountability to the IRS for anything).

There may be other means and other entities by which to accomplish this (e.g. "trusts"). Unfortunately, other entities must have been "pre-approved" by the IRS - from their creation - to be "tax exempt"; in other words, they must get a ruling from the IRS upon their creation that they are "tax exempt" - and most purveyor's of such entities have not gone to the time and expense of ensuring that this has occurred for the entities they market. Most entities would not qualify, at any rate - but the corporation sole doesn't even have to worry about such details.

I know some folks are counting on the fact that very little (if any) reporting of income is being done from offshore sources to the IRS. From my perspective, the recent changes in the banking laws, stemming from the "Patriot Bill" (the result of 9-11), are aimed at giving the government more ability to "track" the actual TRANSFER of monies, and I suspect more and more folks, who have not taken the required steps, will find that the mere "non-reporting" by offshore sources will not really protect them. Once the government catches the scent of someone's money being transferred (that is, someone who has the legal requirement to report, file, and probably pay income taxes on the money), they have the authority of law to pursue that person and his money.

The corporation sole is the only entity that has NO such reporting, filing or paying requirements of any kind.

The other way, without [THE COMPANY's] services, for comparison, is to bring the money into the country, in any manner you choose, and "take your chances".

I'm aware I answered your questions in reverse order from the way you asked.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

.....

Here's a short message from one of the tax researchers aligned with "The We The People Foundation".

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

From: "Larken Rose" <GrandDelusion@erols.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2002 10:31 PM

Subject: Let them huff and puff

As some of you are aware, Congress is trying to pass HR 3991, the "Taxpayer Protection and IRS Accountability Act of 2002." (If that title weren't so sad, it would be funny.) That Act includes a provision which would raise the "frivolous return" penalty in 26 USC § 6702 to \$5000, instead of \$500. No doubt the IRS would continue its present course of trying to penalize people for being "frivolous" enough to quote the Treasury regulations, by pointing out which sections are to be used to determine "taxable income from sources within the United States" (see 26 CFR §§ 1.861-1(a), 1.861-1(b), 1.861-8(a), 1.862-1(b), 1.863-1(c)), and to point out what those sections show to be taxable (see 26 CFR §§ 1.861-8(a), 1.861-8(f)(1)).

If you'd like to tell your Congressman to oppose the bill, be my guest. I for one don't intend to leave the fraud intact long enough for it to matter. I think the Act is supposed to go into effect on April 15th. Something else should be "going into effect" shortly before that, which may very well render all such intimidation tactics moot.* Stay tuned.

Larken Rose
larken@taxableincome.net

(* For any feds reading this message, no, I'm not referring to anything violent. We deal in information. You deal in violence and intimidation.)

I believe that when he says, "something else should be going into effect shortly before that," he is referring to the rally in Washington, D.C. this coming Sunday. I doubt that's going to change much by the following day, but we are seeing things like this that we haven't seen before (at least not in our lifetime). I guess we could say there's an increasing amount of "potato washing" going on.

.....

Hi XXXXX

I'll respond in my usual manner:

Paul:

I have been reading your newsletters for over a year but have not seen a Q and A regarding the following issue:

The IRS reserves the right to "come back" to any filer to re-evaluate the filer's declarations (statements of income, deductions, exemptions, etc.) for varying lengths of time. The length of time that the IRS has to question the filer's declarations depends on the type of declaration. Typically, from what I understand, the IRS can question declarations relating to deductions, for example, for up to three years from the date of filing. In the case of declaring income (or of NOT declaring it) the IRS has NO time limit to review and question the filing. The filer would be "evading", I believe, if they do not come clean on their income.

The only ones who have any responsibility for declaring income are those who have income from a "taxable source", which is always tied to some ACTIVITY of business or commerce. In other words, there are certain ACTIVITIES which are taxed, and then the income from those activities is to be reported and then "taxed" accordingly. If there is no income from those activities (taxable sources), there is no reporting of the income required, either now, later (as long as the law stays as it has for 90 years), or in the past. Therefore, although the IRS may "question", there is no "answer" required by law - AS LONG AS no taxable activity has occurred for the period of time for which they are inquiring. Besides, they already have a record of any 1099's or W-2 or K-1's that were supplied to them.

