

Dear Friend:

My name is Pete Hendrickson, and I am a researcher and scholar with a primary focus on American tax law and its history. Just after the turn of the century, I unraveled some key snarls in the massive mess that is the income tax and began publishing the remarkable things I discovered. THAT'S NOT WHAT THIS LETTER IS ABOUT, but it's important that you have some context for the actual subject, so please bear with me for a moment while I set that stage.

Since my first book on the subject went to print in 2003, many tens of thousands of Americans have been able to stop paying these taxes (which include Social Security and Medicare taxes) and have been routinely recovering anything withheld or paid in at both the federal and state level. The amounts involved total in the billions of dollars at this point. You can go to <http://losthorizons.com/BulletinBoard.htm> to see a sampling of about 1,000 of these remarkable events-- with checks, notices, transcripts, tax agency correspondences and the filings that produced them.

Almost needless to say, the feds, especially, are not happy about this. From the very beginning eleven years ago, and continuing to this day, corrupt elements in the federal government have been doing whatever they can to discourage the spread and use of my revelations-- even while routinely sending out those refund checks to folks all over the country the entire time.

The suppression effort began with an attempt to get distribution of my book enjoined back in 2004 and 2005. With the help of the Center for Individual Rights (the same folks who shut down discriminatory admissions practices at the University of Michigan in the Supreme Court in 2003 in *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 539 US 244), I thwarted this initial assault on the Constitution. But the feds, having what they see as a great deal at stake, simply came back the next year with another effort-- different in method, but not in character.

That latter effort, begun in 2006, has been playing out ever since. Its rubber is really only hitting the road right now, in a fashion hugely erosive of every American's speech and due process rights, and by way of a despicable attack on my wife, Doreen,

through an exploitation of the increasingly corrupt federal judicial system. That's what I'm writing you about today.

PLEASE read what follows. Please resist your skepticism reflex.

Understand that if you don't already know what I've just told you about, it's because the feds' suppression/smear/out-shout campaign of the last eleven years has been working. The things that have been done to me and about me and my work in the media and in the courts are appalling, but are also disturbingly effective. Resist that skepticism by thinking about those checks I just showed you, and the fact that not too long ago, you wouldn't have believed that the NSA reads everybody's emails, either-- due in part to a complete willingness of government officials and many other interested parties to lie whenever necessary to keep you in the dark.

By the way, you will note that there is no reference to the "why" on which I have just focused in the discussion of what is being done to my wife that follows. As important as that is, and as welcome as you are to focus on it as you wish in anything you do with this story, I think you'll agree that the assault on the Constitutional principles of speech rights and due process involved in this grotesque injustice merit the bright, disinfecting light of your attention all on their own.

So, that said...

WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF YOU WERE in a legal contest with the United States and at its request, a federal judge ordered you to sign an affidavit declaring your agreement with the government's version of the facts material to the case-- even though you don't agree, and have already declared that you don't on a freely-made affidavit?

Would you stand firm for your rights and go off to prison for resisting the corrupt command of the court? Or would you just let words be forced into your mouth in violation of the First Amendment, and say goodbye to your right to fairly defend your interests in court, quietly accepting the final collapse of the rule of law in America?

If the conviction of Doreen Hendrickson on a charge of criminal contempt of court for choosing the former option rather than the latter is finalized this coming April, you may well face that decision yourself.

Perhaps the United States will decide to seize control over your land, and will have you ordered to declare a belief that in past years enough has been under water to put the parcel within "wetlands" jurisdiction. Perhaps you'll be made to agree that you've been psychologically cruel to your children in order to justify some agency's interference in their upbringing. Perhaps, as in Doreen's case, you'll be ordered to say that you owe the government a tax when you don't think you actually do.

DOREEN WENT THROUGH TWO TRIALS. For both, the government flew in a team of attorneys from Washington to prosecute this housewife who, with absolutely no legal training or experience, defended herself. The first trial ended in a hung jury. In the second, which took place last July, Doreen was found guilty on the single count of contempt.

The count charged Doreen with criminal contempt for alleged non-compliance with one or both of two distinct court orders. One was that she immediately produce two testimonial documents with government-dictated content for use against her in the legal contest going on at the time. The other enjoined her from ever testifying to government-disfavored beliefs about the legal character of the income tax.

The government alleges in its contempt charge that Doreen did not produce the ordered documents declaring that she believed the dictated testimony (she had, in fact, produced the documents, but with disclaimers declaring that she did not believe the words she was forced to say). It also alleges that Doreen violated the second order by declaring the disfavored belief in an otherwise unrelated matter several years later. Both alleged acts of non-compliance were combined in a single count (over Doreen's objection) in order to improve the odds of a conviction.

