



Letters We Have Received

- [From an M2K Package Holder about the Rizzo Plea](#)
- [Emails to Bill Benson and responses from him about the M2K Package](#)
- [To William Craig from Senator Hatch](#)
- [Jerry Benson's Reply to Senator Hatch](#)
- [Warren Richardson to William Benson](#)
- [Former IRS Officer John Turner to Congressman Hoekstra](#)
- [Tupper Saucey to Larry Becraft](#)

United States Senate
 WASHINGTON, DC 20510-4402
 April 14, 2000

Mr. William Craig
 4215 Harding Road, #701
 Nashville, TN 37205

Dear Mr. Craig:

Your recent e-mail message has just been called to my attention. Thank you for taking the time to inquire about this. **This is not the first time I have heard about some alleged deal with a man named Bill Benson about his book project. I assure you that this is hogwash.**

The only Warren Christopher I know is President Clinton's former Secretary of State, and it should be obvious that he does not represent me.

Other people have suggested that the person doing this liaison work is a man named Warren Richardson, with whom I was acquainted, but who was never authorized to speak for or represent m in any way.

Moreover, I have no interest in buying up copies of a book in which the main point is that the income tax is constitutionally invalid. The fact of the matter is that, for better or worse, the 16th Amendment to the Constitution was declared ratified by the requisite three-quarters of the states, then 38 states, on February 25, 1913. It was subsequently ratified by four additional states. Only four states rejected the amendment.

What concerns me most is that such completely **bogus information** can be spread over the Internet at warp speed. Again, thank you for contacting me directly about it. I hope you will pass this information on to any others you know who have expressed concern. If you have further questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Orrin G. Hatch
United States Senator

[Back to Top](#)

To the Honorable Senator Hatch,

There are a lot of Hogs that need washing! Only a fool judges a book by its cover and not its content. If you have not read [The Law That Never Was](#) how can you say it is good, bad, or indifferent? Bogus information can also be spread from people of great influence like yourself when you judge something to be true or false without the knowledge of having read it. If we do not understand something after we read it, that is OK, but if we don't even bother to read the book in question and we comment on it as if

we had read it, then who is guilty of passing on bogus information? Now that's what I call **HOGWASH!**

Jerry Benson

[Back to Top](#)

WARREN S. RICHARDSON, J.D.
Attorney at Law

May 5, 2000
Mr. William J. Benson
Constitutional Scholar
1128 East 160th Place
South Holland, IL 60473

You may address me simply as Warren and I'll call you Bill. My first comment is to applaud you for the tremendous amount of work you have done in bringing to light the enormous volume of factual data- over 17,000 pages of certified government documents from each of the 48 states (the number in 1913) as well as from the National Archives in Washington, D.C. In fact, the whole project, which includes your two books, is truly monumental.

In case you wish to know a little about my background, let me give you a brief overview. I was honored to serve my nation in World War II as a Naval Aviator. Since my college career at the University of Rochester had been interrupted by the war, I went back to the U. of R. and obtained my A.B. degree in history. That was followed by a B.S. in accounting. By then I was married and we moved to the Washington, D.C. area so that my wife could continue her college work while I attended law school. Upon receiving my law degree, I was honored to be chosen for the first class of Honor Law Graduates at the Justice Department. (This program was started in 1953 while Eisenhower was president.) Because of my law and accounting background, I moved to the legal department at the General Accounting Office. After 5 years as a government attorney, I left for the private sector, where I have been ever since. Two years of that time was spent in a law firm and the rest has been working in the lobbying profession.

Before going to the subject of your books-the 16th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America was not properly ratified-I wish to lay some groundwork. In 1895 the United States Supreme Court ruled a direct income tax to be unconstitutional in the case of *Pollock v. Farmer's Loan and Trust Company* (158 U.S. 601). Since our forefathers who established our form of government (a republic, not a democracy) by splitting the federal power into three equal branches (legislative, judicial, and administrative), it was clearly within the Court's discretion to render their verdict in the Pollock case.

The Supreme Court's decision in that case can only be changed by one of two methods:

The Supreme Court, assuming it has valid reasoning, could reverse the Pollock case; or,

An Amendment to the Constitution authorizing a direct income tax could be passed by a vote of two-thirds of both houses of Congress and then ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

Following the procedure of item 2, above, the Secretary of State has the duty of announcing to the public, the President, and the Congress that a proposed amendment has been accepted or rejected.

The people who wished to overturn the Pollock case chose the second alternative.

In my professional opinion your two books demonstrate, at least to me, that the 16th Amendment was not properly ratified even though the Secretary of State made the public announcement that it had been properly ratified. When only four states of the required 38 ratified it properly, how could it be considered valid? In view of the facts, how could it become a valid part of our Constitution? Since the Pollock case has not been reversed by the Supreme Court, what is the legal framework upon which the current income tax law is based?

Although i am a lawyer, it is important to note that i am not a constitutional scholar;

therefore i do not speak as one. as noted above, it is my opinion that, based on your overwhelming evidence, the 16th amendment was not properly ratified. furthermore, i believe that it is imperative to have legal scholars in constitutional law study this matter deeply and render their opinions on whether the 16th amendment was properly ratified. provided they come to the same conclusion we do (that it was not properly ratified), what would be the logical next move? that last question is a real tough one because of the politics involved. assume that the supreme court rules upon a case properly brought before it that the tax system of the u.s. is not legal. can you even visualize the reaction of the members of congress?

