


FREEDOM'S *Phoenix*



Featured Articles

- Pg # 3 Nick Barnett - Freedom's Phoenix Digital Viewing Tips**
- Pg # 4 Powell Gammill - We're Going to be Free...And Government is Not In-**
- Pg # 8 Julian Heicklen - TO STAY OR LEAVE THE U. S.?**
- Pg # 10 James Babb - The Anarchist's Burden...**
- Pg # 12 Meghan Kellison - Are We There Yet?**
- Pg # 14 L. Neil Smith - IN OR OUT**
- Pg # 16 Larken Rose - Should I Stay or Should I Go?**
- Pg # 18 Angel Clark - There's No Place Like Home**
- Pg # 19 Jack Gregson - Back in the U.S.S.R.**
- Pg # 20 Rosa Koire - Nowhere to Hide**
- Pg # 21 Tarrin Lupo - Is it Finally Time to Say "So Long, and Thanks for All the Fish"?**
- Pg # 22 Ray McGovern - The Larger Question of Chuck Hagel**
- Pg # 25 Howard Blitz - Looking to the Future**
- Pg # 26 Christina Tobin - Will Work for Freedom**
- Pg # 27 Loaded Guns, Loaded Kids**
- Pg # 29 Meghan Kellison - When Can We Have an Honest Discussion on Men-**
- Pg # 31 James Gierach - Impending Drug-War Armistice Offers New Year Hope**
- Pg # 36 Marc J. Victor - I AM A PEACEFUL AR-15 ASSAULT RIFLE OWN-**
- Pg # 42 Michael W. Dean - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid "The Man"**
- Pg # 58 Chip Saunders - Buy Guns While You Still Can**
- Pg # 75 Joby Weeks - Sandy Hook - Betrayal of Blood**
- Pg # 78 Ernest Hancock - Publisher's Backpage: Humanity Marches On**

Credits:


Editor-In-Chief-----Donna Hancock
Publisher-----Ernest Hancock
Technical Advisor-----Nick Barnett
Illustrator-----Athena Tivnan
Webmaster FreedomPhoenix.com-----Tyger Gilbert

Contact Us :
FreedomPhoenix.com


The domain and name of FreedomPhoenix are servicemarks of Ernest Hancock. All rights reserved worldwide. Feature articles, columns, artwork and illustrations should be examined to determine the copyright status claimed by each individual creator.

Ernest Hancock
 4886 W Port Au Prince Lane
 Glendale, AZ 85306 USA.

PERMISSION is Granted to Forward this magazine in its entirety.



SUBSCRIBE NOW!
 (CHECK OUT OUR SILVER PACKAGE)



**Cool New Stuff
 Now Available!**



**Buy Online Now
 and Support
 Freedom's
 Phoenix**

Freedom's Phoenix Digital Magazine viewing tips

By Nick Barnett

(For continuous updates to enhance your digital magazine experience use links below)

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

[iPad/iPhone](#)

[SmartPhone](#)

[Andriod Device](#)

[Other](#)



The Freedom's Phoenix digital magazine has been optimized and tested for use on the iPad with the "GoodReader" application. Since Apple's products do not have native support for interactive publications, you have to purchase the application from the iTunes digital download store. You can either follow [this link](#) to be taken to the application purchase page or use your iPad's AppStore and search for "GoodReader."



Once GoodReader is installed, you can optimize your digital magazine experience by changing a few default options in the application. Launch GoodReader and click the settings icon (it looks like a little gear in the bottom left of the screen). In the "General Settings" tab, it is recommended that you set the "Asks for link action" option to OFF. In the "PDF files" tab, you should ensure that "Horizontal swipe" is set to ON, and "Fit page to width (portrait)" is set to ON.

Once you have made the above changes, you will be able to swipe left and right to "flip" through the digital pages and the pages should appear as intended, just like a real paper magazine, but with modern paperless interactivity.

To obtain the Freedom's Phoenix digital magazine, launch GoodReader and click "Browse the Web." To get to this option, you may need to expand the "Web Downloads" sub-window found on the right hand column of the application. When you click "Browse the web" you

will be presented with GoodReader's internal web browser, just type in www.freedomspheonix.com in the address bar and hit "Go" on your iPad onscreen keyboard.

Once Freedom's Phoenix has loaded, click on "Magazine/Radio/TV" in the website's navigation bar, then choose the option for "Online Magazine List." You may be prompted to enter your Freedom's Phoenix username and password at this point. Choose the digital magazine you wish to download and you will be taken to a page with a link that says "Download Magazine File." Once you click this, GoodReader will begin downloading the file. Once the file has finished downloading, you will be able to access it from the "Recent Downloads" menu in the "My Documents" screen of GoodReader.



The best software for all [android devices](#) so far has been the FREE software from the Andriod Market: [ezPDF Reader](#)

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



FREEDOM'S Phoenix
Reigniting the Flames of Freedom
FreedomPhoenix.com
Uncovering the Secrets & Exposing the Lies

www.FreedomSummit.com

PAST SPEAKERS: JACOB G. HORNBERGER - DON BOUDREAUX - ROBERT A. LEVY - BUTLER D. SHAFFER - VIN SUPRYNOWICZ - CLINT BOLICK - KATHERINE ALBRECHT - JAMES BOVARD - NATHANIEL BRANDEN - RON PAUL - PETER D. SCHIFF - GEORGE H. SMITH - EDWARD STRINGHAM - ALAN BOCK - DOUG CASEY - CHARLES GOYETTE - JUSTIN RAIMONDO - MARY RUWART - KEN SCHOOLLAND - CLAIRE WOLFE - RICHARD BODDIE - HARRY BROWNE - HANS-HERMANN HOPPE - ERNEST HANCOCK - BOSTON T. PARTY - MARC VICTOR - DONALD "MAC" MACPHERSON - RICHARD MORRIS - WALTER BLOCH - LEW ROCKWELL - JOHN PUGSLEY - LARRY PRATT - SHARON HARRIS - LOUIS JAMES - JOHN BUTTRICK - L. NEIL SMITH - MARSHALL FRITZ - DR. STEVEN GREER - CHRISTOPHER HEWARD - KAREN KWIATKOWSKI - JANE SHAFFER - SUNNI MARAVILLOSA - DR. BRIAN WOVK - DAVID D. FRIEDMAN - STUART KRONE - ADAM KOKESH - BUD BURRELL - JOEL SKOUSEN - JOHN TAYLOR GATTO - JEFFREY A. SINGER - DAN BARNER - JAMES P. GRAY - MARC STEVENS - WILLIAM BUPPERY - SCOTT HORTON - LAWRENCE W. (LARRY) REED - STEFAN MOLYHEUX - JORDAN PAGE - THE CARTRIDGE FAMILY BAND

"WHERE THE GREAT MINDS OF THE MODERN FREEDOM MOVEMENT COME TOGETHER"

We're Going to be Free...And Government is Not Invited

By Powell Gammill

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



SHOULD I stay or should I go now?

*If I go there will be trouble
And if I stay it will be double
So you gotta let me know
Should I stay or should I go?
-- The Clash (1981)*

I wrote about this topic before; it was for this magazine or [Freedom's Phoenix](#). And it seems like a good time to visit this topic again as things have gotten worse. Claire Wolfe started this with her great book, [101 Things to Do 'Til the Revolution](#) (updated several times under new titles as tyranny eliminated some avenues of worthwhile activism) in which she posed the observation, "America is at that awkward stage. It's too late to work within the system, but too early to shoot the bastards."

This has always broached a perennial question: Is our awkwardness over? Is it time to shoot the bastards? I believe the answer now is a definite, "maybe." But the observation itself was not so much a question as a statement of the inevitability of the necessity to kill the bastards. Peaceful means to insist on being left alone were clearly and deliberately ignored. When not ignored, they were brutally responded to with great enthusiasm and public attention. Often later do we learn that agitators promoting or instigating violence among us were in fact government employed provocateurs infiltrated to not just spy upon us, but to get us to do violence against the state. So obviously the state wants some overt violence against it. Why would they want that?

There was little left to do than try to define the problem, recruit like minded individuals yearning to be free, and set out on a course to make it clear to those who won't leave you alone that the price for it will be everything. Unfortunately, the numbers still seem too few to succeed in civil war. Though we do trouble the masters, I suspect, because our message is clear and consistent, and growing louder (as it was in the middle 1800's). "Why does anyone need to be ruled?" You can see why this might make the masters nervous. They might have to plow their own fields in life rather than steal the fruits of others' labor.

The problem?

Government is the problem. Throughout history there have always been producers eking a living off of the world. There have always been others who figured out they could make a living off of people either by convincing them to share the fruits of their labor through trade, fraud or force, or convincing others to join them in convincing others through trade, fraud or force. Only trade is the least costly and--to free minded people--



--morally acceptable and even desirable, as free trade is giving something of value to another in exchange for getting something of value in return, by a mutual, non coercive agreement.

Depriving others of their labor through theft of either fraud, trespass or force is unacceptable to free minded individuals. This has been demonstrated in primates---that they become enraged when cheated. So they understand a fair deal.

Primate species usually--but not always--organize into collectives, troops, or tribes with a dominant ruler. Usually the biggest and strongest rules. Unfortunately, it has proven a successful survival strategy for certain humans for uncounted millennium, and has been refined into ruling oligarchies who have organized other humans into ruthless collectives called government to directly serve them in this plunder. We have evolved to be very, very clever. During that time, the cleverest rule became the strongest rule. And they tried to pass their rule onto their offspring by creating a rule book for ruling.

In no small part this is because the benefits to this sort of ruling and thieving behavior outweigh the risks to the instigators---indeed, things are so well organized that the risks to the rulers are now small while their vassals (often armed and well practiced) risk a bit more, but nowhere near the risks imposed on those who would disobey or far worse, oppose those who demand their labor.

The obvious solution is that the risks in theft MUST rise to outweigh the profits of the theft. Or the people who just want to be left alone won't be.

But that is a description of revolution. The question put forth is "should I stay or should I go?"

Historically, looking back after a conflict, the smart move has ALWAYS been to those who have fled before the conflict started. Those that fled had a better chance of surviving than those that stayed. Those that remained until it got so bad they fled with little but themselves fared

Continues on Page 5

Continued from Page 4 - We're Going to be Free...And Government is Not Invited

worse, but still were more likely to survive if their escape was successful than those who remained and fought, or like most in that area just wanted to be left alone. That is likely to remain true, but it is a lot harder to presently flee with anything but yourself (i.e, your wealth) and it will get harder to flee as time goes on.

So if I go?

Where? When? How? With whom?

No matter where you go in the world there is government. The ruling class even has mechanisms to violently insert government into areas where no unapproved limited government exists. Any economic niche identified is quickly filled with government monitoring, demanding, seizing and terrorizing the populace that falls under their reach.

So make no mistake you are fleeing one government for another.

Is that new group of organized criminals better than your present organized gang? Will they grow worse over time? Will the new thugs protect you from the old thugs?

Will your present government let you go?

As an unmasked designated U.S. Citizen, your government now lays claim to all you possess and all you earn, no matter where on the planet you reside. To renounce your citizenship you must visit a U.S. embassy at least twice. Once to total your debt to them and make sure you are not wanted by them. And the other to pay them off if you wish to leave the embassy in other than rendered chains with your permit slip to leave their plantation for good.

Rather than renouncing their U.S. Citizenship, most departing Americans simply become "unpatriated" Americans or acquire dual or multiple citizenships (illegal in the U.S. once you are over 18 years of age), presumably to hope one criminal gang will offer protection from the other. Of course such organized crime protection comes with a price, and usually more of a pay us and we leave you alone rather than pay us and we protect you from others. It is not uncommon to pay multiple government gangs to make them go away.

Unpatriated Americans are subject to recall, and warrants may be issued to compel their repatriation that will be carried out by that gang who rules over you for the gang that runs The United States of America (Inc.). But often you are out of sight and out of mind---and unpatriated Americans are reasonably left alone.

But that wonderful band of criminals known as the U.S. government continues to make friends at the drop of a bomb around the globe, turning your U.S. Citizenship into an overnight ass fucking. Nothing like waking up to an enraged populous looking to spill some American blood.



Since the U.S. Government gang itself is protected, you will have to substitute for the mob's actions.

And the love of Americans on foreign soil extends mostly only as far as their money does. Investing in bars and servants only buys you so much love. A lot of Americans get pension and social security checks sent to them in these foreign lands. So not only does the U.S. criminal gang know where you live and bank, but they can stop the flow of money instantly as well---even drain your accounts instantly without your knowledge in the same way they do so here in the land of the free.

Or that gang makes that U.S. Government taxpayer slave backed money worthless---which is what they are doing now, by printing as much as they need.

If you decide to run or stay, your wealth must not be tied to the dollar at least not for long and not in significant percentages. I wouldn't want it tied to the other gangs currency. either. So plan accordingly.

So if I stay?

How do I survive? Where? With whom?

Pretty much this is true no matter where you go in the world. But for most people in the United States, the question becomes do I stay put in my city, or do I flee to a rural area? If you flee, when do you go?

Everyone should have at minimum a couple of weeks of nonperishable food and water (rotated) set aside for everyone in the household for emergencies. Natural and man-made emergencies happen more often than you would think. Smart people, free people, should have three to four months worth of food, water and supplies set aside (toiletries, medical) for everyone, stored under beds and in closets or attics and basements. As the Mormons tell their young adults---if you get unexpectedly laid off or fired, it is a lot less stressful knowing where your food

Continues on Page 6

Continued from Page 5 - We're Going to be Free...And Government is Not Invited

will come from for the next four months, allowing your savings to go towards rent and gasoline while looking for other employment. If you plan on fleeing to a rural area, four months worth of supplies covers whatever you will need and leaves plenty to barter on your way out.



But beyond that if you are staying, you must plan to have a stockpile of a couple of years on hand. And resources (a well, seeds, fruit trees, gardens, food animals(?), food storage basement, food preservation, compost pile to renew gardens...) on hand to stretch your supplies. Where is water coming from if municipalities shut down? Where is heating and cooling coming from along with lights if electricity and natural gas disappear? How will you get around if gasoline either goes to exorbitant prices or disappears altogether? How will you repair vehicles and your home if such supplies are nonexistent? How will you protect what is yours?

Cities are where resources will be directed, but it is also where the tyrants will pillage first until there is little left to steal and any opposition has been crushed. Then they will send their armies forth to seize the outlying areas. Hoarders--that is those who planned ahead--within the city will be targeted followed by those outside the cities. Slave labor and overseers on the newly formed government-run plantations will take over to produce food for the angry starving cities.

Pretty much the rural areas will experience the joys of being reunited with their rulers as soon as the cities are quelled. So you can either wait for them to come for you, or help fight them in the cities. This is equally true of those who flee the country---they will come for you and are you going to wait for them, or figure out how to fight them where they are at present?

