

Robert B Clarkson

515 Concord Avenue, Anderson SC 29621
(864) 225-3061; clarksonrobt@sbcglobal.net

Attorney Stephen Schaeffer
DOJ-Tax
POB 7328 BFS
Washington DC 20044-7328

February 8, 2008
sent via email

Re: US v Clarkson and PN. No. 8:05cv2734-HH [letter #3]

Dear Attorney Schaeffer:

I have read your letter dated January 29, 2008 again and again. I had some intelligent, capable folks also read it. We just do not see what you are seeing. Personally I do not think the area of activity as “interference” is definable or enforceable. Your opinion is way too broad and you would not prevail in any court proceeding.

However in an abundance of caution, we are eliminating and modifying many programs to accommodate your letter. Under the circumstances your letter was well written and shows evidence of great research. You found many things on my website that I had long ago misplaced and nobody uses.

The law authorizes the court to order removal from my website those sections regarding federal income taxes that are “false and fraudulent as to any material matter”. These sections classified as interference pertain to debt collections in general or can be modified by me to that effect. Therefore, the promoter injunction does not apply. Further, the information therein is not false and cannot be false. I can state that you have a right to deed your property to your wife and the consequences thereof. That cannot be a false statement. Therefore the promoter lawsuit cannot apply.

Months ago I eliminated my No Checks program. However, this program as well as all the others, are somewhat intertwined. The other sections refer to our Financial Privacy Advocacy. Where we instruct folks about closing bank accounts to actively interfere with the IRS, we will remove those references.

However as to news articles such my report on liens and levies, we feel these are protected by the First Amendment and have not decided to remove them at this time.

A number of our sections are undergoing editorial changes and the revised articles will be posted soon. As I mentioned long ago, as we revise articles we put a small notation at the end. We are revising articles to suit your letter and some general updates. Can you tell what changes we have made or do we need to carefully explain to you what we are doing. If you like, when we are finished, we can send you the scratch copy with my hen scratching so you can see what changes have been made.

My oldest sections are not as outdated as I thought they were and we are making very few changes except to accommodate your letter.

Specific sections undergoing changes include:

- A) **Removing Tax Liens and Levies.** This is the section the IRS hates the most. We have modified it to accommodate you, but I just do not see it in either format as being inside the promoter lawsuit. We will not remove this information without a court order.
- B) **Executive Service Plan.** We have modified the Simple Freedom Package (1) to accommodate you. The Royal Freedom Package (2) has not been changed as of this date, but changes are forthcoming.

We do not need to change these, but are not willing to contest you on this. If you do not like our changes, we may decide to get rid of them altogether. This is not our program and not my article, which had not even been read by me. This is a referral program, not our program and does not fall into the prohibition of Judge Herlong.

- C) You also object to us preparing letters and other writings for a fee. This is not a program of our association, but it is for a number of other Patriot organizations. In the last 30 years, me and my associates have written a letter or two for a fixed fee, I assume. It is not a program or normal operation of the Patriot Network, and I do not remember doing this in any particular instance. I did not know the Executive Service Plans did that. Further, paid letter writing is not listed in the flyer of the ESP's and from what I know, the charging for letters is not done by the contractor.
- D) You also object to the ESP's dealing with a legal defense fund and "iron clad protection". I understand the contractor does these two programs and does a good job. These two programs are not false or fraudulent according to my research and besides they are not controlled, managed or connected to me. I do not offer these plans for sale, I just make a referral.
- E) **References to the Federal Reserve** throughout our website. We are a political organization and our political enemy is the Federal Reserve System and their lackeys in the IRS. We of course, do not hate or even wish ill will to the fine citizens who work in these dreadful businesses, with maybe a few exceptions. The former chairman of the Fed, Mr. Greenspan is a founder of the libertarian movement and our economist hero. We can forgive our friends for transgressions.

We have a right to our political opinions and will not allow the FRS escape the criticism it justly deserves. However, we would obey any order of the court. I know that this entire case is a sensitive issue and some of the definitions are impossible, but I am an American citizen, combat veteran and I have rights.

- F) **Our Membership Agreement** includes an avoidable condition requiring members to stay out of banking. This is not an avoidance tactic against the IRS, but this is a political statement against the evils of the Central Bank.

Thomas Jefferson said central banking is a greater threat to our rights and liberties than a standing army. Then he abolished both.

- G) You objected strongly to our section "**STEP BY STEP GUIDELINES**". This is your strongest point and may be your only real point. We are going through that now and have not decided yet whether to delete the whole section or try to modify it to accommodate you.
- H) You stated the **Membership Agreement** tells members to evade taxes. We do not see that in said contract and we do not advocate evasion anywhere on our website. If you know otherwise, please let us know and we will take it off.
- I) You possibly object to our **Silver and Gold program**. I agree that one reason could be to prevent the IRS collections. But I can personally assure you that is not our main objective. Our members are convinced

that our wonderful nation is headed for a financial collapse, currency debacle, run-a-way inflation. We advocate switching assets into precious metals for the political purpose of saving our country. We are a political organization, and operate for a political purpose. You and many others may not recognize our political goals and methods. However, the Bill of Rights protects us and I will continue to hide behind the First Amendment.

- J) You object to our **Judgment Proofing program**. This is a legitimate objections and I will write you later with my position. Again, we are going to have a problem coming to a definition. We may have to prepare a joint motion for the Judge to make some decisions in this area. Let us hone, or sharpen the issues so the Judge can make a full informed and fair decision.

You are mainly objecting to a number of news articles which are educational and informational. Some may be old and a little out of date, but they are not necessarily false and fraudulent. The information in the news articles came from standard news publications, mainly The New York Times. The First Amendment covers standard news articles, even when rewritten by me.

These news articles explain what will happen to non-filers (my base constituency) and the effectiveness of the tax service. I cannot think of any publication more protected by the Bill of Rights than articles that expose government agencies for their failure to carry out their legal duty. A story by me on the failure of the IRS to enforce the laws can force Congress to rewrite the law. The IRS can use my articles to grab more power from the people from their slaves in the Congress--again. Over the last 30 years, I have personally made the IRS change their forms, laws and procedures.

In conclusion, after a great deal of thought, study and discussion with colleagues, I do not see any of my website in violation of the injunction. However, your letter was gone over with great thoroughness. We think that we are right, but we are not going to fight you on sections that nobody looks at anyway. However, some sections are important to us and we are convinced that you are wrong.

We will go over again the audit guidelines and write you soon. I can change that section or eliminate it. We will write you another letter on the issue of hiding assets. I think I can make some changes in this area.

Yours,

Robert Clarkson
Cc: AUSA Conits via USPS