Bill, you have done a magnificent job in providing the factual data about whether the 16th Amendment was properly ratified. I am hopeful that we can find the scholars who will go to the next step and suggest what should be done now.

Thanks for your hard work. You have done a great service to your country.

Sincerely,

P.S.: Since a personal letter cannot be distributed, or even shown, to anyone other than the recipient without permission of the author, I hereby authorize you to show it (not publish it) to other people at your discretion.

This letter is to be shown only and not to be published as Warren has requested.
Bill Benson

[Back to Top](#)

John Turner
P.O. Box 612
Paradise, California 95967

March 25, 2003
U.S. House of Representatives
Congressman Peter Hoekstra
2234 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-2202

(Sent via FAX (202) 226-0779 on March 27)

CC: Senator Carl Levin, FAX (202) 224-1388
Senator Debbie Stabenow, FAX (202) 228-0325

Dear Congressman Hoekstra:

My letter to you concerns the plight of Rose Lear who is a constituent of yours. As you know, Rose is withholding food from herself and has pledged not to eat unless the government answers questions raised by We The People Foundation For Constitutional Education regarding various aspects of the federal income tax. I know you are now aware that her husband William was recently convicted of "tax crimes" and is now serving a prison sentence, which is what precipitated Rose's action. I hope you will overlook the lengthiness of this letter and make the needed and timely response.

I see from your web site that you and I are the same age and that you are a Christian man. Please know also that I am a believer and hold close the Word of God. So, we have some things in common, many more things I am sure if we took time to discover them.

Please allow me to introduce myself and provide you with some background about me, my beliefs and my involvement with the so-called "tax honesty movement". I worked for Internal Revenue Service for ten years, 1987 - 1997, as a commissioned Revenue Officer. I resigned in April 1997 for reasons that are unique. I held then, and hold now, no grudge against the government of the United States nor the Internal Revenue Service. I was not an IRS employee with a chip on my shoulder or "sour grapes". I enjoyed my job as a tax collector and strove to be an asset to both the Service and the public that I served.

I believe the IRS is enforcing the income tax law beyond the scope that Congress intended. The amount of evidence to support my beliefs is staggering, but several Supreme Court cases, the Congressional Record, as well as other things, including internal agency data lend weight to my conclusions. I have been quite open and public in sharing my opinions in this regard, that is the IRS' misapplication of the law. I am not

"anti-government" or "anti-tax". In fact, I am a god-fearing, patriotic man who has served my country also as a member of the armed forces.

Let me just put it this way: the IRS needs to be absolutely honest in administering and enforcing the law and I don't believe the agency is close to meeting that standard. I am absolutely positive that you and I agree that the agency must honestly and fairly enforce the law. So, the issue is whether the agency is or is not as a matter of fact, being honest in its business of administering the tax laws. This is where the controversy lies. Verifying the facts to determine who is right is a time-consuming matter, but it is possible. It requires at minimum an open mind. Dismissing the claims and facts out of hand that "the IRS is misapplying the law" simply because it is "too unbelievable that the claims could possibly be accurate" will not suffice. On the other hand, dismissing the claims because just possibly The People could be right and the government could be wrong is a sobering thought. If it was established after all that The People were right, think of what that would mean! Of course, the government does not publicly address this obvious factor when they summarily dismiss The People's claims. A concerted effort of study and research will either verify the overall conclusions of the "tax honesty movement" as being largely correct or it will show them to be wrong. If shown clearly to be wrong, what better way to demonstrate that the government, does, after all have clean hands in the administration of the income tax? Again, the obvious problem is what would happen if the IRS position was refuted by Congress? Well, if that was communicated loudly and clearly to the public the chaos and disruption that would likely follow would be unacceptable, to say the least. If the public were suddenly made aware of the truth that the income tax has been misapplied against them for many decades the result would be disastrous to our national economy. I for one am not wanting to see anything, including the failure of the income tax, be responsible for such a catastrophe. And yet, sir, there remains that little problem of the need, the requirement for honest government. The People require and demand honest government. So, how would the nation maintain economic and social tranquility while addressing obvious shortcomings in the administration of the income tax? I cannot confess to know the answer to that complicated question. I would say that the solution, if politicians such as you would be moved to even consider such a mind-boggling thing, would be fairly long-term in its implementation.

I have great faith in the American people. I believe they want to contribute their fair share for the running of the government. We are a generous and fair-minded people. But I don't believe the American people would knowingly tolerate any tax system that was being enforced against them using deception to pull it off. It is my opinion that that is what is occurring and that is why I speak out. You being a Christian and one who took an oath to defend and protect the Constitution I am sure you would not knowingly permit deception by government against The People.

The Internal Revenue Code is perfectly constitutional. In that context, it really does not need to be abolished; however, it needs to be properly enforced. Credible and verifiable evidence exists to demonstrate that the Sixteenth Amendment was not properly ratified. Even so, a proper understanding of the Sixteenth Amendment reveals that it did not allow the IRS to improperly use the law to make direct tax assessments against the working people's income from labor. So, assuming it had been properly ratified, it would really not need to be repealed; it would simply need to be applied according to Congress' original intentions and the rulings of the Supreme Court (not the lower courts).