So do I stay or do I go?

I would go if you can afford to do it. Stock up somewhere ostensibly outside of the U.S. Government's reach. Plant some vegetation that will sustain you. Hope your government doesn't come after you or your stuff, and hope the new government steals less.



Alternatively, move to a rural area and set up house there. Hope you can get there by road with obtainable gasoline when the time comes, and the property is intact and welcoming.

Try moving to the outer edges of the city now and drive into work or work nearby. When it hits the fan, you likely won't be contained at first. You won't have as far to go or as many

impediments when fleeing. You may even have a few days' warning to flee.


Or you can stay. Most will. Best of luck. I am haunted by the saying "If we don't hang together, we shall surely hang apart." You've a fight on your hands.

Make no mistake, the fight will come to you no matter where you reside. It will simply either take time for your enemy to gather its forces (its resources are already conveniently gathered) and secure its position, or you will find your are immediately on the front lines. Either way, your turn will come.

Leviathan may crumble under its own weight. But the forces behind leviathan are still there. They will still run their armies of followers and conscripts. They will still demand their tribute--as much as they feel they can profitably take from you. Maybe all. The numbers are with Leviathan. People believe in government. People have been conditioned to demand what government is going to do either to deal with an acute or chronic situation (often of government's own making), or what is government going to do for me. Government consists of vast armies of people who truly believe they are doing good in following the demands of their leaders at whatever tasks they have been ordered to perform. They not only will follow orders, they believe they are right in following them. Many non-government citizens, residents or denizens believe government is doing right as well.

While activism may have collected those who oppose Leviathan, and may have created doubt in the cult of the omnipotent state in others, it may have shown many a potentially better way than to be ruled; the majority still craves rule. They likely will follow their masters orders (with or without immediate regrets).

To me, that spells disaster for those who stay in the cities ruled by government. You will be behind enemy lines fighting a fight against terrible odds, hoping to survive long enough for disenchantment to take hold among the local populace in hopes that they will join your side. History rarely tells of such success, and mostly boasts of the success of government to restore




Continues on Page 7

Continued from Page 6 - We're Going to be Free...And Government is Not Invited

and expand its rule, quell dissent, and eliminate or enslave its opposition. That is the playbook; it is what government does every day. Why should tomorrow be different?

It seems to me Leviathan is rotting both from within and from without. The pieces that result from the crumble may be easier dealt with. There may indeed be a geographic focus for liberty to migrate towards and seize their freedom in a fortress that can then infect as free markets and free ideas spread from one area into the surrounding areas, much as such liberty and freedom has spread into the electronic area we now call the Internet. We must continue to be the disease for now.



BE REVOLUTIONARY

It is hard to compete with "mommie." But you can attack the notion that government behaves like your parents, that government is indeed even capable of fulfilling those promises, and that the costs to the individual are its freedom to make choices for itself and its progeny.


Note that your parents restricted your freedoms hopefully to protect you from foolish interactions with the world that could end your existence while you were young, and learned to recognize threats on your own and how to deal with them. Your parents eventually gave you the freedom to let you make your own decisions, and let you survive and live with some of the consequences of those decisions until one day they gave you the freedom--or you took it on your own--to make your way into the world and survive on your own. Government as "mom-mie" will always make you dependent upon it. To do chores for it. Government will never permit you the freedom to make your own decisions. Under the promise that you will never have to face the consequences of the actions you take under the commands of government. With government, you never grow up.

The more people you can pull away from government, the more it is diminished and the more you can then spread the word. The more people who are in government that now doubt their

mission, the more rot you cause within. But it seems to me when the elephant goes rogue you want to be nowhere near when the death-rattles start. You can be crushed. It attracts predators wanting a piece of the carcass and maybe some fresh meat like you. Seems like admiring your work from afar is the safest plan.

But hiding in a hole as survivalists advocated during the Carter years, and some still do, is foolish. Humans are tribal. Humans are community. We do much better interacting with one another than alone. Waiting in some hole to survive is a recipe for being nothing and dying alone, unmarked. The trick is figuring out where to be when it all goes to hell to watch from a safer distance to be in a position to interact with the pieces when the dust is settling and survive; preferably to thrive.

Let us remember these fuckers have nukes. They have used them and constantly threaten to use them unless they get their way. That means nowhere on the earth is safe from them. That local governments WILL cave to their demands when sufficiently pressured. That Leviathan or its remnants WILL have to be dealt with, therefore you must be in a position where you survive to deal with it, but also be in a position to deal with it. And the mess will be great. Hyperinflated economy, material shortages, destroyed infrastructure and lost lives when the figurative and hopefully not radioactive dust settles. And there will be plenty who will want pay back and do looting of their own. It will be free minds and free markets that rebuild the fastest, most efficiently and with the least costs. It will be the free minds that build in ways that few imagined.

So there is my opinion. You should go, but how far--either to the periphery to continue to make a living, or to the country or elsewhere in the world to hopefully prosper away from as much government as you can--I am a little fuzzy on. If you stay, then you will either comply, infiltrate or fight. I don't like your chances. Either way you will be the first to feel the tender touch of the iron fist and the jack boot. It should frighten you. It is what it is, but you can prepare to survive this too. You are human. 

Powell Gammill is the Senior Editor of FreedomPhoenix.Com, Micro/Molecular Biologist, and a libertarian activist.

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

TO STAY OR LEAVE THE U. S.?

By Julian Hecklen

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



DONNA Hancock, the Editor of Freedom Phoenix E-Zine asked the editorial writers to discuss the question:

“‘staying or going’ (should we stay and

fight the tyranny that is before us or at least try to hide from/survive it, or just go and leave it all behind to start a new life in another part of the world)”

My decision in 1997 was to stay and fight by non-violent civil disobedience. As a result, I was arrested 16 times, tortured in 2 New York County hospitals (Bellevue Psychiatric Hospital and New York Downtown Hospital), and a hospital in Springfield, MA; and denied any semblance of justice in four courts (New York City Criminal Court, U. S. District Courts in New York County and Newark, NJ, and the Orange County court in Orlando, FL). Threats of arrests were made to me, but not executed, at the Allentown, PA, and Buffalo, NY, federal district courthouses; and the Binghamton, NY, and Fort Lauderdale, FL county courthouses. Threats of arrest were also made at the NY Times building for carrying a sign which read **“THE NY TIMES HATES JEWS,”** and at the Hackensack, NJ, main post office for distributing Libertarian Party million dollar bills.

In December, 2011, the U. S. Congress passed the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) of 2012, which gave the President the authority to arrest and detain indefinitely any person without charges or a trial. The Senate approved the bill in a 98-0 decision. In the House of Representatives, there were only 3 dissenting votes. The President signed the bill on New Year’s Eve, 2011.

Immediately after the signing of the NDAA, I decided to leave the United States. I arrived in Israel on January 9, 2012, where I now reside as a citizen of that country. Again the U. S. Senate has passed a similar NDAA of 2013 by a 98-0 vote and the House by a vote of 299 yea's to 120 no's.

Until the Reagan administration (roughly 1984), the United States probably was the best country ever placed on the face of the earth. As Abraham Lincoln stated “It is the last best hope of mankind. It must not perish from the earth.”

The U.S. had several serious faults, but they were gradually removed until the Reagan years. During his administration we began the path to the number one prison state in the world and entered the period of excessive deficit financing. These 2 events turned the United States into one of the most repressive and irresponsible countries on earth.

Can the United States be returned to a constitutional republic? I certainly had hoped so. Many of us tried to do so with publicity and non-violent civil disobedience methods. We have failed. Hitler is in the White House. The U. S. Congress tramples on the Constitution routinely. It refuses to understand the concerns of freedom-loving citizens.

The courts are completely corrupted. All judges routinely trample on the U. S. and state Constitutions when they refuse jury trials or instruct the juries to uphold the law as they give it. It is not the duty of the jury to uphold the law. It is the jury’s duty to see that justice is done. Furthermore judges sentence innocent people to execution. Since 1992, the Innocence Project has freed 141 of those sentenced to execution. Who knows how many other innocent people have been executed?

The police departments in the major cities are the major crime syndicates in the United States. They trample on people’s rights daily by arresting them for photographing, loitering, drug possession, prostitution, and free speech activity. Police departments are the largest syndicate for the distribution of illegal drugs in the nation. They routinely torture and kill detainees. People are arrested for owning firearms without a government license in direct conflict with Amendment 2 of the U. S. Constitution.

The election of November 6, 2012, was an out-and-out fraud. Typically 40% of the registered voters vote in presidential elections. In the last election dozens of precincts reported votes from more than 100% of the registered voters. Other precincts were reporting 100% votes for Obama and 0% for Romney. That's what happened in 59 Philadelphia voting divisions, according to the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The Columbus Dispatch reported that “more than one out of every five registered Ohio voters is probably ineligible to vote.” Furthermore, “in

Continues on Page 9

Continued from Page 8 - TO STAY OR LEAVE THE U. S.?

two counties, the number of registered voters actually exceeds the voting age population . . .”


One Colorado county had 140% of the population cast votes. NOT 140% of the registered voters...140% of the total population! Another in Colorado had 109% of the population cast votes.

Nationwide, the Pew Center for the States estimates about 24 million ineligible voter registrations, including “more than 1.8 million dead people listed as voters; about 2.75 million with voter registrations in more than one state; and about 12 million voter records with incorrect addresses, meaning either the voters moved or errors in the information make it unlikely any mailing scan reach them.”


The only choices left to return the U. S. to a constitutional republic are violent ones. The military has not moved to take over the government. If it did, I doubt that it would solve the problem, though it would not make it worse.

The U. S. government uses torture and assassination. The people have the right to use the same techniques. Armed rebellion is very bloody and not reliable. If it fails, the oppression becomes worse. If it succeeds, the winners will not give the people the right to make decisions. They will be at least as corrupt and oppressive as the present government.

The only mechanism that I see that has possible success is a continual assassination of judges and elected officials. The immediate reaction will be to increase the oppression. However after sufficient government officials are assassinated, the remainder will realize that their only



hope to remain alive is to return the government to the people and a constitutional republic.

I have not chosen to follow this route because I not only believe in a constitutional republic, I also believe in God’s commandment of “Thou shall not murder.” Therefore I chose political exile to “start a new life in another part of the world.” For me the only choice that the world permits, or that I wanted, is Israel. 

Julian Heicklen is a retired Chemistry Professor from Penn State University. He has been a libertarian activists for many years, has spent countless hours on the steps of court buildings handing out FIJA (Fully Informed Jury Association) information, as well as being an advocate for marijuana legalization. He has been arrested and incarcerated many, many times for his efforts to educate the public of government corruption, and fled to Israel on May 22nd, 2012 as a political exile and was granted Israeli citizenship at customs. Visit his webpage at TyrranyFighters.Com and [Facebook](#).

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

The Anarchist's Burden...

By James Babb

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



SHOULD we stay and fight for freedom, even when those around us seem unaware and unwilling to address the root problems of society?

In the classic fable of the

"Blind Men and an Elephant," each blind man feels a single part of the elephant, like the tail, side or leg. One man detects a wall, another a rope, another a large column. They then compare observations and learn that they are in complete disagreement about the nature of what they have experienced. When a sighted man walks by and sees the entire elephant all at once, he not only informs the blind men about the elephant, but also informs the men that they are blind.

Progressives, conservatives, etc., often perceive problems the way the blind men perceive the elephant. Conservatives may see the problems of taxation or market regulations. Progressives may see problems like drug prohibition or police abuse. The burden of anarchists is similar to the sighted man. Not only does he get the whole picture, but he must confront the others about their blindness. How can you explain sight to someone who has been blind for life?

Every fan of Freedom'sPhoenix has heard the slogan "Freedom's the answer. What's the question?" To anarchists (principled libertarians, voluntaryists, leave-me-alone-ists, whatever you call yourself), this is undoubtedly true.

While statist struggle with endlessly complex solutions, on top of solutions, on top of solutions, anarchists have seemingly simple answers that happen to be correct every time: more personal freedom, more choices, more competition, less coercion, less violence. The non-aggression principle is the key to solving so many problems, that anarchists can be easily resented by those engaged in the complex mental gymnastics required to justify their statism.



Problem: War

Statist Solution: More war, sanctions, death, deficits, taxes, inflation, death

Anarchist Solution: Abolish the state

Problem: Availability of Healthcare

Statist Solution: Massive bureaucratic cartel, eliminate choice, rationing, death

Anarchist Solution: Abolish the state

Problem: Security

Statist Solution: Grope grandmas and children at airport, spy on everyone, suspicionless checkpoints, keep everyone scared.

Anarchist Solution: Abolish the state

Problem: Drug Addiction

Statist Solution: Arm Mexican drug cartels, lock up brown people and hippies. SWAT raids in schools, shoot family pets.

Anarchist Solution: Abolish the state

Problem: Helping the poor

Statist Solution: Steal money from everyone, outlaw private charity, keep people dependent, prohibit low value labor, limit new businesses.

Anarchist Solution: Abolish the state

Problem: Economic depression

Statist Solution: Buy champagne with freshly printed dollars. Make up stories about a "fiscal cliff."

Anarchist Solution: Abolish the state

Notice a pattern? As anarchists, we know that freedom is the right answer for both moral and pragmatic reasons. We know that there is no product or service that is best produced with coercion. We understand that the freedom to choose is essential to human happiness.

As an anarchist, I regularly receive calls for help from people that encounter some problem with the state. It usually involves an arrest for a victimless crime, eminent domain property seizure, or some corruption in their town council. I try to help in these situations as often as I can. These are teaching opportunities. But it can be quite a burden. Sometimes we can help these victims of the state see the whole elephant. Sometimes we can't.

Early in the history of We Won't Fly, (a travel dignity webpage), one reporter identified co-founder George Donnelly as an anarchist in a newspaper. Quite a few people had negative comments about this. They said things like "I liked you for opposing the TSA, but if you're anarchists, Im out of here!" When a government hand is in your grandma's pants, perhaps it's time to consider anarchy.

Continues on Page 11

Continued from Page 10 - The Anarchist's Burden...

At a recent peace rally, I saw a woman holding a sign with a message on each side. One side said "End the wars," the other said "Tax the rich." The inconsistency was lost on this poor woman, as it is on those Subaru drivers with bumper stickers of peace signs and Obama.

Consider all of the marijuana legalization advocates that think gun prohibition is a good idea. I know a man who had TWO medical marijuana clinics shut down by the Obama administration. He then endorsed and voted FOR Obama!

Armed men with state badges had kidnapped this man and held him hostage for several years. He now supports a total gun ban. Presumably, only the gang that destroyed his life can be trusted to wield lethal force. If this view wasn't isolated, I would dismiss it as Stockholm Syndrome.