In the statement that the company sends to the IRS on behalf of the client, I do not believe that the income from non-federal sources is "declared". (If the client has any U.S.-source income, it must be declared and taxes must be paid on it, of course.) Since the statement does not declare the non-federal "income" (term used loosely here), then doesn't that leave the door open indefinitely for the IRS to revisit the filer on this issue?

You're correct in saying that [THE COMPANY] does not declare the amounts of a client's income - UNLESS he has income from a taxable source (activity), which I refer to as "federal source income" - which, for most clients does not occur. What [THE COMPANY] declares - actually, what the client declares (since the "declaration of material facts" which accompanies the annual statement is a declaration from the client prepared by [THE COMPANY] - are a series of over 40 declarative statements, with the particular legal cites quoted for each, which make clear to anyone reading the declaration that it "frames the relationship of [the client] to internal revenue laws of the United States...and is intended to satisfy requirements of statements required by 26 U.S.C. § 6011(a)"; and that "It is intended to comply with the 'substantial authority standard' (26 CFR § 1.6662-4(d)) and the 'good faith and reasonable cause standard' (26 DFR § 1.6664-4(a)). It also satisfies requirements of state law, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Federal Rules of Evidence and therefore qualifies as testimony."

Does the company somehow slam the door on the IRS and negate the possibility of this happening?

[THE COMPANY] does not slam the door on anyone's face. The law, itself, is the door through which all must pass, including the IRS. The only real authority they have is where the law gives them specific authority.

What [THE COMPANY] does is to hold the mirror of their own law, rules, regulations, and procedures in front of them to remind them that they have no position or authority to step outside the bounds of their own law. The IRS has got most of its power through ignorance of the law, where most people believe that whatever the IRS says, claims or instructs is actually law...which leads us to your next question.

On another issue, I heard yesterday that a client has been notified by the IRS that involuntary withholding will be instituted on the client's mutual fund earnings. This client has been with the company for over two years. This is a bit disconcerting to me. You'd think that the IRS would have "gotten the message" by now. I am actively attempting to discover the details regarding this situation. If I (being a client), personally get a similar notice, I will immediately cash out my holdings and move them to a different investment firm.

Best regards,

XXXXX

The IRS, in many instances, is obviously not interested in getting the message of their own law, which, when properly understood and applied would put a real crimp in their style of power for which they have come to be known and greatly feared. The truth of the law remains, however.

In the example you gave, I would suggest that the IRS is pulling one of its typical power plays. They really don't have the authority of law to do what you're saying they have communicated to the client. However, that doesn't mean they won't communicate such "instructions" to the client's mutual fund. If the mutual fund thinks the IRS' instructions are something they are beholden to obey (as if the instructions are the law), then, yes, the "involuntary withholding" (robbery) may well occur.

I agree with you, that if I were in that position, and my mutual fund were going to act in fear and not obey the law, and instead, obey the "instructions" coming from the IRS, the most efficient course of action on my part would be to take my cash and find another mutual fund or some other way to make my money grow.

When dealing with the IRS, the maxim holds true: "Possession is nine-tenths of the law". When the IRS gets possession (through another person doing the dirty work of actually withholding), they've got their "nine-tenths", and, in the course of it, they have done nothing illegal. The persons (employers, mutual funds, banks, etc.) doing the withholding, while they "believe" they're obeying the law, are actually the ones breaking the law.

Of such is the course of ignorance.

Sincerely,
Paul Leinthall

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

First, from the San Francisco Chronicle:

PAINFUL PROBING

IRS brings back the dreaded random audit under the guise of conducting research

DAVID LAZARUS

Wednesday, March 27, 2002

Remember all that talk about the Internal Revenue Service feeling taxpayers' pain and adopting a kinder and gentler approach to how it reaches into our pockets?

Forget it.

"The IRS never said it would be kinder and gentler," said Jesse Weller, a spokesman at the agency's Bay Area headquarters in Oakland. "That was just a catchword invented by the media. We never said that."

I asked if that meant the IRS plans to beat the snot out of taxpayers to keep us in line. (Actually, I used a stronger word than snot, and Weller took my reference to beatings literally; he insisted that the IRS never physically assaults taxpayers.)