Now, if the law was being properly enforced would there be a huge loss of revenue to the government? Yes! I can see how you politicians see that as a huge threat. Fine. Let's find a solution that provides the needed revenue but does not stray from the law or deceive The People in administering it. That is the problem is it not? Our Founding Fathers purposely made it politically-difficult and unpopular (but permissible within the law) for Congress to directly tax people's labor. Congress has always had plenary powers to tax our income directly but they must follow the Constitutional provisions to do so. Currently, IRS is not doing that. If more Americans today were acutely aware of this they would insist that Congress exert its authority to tame the IRS. If Americans understood the legal hoops that Congress must follow to collect a direct tax they would exert their political power at the state and local level resulting most likely in an outright rejection of the outrageous amount of tax that is extorted from them. I think Congress knows this and fears this. Nevertheless, the law must be followed.

Ahh. So, it is about money. But it is also about honesty. Tax me within the confines and limitations of the Constitution and the political and practical limits that We The People will hold you to - but don't try to trick me with the law. That's the essence of the problem: if Congress did its job and forced IRS to apply the law as written, revenues would shrink. If Congress wanted to maintain revenues by lawfully and directly taxing the labor of Americans it would face the scrutiny and approval of The People. The fact is,

The People may not approve. As it is now, The People have not really approved; they have been tricked and are not in a position to overcome the power that comes from the barrels of the guns of the taxing agency.

If the IRS is correct that the law so clearly applies to the income of working Americans, why should you, the IRS or some government official not be able to easily demonstrate the legal requirement to the American people? Why won't someone of authority refute the claims? Isn't that a worthwhile thing to do in order to save the life of Rose Lear? If the government were able to do that wouldn't it serve to shut the naysayers up, including me? I was challenged to do that nearly 6 years ago. I ended up resigning and giving up my very secure government career.

So, the question is, will you sincerely and thoroughly try to verify this deception that I am speaking of? Will you announce that you are in favor of putting this issue to rest? If so, will you announce it now so that Rose Lear will cease her starvation fast?

Earlier today I spoke with Rose. Her voice was very weak after 20 days of fasting. She cannot possibly have too many days left before something bad happens to her. While talking with her, I made several attempts to persuade her to give up the fast, to no avail. Mr. Bob Schulz, founder of We The People Foundation For Constitutional Education, informs me that every time he speaks with Rose he too tries to persuade Rose to give it up. She is determined. I don't want to appear to be placing her fate in your hands. Rose is responsible for her own life. From talking with her she appears quite cognizant of that. However, I am appealing to you, nevertheless. You cannot control Rose but you can do better than you have thus far. It is my understanding that you finally, recently met with Rose and agreed to "look into" the matter. Under the circumstances, I don't think that represents the appropriate response that Rose, a constituent of yours, deserves!

I don't know William Lear. I am told that back in his home town of Muskegon, Michigan he is very well known by the townspeople as a good and honest man. Various federal prison camps are currently holding many good and honest men and women for tax crimes. In a nation like America, how can so many really good and honest Americans find themselves in prison because of legitimate disputes about our income tax law? I'm talking about decent people here, Mr. Hoekstra, the kind of people you would enjoy eating a meal with.

Obviously, you by yourself have not the power to change the tax system, even if you saw that it was necessary. But that is not what I am asking of you. I am asking that you contact Rose now and find a way to satisfy her, with honesty and integrity. When I spoke with her on the phone she told me that when she met with you and looked into your eyes she saw "no soul". She is under great stress and very frustrated, so, a description like that might not be unreasonable from her vantage point. I doubt that you, a married man, a businessman, a Christian, and a six-term Representative could be anything but a warm and responsive man. Please don't let your lack of having the perfect solution in this matter stop you from exerting your full influence and power of persuasion with your peers in Congress.

My purpose for writing is not to bother you with my views about our income tax system. I've taken some pains to give you my background and outline my views about the income tax so that you have an understanding as to why I am so concerned, in order that it may encourage you to respond quickly and appropriately to the needs of Rose Lear.

I will be making this letter available to concerned Americans via fax and email. It is my hope that you will simply respond to Rose Lear. However, if you should take the time to respond to this letter, which I will greatly appreciate, I will make your response available also to the public, as I think they are very much interested in how you are attempting to respond in this matter. Thank you very sincerely,

John Turner
Former IRS Revenue Officer

[Back to Top](#)

Subject: Re: Richardson
Date: Mon, 19 Jun 2000 03:04:50 -0700
From: Pastoral Business <tupper@ix.netcom.com>
To: Larry Becraft <becraft@hiwaay.net>
CC: devvy kidd <wallace@devvy.com>, Bill Benson <bjbenson1@home.com>'

Devvy & Bill:

I read about Warren Richardson's letter in material Devvy sent me. I then looked up his name on my search engine and found an address. I wrote him for verification that he was, indeed, the author of the letter. I copied the letter, striking the business at the bottom about Bill's please not publicizing the letter. I told him I intended to write an article about the letter. A couple of days later, Richardson called me at home. The first thing he wanted to know was who I was writing for. I told him I would probably publish first on my website and go from there.

He said he used to be an attorney, but for the past 30 years he's been a lobbyist in Washington DC. He said he thought Bill's books were wonderful and had the power to bring down the IRS. But he said that an article right now would maybe not be a good thing. Knowing how Larry feels about planning, I agreed.