At a recent rally against police brutality, demonstrators had gathered to protest a savage surprise attack on a defenseless woman. One of the organizers was quoted in the paper as saying something like "We like the police. We respect authority. We just ask for better training." How many police beatings are required before it's obvious that a police monopoly is a dangerous menace to society?


A have a "friend" on Facebook that I know through our mutual opposition to youth curfews in Philadelphia. Today, she wrote on her wall about the need for universal healthcare, because her sister can't afford medicine. I suggested that she put up a chip-in for donations and investigate why healthcare is so expensive. I was quickly

informed that voluntary aid is "bullshit", I'm an "idiot," and that I support a "barbaric" philosophy. Of course, her philosophy of statism has resulted in the deaths of hundreds of millions, but I'm a barbarian for offering to help with MY OWN money.

Even Ron Paul, who has an extraordinary understanding of free market economics, has certain blind spots. Even though he knows prohibition doesn't work, he knows the advantages of market competition, and he understands the inher-

ent rights of association and travel, yet he still advocates government restrictions on the movements of peaceful people.

As anarchists, of course we want to end the wars, end prohibition and stop police brutality. Our burden is to help the people in these causes without pulling our hair out. We need to remember to help the blind men perceive the full elephant. That elephant is the belief in a horribly destructive myth; the myth of legitimate government authority, the myth that violence and coercion can solve problems effectively.

Staying in the fight is a burden for anarchists, but the reward of seeing folks open their eyes to the big picture is worth it, even if it's rare. 

James Babb is a Co-founder of [We Won't Fly](#), and a member of the [Vote For Nobody Campaign \(Anti-Politics.WS\)](#)

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Are We There Yet?

By Meghan Kellison

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



“Well, if you don’t like it, you can just GET OUT.” If I had a silver dime for every time I have heard that one, I’d be financially secure! The topic of whether to stay and fight the tyranny or get out of Dodge is one that


has weighed heavily on my mind and heart for a few years now. With more and more reports coming out showing the expanding police state and laws being passed eroding our civil liberties, sometimes Uruguay or Switzerland or Argentina or Somalia (just kidding, kind of) sound like nice places to relocate to. In fact, not a day goes by that I don’t see a news story chronicling the slow death of the republic, and it is difficult to not say something. I have been called names and ridiculed by so many people who think the information I share is “sensationalist.” Touché. It is sensational how this country has gone from one of the freest to one of the most controlled and monitored by surveillance. I used to respond to these insults by defiantly saying, “Well, I just might move to another country!” Now, I have changed my tune, and instead reply that I don’t give up that easily.

I don’t give up that easily because it is so easy to give up and lose hope when faced with the harsh realities, but my short life has taught me that nothing worth fighting for is going to be easy and nothing easy is worth fighting for. As cliché as that may sound, I am a firm believer in taking the more difficult approach if it results in a greater long term pay off. The appeal of get rich/powerful quick schemes has no appeal to me. Life is hard and harsh, and it is through struggling that we learn the greatest lessons. While I can totally empathize with how others who are leaving feel and was once there myself, I cannot fathom where I would go, how I would get there financially (no offense, but I’m no Doug Casey), or what I would do once I got there. It would be a disservice to go to another country and not attempt to assimilate into their culture, and though I love learning about other languages and cultures time is of the essence and I simply don’t have enough of it to truly dedicate to moving the proper way.

Now that I’ve rationalized why I must stay, the logical next question is how do we “fight?” This is another issue I have gone back and forth on multiple times. My inspiration comes from two radically different approaches that were profoundly in the public eye during the civil rights movement. Though not limited to the civil rights movement, it comes down to violent revolution or nonviolent revolution. For a long period of time I was heavily influenced by the approaches of the Black Panthers and the Black Liberation Army, and still believe that their usage of gun

rights in the face of oppression had a significant impact on the way ordinary people stand up to the state. With talk of banning certain firearms, it seems people have forgotten the whole purpose of the Second Amendment---to protect the people from a government gone wild. The Panthers exercised their rights, and the images of them open carrying large guns in front of the Capitol are not only poignant, but let’s face it, pretty badass. We should never forget what our own government did to black people and the indigent people of this land, and how instrumental disarming these people was to their subjugation and likewise the exercised right of bearing arms was in preventing government tyranny. Why should we have any reason to believe this won’t happen again when history plainly shows that the most violent atrocities and genocides were carried out after guns were confiscated?

While maintaining a well-armed presence is necessary, I can’t discount the role of shaming the powers that be in gaining widespread support for a cause, and that is where I have tremendous admiration for the tactics of Dr. Martin Luther King. Dr. King’s nonviolent approach provided a foil to the brutality of the state and its minions, and earned the empathy of the majority. You can’t be an island and survive, and winning the hearts of the majority is the most efficient way of gaining support and showing the true colors of the state. Inspired by Jesus Christ and Gandhi, Dr. King and his supporters used love as their guns, and though they got beaten and arrested, their mistreatment provoked a shift in morality that was the basis for a change in how we view other human beings and that human rights are universal regardless of race. Both tactics are useful in affecting change, and have their share of supporters according to the skills of individuals. I would say I fall on the side of nonviolence at all means unless I am being directly attacked.



We are at yet another pivotal point in this nation’s history where government power has increased to epic proportions, and more and more legislation restricts our basic rights. It’s almost the calm before the storm where it’s too late to completely turn around the police/surveillance state, but not quite time to break out the guns (I don’t believe the people have the adequate firepower to effectively fight the military). Because the size and scope of the military has grown so much along with the variety of weapons they could use against us, I cannot fathom full on war

Continues on Page 13

Continued from Page 12 - Should I Stay or Should I Go Now?

between the people and the state. This is why I am now more in favor of using love as the gun to win hearts and minds.

The internet has set back what I believe was a calculated plan to completely subjugate the US population, and it is an excellent weapon in this battle. We can delay government plans for more control through education. Malcolm X famously said, "Education is the passport to the future, for tomorrow belongs to those who prepare for it today," and "Only a fool would let their enemy educate their children." If at all possible, we must educate the next generation with the knowledge and understanding that we have gained because the state at this stage is the enemy, and public school is becoming more and more propagandized. I have been through the indoctrination schools, and though there were some bright stars working within the system, their light was dimmed by the overall darkness of the institution. Children are the future, and forcing them to start the day pledging allegiance to an inanimate object that represents an empire of destruction is waste of time at best and sickly nationalistic propaganda at worst. We can do better for our children and are living in the best possible time to utilize the tools we have to educate our own children. There's really no excuse to be ignorant because we have access to more knowledge than ever before in history, and even if for financial reasons one must send their child to public school, we are armed with the abilities to unschool them from any misinformation they may be taught.

Education begins with the children, but it doesn't end with them. By working together and lovingly disseminating useful, practical information we can help people of all ages. I emphasize a loving approach above all because I have seen too many people turned away from good information because of the way in which it was presented. When someone is in the process of opening their eyes to the realities that surround them, their first instinct is to tell everyone they know about everything they are discovering and sometimes this results in information overload for the person receiving the truth and can end relationships between friends and families. Care must be taken to not dominate a conversation



with inconvenient truths in a tone that is offensive or off putting, and I have been guilty of this before. It is not only an ineffective tactic, but can be damaging or hurtful to particularly sensitive people. If the liberty movement is to have a positive impact on the mainstream, we have to perhaps change our methods of speaking to people who have never heard of these ideas. I already see this change taking place, and it really gives me hope for the future.

Another way to protect ourselves would be to network with other like-minded people in our local communities. Building relationships based on trust and cooperation that will stick together is the best way to stay safe in times of duress. If we are indeed heading towards economic distress, having a trustworthy group and a plan can prevent you from becoming a victim in an unsettled world. In a way, we have to get back to the tribal mind set and really keep our friends and families close in these uncertain times. The spirit of love must dominate our relationships with others, and if the foundation is love you will be able to persevere through even the roughest of times.

In closing, I am choosing to stay in the country I was born in, and fight it out with the weapons of peace. I have no love for what this country has become, but my love for the great people I know is what drives me to keep fighting. If we can fight this battle with love and education, hopefully we won't have to resort to guns, but in the circumstance that we do, now may be the best time to stock up for reasons of purely self-defense. We may be up against an ever growing, violent behemoth, but I don't give up that easily. 🌸

Meghan has been writing poetry, prose, short stories, and essays for several years, has been published in small independent publications (mostly poetry), and currently runs the blog at Roberts & Roberts Brokerage (<http://rrbi.co/category/blog/>). Her focus is on social issues, politics, fitness, and natural health topics. The best way to contact Meghan is on Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100001243544080>

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

IN OR OUT

By L. Neil Smith

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



The other day, in the *Daily Mail Online*, I saw a sad photograph of an old, white-haired Georgian man (*cha-cha*-style, not mint julep) passionately kissing what looked like a gold-plated bronze bust of Josef Stalin

on what would have been the murderous dictator's 133rd birthday. As their nation-state disintegrates around them, some older Georgians miss the man who was possibly the second worst mass-murderer in history (behind Mao Zedong), and wish that they could bring him back.

Meanwhile, a hundred thousand blogs, Facebook pages, and websites on the Internet, blast out "America is Over!" like the hysterical idiot aboard the airliner in every disaster movie who screams "We're all gonna die!" until he has to be bitch-slapped back to sanity by a stewardess.

"Thanks, I needed that," he usually tells her.

But to a degree, it's true. The U.S. government is firmly in the grasp of Barack Obama's Bolshevik thugs, while John Boehner and the rest of his timorous little Mensheviks dance around it like naked cherubs.

So the question before the house seems to be, as Atlantis shakes and shudders under our feet, and the cold, black, predator-filled waters rise inexorably, swallowing up everything we've ever known and loved, should we find something -- anything -- that floats and try to paddle away from the continent sinking beneath us, or do we climb to the top of the tallest column we can find and wait the catastrophe out?

Put that way, the answer appears fairly obvious.

But it's more complicated than that, for me. I'm an old man (you have no idea how it hurts to admit it) with a crippled foot, diabetes, and a history of heart disease. I've been collecting guitars and other instruments since the 60s, weapons of various kinds since the 70s. I don't have enough money to move next door, let alone another country. I grew up with an Air Force father, moving from place to place about once a year on average and swore to put down permanent roots when I could.

Besides, this is my country, Sam Donaldson, you odiferous blob of belly-button lint and toe-jam, and I'll be damned rather than run out of it, especially by low, belly-crawling, craven Quisling scum like you.

It's easy to see what Obama and his bloodsuckers have in mind for you and me, especially if you've seen the United Nations' Agenda 21, or various preparatory manuals written for the Department of Homeland Security and FEMA. This country never really won its independence from Europe. It has always been a cow, milked, and occasionally slaughtered by European aristocrats of one lineage or another, and their banker cronies.

But unlike the crowned or pomaded powers of the Old World, who have always been patiently content to regard America as a kind of annuity, socialists, perhaps owing to the instability of the societies they generate, can't hold their wad. They want it all and they want it now. And, failing, as socialists always have, to understand that the source of the wealth they're lusting after is individual liberty, they mean to enslave us and impoverish America as rapidly as they possibly can -- until it resembles Haiti -- and redistribute its wealth.

To themselves.

But there are other forces at work today that individuals on the side of liberty seldom perceive, and almost always fail to take proper advantage of. Rather than enjoying their victories so far, the other side -- call them the anti-libertarians -- is in a miserable funk. Exactly like a cattleman or a farmer in the midst of a drought, all that these totalitarian parasites can see is their livelihood starting to wither on the vine, and dust blowing through dried bones on the prairie.

True, they have accumulated more political (and military) power than at any time in the last 10,000 years, but the American people, with the consent of whom they rule, theoretically, detest them more than ever, too. And in broadening circles, government creation and control of the money supply -- and indeed the very notion of taxation -- is being seriously questioned, possibly for the first time in human history.

Continues on Page 15

Continued from Page 14 - IN OR OUT

If a single one of these scavengers has a brain, he knows that the 2012 election represented not a victory, but a fundamental disaster for the basic concept of government. They almost certainly won it by fraud -- there was no other way they could have. Even so, half the country voted against a corrupt, brutal, and transparently duplicitous incumbent, while a huge portion of the other half -- those who are not potential worshippers of Stalin like that poor old Georgian idiot -- voted against the financial powers that have owned and controlled the American government and banking since the times of Alexander Hamilton.

This is not a stable configuration.

Anyway, if I were to decide to leave the United States, where the hell would I go? Where were you planning to go? At present, the globe is about to be divided into a small handful of empires. As America's empire is receding, China's is growing. They have nuclear weapons, a lively space program and (always prepared to fight the *last* war, like any other empire) are building aircraft carriers. If they don't listen to the same economic advisors the United States government does, they will end up controlling every island in the Pacific, including the Philippines, Hawaii, and possibly Australia and New Zealand.

Another country like China, with nukes, spacecraft, and carriers, is India. I suspect the next Cold War will be between them and China. I have sometimes thought that I could make more money writing for Bollywood than I do here, but India is far from a free -- or rational -- nation. And it shares borders and buffer-states with its future arch-enemy.

Amidst them all, sweating but game is Japan, equally equipped.

By the time most of this stuff has happened -- it's well underway right now -- Europe will be dominated by Muslim fundamentalists, and the Muslim world will either stay out of the great planetary struggle, consolidating its holdings, or become another competitor among the empires.

Most of the fighting will be over who gets Africa. We will play no part in it. I wouldn't bet that Brazil will only be a minor player, either. For a while, there will be no place in the world, anywhere, for a free man or a free people -- except what's left of the United States.

So here we are, all dressed up, in our cammies and armor, with no place to go. I believe that we must stand and fight, with the eventual goal of reclaiming America and making it something like Switzerland has been for several centuries. We must stop playing international politics. We must stop trying to disarm our own people, and jail those politicians too damned dumb to understand what "shall not be infringed" means.

For those who still believe that a frontier is as necessary to the security of a free state as the right of the people to keep and bear arms (and I happen to be one of hem), simply look up. Look straight up, preferably at night. Not to the planets, but the asteroids. The big one out there is Ceres. The next biggest is Pallas. There's our frontier.



That's where to go. What are we waiting for? 

L. Neil Smith is the award-winning author of 33 freedom-oriented books, including [The Probability Broach](#), [Ceres](#), [Sweeter Than Wine](#), and [DOWN WITH POWER: Libertarian Policy In A Time Of Crisis](#). Visit his webpage at [LNeilSmith.Org](#)

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Should I Stay or Should I Go?

By Larken Rose

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



More and more these days I hear people asking why any sane person would remain in the collectivist police state which the U.S. has devolved into. And while I totally sympathize with those who want to run for the hills in the hopes of finding greener, less fascist pastures, for myself I have no intention of leaving. Allow me to explain why.