Indeed, knowing both how much power the precedent would give it, and how alien the charge is to the Constitution and to American sensibilities, the government stuck at nothing in order to get the outcome it wanted here. It sought and received instructions in both trials that the jury could not consider the unlawfulness or unconstitutionality of the orders Doreen resisted to be a defense to the alleged crime of having resisted them-- even though by statute one can only commit contempt in regard to a "lawful order". The only defense allowed to Doreen was compliance with the orders.

In both trials the government sought and received instructions to the jury that it need not unanimously find that Doreen had actually done either of the two distinct acts of non-compliance alleged in the charge. Instead, the jury was told it should find her guilty even if only some thought she did one thing and the rest thought she had done the other.

In both trials the judge refused to instruct the jury that it is actually a legal impossibility to comply with orders to produce what actually would qualify as *testimony* if the content of what is ordered to be said is disbelieved.

In the second trial, Doreen was prevented from reading holdings of the US Supreme Court and the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals to her jury, in which both courts very plainly and unequivocally affirm the right of any American to control the content of her own speech and that, as the Supreme Court re-iterated unanimously in a ruling issued just weeks before Doreen was arraigned:

"It is, however, a basic First Amendment principle that "freedom of speech prohibits the government from telling people what they must say. ... If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

Also in the second trial, sensing that they were losing the case despite all the help they were getting from the judge (which included not merely the unprecedented government-serving instructions but not letting Doreen complete her Opening Statement or Closing Argument, constant interference with her conduct of her defense during trial and endless disparagement throughout the proceedings), the government attorneys engaged in an outright fraud in the last moments before the close of evidence. They produced previously-unseen documents they told the jury disproved certain historical facts relevant to the legitimacy of the proceedings in which the orders were issued, and about which Doreen had testified the day before.

The claim was a complete fabrication, as even the government attorneys were forced to acknowledge later. The facts ARE as Doreen had testified. But the lie was enough. Where the jury in the first trial had deliberated for many hours before finally

ending hung, this defrauded second jury took forty-five minutes, during which lunch was served, before coming back with a verdict of guilty.

DESPITE ALL THESE CORRUPT ACTS, which plainly delegitimize the outcome of the trial in which they were deployed, if Doreen's conviction is finalized at sentencing (now scheduled for April 9) the precedent of government-dictated testimony and punishment for heresy will have been established. No one will later look behind the scanty, government-serving Lexis-Nexis blurb that will be posted on the case to learn what it really was about, or how the decision was reached.

Doreen's conviction will become just be a big, heavy, effectively-opaque foundational brick in the wall, to be cited on the government's behalf in the next case as support for the proposition that it's alright for the government to have a court tell you what you must say you believe, under the reasoning that despite your protests to the contrary, you must really believe what you're being told to say, because a judge told you to say it-- as was argued in Doreen's case. Maybe that next case'll be one in which it's you or your kid who are targeted with government-serving orders to say what you're told to say, even when you don't believe it and when saying it will mean conceding in a government lawsuit against you.

Welcome to 1984-- in a sense far darker and more real than all the previous events to which that phrase has been applied as a rhetorical flourish over the decades.

Welcome to this darkness, that is, unless you choose to do something about it.

DOREEN'S CASE HAS RECEIVED VIRTUALLY zero publicity. Because what she was ordered to do involved the income tax, most everyone not already familiar with her case since long before these charges were brought brushes past efforts to introduce it to them without ever giving the speech and due process-rights at the real heart of the case a chance to sink in. Even the ACLU couldn't (or wouldn't) grasp the fact that whatever else it might imagine to be true of the case, there are definite and dire speech-rights issues involved (or maybe the reality is that the organization is so enamored of big government in most respects that it won't get involved in defending what it may see as a case threatening the health of the income tax, which is the life-blood of Leviathan).

YOU have a bully pulpit.

YOU can shine some disinfecting light on what otherwise will remain a vicious mugging of the rule of law under cover of darkness.

I hope you will.

TRANSCRIPTS, MOTIONS AND EXHIBITS documenting everything I've told you can be found at <http://losthorizons.com/TheAssaultOnDoreen.htm>. There is not one little bit of self-serving "interpretation" in anything I have said here. This is all as solid as the sun going down at night, and as serious as a national heart-attack.

You can contact me anytime at 248-366-6858 (home office) or 248-766-0352 (cell), and you can reach me by email at phendrickson@losthorizons.com.

PLEASE give this story serious consideration. There's a lot at stake. First and foremost, to me, is the fate of a good woman who has already suffered a prolonged and grotesque injustice since the day of her arrest and arraignment in June of 2013, and is targeted for more in a couple of months.

Beyond that is what lies in store for the rest of us if this outrage isn't vigorously and vehemently denounced by those wise enough to see the peril and blessed with voices that can be heard by many others.

There are, of course, a million outrages and assaults on the rule of law committed by the increasingly lawless state these days. Not too many of those are as carefully documented, analyzed and laid-out for presentation and absorption as this one, though, and I submit that few or none are as central to the preservation or destruction of our national health. I hope to hear from you soon.

Best Regards,

Pete Hendrickson

1/22/15