He said he wanted to contact certain unnamed congressmen and judges, and talk with them about what to do. He spoke of the flat-rate proponents, how their issue lost steam. If they could get behind Bill's material they I could rekindle interest in the flat-rate as an immediate patch to compensate for the dismantling of IRS. His attitude, like Larry's, seemed to be one of proceeding with method, caution, and great discretion. He didn't want to destroy careers over this. Much attention has to be paid to how do politicians salvage their credibility after so many years of marginalizing Bill Benson. I agreed that this was an important consideration.

He has my number. I told him that if I could be of any kind of assistance to him, covert or otherwise, he was welcome to call anytime. I was given to understand he knew how to contact Bill, and figured that once he'd woodshedded with his congressmen and judges he'd be in touch with Bill, and things would be set in motion.

If you need his telephone number, let me know. It's in Santa Monica, and I won't be there until later this afternoon.

Tupper Saucey

[Back to Top](#)

March 9, 2004

DEAR M2K PACKAGE HOLDERS,

ON MARCH 2, 2004 DURING THE TUESDAY NIGHT CALL BILL BENSON WAS ASKED IF HE BELIEVED THAT THE M2K PACKAGE WAS SOUND AND SATISFACTORY TO TURN INTO THE IRS. BILL BENSON EMPHATICALLY SAID THAT HE BELIEVED THAT IT WAS **DANGEROUS** TO USE. HE WAS THEN ASKED WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE PACKAGE? HE SAID THAT BECAUSE OF JOHN RIZZO'S PLEA AGREEMENT THE PACKAGE WAS NOW TAINTED AS HEARSAY.

On page four of John Rizzo's plea agreement it shows the details of his plea - Conspiracy to defraud the United States Government. It states:

"First, there existed a conspiracy, agreement, or understanding to defraud the United States by dishonest and deceitful means for the purpose of impeding, impairing, obstructing, and defeating the lawful governmental functions of the U.S. Department of Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, in the ascertainment, computation, and collection of income taxes as described in the indictment, was formed, reached or entered into by two or more persons;"

"Second, at some point during the existence or life of the conspiracy, agreement, or understanding, one of its members knowingly performed one of the overt acts charged in the indictment in order to further or advance the purpose of the agreement; and"

"Third, at some time during the existence or life of the conspiracy, agreement or understanding, defendant knew the purpose of the agreement, and then deliberately joined in the conspiracy, agreement, or understanding."

IT'S CLEAR IN THE RIZZO PLEA AGREEMENT THAT JOHN RIZZO IS VIRTUALLY SAYING THAT IN CREATING M2K HIS PURPOSE WAS TO DEFRAUD THE GOVERNMENT. CONSEQUENTLY, HE IS SAYING THAT HE DOESN'T TRULY BELIEVE THAT THE 16TH AMENDMENT WAS NEVER RATIFIED.

In the plea agreement John Rizzo further pleads to "False Declarations Before a Grand Jury of the United States". It states:

"First, the defendant testified under oath before a Grand Jury;

Second, the testimony was false; and

Third, the defendant knew the testimony was false and material to a matter before the Grand Jury."

ACCORDING TO PAGES 12 & 13 OF JOHN'S PLEA AGREEMENT, IT STATES:

"On January 29, 2003, in the District of Arizona, defendant JOHN J. RIZZO **voluntarily** appeared before a Grand Jury of the United States knowing that he was a target of the Grand Jury's investigation concerning his willful failure to file income tax returns, possible income tax evasion and other income tax-related violations. Having been advised of his legal rights and having taken an oath under penalties of perjury that he would testify truthfully, defendant JOHN J. RIZZO knowingly provided materially false and misleading testimony before the same Grand Jury by falsely declaring that it was his belief that he and his wife had filed tax returns for the tax years 1999, 2000 and 2001, and was current through tax year 2001, when in fact and material to the Grand Jury's investigation, defendant JOHN J. RIZZO, and codefendant Carol A Rizzo had not filed any federal income tax returns as required by law for the years 1999, 2000 and 2001."

THIS GOES TO THE FACT THAT JOHN NEVER BELIEVED IN THE M2K PACKAGE. OTHERWISE HE WOULD HAVE PUT IT TO THE TEST INSTEAD OF LYING BY SAYING THAT HE HAD FILED FOR 1999, 2000 AND 2001 WHEN, IN FACT, HE DID NOT FILE. ADDITIONALLY, THE FOLLOWING IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE THAT SPEAKS TO JOHNS TENDENCY TO LIE, IN AN EMAIL SENT OUT TO EVERYONE FROM:

M2Kcontact@aol.com

Date: Fri, 8 Feb 2002 16:58:59 EST

Subject: Re: LIVE CALL,

THE PERSON WE SHOULD JUSTIFIABLY ASSUME TO BE JOHN SAYS:

"The latest rumor is that I have only been dealing with the IRS for a few years. This is totally without merit. Many of you that know me know that I have developed several programs in the last 15 years that have been very successful in beating the IRS."

IF THIS IS TRUE, WHY DID JOHN BARELY STOP FILING IN 1995? FURTHERMORE, WHY DIDN'T HE USE ONE OF THESE PROGRAMS AT THE

GRAND JURY. IN THE GRAND JURY TRANSCRIPT WHERE JOHN RIZZO **VOLUNTARILY** TESTIFIED, HE WAS ASKED:

Q: US Attorney: "With respect to the 16th Amendment argument, sitting here today are you aware that the 16th amendment defense for filing tax returns has been rejected by the courts of the USA."