1) Bite Me

The first reason is basic stubbornness. I live here. If someone else is being an obnoxious jerk, why should I have to leave my home, and surrender to them any turf? If a private crook broke into my house, I wouldn't just run away and find a new house. I would try to get the intruder out, by whatever means necessary. Likewise, why should I leave the entire country, just because a gang of sociopathic control freaks are pretending that they have the right to rule everyone and everything on this particular piece of dirt? Forget "love it or leave it." I prefer, "love it, or get rid of the bastards who are messing it up."

2) A Planet of Slave Plantations

Once upon a time it was possible to outrun the arm of the authoritarian control freaks. In frontier days, for example, people migrated west faster than the megalomaniacal parasites could keep up with them. But that didn't last forever. Eventually, people desiring freedom ran out of planet. Now, unless you know how to survive in the middle of the ocean, or in the Antarctic, just about every piece of dirt is claimed by one group of control freaks or another as their turf. Personally, I'm aiming for something a little better than being owned by a slightly more permissive master. So rather than move to the next plantation over, I intend to put the plantation owner here out of business.

3) Fascism Will Follow

Running to somewhere less fascist is a temporary solution. Do control freaks ever decide they have enough power? Does the beast called "government" ever stop growing? Does anyone really think there is anywhere he can go, which the tyrants and parasites won't get around

to claiming as their rightful territory? So why keep backing up, and running away, if eventually you'll be cornered anyway? "Government" is worse than a common crook, because if you abandon your property to a common crook, he probably won't follow you, demanding more and more.



The sociopathic megalomaniacs known as "politicians" are driven by a love of dominion; they literally hate the idea of other people being free. Why else would anyone try to obtain the power to forcibly control hundreds of millions of people he's never met, and knows almost nothing about? By their very nature, these people are malicious, sadistic control freaks. Leaving humanity in peace is something they're just not willing to do. They literally spend day after day thinking up new ways to rob people and boss them around. That's all "legislation" is, and they crank it out just as fast as possible, to get their tentacles into as many activities, as many choices, and as many places as they can. They are predators, driven entirely by the desire to rob, enslave and control as many human beings as possible. They will never suddenly decide that they have enough power, and enough wealth, and enough control. If you try to escape them, sooner or later they will follow.

4) Abandoning Victims

To continue the analogy of a home invasion, if an intruder wanted my stuff, or wanted my house, I would resist a whole lot before surrendering my property to him. But if my family was in that house, there is no way in hell I would turn tail and run. Likewise, while they aren't exactly "family," there are many millions of decent people living in the U.S. who have been, and will continue to be, victims of "government" aggression. To simply flee the country myself, leaving millions of others to fend for themselves, is not something I am willing to do. Not yet, anyway.

Continues on Page 17

Continued from Page 16 - Should I Stay or Should I Go?


Ironically, many Americans unwittingly contribute to their own subjugation and oppression by accepting the mainstream mythology about politics and "government," and by playing the very games which legitimize tyranny and empower tyrants. Nonetheless, I don't even want people to suffer unnecessarily for problems that they created, that they aggravate, and that they perpetuate. Yes, all statist condone widespread extortion and thuggery in the name of "law" and "government," but most don't do so out of malice or hatred, but simply because their authoritarian indoctrination has drastically warped their view of reality, tricking them into advocating mass injustice without even realizing it. Not to sound paternalistic, but I would like to do what I can to save them from their own ignorance, having been a well-intentioned but horribly misguided statist myself in the past.



By analogy, back when open slavery was "legal," many slaves actually believed that they were supposedly to be slaves, and that slavery was legitimate. In fact, they were so thoroughly indoctrinated that they would often view a fellow slave who attempted to run away as a thief, for trying to steal himself from the master. (Read the writings of Frederick Douglass--who spent many years as a slave--if you doubt this.) And that indicates a profound problem that cannot ultimately be fixed by a few slaves running away. Yes, I fully support a slave who tries to escape, but until all the slaves escape--first mentally,

then physically--then the underlying problem remains. So maybe I'm that stupid slave who has a chance to flee, but instead hangs around trying to convince the other slaves that they shouldn't be slaves. But it's what I feel I must do. Maybe it's because I'm an obsessive nutcase, but I can't imagine feeling fully free and content if I escape the clutches of the current regime myself, while leaving several hundred million decent people behind to be assaulted, extorted, and oppressed.

I don't even want active collaborators of statist domination to be victimized by the monster they created, the monster they feed. In fact, to show just how crazy I really am, I even view the mercenaries of the state--cops and soldiers--as victims (as well as perpetrators) of authoritarian mental and physical oppression. I even want to do what I can to convince the jackboots to choose humanity. Don't take this as irrational optimism; I fully expect most of the state's hired thugs to choose ignorant brutality over reason and morality, but I want them at least to be shown that there is a choice.

As long as I can remain here alive, I intend to stay, throwing the ideas of self-ownership and voluntaryism at as many people as possible. And if once in a while a few people listen, and my efforts help them to escape the mental chains of statism, it will have been worth it. Eventually, the lie of "government" will come crashing down. Whether or not it happens in my lifetime, as long as I'm breathing I intend to do whatever I can to push it over. Sorry, Mr. and Mrs. Megalomaniacal Tyrant Control Freak, I'm not leaving. But sooner or later, you are. 

Larken Rose is author of several books, including [The Iron Web](#) and [How to be a Successful Tyrant](#). Visit his webpage at [LarkenRose.Com](#)

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

There's No Place Like Home

By Angel Clark

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



THE Clash wrote one of the “[500 Greatest Songs of All Time](#)”, *Should I Stay or Should I Go*

Should I stay or should I go now?

Should I stay or should I go now?

If I go there will be trouble,

And if I stay it will be double,

So, come on and let me know

The song questions a relationship, and brings us to question another relationship, the relationship between citizen and country. I am a citizen of the United States of America. As I was growing up, the child of an immigrant, it was drilled into my head that there was no other country greater than the one who's soil I had the privilege of being born upon. With beautiful and spacious skies, with amber food everywhere, the USA was the country worthy of the songs written about her. The country gave opportunities like no other, and life was good.

My father, who had come to this country with the clothes on his back and managed to get a good union job at General Motors, knew that this country would offer more opportunities than the places he had travelled. My mother, born in a small town in Delaware, knew no other life. Both assumed that America would stay a great country and were pleased that their three children (my two brothers and I) were born in America. Neither saw what was coming down the political and economic track.

I am now a few years away from turning 30, and considering that whole “growing up” scenario. Both of my brothers are parents, my niece is almost seven and my nephew turned one day old as I was writing this. As a liberty-oriented individual, I have put maybe too much thought into the right place to raise a child. I don't really think America is the best place anymore to raise a family.

To answer the age-old question posed by The Clash (well, they asked in 1981, so it's age-old to me), should I stay or should I go now, one has to look at the operative word “now”. I believe an economic collapse in America is likely, but I'm not leaving now. I do, of course, have a plan. I believe that, for right now, America is livable, as long as I take precautions. I do not feel any obligation to the land I was born upon, that was simply circumstance. I will continue to fight for liberty and rights in whatever country I live, and for now, America is lucky to have me.

Remember that there is nothing wrong with a back-up plan. I've had people criticize me for saying that I'm looking at other countries to relocate my small family to, but I'm secure in the knowledge that I am prepared. I have a small prepper's pantry, filled with enough food to last my significant other, the cat, and myself for several weeks. I have a stash of precious metals, mainly silver, that is easily transportable. I have a small weapons cache, including numerous stun guns and other [less-than-lethal weapons](#) that are “legal” in almost any country. I also live next to a beach and an airport.

I have found a few countries I wouldn't mind relocating to, and [Transparency International](#) has a well-researched list of the corruption of governments around the globe. The top ten “least corrupt governments” are Denmark, Finland, New Zealand, Sweden, Singapore, Switzerland, Australia, Norway, Canada, and the Netherlands. Iceland is ranked 11, the United States is ranked 19.

It is up to you to decide what is best for you and your family, but I will not risk the lives of those I love over sentimentality for a piece of land. Especially not when the government steals money from me and uses it to murder children. The best advice I can give you is to always have a back-up plan. You can always move back to America if you desire, but you cannot bring people back from the dead. 🌸




Angel Clark is a liberty-oriented lady, and blogs at [SussexCounty-Angel.Com](#). Angel focuses on economics and civil liberties, but you will hear her opinions on plenty of other topics. The Angel Clark Show airs live weekdays on [LRN.FM](#), from 5-7 p.m. Eastern. Angel also has podcasting of her show listed on [RadioFreedomUS.Wix.Com/Radio-Freedom](#).

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Back in the U.S.S.R. By Jack Gregson

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



Here is a collection of videos that provide you with a compilation of how we got into this mess.

It was designed that way from the very beginning...

American History We Won't Get Fooled Again (video):



[Aldous Huxley's Letter to George Orwell:](#)

Wrightwood, California.
21 October, 1949

Dear Mr. Orwell,

It was very kind of you to tell your publishers to send me a copy of your book.

It arrived as I was in the midst of a piece of work that required much reading and consulting of references; and since poor sight makes it necessary for me to ration my reading, I had to wait a long time before being able to embark on Nineteen Eighty-Four.

Agreeing with all that the critics have written of it, I need not tell you, yet once more, how fine and how profoundly important the book is.

May I speak instead of the thing with which the book deals — the ultimate revolution?

The first hints of a philosophy of the ultimate revolution — the revolution which lies beyond politics and economics, and which aims at total subversion of the individual's psychology and physiology — are to be found in the Marquis de Sade, who regarded himself as the continuator, the consummator, of Robespierre and Babeuf.

The philosophy of the ruling minority in Nineteen Eighty-Four is a sadism which has been carried to its logical conclusion by going beyond sex and denying it.

Whether in actual fact the policy of the boot-on-the-face can go on indefinitely seems doubtful.

My own belief is that the ruling oligarchy will find less arduous and wasteful ways of governing and of satisfying its lust for power, and these ways will resemble those which I described in Brave New World.

I have had occasion recently to look into the history of animal magnetism and hypnotism, and have been greatly struck by the way in which, for a hundred and fifty years, the world has refused to take serious cognizance of the discoveries of Mesmer, Braid, Esdaile, and the rest.

Partly because of the prevailing materialism and partly because of prevailing respectability, nineteenth-century

philosophers and men of science were not willing to investigate the odder facts of psychology for practical men, such as politicians, soldiers and policemen, to apply in the field of government.

Thanks to the voluntary ignorance of our fathers, the advent of the ultimate revolution was delayed for five or six generations.

Another lucky accident was Freud's inability to hypnotize successfully and his consequent disparagement of hypnotism.

This delayed the general application of hypnotism to psychiatry for at least forty years.

But now psycho-analysis is being combined with hypnosis; and hypnosis has been made easy and indefinitely extensible through the use of barbiturates, which induce a hypnoid and suggestible state in even the most recalcitrant subjects.

Within the next generation I believe that the world's rulers will discover that infant conditioning and narco-hypnosis are more efficient, as instruments of government, than clubs and prisons, and that the lust for power can be just as completely satisfied by suggesting people into loving their servitude as by flogging and kicking them into obedience.

In other words, I feel that the nightmare of Nineteen Eighty-Four is destined to modulate into the nightmare of a world having more resemblance to that which I imagined in Brave New World.

The change will be brought about as a result of a felt need for increased efficiency.

Meanwhile, of course, there may be a large scale biological and atomic war — in which case we shall have nightmares of other and scarcely imaginable kinds.

Thank you once again for the book.

Yours sincerely,

Aldous Huxley

The Rise of the Police State Back in the U.S.S. R. (video):



Testing America's nuclear weapons on members of the U.S. military and civilians in the '40s, '50s, and '60s Dear Prudence (video):



Jack Gregson is a Freedom's Phoenix economic columnist. Visit his YouTube Channel at [Material World 4](#).

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Nowhere to Hide

By Rosa Koire

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



MUSING on the question posed by Ernest Hancock at Freedom's Phoenix: Should one stay and fight or flee?

As you can imagine I've thought about this a lot. It's a bit like asking whether you'd like to eat a nice meal or dig a ditch. Of course you'd rather eat, but there's that work that must be done.

In the case of fighting to expose and stop UN Agenda 21/Sustainable Development in your city and nation, the truth is that there is nowhere to go that isn't implementing it, now. UN Agenda 21/Sustainable Development is the action plan implemented worldwide to inventory and control all land, all water, all minerals, all plants, all animals, all construction, all means of production, all energy, all education, all information, and all human beings in the world. INVENTORY AND CONTROL. You won't see it called Agenda 21--it is a stealth plan in plain sight; a global plan that is implemented locally. When you're looking for it remember: Inventory and control.

We're not quite at square one anymore and people all over the world are speaking out and identifying what Agenda 21 looks like in their town. Whether it's called Horizon 2025 or PlanNY or OneBayArea, or Imagine Calgary or Hanoi Center Regional Plan 2030, it's the same plan. And the same Delphi mind-control technique is used to get you to accept the plan for regional governance: visioning. Visioning techniques are designed to indoctrinate you with a pre-determined viewpoint while giving you the impression that your input was taken and that you crafted the plan. This is manufactured consensus. Regional governance is the stepping stone to global governance.



You might see UN Agenda 21/Sustainable Development as an internet 'protection' law like Bill C-30 in Canada--supposedly


designed to protect children from internet predators--a domestic spying bill. When the same sort of thing was announced in the UK objectors were accused of having something to hide.

Where else would you find it? Agenda 21 looks like Smart Meters and the Smart Grid forcibly installing meters on your home or, if you're lucky, charging you not to do that. You'll see the Happiness Index, which is a mental health assessment that is being conducted without parental consent. Or how about genetically modified crops being sold without your knowledge?

Carbon taxes are beginning to wind their way into your life, slowly, and you'll find that you'll be paying more to fly or to drive (vehicle miles traveled taxes) until you can't afford it. Asset based community development will measure your willingness to volunteer and eventually penalize you if you don't.

You'll see Agenda 21 as 'green jobs' that don't materialize unless mandated and paid for with your taxes or fines; green energy loans that enrich a few manipulators; non-recourse loans for green energy---like Solyndra and all of the other solar panel companies that took the money and ran. Let's not forget about land use restrictions that change the game right in the middle, right after you've spent every penny you had on a dream that evaporates in fees, fines, penalties, and studies.

The truth is that there is no Switzerland in this fight. No easy way out, no Shangri-La that you can run to. You can stand tall and know that when the time came, you were right here, where you should be. Standing up for yourself and the future of your world. Because you don't buy the rhetoric that says that if you don't give up your rights you'll kill the planet. You understand that the environmental movement has been hijacked. And you know that it isn't sustainable to suck the life out of people and turn their world into a museum--or a gulag. You also understand that global governance is a recipe for the destruction of individual liberty, and that is not the legacy you will leave this world.

It's better to engage in this struggle now than to wait. Every one of us needs to educate ourselves and each other and join in. We don't know what it will take to reach critical mass on awareness, but it looks like 2013 will be the year that we achieve it. Throwing the blinders off and having the courage to dissent is far more than our duty. It is our life. 