"We're going to enforce the laws as we always have," Weller said. "We'll make sure everybody pays their fair share."

Fair Share? What is a "fair share"? And a fair share of WHAT, exactly?

The IRS is thus bringing back an old friend: random audits. But the agency promises that this year's audits will be different from 1988, the last time it pulled taxpayers' names out of a hat.

Back then, 54,000 people were inflicted with a torturous line-by-line examination of their returns. One's accountant or lawyer wasn't even allowed to help.

The program was scuttled after Congress decided it sure seemed like an abuse of power.

This year, the IRS says 50,000 taxpayers will be hit with random audits, but only 2,000 will be forced to undergo line-by-line fiscal colonoscopies.

The majority -- about 30,000 people -- will experience limited in-person audits that are pledged to be less intrusive than past showdowns with IRS agents. And auditees will be permitted to have their accountant on hand.

Nine thousand taxpayers will be able to handle their audits by mail, and 8,000 will have stealth audits in which, if all their paperwork is in order, they may never know they were audited at all.

Gerry Padwe, vice president of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants in Washington, D.C., told me that the primary goal of random audits is to keep people on edge, thus providing an incentive to pay one's taxes.

"You get a letter from the IRS, your heart's going to beat a little faster," he observed.

The TRUTH will out - "the primary goal...is to keep people on edge". Why would a society, that prides itself in being a lawful society, have to have their government servants doing things to "keep people on edge"?

GATHERING INFORMATION

Nevertheless, the IRS is dressing up its new program in touchy-feely language apparently intended to demonstrate to congressional overseers that the agency has turned over a new leaf.

To the IRS, therefore, these aren't really random audits. They're field work for a "national research program" aimed at improving customer service.

"We don't want to audit somebody who doesn't need to be audited," IRS Commissioner Charles Rossotti said while announcing the program in January. "We have an opportunity to reduce the burden on the honest taxpayer."

Yes, I'm sure they're going to reduce the burden of fear, worry and intimidation on the honest Citizens of America - if not by their tactics, at least by their words.

The IRS' Weller explained that the statistical data gathered from this year's audits will help the agency update its profiles for who's deducting what, and which taxpayers in turn should be looked at more closely in the future.

And that's all fine and dandy. But accountants say taxpayers would be unwise to be lulled into a false sense of security.

"An audit is an audit," said Padwe at the American Institute of CPAs, the largest association of accountants in the country. "This may also be a research program, but that doesn't mean IRS agents are rolling over when they see returns."

FUDGING THE NUMBERS

He said the IRS has noticed the same trend the institute's 340,000 accountants nationwide have spotted: a growing aggressiveness among taxpayers when it comes to fudging their returns.

One reason for this is because the number of returns audited has plunged to little more than half of 1 percent. "This has encouraged taxpayers to take a chance," Padwe said.

Indeed, a Roper survey in January found that about a quarter of all Americans are comfortable cheating on their taxes. Eleven percent of those polled said it's OK to finesse numbers "a little here and there," while 5 percent said they cheat "as much as possible."

The odds clearly favor the taxpayer. In 1988, the IRS audited 1 out of every 79 returns. But amid budget cutbacks and personnel shortages, it was only able to audit 1 out of every 232 returns as of 2000.

Meanwhile, the number of tax returns continues to increase each year. IRS agents expect to be deluged with a record 132 million returns by the time the filing deadline rolls around April 15.

Steve Wimmers, vice chairman of the California Society of CPAs, said he's seen a subtle shift in the attitudes of many IRS officials. "They're trying to be more human," he said.

But he said the IRS is indulging in "interesting spin" by trying to depict random audits as a form of opinion poll.

"Most people are terrified by the idea of being audited," Wimmers said. "The IRS still uses that to increase compliance with the tax code."

NO SIMPLE SOLUTION

As for things getting easier for taxpayers in the future, he placed the likelihood of the 10,000-page U.S. tax code being simplified at "slim to none."

Padwe at the national CPA association agreed. "The tax law is a disgrace in terms of its complexity," he said. "We find it as frustrating as clients do."

Weller at the IRS was still miffed about my implying the agency roughs up taxpayers, so we couldn't get into a discussion about the vagaries of tax law.