Ans.: John: "I'm aware that the courts have rejected the argument but I'm also aware that the courts have never examined the documents and I never told anyone to stop filing tax returns based on the 16th Amendment. But it's my belief that the 16th amendment was never ratified by my examination of the documents which the grand jury is more than welcome to look at for themselves and make their own determination."

Q: US Attorney: "**But you have not taken any action yourself based upon this belief?**"

Ans. John: "**I don't believe that I have. I believe that it wasn't ratified. I didn't say that paying taxes was illegal.**"

Q: US Attorney: "**I'm saying you sold materials, have you not, Mr. Benson and others have put together?**"

A: John: "**that's correct**"

Q: US Attorney: "**advocating that the 16th Amendment was never ratified?**"

A: John: "**that's correct**"

Q: US Attorney: "**have you personally taken any action consistent with this belief?**"

A: John: "**describe what you mean by any action?**"

Q: US Attorney: "**not filing tax returns**"

A: John: "**I think I already testified to that**" (we know what John is referring to because According to page 13 of rizzo's plea agreement under section 2 it states: "JOHN J. RIZZO knowingly provided materially false and misleading testimony before the same Grand Jury by falsely declaring that it was his belief that he and his wife had filed tax returns for the tax years 1999, 2000 and 2001, and was current through tax year 2001, when in fact and material to the Grand Jury's investigation, defendant JOHN J. RIZZO, and codefendant Carol A Rizzo had not filed any federal income tax returns as required by law for the years 1999, 2000 and 2001.")

AS FOR EVERYONE WHO ASSUMES THAT BILL BENSON WAS A PARTNER TO JOHN RIZZO, THE ABOVE QUOTES (IN BOLD TYPE AND TAKEN FROM THE GRAND JURY TRANSCRIPT) PROVES THAT **THIS ASSUMPTION IS FALSE**. IN THE GRAND JURY TRANSCRIPT WHEN ASKED BY THE US ATTORNEY: "I'M SAYING YOU SOLD MATERIALS, HAVE YOU NOT, MR. BENSON AND OTHERS HAVE PUT TOGETHER?" BY RESPONDING, "THAT'S CORRECT" YOU CAN SEE THAT JOHN RIZZO TESTIFIED THAT HE WAS ONLY SELLING BILL BENSON'S MATERIALS NOTHING MORE. **ON THE MARCH 2 TUESDAY NIGHT CALL BILL BENSON ASSERTED THAT HIS M2K**

ASSOCIATION WAS CHIEFLY TO PROVIDE M2K WITH BOOKS AND OPINION LETTERS, NOTHING MORE. HE FURTHER EXPLAINED THAT HE WAS NEVER A PARTNER TO JOHN RIZZO. JUST RECENTLY I FOUND OUT THAT BILL BENSON'S ASSOCIATION WITH M2K ENDED IN 2000 AFTER A FALLING OUT THAT OCCURRED BETWEEN HIMSELF AND JOHN RIZZO CONCERNING RIZZO'S TENDENCIES TO MISREPRESENT THE TRUTH AND TO FLAT OUT LIE. AT THAT TIME BILL BENSON STOPPED SELLING ALL MATERIALS TO RIZZO. ADDITIONALLY, IT WAS SOMETIME IN 2000 WHEN RIZZO CHANGED THE COVER TO THE 16TH AMENDMENT RELIANCE PACKAGE WHICH WAS A STEP THAT COMPRIMISED THE VALIDITY OF THE PACKAGE.

REMEMBER, ACCORDING TO PAGE 12 OF JOHN'S PLEA AGREEMENT, HE **VOLUNTARILY** TESTIFIED TO THE GRAND JURY ON JANUARY 29, 2003. IF JOHN RIZZO BELIEVED THAT THE 16TH AMENDMENT WAS NEVER RATIFIED WHEN HE TESTIFIED TO THE GRAND JURY WHY WOULD HE LIE BY TESTIFYING THAT HE HAD FILED HIS TAX RETURNS? HE HAD NOT BEEN INCARCERATED YET. HE CAN'T SAY THAT HE WAS AT THE MERCY OF THE IRS WHEN HE LIED AT THAT TIME. HE CAN'T SAY, AS AN EXCUSE FOR HIS FALSE TESTIMONY, THAT THE IRS WAS THREATENING TO HARASS HIS FAMILY. USING THE M2K PACKAGE HE COULD HAVE JUMPED ON THE FACT THAT THE 16TH AMENDMENT WAS NEVER RATIFIED TO JUSTIFY HIS NOT HAVING FILED TAX RETURNS AND AT THE SAME TIME FURTHER "THE CAUSE". INSTEAD HE LIED AND LET EVERY ONE DOWN INCLUDING HIMSELF.