Rosa Koire is the executive director of the [Post Sustainability Institute](#). Rosa speaks across the world and is a regular blogger on her website [Democrats Against UN Agenda 21](#). She is the author of [BEHIND THE GREEN MASK: UN Agenda 21](#), and a member of the [Santa Rosa Neighborhood Coalition](#).

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Is it Finally Time to Say “So Long, and Thanks for All the Fish”?

By Tarrin Lupo

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



AS the U.S.A spirals into a police state I find myself asking if it is time to leave this country. I have been a liberty activist most my adult life, so I guess I think about

it more than the average Joe. I have watched the government for the last 20 years strip away my freedoms and ignore my rights. The last five years have been very disturbing because it seems to be happening at light speed. There are so many liberties being trampled that I am out of outrage, I just don't have the energy to even complain about it anymore.

I started doing research like many activists do after they start paying attention and realize the Titanic is finally on its way down. It does not take long for one to discover there is no place in the world that is free and you are basically deciding what your tolerable level of government intrusion into your life will be.

It's an exciting time for freedom and many ideas are bouncing around the liberty community right now. The most prevalent idea is one of moving like-minded folks all to the same state. The movement is called the Free State Project. There are other smaller projects that encourage people to move to one county or even one town such as the Free Town Project. These projects are the most realistic and easiest solution to start with. The Free State Project, in New Hampshire, is already having success at rolling back the size and power of their state government. Even micro movements like the Free Town Project are literally just a few people away from changing their city council to majority liberty activists. I would advocate these options first before completely leaving this country.

I also think it is wise to have a back-up plan to leave the USA if things get too out of control. It is getting considerably harder to leave this country



with your money. The laws keep changing to make it more and more difficult to move away. The USA is only a few years away from

not allowing its producers to leave permanently. As the mounting debt becomes crushing, the government is holding on to its tax cows as hard as they can.

The sad truth is, if you are American, you can't really get away from their reach if they really

want you. Although you can make it difficult for them to come find you, they can if they really want too. The USA is one of the only countries that make you pay taxes on income you earn in other countries. Because of that, they pass restrictive laws to discourage folks from denouncing their citizenship.

I explored moving to New Zealand, Hong Kong, Mexico and South America. After a few trips, I figured out I was just exchanging one set of problems for another and nothing seemed like an easy choice. I am seeing a little success in living free as activists live, like a tourist in other countries. This allows them to keep much of what they do off the books and gives them many freedoms they don't have as residents. They just keep moving around making money and staying low key.

That is not to say there is no hope; I am seeing some exciting experiments starting to be tried around the world. Ideas like the Seasteading Project, Erikson Project and the free Honduras cities are really coming together. I think these are worth exploring and keeping an eye on.

Sadly I really do believe a big currency crash is coming to the USA in the next 10 years. It would be a great idea not to be living here when it all goes down. I will keep looking for options but will choose the Free State Project in the meantime.

I just recently wrote a romance novella, which takes place in Nazi Germany as Hitler rises to power. While doing research, I was frightened by all the similarities this country has to pre-Nazi Germany. I kept asking myself why the Jews and the people Hitler deemed undesirable didn't just leave. What I found out was that many laws were passed to keep them from fleeing so the Nazi government could take all their assets first. The USA is in this stage now; try leaving the country with all your assets and see what happens. It really makes me wonder; just how long can a person wait until it is too late to leave. I feel that tipping point is only a few years away now and the clock is ticking. 🌸

Tarrin P. Lupo is the author of "[One Nation Under Blood](#)" and is also known for the historical fiction series "[Pirates of Savannah](#)". Tarrin has successfully published sixteen eBooks and short stories. He currently resides in Savannah Georgia and is a member of the Free State Project, spending time in New Hampshire promoting the ideas of Freedom and Liberty. Please visit www.LupoLit.com for more information.

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

The Larger Question of Chuck Hagel

By Ray McGovern

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



THE up-in-the-air nomination of Chuck Hagel to be Defense Secretary has become a test of whether the Israel Lobby can still

shoot down an American public servant who is deemed insufficiently passionate regarding Israel, a test that now confronts President Obama, says ex-CIA analyst Ray McGovern.

The Israel Lobby is hell bent on sabotaging President Barack Obama's tentative plan to appoint former Sen. Chuck Hagel as Secretary of Defense. And – with Obama now dithering about this selection – the Lobby and its neocon allies sense another impending victory.

Perhaps The New Yorker's Connie Bruck [described](#) Hagel's predicament best in assessing why the Israel Lobby is so determined to destroy the Nebraska Republican though he is "a committed supporter of Israel."



But, as Bruck explained, "Hagel did not make the obeisance to the lobby that the overwhelming majority of his

Congressional colleagues do. And he further violated a taboo by talking about the lobby, and its power." Hagel had the audacity, in an interview for a 2008 book, to say something that you are not supposed to say in Official Washington, that the Israel Lobby pulls the strings on many members of Congress.

In Aaron Miller's book, *The Much Too Promised Land*, Hagel is quoted as saying that Congress "is an institution that does not inherently bring out a great deal of courage." He added that when the American Israel Public Affairs Committee comes knocking with a pro-Israel letter, "you'll get eighty or ninety senators on it. I don't think I've ever signed one of the letters" — because, he added, they were "stupid."

Finding Other Reasons

Yes, it's true that when the neocon editors of the Washington Post [decried](#) the prospect of Hagel's appointment to run the Pentagon, they cited a bunch of other reasons without mentioning Hagel's independent thinking regarding Israel. For instance, the Post's editors fretted over a September 2011 [interview with the Financial Times](#), in which Hagel said, "The Defense Department, I think in many ways, has been bloated. ... So I think the Pentagon needs to be pared down." What heresy!

The Post's editors also questioned Hagel's interest in avoiding another war with Iran, calling his interest in meaningful engagement with Iran "isolated." The Post noted that Hagel "repeatedly voted against sanctions, opposing even those aimed at the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, which at the time was orchestrating devastating bomb attacks against U.S. troops in Iraq. Mr. Hagel argued that direct negotiations, rather than sanctions, were the best means to alter Iran's behavior."

Though the Post noted that Hagel also wrote an [op-ed](#) last September that contained the usual refrain about "keeping all options on the table," the neocon editors worried that a Defense Secretary Hagel might not be enthusiastic enough in carrying out the war option against Iran. Obama "will need a defense secretary ready to support and effectively implement such a decision," the Post wrote.

Yet, despite the Post's avoidance of any mention about the controversy over Hagel and the Israel Lobby, you can bet that the editors were particularly worried that Hagel might become a strong voice within the Obama administration against simply following Israel's lead on issues in the Middle East.

If Obama were to actually nominate Hagel—rather than just float his name as a trial balloon and recoil at all the efforts to prick holes in it — the message would be a strong one to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and the Israel Lobby that the old rules for the game are changing, that they can no longer blackball American public servants from key jobs in Washington.

Defecting on Iraq War

As a two-term senator, Chuck Hagel's other real sin was that he was one of the few defectors among congressional Republicans regarding the Iraq War. Though Hagel voted for President George W. Bush's war authorization, he eventually recognized his mistake and fessed up.

Hagel said he believes the Iraq War was one of the biggest blunders in U.S. history. He sharply criticized the Bush/Cheney foreign policy as "reckless," saying it was playing "ping pong with American lives." Such comments have made Hagel particularly unpopular with the top tier of hawkish Republican senators, such as Lindsey Graham of South Carolina and John McCain of Arizona.

But Hagel's ultimate offense, as far as Official Washington is concerned, is his unusual record

Continues on Page 23

Continued from Page 22 - The Larger Question of Chuck Hagel

of independent thinking that could, in Israel's eyes, endanger or even derail business as usual with the U.S. He is considered a realist, a pragmatist. Moreover, there can hardly be a more offensive remark to Israeli ears than the one made by Hagel to author Aaron Miller reflecting the sad state of affairs in Congress:

"The Jewish Lobby intimidates a lot of people up here" [on the Hill], but "I'm a United States Senator. I'm not an Israeli senator."

This remark, and others like it, have raised doubts in Israeli and pro-Israeli circles as to whether Hagel has the requisite degree of "passionate attachment" to Israel. This has generated a volley of vicious invective characterized so well by former Ambassador Chas Freeman in "[Israel Lobby Takes Aim Again](#)." This invective is aimed at forcing Obama to drop any plan to put Hagel in charge of the Pentagon. After all, it takes courage to counter character assassination.

Why the Fear?

What really lies behind this? I suspect the fear is that, were Hagel to become Secretary of Defense, he would take a leaf out of his book as Senator and openly insist, in effect, that he is the American Secretary of Defense and not the Israeli Defense Minister.

This, in turn, gives rise to a huge question being whispered in more and more corridors of power in Washington: Is Israel an asset or a liability to the U.S., when looked at dispassionately in the perspective of our equities in the Middle East and our general strategic defense?

Hardly a new conundrum. Many decades ago, Albert Einstein, who feared the consequences of creating a "Jewish state" by displacing or offending Arabs, wrote:

"There could be no greater calamity than a permanent discord between us [Jews] and the Arab people. Despite the great wrong that has been done us [in the western world], we must strive for a just and lasting compromise with the Arab people. ... Let us recall that in former times no people lived in greater friendship with us than the ancestors of these Arabs."

Realpolitik, including the increasing isolation of Israel and the U.S. in the Middle East, is breathing some life into this old attitude and generating consideration of a new approach – necessity being the mother of invention.

Few have been as blunt, though, as Zbigniew Brzezinski, who has been described as the "unofficial dean of the realist school of American

foreign policy experts." In a recent talk, the former national security adviser to President Jimmy Carter minced no words:

"I don't think there is an implicit obligation for the United States to follow like a stupid mule whatever the Israelis do. If they decide to start a war, simply on the assumption that we'll automatically be drawn into it, I think it is the obligation of friendship to say, 'you're not going to be making national decisions for us.' I think that the United States has the right to have its own national security policy."

Even Petraeus Lets It Slip Out

Back when Gen. David Petraeus was head of CENTCOM, he addressed this issue, gingerly but clearly, in prepared testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee in March 2010 on the "challenges to security and stability" faced by the U.S.:

"The enduring hostilities between Israel and some of its neighbors present distinct challenges to our ability to advance our interests. ... The conflict foments anti-American sentiment, due to a perception of U.S. favoritism for Israel.

"Arab anger over the Palestinian question limits the strength and depth of U.S. partnerships ... in the area and weakens the legitimacy of moderate regimes in the Arab world. Meanwhile, al-Qaeda and other militant groups exploit that anger to mobilize support."

Petraeus's testimony provoked a sharp rejoinder from Abe Foxman, head of the Anti-Defamation League, one of the leading American Zionist lobby groups. Foxman protested:

"Gen. Petraeus simply erred in linking the challenges faced by the U.S. ... in the region to a solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict, and blaming extremist activities on the absence of peace and the perceived favoritism for Israel. This linkage is dangerous and counterproductive."

Petraeus or someone on his staff had inadvertently touched a live-wire reality that is becoming increasingly debated in official circles but remains taboo when it comes to saying it out loud. Fearful that he would be dubbed an "anti-Semite," Petraeus began a frantic attempt to take back the words, which he noted were only in his prepared testimony and were not repeated in his oral presentation. [See Consortiumnews.com's "[Neocons, Likud Conquer DC, Again](#)."]

As Ali Abunimah of the *Electronic Intifada* describes it, this taboo proscribes "stating publicly that U.S. 'interests' and Israeli 'interests' are not

Continues on Page 24

Continued from Page 23 - The Larger Question of Chuck Hagel

identical, and that Israel might be a strategic burden, rather than an asset to the United States.”

Ironically, while Foxman and hardline Zionists were objecting vociferously, Meir Dagan, then-Israel's Mossad chief told a Knesset committee, “Israel is gradually turning from an asset to the United States to a burden.”

Taboo or not, an un-passionately-attached realist like Chuck Hagel presumably would be able to see that reality – anathema in Zionist circles – for what it is.

As prospective Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel would bring something else that would be extremely valuable to the job, a real-life understanding of the horrors of war. He volunteered for service in Vietnam in 1967 at the height of the fighting there, rejecting his local draft board's suggestion that he re-enroll in college to avoid Vietnam. A combat infantry squad leader, he was twice wounded in that crucible. Do not let anyone tell you that this does not have a lasting effect on a man.

First in Three Decades

Were Hagel to become Secretary of Defense, he would become the first in 30 years to bring to the job direct battle experience of war. One must trace 14 former secretaries of defense all the way back to Melvin Laird (1969-1973) for one who has seen war up-close and personal. (Like Hagel, Laird enlisted and eventually earned a Purple Heart as a seaman in the Pacific theater during WWII.)

Given this real world experience, the Israelis and their supporters in the U.S. might well conclude that Hagel would not be as blasé as his predecessors when it comes to sending troops off to war – and even less so for a war like the prospective one with Iran.

Hagel's past statements suggest he would urge more flexibility in talks with Iran on the nuclear issue and on Palestine, as well. This leaves him vulnerable to charges from the Israel Lobby, but even some pro-Israel stalwarts reject the far-fetched notion that this makes him “anti-Semitic.”

In comments to the *New Yorker's* Connie Bruck, for example, Rep. Gary Ackerman, D-New York, has drawn a sensible contrast between Hagel's apparent inclination toward more flexibility with Iran on the nuclear issue and the more familiar attitude – which Ackerman described as: “You know ‘Let's bomb them before the sun comes up.’”

If recent reports are correct in suggesting that Obama intends to enter more than just *pro forma*

negotiations with Iran, he would have in Hagel the kind of ally he would need in top policy-making circles, someone who would support, not sabotage, chances for a peaceful resolution of the crisis.

Recall that in 2010 Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was able to put the kibosh on a plan that had been suggested by Obama himself, and carefully worked out with Tehran by the President of Brazil and the Prime Minister of Turkey, that would have been a major step toward resolving the dispute over Iran's enrichment of uranium. [See Consortiumnews.com's “[U.S./Israel Challenged on Iran](#).”]


Avoiding “Complicity”

The year just ending has been a rollercoaster for U.S.-Israeli relations. It started with Obama's rather extreme professions of fealty to Israel. In a pre-Super Bowl interview with Matt Lauer on Feb. 5, the President said:

“My number one priority continues to be the security of the United States, but also the security of Israel, and we're going to make sure that we work in lockstep as we proceed to try to solve this problem [Iran], hopefully diplomatically.”

Speaking to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee in March – amid suggestions that his devotion to Israel was still not enough – Obama again used the first person in assuring the pro-Israel lobby group: “when the chips are down, I have Israel's back.”