Still, he assured me that things will only improve once all those random audits -- er, statistical samplings -- get done.

"We haven't had any new data since 1988," Weller said. "This will really help."

Why am I having such a hard time believing that?

"Nuff said".



Lastly, let's turn to a commentary from today's "World Net Daily", sent to me by a friend.

World Net Daily Exclusive Commentary
Monday, April 8, 2002

Is the IRS American?

Posted: April 8, 2002
1:00 a.m. Eastern

By Vox Day

© 2002 WorldNetDaily.com

The federal income tax is a hideously complicated structure, but it is actually much easier to understand than one might think. What is more difficult is putting aside one's misconceptions of how the system works based on years of surface exposure to it.

Just as time spent watching TV does not give even the most dedicated couch potato a comprehensive understanding of the hidden mechanics of his television, the fact that you have faithfully paid your taxes every April 15 does not mean that you, or your accountant for that matter, know anything about the realities of the federal income tax in all its sordid glory.

Because the status quo has existed for so long, it is extremely difficult for most honest taxpayers to fairly examine evidence which suggests that they have been victimized by one of the most impressive con games in history. I know this because I used to faithfully fill out 1040s and have the appropriate taxes withheld every year myself, until some bizarre behavior on the part of an IRS agent caused me to begin wondering if there just might be some truth behind what I had always considered to be aberrant and wishful thinking on the part of the anti-tax lunatic fringe.

Another aspect to this subject which makes it a difficult one to grasp is the bewildering amount of information and misinformation available. But if the wide variety of claims being made against the legitimacy of the federal income tax are troubling, perhaps it is worth remembering what happened the last time a powerful governmental figure lied under oath. That lie, as often happens, spawned more lies in turn, until the entire web of deceit was finally exposed by a piece of evidence which did not remain hidden.

Given that there is strong evidence suggesting that lies have surrounded the income tax for most of its 89 years, I would not be surprised if most of the extant anti-tax arguments should, over time, be proven true. There is not space in this

column to list them all, nor to address even one in detail, but there are some points worth mentioning nevertheless.

In the next paragraph, the author is going to touch on just ONE of the key understandings we have in our successful work with clients. I'll use some bold and italic emphasis (and addition) so you can't miss it.

The most important thing to mark, in my opinion, is **the definition of the United States in the section of U.S. Code relating to taxable income, which deviates from the usual definition of the United States of America. This United States is better described as the federal United States, consisting only of territories like Puerto Rico and Guam [*and don't forget Washington, DISTRICT of Columbia*] which are governed by the federal government but are not part of the 50 states. This is where the con apparently enters the game, as the income-related law written specifically to address these territories is then falsely interpreted as applying to the fifty states as well.**

While the IRS points to court cases such as Collins, Becraft, Barcroft and Ward in an attempt to refute this argument, it is very interesting to note that in each case, the agency relies solely on a court's unsupported statement instead of a proper legal reference, which, of course, is what the illegitimate jurisdiction argument is based upon.

Which naturally leads one to the question, do we live under a government of laws, or men?

The assertions of the IRS become particularly curious when one examines a document submitted by the U.S. Attorney in a 1993 civil case in Idaho, wherein the attorney "denies that the Internal Revenue Service is an agency of the United States government but admits that the United States of America would be a proper party to this action." This distinction becomes all the more intriguing when one considers that the IRS was first established as a Puerto Rican agency and supports the contention that there is a significant distinction in law between the federal United States and the constitutional United States of America.

There is no question that the truth is easier to ignore if you don't know what it is. But if you consider yourself a freedom-loving American, can you in good conscience refrain from examining the facts for yourself and considering the possibility that a portion of your freedom has been stolen from you through federal chicanery? Read the law. Read the facts about the 16th Amendment and about the 25 percent of non-filer cases the IRS loses every year. Then do what is right, not what is expedient, and refuse to be swayed by anyone who attempts to hide the truth through bluster, intimidation and lies.

Vox Day is a novelist and Christian libertarian. He is a member of the SFWA, Mensa and the Southern Baptist Convention. He has been down with Madden since 1992.

<http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=27132>

=====
[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.