THE QUESTION IS, 'HOW DO HIS LIES AND HIS PLEA AGREEMENT AFFECT THE M2K PACKAGE AND THOSE OF US WHO PURCHASED ONE?' ACCORDING TO BILL BENSON, HE FEELS THAT IN LIGHT OF ALL OF THIS, TURNING IN THE PACKAGE WOULD BE DANGEROUS. ACCORDING TO RIZZO'S PLEA AGREEMENT, IF THE ONE'S THAT SUBMIT THE PACKAGE ARE CALLED INTO COURT AND IF JOHN IS CALLED IN **AS A WITNESS FOR THE GOVERNMENT**, HE MUST TESTIFY AGAINST THEM. ON PAGE THREE OF THE PLEA AGREEMENT UNDER Cooperation Required, IT STATES:

"The defendant will cooperate with the United States on the following terms and conditions.

a. Defendant will waive the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination and will no later than the time of sentencing, meet as directed with federal authorities and provide truthful information known by the defendant concerning this and all related investigations. In addition, when requested by the representatives of the United States, the defendant shall testify candidly and truthfully in any matter arising from this, or a related investigation, including at any state or federal grand jury proceeding, forfeiture proceeding, bond hearing, pretrial hearing, civil and criminal trial, retrial or post-trial hearing."

WE'VE BEEN TOLD THAT THIS PLEA AGREEMENT WILL NOT EFFECT ANY OF US. HOWEVER, IT'S PLAIN TO SEE THAT THIS IS NOT TRUE. ON PAGE 6 OF THE PLEA AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION "P" IT STATES:

"Defendant shall cooperate fully and without reservation with the Internal Revenue Service and state tax collection agencies with ascertainment, computations and collection of all taxes that may be owed by defendant and **related entities**."

IN OTHER WORDS, IF JOHN DOES NOT COOPERATE AND GIVE THE IRS OR GOVERNMENT EVERYTHING THEY ASK FOR, HIS PLEA AGREEMENT IS NULL AND VOID. THEREFORE, IF THE IRS ASKS JOHN TO TESTIFY AGAINST ANY OF US - THEN JOHN REFUSES TO COOPERATE - ALL BETS ARE OFF. IN ESSENCE TO GET THE PLEA AGREEMENT THAT WAS NEGOTIATED BY JOHN AND CAROL, JOHN RIZZO IS NOW WORKING FOR THE GOVERNMENT. THIS IS WHY SUBMITTING THE M2K PACKAGE TO THE IRS IS **DANGEROUS**. BECAUSE IN THIS PLEA AGREEMENT JOHN HAS ESSENTIALLY REJECTED ANY BELIEF THAT THE 16TH AMENDMENT WAS NOT RATIFIED AND IN DOING SO HE IS SAYING THAT HIS PACKAGE IS BOGUS.

SOME OF YOU MAY SAY, "BUT THE PACKAGE IS ALL BILL BENSON. IT CONTAINS HIS WORK, HIS SEAL AND HIS SIGNATURES. ALL M2K DID WAS TO PUBLISH THE PACKAGE. WHY DOES IT MATTER WHO PUBLISHED IT OR WHERE IT WAS PUBLISHED?" **THE ANSWER TO THIS IS THAT IT MATTERS NOW BECAUSE DUE TO JOHN RIZZO'S LIE BILL BENSON CANNOT STAND BEHIND THE PACKAGE. IT'S THIS LIE THAT MAKES THE WHOLE PACKAGE HEARSAY.** RIZZO DIDN'T BELIEVE IN IT ENOUGH TO TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY ON ITS MERITS. BY NOT TESTIFYING ON ITS MERITS, HE ABANDONED THE OPPORTUNITY TO BRING ITS AUTHENTICITY INTO LIGHT. IF YOU DECIDE TO SUBMIT THE PACKAGE, AND AT SOME POINT YOU ARE ASKED WHERE YOU GOT IT, YOU CANNOT SAY THAT YOU GOT THE INFORMATION FROM BILL BENSON BECAUSE YOU GOT IT FROM JOHN RIZZO/M2K. AS A RESULT, THE PACKAGE IS WORTHLESS WITHOUT BILL BENSON'S ORIGINAL DOCUMENTATION (HIS PERSONAL ACTIONS AND HIS BELIEF THAT THE 16TH AMENDMENT WAS NEVER RATIFIED) TO BACK IT UP.

YOU MAY ASK, "CAN'T WE JUST TAKE RIZZO OUT OF THE EQUATION AND FOCUS ON THE FACT THAT THE M2K PACKAGE CONTENTS ARE PRIMARILY BILL BENSON'S MATERIALS?" THE ANSWER TO THIS IS "NO" BY LYING JOHN HAS PUT THE ESTABLISHED BELIEF OF EVERYONE WHO TURNS IN THE M2K PACKAGE IN QUESTION. BECAUSE JOHN RIZZO SIGNED THE PLEA AGREEMENT, IF YOU USE THE M2K PACKAGE YOU ARE PUTTING YOUR ESTABLISHED BELIEF THAT THE 16TH AMENDMENT WAS NEVER RATIFIED IN JEOPARDY. IN OTHER WORDS, YOU ARE ON YOUR OWN. JOHN RIZZO CAN'T AND WON'T BACK YOU UP. **ACCORDING TO THE GOVERNMENT, IF YOU USE THE M2K PACKAGE, YOUR BELIEF WAS ESTABLISHED IN CONNECTION WITH A CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD THE GOVERNMENT** (WHICH JOHN PLEAD TO). WITH REGARD TO THE M2K PACKAGE, BILL BENSON'S HANDS ARE TIED BECAUSE JOHN'S LIE HAS PUT A STIGMA OF FRAUD ON THE PACKAGE. BY LYING, JOHN HAS DAMAGED THE "CAUSE". **CONSEQUENTLY, IN ORDER TO KEEP "THE CAUSE" ALIVE, PROTECTED AND UNTAINTED, BILL BENSON HAS NO CHOICE BUT TO SEVER ALL RELATIONS WITH REGARD TO THE M2K PACKAGE.**