By late August, as Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu was suggesting that Israel might ignore Obama's sanctions strategy on Iran and launch a preemptive strike on its own, Obama used Joint Chiefs Chairman Gen. Martin Dempsey to say that he (Dempsey) did not wish to be “complicit,” if the Israelis chose to attack Iran. In September, Secretary Clinton was publicly brushing aside Netanyahu's pleading for U. S. endorsement of his various “red lines,” and Obama was too busy to receive Netanyahu when he came to the U.N.

What lies in store for U.S.-Israeli relations in Obama's second term? It is too early to tell. But whether or not the President decides to tough it out and nominate Chuck Hagel for Secretary of Defense is likely to provide a good clue. 

Ray McGovern works with Tell the Word, a publishing arm of the ecumenical Church of the Saviour in inner-city Washington. He was an Army infantry/intelligence officer and then a CIA analyst for 30 years, and now serves on the Steering Group of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity.

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Looking to the Future

By Howard Blitz

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



“WINNERS never quit, quitters never win” is a quote attributed to Vince Lombardi, the great coach of the Green Bay Packers, that matches his character. He never gave up, no matter what the odds. He

engrained this concept in his players. It is the reason why the Green Bay Packers became a powerhouse in the National Football League and won the first two Super Bowls ever played. It is the reason why the Super Bowl trophy is named after him, one of the greatest coaches to have ever lived. He never gave in to defeat, he persevered.

Thomas Edison is considered one of the greatest inventors of all time because he also persevered. After thousands of experiments ending in failure, he finally found the right combination to give us the light we now could not even imagine living without. Each failure put him that much closer to success. He learned from his failures. He never gave up. He succeeded in his world changing goal.

This is why failure should never be looked down upon. It is the foundation for success. It should only be viewed as being something closer to winning. Humans have the ability to grow and to build on failures in their quest to succeed.

All of the greats in history, including the many women who invented everything from ironing boards, to circular saws, to elevated trains, to computer programming, share one thing in common, they did not quit until they found success. Winners never quit, that is why they are called winners. It is impossible to win or succeed if one does quit.

Take the opening words of Thomas Paine in his series of pamphlets entitled, [The American Crisis](#), “These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot may, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman.” He was encouraging individuals to persevere and not quit against all odds of defeating the most powerful army on the planet so that individuals could be free to seek out their own success without being restricted through the heavy taxation of the British government. Thomas Paine continued in his pamphlets by stating, “The harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: it is dearness only that gives everything its value.”

As these words were read aloud to General Washington's troops on Christmas Eve in 1776, they encouraged the soldiers of that frigid night to seek the liberty that Americans have since enjoyed.




Today, Americans face a similar challenge that requires no less the determination of a Lombardi, Edison, Paine or the many women inventors of the past and present. Excessive government taxation and spending, inflation, and government initiated undeclared wars were all obstacles faced by our American ancestors. In order to prevent those conditions from happening to future generations, those Americans created the Constitution and Bill of Rights to chain down the government. Those chains have now been cast off by the passing of numerous laws by many congresses, and signed by many different presidents, including, but not limited to, the Patriot Acts, the National Defense Authorization Act, and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The once chained American government is now a rampaging beast on the loose, gobbling up greater and greater shares of the individual's income, Freedom, and Liberty. The challenge for Americans today is to understand how and why unchained government devastates the lives of everyone. Helping educate individuals regarding the nature of government and the purpose for its existence is paramount to winning their hearts and minds so that they can succeed in life, no matter their level of skill, education, talent, or background without dependency upon government.

If individuals quit on this matter, success in preserving Liberty will not happen. Quitters never win. Liberty will be preserved so long as individuals do not quit in their learning of why government can never create wealth, but can only transfer it, and why Rights and Liberty are from God, not governments. Winners never quit.


Following in the path of the likes of a Vince Lombardi, Thomas Edison, Thomas Paine, and the many women inventors of the past and present will insure that people everywhere will taste the fruits of liberty. Persevere. Do not quit and give up. Keep learning the tenets of liberty, its significance, and how it allows everyone the opportunity to succeed in life. Life without liberty is no life at all. It is slavery. 🌟

Howard J. Blitz, Founder of The Freedom Library, Inc. Visit his webpage at [FreedomLibrary.Org](#)

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



To promote an understanding and acceptance of the Freedom Philosophy and the principles of liberty as expounded in The Declaration of Independence and The United States Constitution, including the concepts of free markets, private property and limited government and the moral and intellectual principles which form the basis of a free society.



Will Work for Freedom

By Christina Tobin

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



AMERICA has always been a bastion of liberty and a home of innovation; that's true now more than ever. The truth is that working for liberty in America is also working for liberty everywhere else in the world. Now is the time and here is the place where you can effectively work for peaceful, positive reform and the defeat of the corrupt two-party system.

I know that a change for the better is sweeping through this nation. It will ripple out into the world and effect change everywhere else. In the last year, here is what I have seen:

A national audience of over 20 million tuned into the presidential debates moderated by Larry King. They heard candidates talk about the erosion of our precious civil liberties, a foreign policy that breeds war, taxation, monetary policy and the Federal Reserve and more. C-SPAN, MSNBC, Al Jazeera, YouTube, CNN Radio, LA Times, Washington Post and RT America all noticed and reported it. [Free & Equal](#) was a top ten trending topic on Twitter. Proposition 121 was defeated in Arizona.




The lesson is that people do respond to education. People are willing to stand up and demand something different. The response from the youth in particular has been incredible, and it fills me with optimism for the future. The grassroots movement to break the two-party stronghold is alive and well and growing by the minute. And Free & Equal will continue this work:

In February of 2013 we're going to take Free & Equal on the road with a 10-city university bus tour. Notable speakers such as Ron Paul, Jesse Ventura, Gary Johnson, Jill Stein, Dennis Kucinich and Ralph Nader will be invited. Musicians such as Adam Levin of Maroon 5 and Billy Corgan of Smashing Pumpkins are a few of the many being considered who generate interest in Free & Equal's mission by staging concerts. The tour will be a powerful way to get our greatest resource —young people— engaged and acting now for free and open elections.

Free & Equal will also be creating an elections database, which will provide information on every candidate, including voting history, associated private interest groups, and more. This database will also serve as a database for the entire liberty movement, by connecting activists and organizations all over the United States. It is especially intended to help independent candidates by putting them in touch with the resources they need. This is monumental news – the independent movement has grown so large that it needs its own database!

Even more exciting is that Americans are hungry for good information, and Free & Equal wants to help provide that with a Los Angeles-based studio, called the Honest News Network, which will foster open discussion on a range of issues from electoral reform, foreign and domestic policy, the war on drugs and more.

Our successes from last year and our exciting new ventures tell me that staying involved does work. I have seen the results with my own eyes: the youth are more excited, people are questioning what they're told, peace and prosperity are the new watchwords. Knowledge of the corruption of the two-party system is growing. There is much still to do, but with the passion and dedication of so many activists, we can overturn this unjust system. We've already made incredible progress, and there's more to come.

This is a grassroots movement, started by a few brave, far-seeing activists, whose place is now being taken by thousands and then by millions willing to take up the torch. The message of peace, prosperity and freedom is too powerful to be denied. People recognize that there is a better way, and they seek it out. A movement is building, and I wouldn't miss it for the world – because, in fact, the world is at stake. Never has a movement for peace and prosperity had so many eager, tenacious young people behind it; this movement cannot be denied. There will be a peaceful, positive solution. Stay, and be a part of it with Free & Equal. 

Christina Tobin is the Founder and Chair of Free & Equal Elections. Visit their webpage at www.freeand-equal.org



[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Loaded Guns, Loaded Kids

What is the Root Cause of Mass Shootings?

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



WHAT is the root cause of mass shootings?

How people answer that complex question often depends upon their politics. Like every other problem we struggle with today, we see a line of bumper stickers drawn down the center of America: people on the left side

frequently answer that guns and the NRA are the cause, while on the right, the response appears to be divided between “mental illness” and “evil character/lack of religion.”

This battle of the bumpers seems to generate the most eye-rolling when someone points out that mentally ill people are not all violent, and are more likely to be victims of violence than perpetrators. A “normal kid” desensitized to brutality by a diet of violent video games and hate-filled rap lyrics are far more dangerous than someone who can’t ever manage to be happy. It’s an important distinction. In fact, the U.S. Army uses a similar desensitization process to “overcome the normal antipathy to killing” experienced by young soldiers, according to Lt. Col. Dave Grossman, a former Army psychologist.

The argument has understandably grown heated in this year of so many mass shootings. With December 14’s mass murder at Sandy Hook Elementary committed by a young man diagnosed with autism – a diagnosis by itself not associated with violence – We The People (a group associated with some Constitution Party members) launched a petition on the White House website to demand an investigation of drug company products, stating that between 2004 and 2011, there have been over 11,000 reports to the U.S. FDA’s MedWatch system of psychiatric drug side effects related to violence.

As a pharmacist, I agree that it’s long past time for the people of this country to take a hard look at the side effects of psychiatric drugs. Since I would like to remain employed, I choose to remain anonymous, like the author of “I Am Adam Lanza’s Psychiatrist” (who also admits he has trust issues with Big Pharma).

Rather than make a list of all the mass killers on psychiatric drugs since Eric Harris shot himself in the Columbine library with therapeutic levels of Luvox in his blood, I will focus on what I know about the behavior of drug companies. We have yet to find out what medication Adam Lanza was on. We don’t know the percentage of mass killers on psychiatric drugs, because many psychiatric records have never been released to the public (Dylan Klebold and James Holmes are cases in point).

However, drug company distortions of the truth are no secret. You can read about their indiscretions everywhere from The New York Times to Psychology Today. “Follow the money” is as true now as it was in the Watergate era.

In July of this year, the FDA levied its biggest fine ever on drug-maker GlaxoSmithKline, \$3 billion to resolve federal criminal and civil inquiries arising from the company’s “illegal promotion of some of its products, failure to report safety data and alleged false price reporting.”

The company agreed to plead guilty to three criminal counts, including two counts of pushing unapproved uses of Paxil and Wellbutrin, and one count of failing to report safety data about the drug Avandia to the Food and Drug Administration.

This wording by the Justice Department vastly downplays the reality. Among other sleazy practices, the company hired attractive women from

Continues on Page 28

Continued from Page 27 - Loaded Guns, Loaded Kids

the ASU golf team to travel around the country playing golf with doctors. As for “failing to report safety data” – is that what you call it when a company leaves out data about patients who died from heart attacks during Avandia’s first clinical trial?

From April 1998 to August 2003, GlaxoSmith-Kline hired doctors to tell other doctors to prescribe the drug Paxil for treating depression in children, though the FDA had never approved it for anyone under age 18. The same illegal promotion happened with Wellbutrin from January 1999 to December 2003 for adults who needed help with weight loss, sexual dysfunction, substance addictions and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, despite the fact that it was only approved for treatment of major depressive disorder.

The previous record-setting fine hit Pfizer, the world's biggest drug maker, in 2009. Pfizer paid the government \$2.3 billion in criminal and civil fines for improperly marketing 13 different drugs, including Geodon, an antipsychotic, as well as Viagra and Lipitor. Pfizer was accused of encouraging doctors to prescribe its drugs with free golf, massages, and junkets to posh resorts.

It’s worth pointing out that the usual prescriptions for autism include Adderall-type stimulants, SSRIs such as Prozac and Luvox, and anti-psychotics. Unfortunately, sometimes doctors don’t notice that a patient is getting worse, not better. Sometimes they ignore the family’s pleas to discontinue the drugs.


Have prescriptions for these drugs decreased since the fines? I haven’t seen much of a change. Prozac isn’t prescribed much now, but its popularity has been waning for several years. In my



opinion, we’ll see a drastic change only when drug company executives are brought up on charges of manslaughter. Timely prosecution could have prevented much tragic loss. For the families of the victims, it’s small consolation that the FDA is now \$5.3 billion ahead.

“Violence and other potentially criminal behavior caused by prescription drugs are medicine’s best kept secret,” says Dr. David Healy, a world-famous psychiatrist (and former Secretary of the British Association for Psychopharmacology) who has written extensively about the lack of data in evidence-based medicine, including in his latest book, *Pharmageddon* (Feb 2012).

It’s a secret that now must be shouted from the rooftops.

Or in America’s case, the clock towers. 

(Editor’s Note: This was written by a close friend who is a pharmacist and wishes to share their knowledge and opinion. But to protect their career they wish to remain anonymous.)

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



When Can We Have an Honest Discussion on Mental Illness and the Way it is Treated?

By Meghan Kellison

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



WITH the recent heartbreaking event at Sandy Hook Elementary School shaking the people of this country to their core, both sides of the predominant political spectrum have succeeded in politicizing the deaths of the children.

Whether pro-gun control or pro-second amendment, the emotions on both sides are running high and the debate is necessary, but perhaps too rushed. The fact is, twenty seven people are dead not because guns exist or there were too many gun laws, but because one man lacked the mental stability to restrain himself from committing such an atrocity.

The shooting is a result of mental illness above all else, and it is this cause that we should pay close attention to. Why are we seeing more shootings by deranged, single men even as overall gun violence is on the decline? Why do these people share similar traits including isolation from society and unbalanced psyche? There is an article that is making the rounds that I recently read that brings up the problem of mental illness in relation to violence, and while I found it an interesting and even refreshing diversion from the gun debate I thought it lacked a coherent solution to dealing with the problems of mental illness. In the article "[I Am Adam Lanza's Mother: A Mom's Perspective On The Mental Illness Conversation In America](#)," Lisa Long expresses empathy with the mother of the shooter Adam Lanza as she chronicles her struggle in raising a child with what is believed to be Asperger's Syndrome who sometimes exhibits violent tendencies. Long does an excellent job of showing how difficult life can be living with a child who threatens her life, and the complexity it brings to a relationship that is one of unconditional love.

My concern comes when reading through the long list of prescriptions for mind altering drugs her son has been on, and her frustration with their ineffectiveness and even the ineffectiveness of the doctors in diagnosing her son's condition. This leads to another worthwhile discussion the country needs to have, with all the advances we

have made medically, why are there more cases than ever before of people suffering from mental conditions and also why are the "solutions" as bad as the conditions? Drugs have failed at treating mental illness of all kinds, and have such damaging side effects that they often cause the problems they intend to treat. Homicidal and suicidal tendencies are two of the main side effects in psychotropic drugs, and having lived with four people who have had legitimate mental conditions I have personally seen the terrifying effects these drugs can have on people. Prescription medications are not only ineffective at treating conditions; they are often times significantly more damaging.

How did we as a society get to this point, and are drugs really the best solution we can come up with to treat this problem? I think a paradigm shift is in order regarding the way we think about mental illness and the way we treat it. So many people could benefit if we can formulate a different approach to mental and physical health, and I think a good first step would be to realize the holistic nature and interconnectedness of the two. As science improves and we gain more knowledge, there is resurgence in viewing humans as beings with complex systems that rely on processes that can't be cut, poisoned, or burned out once a part is seen as malfunctioning. Mental health is linked with physical health, and treating the symptoms of a condition without addressing the cause is partly why our healthcare system is so lacking and our people are so sick. Why do we avoid what is blatantly obvious---that as our waistlines increase, so does the incidence of mental disorders?

Over two-thirds of Americans are overweight or obese, and while correlation is not always causation, how can we hope to be mentally fit if we aren't physically fit? I have seen first-hand how much someone who suffers from something as serious as schizophrenia can be significantly helped by given nutrient dense



Continues on Page 30

Continued from Page 29 - When Can We Have an Honest Discussion on Mental Illness and the Way it is Treated?


food, exercise, and ample sunlight along with the elimination of drugs and denatured food. After testing this on myself, and also seeing it benefit people I know, I can see a huge difference in how denatured food affects our mental processes. I have felt a tremendous difference in my mental and physical health after cutting out processed foods and switching to a diet high in healthy saturated fats, plenty of fresh fruits and veggies, adequate sunlight, and some supplements. More and more research is coming out linking mental and physical health, and more people are feeling the difference in their health when they make the change. I have been seeing more articles like this one "[Hannah's Story: 2 Years on GAPS Diet Reverses Autism](#)" that show parents taking a more proactive role in their child's diet. With diabetes rates and other diseases that normally affect older people at an all-time high limiting the lives of children, the effects of denatured, high sugar diets are apparent.

Can a change in diet cure the darkest mental disorders? Absolutely not. Modern medicine has its place in treating a variety of physical problems. I am also not making the case that this or any tragedy could have been prevented by proper nutrition as life is never that simplistic, but I am saying that we need to re-focus our efforts on how we treat these illnesses. Drugs don't work, but we can work together to find something that



does, or at least is much, much better and far less damaging. My generation was the guinea pigs for psychotropic drugs and attention disorder drugs, and I believe we are seeing the fruits of this flawed approach manifest in these outbursts of extreme violence

from people in my age range. We are also seeing another approach surface—one based on using the foods we were created to eat to treat the physical and mental problems we are developing as a result of malnutrition. Americans didn't get sick physically or mentally overnight, and all of these health problems cannot be fixed with a pill.

Throughout history there have always been people who commit violent, irrational acts, and I want to be very clear that I am not trying to completely diagnose the "why" of this tragic situation, but I do see it as a symptom of a society that treats the causes of mental illness with mystery instead of logic and quick fixes instead of painstaking, long term efforts. I am optimistic that in every tragedy there is a lesson to be learned, and that working together to formulate real solutions to the issue of treating mental illness we can at the very least correct a broken approach and possibly even raise a less violence prone, healthier generation. We owe it to future generations to give them a better start especially those victims of mental illness and the victims of its effects. By opening and expanding the discussion we can start working on long term, meaningful solutions. My heart and prayers go out to those affected by the actions of an unstable man, and I sincerely hope the families find closure and peace in these troubling times. 

Meghan has been writing poetry, prose, short stories, and essays for several years, has been published in small independent publications (mostly poetry), and currently runs the blog at Roberts & Roberts Brokerage (<http://rrbi.co/category/blog/>). Her focus is on social issues, politics, fitness, and natural health topics. The best way to contact Meghan is on Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100001243544080>

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Impending Drug-War Armistice Offers New Year Hope By James Gierach

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Drug Abuse is Bad The Drug War is Worse Law Enforcement Against Prohibition



TWO Thousand Thirteen (2013 A.D.) holds promise for the restoration of freedom and liberty around the globe as world leaders and citizenry repudiate zero-tolerance as a societal value and drug

policy, and instead continue to inch forward toward an inevitable Drug-War Armistice. Evidence of the promise and progress is seen in the November 2012 U.S. elections and felt as heat at the United Nations as world leaders and nation-states brave the wrath of the United States and threaten to jettison the U.S., U.N. and Al Capone-style, drug-prohibition policies that have bloodied the world, incarcerated masses, strangled freedom, and served the interests of powerful drug cartels and street gangs that thrive on “Just say ‘no’” foolery.

U.S. Elections and Marijuana

So, just what is the significance of the 2012 Election Day approval by Colorado and Washington voters of “recreational marijuana” initiatives (passed by 55 percent and 56 percent of the vote, respectively); the approval by Massachusetts voters of a “medical marijuana” initiative, making it the 18th U.S. state to legalize medical marijuana; and the approval by Michigan voters in a number of cities to decriminalize cannabis and okay medical marijuana dispensaries in Kalamazoo by a 2-to-1 vote margin?

The chief significance is not that for the first time since the enactment of the 1937 Marihuana Stamp Tax Act and since Pres. Richard Nixon’s 1971 infamous “War on Drugs” declaration that adults in two states can now enjoy “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” while legally cultivating, buying, selling, possessing and consuming a small quantity of marijuana, a “one-ounce and six-plant exception” to marijuana outlawry. Nor is the chief significance that the people themselves in another U.S. state (the 18th) by voter initiative have recognized that marijuana

is medicinal, despite the exact contrary legislative finding of the U.S. Congress by virtue of inclusion of marijuana in the Schedule-I list of drugs in the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) of 1970.

After all, these new constitutional and voter-approved changes in state law only legalized a teensy-weensy, itsy-bitsy quantity of marijuana, a toke hardly big enough to bring on a cough. No, the significance is not that, especially given that we live in a world where prohibited drugs are seized by law-enforcers by the ton, the drug war itself causing the result it intended to prevent through the magic economic impact of prohibition on price and profits, and counter-productive “anti-drug” advertising.

Instead, the significance of the Election Day marijuana-approvals is twofold: first, it serves as an objective scoreboard dramatizing for all to see the gigantic chasm between existing U.S. federal law and the will of the people, a chasm so huge that the whole world lies between the people and the government. For example, the people want marijuana legal but U.S. federal law makes it illegal. The people know that marijuana helps people with serious medical conditions but the people’s representatives in the U.S. Congress say it doesn’t.

People do not obey or respect laws diametrically askew with their own personal thoughts, beliefs and desires, especially as government and strong-armed, militarized police fill the prisons with their family members and neighbors, effectively dismantling whole families and entire neighborhoods in the process like a public enemy rather than a public protector. Even more universally disrespectful, poor folk and minorities resent laws that, and fear enforcers who, routinely and disproportionately target them for police action, the action justified only by drug-free policies and zero-tolerance mania, the action taking the form of stop, frisk, harass, search, arrest, detain and incarcerate as the poor and

Continues on Page 32

Continued from Page 31 - Impending Drug-War Armistice Offers New Year Hope

dark-skinned bypass freedom and go directly to jail. From the people's perspective, the truth is that U.S. drug-prohibition law stinks more than the marijuana it prohibits, and laws prohibiting other substances smell and work no better.

Secondly, Election Day marijuana approval is significant because it presents a huge opportunity for the Obama Administration to begin righting U.S. federal drug laws that mistakenly treat drug use as a criminal problem rather than a health problem. The U.S. recovered from the same mistake with alcohol, and it can do the same with illicit drugs starting with marijuana, marijuana regulated by laws enacted by individual states rather than outlawed by federal edict.

Prohibition Drugs Are Big Business



Pres. Barack Obama-led drug policy reform could close the gap between anachronistic

U.S. drug policy and current American thought and opinion that would greatly diminish the gigantic prohibition drug industry worldwide. How gigantic? As author and money-laundering expert Sergio Ferragut writes in his book, *A Silent Nightmare: the bottom line and the challenge of illicit drugs*, "It is broadly believed that the illicit-drug business is a \$400-billion business." In a 1988 *Fortune* magazine article (6/20/88), Asian correspondent Louis Kraar and Jonas Bernard Blank asserted that the illicit drug business was a \$500-billion a year business, the "fastest-growing industry in the world and unquestionably the most profitable."¹

According to Nassir Abdulaziz Al-Nasser, president of the 66th Session of the United Nations General Assembly and a background paper issued by his office preliminary to the New York session held on June 26, 2012, Thematic Debate of the 66th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Drugs and Crime as a Threat to Development, "In 2009, the value of illicit trade around the globe was estimated at US\$1.3 trillion and is increasing.... Drug trafficking has particularly severe implications because of the vast illegal profits it generates: an estimated [U.S.] \$322 billion dollars a year."²

Drug Produce and Violence Commensurate With Huge Prohibition Profits

Prohibition drug produce is as grandiose as illicit drug profits. For example, the National Drug Threat Assessment 2011, prepared by the U.S. Department of Justice National Drug Intelligence Center, estimates the marijuana production in Mexico alone in 2008 at 21,500 metric tons, a fact supporting the conclusion that drug-prohibition policy drives marijuana cultivation and provides Mexican drug cartels with 60% of their estimated revenues while triggering 60,000 drug-war homicides during the six-year killing

spree and drug-war reign of Mexican president Felipe Calderón. In the U.S., drug prohibition policy has made marijuana America's largest cash crop, increased the availability of most, if not all, "controlled substances," and nurtured prohibition street gangs that have brought death, disease, addiction and incarceration to the doorstep of many, each such drug-war plague demanding more attention, remediation, and taxes.

Removing prohibition from the drug equation would decimate drug profits, drug production, and drug violence. Much of the violence is caused by gangs fighting over drug turf and Chicago, home of Prohibition and Al Capone, is a good example. According to an Associated Press report of 12/29/12, "Up to 80 percent of Chicago's murders and shootings are gang-related, according to police. By one estimate, the city has almost 70,000 gang members. A police audit last spring identified 59 gangs and 625 factions; most are on the South and West sides."³ Eric Carter, commander of the Chicago's Gresham police district, home to 11 factions of the Gangster Disciples, explained present day gang dynamics, saying "It's strictly who can help me make money." Carter also noted that a gang narcotics dispute that started about six years ago is at the root of a lot of violence in his district, his comment coming on news that Chicago just logged its 500th homicide of 2012.⁴

Repudiating drug prohibition would not only reduce violence, it would also likely reduce drug use, prohibition profits being the key incentive and ingredient to ever greater drug production, distribution and consumption. The Report of the Global Commission on Drug Policy (June 2011)⁵ is illustrative of the failure of the drug war in terms of drug use. According to the report and U.N. stats, the effect of drug prohibition worldwide over the ten-year period ending 2008 has been an increase in drug consumption: the consumption of opiates up 34.5%, cocaine up 27%, and marijuana up 8.5%. In a word, the war on drugs is "drugogenic;" it puts more drugs uncontrolled and unregulated everywhere. Love that drug war.

Why Does Drug Prohibition Endure Despite Its Failure

One can only wonder why the drug war has endured given its consistent and persistent failure over the past 41 years, but the answer is simple. Historically, to a politician, championing the war on drugs meant winning votes ("We must save the kids from drugs.") and the public bought the snake oil; to the drug cartels and street gangs, drug war meant unlimited profits and government outlawry of licensed, regulated and legal drug outlets; and to the "good guys" fighting the drug war with righteous indignation and public

¹ http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune_archive/1988/06/20/70695/index.htm

² <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/66/Issues/drugs/drugs-crime.shtml>

³ Sharon Cohen, "Violence, gangs scar Chicago Community in 2012," Associated Press, <http://news.yahoo.com/violence-gangs-scar-chicago-community-2012-174051760.html>

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ http://www.globalcommissionondrugs.org/wp-content/themes/gcdp_v1/pdf/Global_Commission_Report_English.pdf

Continued from Page 32 - Impending Drug-War Armistice Offers New Year Hope

support, the drug war meant an opportunity to seize, forfeit and convert to their own benefit the drug lords' Golden Goose. With the "good guys" and the "bad guys" on the same side of the drug-war fight, both teams supporting prohibition, who is against it?

Focusing on the good guys in the Drug War Age, "policing for profit" motivates police brass to assign more personnel to drug duty rather than to the prevention of violent crime or the apprehension of violent offenders, causing drug arrests to skyrocket while permitting more violent criminals to escape justice as arrest-clearance rates plummet. Scott Christianson, published in the Christian Science Monitor ("Questioning U.S. arrest statistics," 1/18/06), noted that "The arrest clearance rate for reported homicides recently dropped to about 60 percent compared with about 90 percent 50 years ago. This means that a murderer today has about a 40 percent chance of avoiding arrest compared with less than 10 percent in 1950. The record for other FBI Index Crimes is even more dismal: The clearance rates have sunk to 42 percent for forcible rape, 26 percent for robbery, and 13 percent for burglary and motor vehicle theft, all way down from earlier eras."⁶ In sum, drug-war prioritization has been bad news for crime victims.

But the "good news" is that law-enforcement agencies have enjoyed riding high on the drug-war gravy train with more money for police salaries, overtime, weaponry, vehicles, and tools of the trade. Meanwhile, drug-war crime, committed by addicts in need of money for drugs and gangs in pursuit of "easy street" cash money, has necessitated and sponsored a prison construction "Gold Rush," and transformed America from the "Land of the Free" into the "Home of the Incarcerated," the U.S. sporting the highest rate of incarceration in the world. More prohibition drug-use, addiction and court-ordered substance-abstinence supervision have enriched associated industries, too, with more money for drug treaters and drug counselors; more money for urine collectors, drug-testers, and drug labs; more money for more court personnel and more probation and parole officers; more money for "anti-drug" advertising on TV and radio aimed incessantly at kids; and year-after-year more and more seized and forfeited drug money and property have enriched and balanced municipal treasuries and police budgets as much as any habit-forming addiction, prohibition revenues chasing prohibition-made problems like a dog chasing its tail. As one correctional-officer friend succinctly told me when I asked him what he thought of the war on drugs, "Job protection." Love that drug war.

⁶ <http://gritsforbreakfast.blogspot.com/2006/02/drug-war-focus-lets-violent-criminals.html>

After 41-years of dismal drug-war failure, it's the drug-war benefactors who continue to hold on to the drug-free, drug-war fairytale for dear life and profit. Find me a supporter of the war on drugs at this late stage who isn't riding the drug-war gravy train, and I'll find you someone who can't read, think, or digest the fear and risk implicit with notions of freedom, free will, and individual responsibility. Until March 2012, I basically blamed the United States for leading the world down the road to more drugs, death, disease, overdose, addiction, and violence in this modern-day "Crusade for Drug Intolerance," following in the footsteps of last century's infamous "Alcohol Prohibition Crusade."

Drug Prohibition Corruption and Violence Overtake Mexico

But then, in March 2012, I had the opportunity to attend the 55th Session of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) held in Vienna at Commission headquarters along with three colleagues, our delegation representing an international, non-profit organization, called Law Enforcement Against Prohibition (LEAP), an organization composed of active and retired police officers, judges, prosecutors and other law-enforcement officers. All four of us, like LEAP's core membership, were active or former drug-war stalwarts but who long before Vienna had concluded that the war on drugs itself posed a much bigger set of problems than mere drug use.