ALSO INSPITE OF JOHN'S TESTIMONY, FOR EVERYONE WHO OBTAINED THE M2K PACKAGE AFTER THE 16TH AMENDMENT RELIANCE PACKAGE COVER WAS CHANGED, THOSE PACKAGES BECAME INVALID BECAUSE THEY HAVE NO AFFIDAVITS. WHEN JOHN CHANGED THE COVER SOMETIME IN 2000, THE AFFIDAVIT WITH THE GOLDEN SEAL WAS AT THAT POINT NULL AND VOID. AS A RESULT, NO JUDGE WILL PERMIT THESE DOCUMENTS TO BE ENTERED INTO ANY CASE BECAUSE JOHN DID NOT DO THE WORK. AND THE SAME THING APPLIES WITH THE THREE RING BINDERS. THERE ARE NO AFFIDAVITS ON THOSE SO THEY ARE HEARSAY. AN AFFIDAVIT IS THE FOUNDATION THAT BACKS UP EVERYTHING THAT YOU SAY IN COURT AND HAVE DISCOVERED - LIKE

CERTIFIED NOTARIZED DOCUMENTS. BECAUSE THE COVER OF THE 16TH AMENDMENT RELIANCE PACKAGE HAS BEEN CHANGED, LEGALLY THE DOCUMENT INSIDE OF THE BOOK WITH THE GOLDEN SEAL IS THEREFORE VOID. IF YOU HAVE NO AFFIDAVIT THERE IS NOTHING TO VERIFY THE CONTENTS OF THE PACKAGE. FOR THESE REASONS **USING THE M2K PACKAGE IS DANGEROUS.**

FOR THOSE OF US WHO BELIEVE THAT THE 16TH AMENDMENT WAS NEVER RATIFIED, THE GOOD NEWS IS THAT, ALTHOUGH THE WATERS HAVE BEEN MUDDIED BY THIS WHOLE UNFORTUNATE ORDEAL, "THE CAUSE" IS STILL ALIVE. BILL BENSON, THE PERSON WHO HAS DONE ALL OF THE REAL WORK WITH REGARD TO THE "CAUSE", HAS A PACKAGE OF HIS OWN THAT HAS BEEN AVAILABLE TO EVERYONE SINCE 1993 (WHICH HAS CONSISTENTLY BEEN UPDATED). IT IS TRIED AND TRUE. HIS HARD WORK AND PERSONAL SACRIFICE ARE REASONS THAT "THE CAUSE" IS ALIVE TODAY. THE RECORD SHOWS THAT BILL BENSON IS TRIED AND TRUE. **I'VE TRIED TO PREVENT THIS LETTER FROM SOUNDING LIKE AN ADVERTISEMENT FOR BILL BENSON'S PACKAGE. BUT ANYONE WHO HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN THIS TAX MOVEMENT KNOWS THAT BILL BENSON'S WORK AND SACRIFICE ARE THE HEART AND SOUL OF THIS MOVEMENT IN FACT WHEN I PURCHASED THE M2K PACKAGE I WAS UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT I WAS PURCHASING BILL BENSON'S PACKAGE. I KNOW NOW THAT THE M2K PACKAGE WAS NOT BILL BENSON'S PACKAGE AT ALL.** IN SPITE OF EVERYTHING, ONE SALVAGABLE THING THAT HAS COME OUT OF HAVING PURCHASED THE M2K PACKAGE ARE THE BOOKS "THE LAW THAT NEVER WAS VOL. 1 AND VOL. 2, AUTHORED BY BILL BENSON.

THERE ARE BASICALLY TWO COMPONENTS NECESSARY IN BUILDING UP A DEFENSE TO INTRODUCE TO THE GOVERNMENT SUPPORTING YOUR RIGHT TO STOP PAYING INCOME TAXES AND TO PROTECT YOURSELF FROM HAVING TO PAY INCOME TAXES. THESE TWO COMPONENTS ARE:

1. A PACKAGE CONTAINING ALL LEGAL DOCUMENTS (SUPPORTING YOUR BELIEF THAT THE 16TH AMENDMENT WAS NEVER RATIFIED) INCLUDING THE AFFIDAVITS SUPPORTING THE LEGAL VALIDITY OF THE PACKAGE.
2. EVIDENCE OF WHEN YOU ESTABLISHED YOUR BELIEF THAT THE 16TH AMENDMENT WAS NEVER RATIFIED.

WITH REGARD TO THE M2K PROGRAM, THE FIRST COMPONENT THE M2K PACKAGE HAS BEEN PUT INTO QUESTION. AS A RESULT *M2K PACKAGE HOLDERS* ARE LEFT WITH A SEVERE VOID AS THE M2K PACKAGE HAS BEEN RENDERED UNSOUND. HOWEVER, THAT VOID CAN BE FILLED WITH BILL BENSON'S UNTAINTED GREATLY SUPERIOR PACKAGE **FORTUNATELY, BECAUSE YOU PURCHASED THE BOOKS "THE LAW THAT NEVER WAS VOL. 1 AND VOL. 2" THE SECOND COMPONENT - YOUR ESTABLISHED BELIEF - IS STILL INTACT PROVIDED YOU HAVE NOT TURNED IN YOUR M2K PACKAGE TO THE IRS.** HOWEVER, THE MINUTE YOU TURN IN THE M2K PACKAGE YOUR ESTABLISHED BELIEF BECOMES TAINTED BECAUSE WITHOUT THE PROPER AFFIDAVITS IN THE M2K PACKAGE AND BECAUSE OF RIZZO'S PLEA AGREEMENT YOU ARE ON YOUR OWN. (AS FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO TURNED IN THE PACKAGE BEFORE JOHN SIGNED THE PLEA AGREEMENT, AND WHO HAD A PACKAGE WITH THE ORIGINAL COVER BEFORE IT WAS CHANGED, YOU PROBABLY HAVE BETTER OPTIONS. IT'S TRICKY. IF I WERE YOU I'D CALL BILL BENSON TO SEE IF HIS PACKAGE CAN HELP YOU TOO. AFTER ALL,

HE'S THE TRIED AND TRUE EXPERT.)

LASTLY, THE PURPOSE OF THIS LETTER IS TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT AS TO HOW JOHN RIZZO'S PLEA AGREEMENT EFFECTS EVERYONE THAT HAS THE M2K PROGRAM. BY USING PUBLIC RECORDS TO ESTABLISH THE TRUTH, THIS LETTER SHOULD BRING TO LIGHT WHAT HAS EVIDENTLY REALLY COME TO PASS. THIS LETTER SHOULD NOT, IN ANY SHAPE WAY OR FORM, BE CONSTRUED AS A HARASSMENT OR RETALIATION TOWARDS JOHN RIZZO FOR HAVING SIGNED THE PLEA AGREEMENT. THE PURPOSE OF THIS LETTER IS TO MAKE *M2K PACKAGE HOLDERS* AWARE OF HOW, IN LIGHT OF JOHN'S INCLINATIONS TO LIE, AS SEEN IN HIS **VOLUNTARY** GRAND JURY TESTIMONY AND HIS PLEA AGREEMENT, THE M2K PACKAGE IS NOW COMPLETELY HOLLOW. UNDER 18 U.S.C. 1001 AS SIGHTED IN THE BOOK, **THE LAW THAT NEVER WAS VOL 1**: *"Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writings or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."* THOSE OF US WHO HAVE READ JOHN'S PLEA AGREEMENT AND NOW UNDERSTAND THE CONTENTS OF THIS LETTER HAVE A DUTY AND A RESPONSIBILITY TO MAKE THE TRUTH KNOWN TO EVERYONE CONCERNED. AS BILL BENSON SAID, "IF THERE'S A LESSON HERE, IT SHOULD TEACH US NOT TO LIE UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE."

RESPECTFULLY,

A FELLOW M2K PACKAGE HOLDER

[Click here to read about the Rizzo Grand Jury Charges](#)

[Click here to read about the Rizzo Hearing Arraignment & Detention Testimony](#)

[Click here to read about the Rizzo Transcripts](#)

[Click here to read about the Rizzo Plea Agreement](#)

[Click here to read about the Rizzo Superseding Indictment](#)

(All links are to large PDFs. Please be patient for the download.)

[Back to Top](#)

Emails to Bill Benson and responses from him:

Dear Mr. Benson,

My wife and I purchased the M2K package from your representatives in Colorado, (name withheld at this point) and (name withheld at this point) in April of 2002. We received the IRS CP-515 on 5-27-03 and 6-16-03. We moved to Missouri in Oct. 2002 and contacted the IRS office in Springfield once we received the CP-515 by letter to set up a meeting. The meeting was scheduled on Aug. 11, 2003 by a representative but once we arrived to the meeting that representative was not in the office to meet with us. An IRS lady took our materials and signed a receipt listing the materials we were handing over to her to be put in our permanent file.

We received the usual threading letters along with holding any bank interest that was not reported to the IRS, but we also had our materials returned back to us on Feb. 27, 2004 with no letter stating why!

Not knowing what to do next we sent a letter asking why these materials where sent back with a copy of the signed receipt from the IRS agent.

We were wondering what we should do next.

We would appreciate you're response.

Respectfully,
(Name withheld at this point)

Response from Bill Benson:

Let it be clearly understood that I Bill Benson have no representatives in Colorado. So the Con JOB of M2K still goes on. Nevertheless, this is a prime example of what I was talking about when I said that it's dangerous to turn in the M2K package. As for what should be done next, I'll be working on this one.

Bill Benson

Emails to Bill Benson and responses from him:

Hi Bill,

I started reading the transcript last night.... As of now I believe that you had no choice but to protect your good name and your belief in what is the truth. As for Rizzo, there is no excuse he should know. The hero dies but once the cowered dies a thousand deaths and he would have prevailed with the truth I don't get it.

Sincerely,
(Name withheld at this point)

Response from Bill Benson:

The transcripts are also being provided to show all that you must not lie but tell the truth when you are dealing with any part of federal government, state, or the judicial system.

Bill Benson

For technical problems with this site, contact: [Site Admin](#)
Copyright©1999-2006 Constitutional Research and Associates. All Rights Reserved.