I arrived in Vienna fresh from an international drug policy conference held in Mexico City last February, organized by Mexico Unido Contra La Delincuencia (MUCD), a non-profit organization supported by the business community and others, and called in search of solutions to systemic drug-war-driven corruption and violence



spreading across Mexico like wildfire. No place was safe. No one was immune. Having met and spoken with conferees from Mexico and speakers especially those from Central and South America, and hearing their shrill and visceral call to the world for help and relief, I expected to witness a blow-by-blow substantive debate in Vienna. I expected that U.N. treaty signatories would candidly face the fact that the U.N. prohibition treaties themselves were the rotten core that framed the failed world drug policy that was causing the deterioration of civilized society and the moral foundation of mankind. I

Continues on Page 34

Continued from Page 33 - Impending Drug-War Armistice Offers New Year Hope

expected that delegates would be issued boxing gloves and a book of Marquess of Queensberry rules.

Bolivia Musters Some Courage But Not Enough

Recent Bolivian events further lifted my spirits and expectations for change in Vienna. In June 2011, Bolivia unilaterally withdrew from the U.N. Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961. This action was a world first and set Bolivia apart from all other nations belonging to the U.N. family with little Bolivia alone having the gumption to risk the ire of the great and powerful U.S. and to stand against its domineering insistence on prohibition as the world's drug policy despite local national needs, realities, history, circumstances or sovereignty.

Bolivia's unilateral treaty withdrawal was precipitated by the terms of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 that classified the coca leaf as a prohibited substance.⁷ Greeted by loud applause, Bolivian president Evo Morales addressed the Commission in Vienna, and pointed out that Bolivian acquiescence to treaty terms was an historic "accident," because Bolivia was not a free country at the time; because the coca leaf is not cocaine but rather a useful commodity used to make many legal products from suntan lotion and confections to beverages; because it had been used by Bolivians living in the Andes for centuries as a high-altitude necessity; and because the coca leaf was protected by the recently adopted Bolivian Constitution, and by practice, tradition and religious convictions of its people.

However, while asserting its sovereignty in defense of the coca leaf, Bolivian Pres. Morales' drug policy reform leadership stopped at its own doorstep. Morales' Vienna address turned mainstream and submissive as he genuflected before world delegates and underscored his country's full support of U.N. prohibitionist-flavored treaties, including the U.N. Single Convention in all respects except outlawry of the coca leaf, and including the restrictive Schedule II classification of cocaine that derives from the coca plant. He further pledged that his country would spend tens of millions of dollars fighting cocaine production, distribution and consumption. Morales' mettle turned to more prohibition mush.

The United Nations – Fountainhead of World Drug-Prohibition

The highly anticipated strident debate of many voices, even Morales – exploring, questioning, examining, trying and judging the pros and cons of prohibition as the world's foundational drug policy – went awry and disappointingly fizzled. Latin American delegates, like all delegates of

the world, meekly and cooperatively reaffirmed their blind allegiance to all U.N. drug-prohibition treaties (The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961; the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971; and the Convention Against Illicit Traffic In Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 1988) without a single dissenting voice or vote. In fact, the Commission's reaffirmation of its drug-intolerant treaties as proposed in a U.S.-sponsored resolution was accomplished quietly without any vote. Yet, it was "adopted."

Instead of free-wheeling drug policy debate and sincere soul-searching, there was blind adherence and predetermined subscription to the status quo; instead of openness and a free exchange of ideas there was prepackaged prohibition marching orders and discouragement of any expression of deviation from established norms, platitudes and sounds; instead of democracy and secret voting, dissent and divergence were suffocated. All delegates were schooled, primed, preconditioned, tamed and homogenized before their arrival in Vienna by documents and materials disseminated in advance of the session. And during the Conference sessions, delegates were often reminded by U.N. leadership of their schooling and indoctrination with repeated emphasis on the need to speak with a unified voice, "one common voice," that voice proclaiming that the Emperor's New Clothes were just beautiful, just as perfect as prohibition drug policy.

From the first day to the last day of the 55th Session of the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the assembly and the proceedings were an embarrassment to democracy, free will, enlightened thought, freedom, tolerance or understanding. The proceedings and U.N. Reports by the Secretariat ("World situation with regard to drug trafficking" and "World situation with regard to drug abuse") clearly documented and established that drug use and drug trafficking were increasing worldwide. Wherefore, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs concluded by reaffirming the three drug conventions and continuing down the same dead-end road. Lunacy.




Again, prohibition was the preordained agenda for the Vienna 55th Session, and prohibition was the end product of the Session. Member States completely avoided the central issues of drug policy: Does the war on drugs do more harm than good? Does the war on drugs cause the very thing it was designed to prevent? Should drug prohibition be discarded and replaced with legalization, control and regulation?

Every Member State of the U.N. effectively called for a continuation of the current path of drug-prohibition policy, evidenced by their bland and uninspired discussions of the U.S.-introduced draft resolution that would reaffirm

⁷ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/jun/23/bolivia-drugs-convention-coca-leaves>

Continued from Page 34 - Impending Drug-War Armistice Offers New Year Hope



the three U.N. drug-prohibition treaties and commemorate the centenary of the first international drug prohibition treaty, the 1912 Hague International Opium Convention. Proposed amendments and discussions regarding those amendments basically dealt with form rather than substance, word choice, and the rearrangement of commas.

Depressingly, world drug policy was reaffirmed despite its full-blown, comprehensive failure with the world and reporters paying little attention and writing hardly a word about the illusory proceedings. About the only thing that worked well at the session was the tight security, limited admission, single-entry, photo-ID badges, and locked doors that kept the world out and only the select in. It was not a pretty sight.

Disturbingly, the U.N. preached and taught the importance of a “single and unified voice” that operated to stifle thought, discussion and debate, making the process look more like a totalitarian process rather than a democratic one. A democratic process invites the expression of divergent opinions, beliefs and strategies, and does not dictate a “party line.”

Now, nearly a year later and with a successful renaissance of thought, tolerance and freedom emanating from Colorado and Washington states in the U.S., the U.N. is attempting to interject itself into the marijuana-approval initiatives in America in a futile attempt to maintain its dreaded “unified voice.”⁸ Why would the U.N. defend the indefensible policy of drug prohibition? Remember the decoder that deciphers the incomprehensible drug-prohibition policy adherence: Is this drug-war defender a drug-war benefactor? The United Nations is a drug-war benefactor that serves as a conduit for the distribution of drug-war revenues.

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) Executive Director’s report (3 February 2012) details a myriad of programs and anti-drug efforts spread around the world budgeted to cost \$1.036 billion for the biennium 2012-2013 budget period, or approximately \$500 million per year.⁹ Drug prohibition is big business, and the U.N. is just another gravy train rider.

8 <http://www.infowars.com/united-nations-moves-to-impose-international-treaties-on-states-legalizing-marijuana/>


9 Report of the Executive Director, “Activities of the United Nations on Drugs and Crime” (p. 19), <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/V12/501/53/PDF/V1250153.pdf?OpenElement>

As a new attendee at the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in 2012, it soon became apparent that the regular attendees at these events utilized a peculiar nomenclature, where everything about drugs was preceded by the phrase “evidence-based.” For example, CND and UNODC officials, delegates and even some NGOs, spoke of “evidenced-based treatment,” “evidenced-based incarceration alternatives,” and “evidenced-based drug solutions.” The practice remained alive and well in June 2012 when observed by a Columbia student who noticed the use of the phrase “evidence-based interventions.”¹⁰

The thought that keeps coming to my mind is the irony that U.N. drug prohibitionists would invoke the use of the word “evidence” to talk and write about new prohibition plans, programs and protocols concerning drug solutions, treatment, incarceration and, now, interventions when the fundamental prohibition drug-policy choice ignores all evidence of its counter-productiveness and key reports prepared by the Secretariat document increased drug abuse¹¹ and drug trafficking.¹²

Hope for Drug Peace in 2013

Why is there hope for Drug-War Armistice in 2013 given the lethargic plodding of the United Nations on the subject of drug-prohibition repudiation? Because the people of the world, like the people of Colorado, Washington, Mexico City, and Vienna, like the readers of this article, are awakening to the need to end the failed war on drugs.

The people of the world not only know that the war on drugs does not work for its intended purpose of saving people from themselves and drug use, but they are quickly learning that the drug war also exacerbates most world crises. Clearly, the world is fraught with too much violence, crime, corruption, drugs, addiction, overdose cases, prisons, bullet holes, AIDS cases, and too many bills unnecessarily inflated by drug-prohibition policy. The people know there is too little freedom, liberty, and tolerance in the world. And most importantly, the people are coming to realize that the war on drugs (not drugs, as Nixon once said) is Public Enemy Number One. The people everywhere know it just as the readers of this article know it. For that reason, there is hope that the inevitable Drug-War Armistice is at hand. Peace, drug peace. 

James Gierach is the Executive Vice Chair of L.E.A.P. (Law Enforcement Against Prohibition). Visit their webpage at Leap.CC



10 <http://ssdp.org/news/blog/attending-the-united-nations-thematic-debate-on-drugs-and-crime/>

11 <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/V12/500/70/PDF/V1250070.pdf?OpenElement>

12 <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/V12/503/27/PDF/V1250327.pdf?OpenElement>

Make a Comment • Email Link
Send Letter to Editor • Save Link

I AM A PEACEFUL AR-15 ASSAULT RIFLE OWNER

By **Marc J. Victor**

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



"FIREARMS stand next in importance to the constitution itself. They are the American people's liberty teeth and keystone under independence ... from the hour the Pilgrims landed to the present day, events, occurrences and tendencies prove that to ensure peace security and happiness, the rifle and pistol are equally indispensable ... the very atmosphere of firearms anywhere restrains evil interference — they deserve a place of honor with all that's good." *George Washington*

I can't think of any reason I need to own my AR-15 assault¹ rifle. I don't pretend to *need* it for self defense. I also own several handguns. Any one of my handguns would be adequate to allow me an opportunity to defend myself, or another person, from virtually any act of aggression by another individual. Indeed, I could have easily halted any of the recent gun based rampages, by any of those deranged lunatics, with just one of my handguns. I wish I had been there.


I have needlessly and peacefully owned my AR-15 for many years. I keep my AR-15 securely locked in a gun safe in the very same home where my young children live. My children are aware of my AR-15. Like many other things in life, I have taught my children about guns.

Recently, some of my kids attended a private gun safety class given by a highly experienced gun expert. I enjoyed watching my kids learn about my AR-15. I admit being a bit nostalgic about my AR-15. I spent lots of time learning about every aspect of the AR-15 when I was in Marine Corps boot camp at Parris Island, South Carolina. I also carried an AR-15 when I served my country in Operation Desert Storm in Saudi Arabia. I had it with me when I lived in a dirt hole on the border of Kuwait. It is the weapon I know better than any other.

I own lots of dangerous things I don't need. I don't need my highly modified 600+ hp Z06 Corvette, or my Harley Davidson motorcycle, or that crazy looking knife I sometimes jokingly say was imported directly from the Klingon Empire.² All of these things can be used, intentionally or accidentally, to hurt others. Because I have always been careful, peaceful and responsible, none of the things I own have ever been used to hurt another person.³

I am an American. As such, none of my rights depend on a showing of need. I am a free man

who has the right to define and pursue my happiness in any peaceful way I see fit. The government does not grant me rights. I was born free. The legitimate role of government is to act as my agent to protect my rights; which exist independent of government. Americans do not beg the government for rights nor are they required to demonstrate a "need" for rights.

LIFE,
LIBERTY,
& THE PURSUIT OF
HAPPINESS 
NO RESTRICTIONS APPLY

I cherish lots of my rights for which I can't demonstrate any need. I don't need the right to say highly offensive things to another person. Although I generally don't try to offend other people, I cherish my right to do so. I also cherish, and would aggressively defend, your right to say highly offensive things to me. Defending the rights of people to say things most people agree with is entirely unimpressive. Liberty must always be defended at the edge.

As a criminal defense attorney, I seek out unpopular clients. When I represented Elizabeth Johnson in what is sometimes referred to as the "Baby Gabriel" case, one of the things that attracted me to the idea of representing her was the fact that she was hugely unpopular. Defending the right to a fair trial starts with the unpopular client.

Although I never have anything to hide, I cherish my 4th Amendment right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. I would never consent to a warrantless government search. Opportunities to defend the 4th Amendment usually arise in cases where people are engaging in some type of criminal activity. The cost of defending our rights in this area sometimes results in dangerous criminals going free. I frequently advocate for our right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures on behalf of people who think nothing of trespassing on others. Indeed, I always advocate for the right to refuse searches in cases where there is nothing to hide. Protecting liberty in hard cases requires the work of the most committed liberty minded Americans.

Government never has a more tempting opportunity to increase its size, power and scope, and to curtail the liberties of free people, than during or immediately after a crisis. Indeed, crisis is so tempting an opportunity for government that governments invent crisis whenever possible. This is why "emergency acts" and "wars" on

Continues on Page 37

¹ Rifles don't "assault" people. People assault people. Calling the AR-15 an "assault" rifle is inflammatory. I have been known to sometimes choose inflammatory titles for my articles. Like any other weapon, the AR-15 should be used solely for defensive purposes. I suspect the vast majority of people who own them, intend to use them only defensively.

² See, Star Trek.

³ I realize there are some things I could own which, by their very nature, cannot be owned by me in a community without posing a substantial risk of harm to others. Reasonable people can disagree about what things truly and honestly fit into this category.

Continued from Page 36 -I AM A PEACEFUL AR-15 ASSAULT RIFLE OWNER


anyone and anything are so popular for governments. Nothing entices people to stop thinking, act impulsively, and to relinquish liberties so easily as a “crisis” or a “tragedy” or an “emergency.” We need to be smarter if liberty is to survive.

Our world is unfortunately filled with real tragedies. The recent school shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary in Connecticut, orchestrated by a deranged lunatic with several guns, was one of the worst tragedies I have seen in my life. However, because of the magnitude of this tragedy, much like the September 11th tragedy, it presents an almost unprecedented opportunity for government to curtail liberty. Don't be fooled!

Banning Guns is Un-American and Immoral

"And that the said Constitution be never construed to authorize Congress to infringe the just liberty of the Press, or the rights of Conscience; or to prevent the people of the United States, who are peaceable citizens, from keeping their own arms; ..." *Samuel Adams*

The right to peacefully own a gun is such an important and fundamental American concept that it was enshrined in the 2nd Amendment to our Constitution. Millions of peaceful Americans own guns for various reasons; none of which need to be justified to the government or anyone else. Peaceful people owning guns is not a problem needing a solution. Countless Americans will peacefully own and even use their AR-15 weapons today without incident.



Ignoring the obvious Constitutional problems with simply banning guns, such action would require immorally initiating force against peaceful people. People who abhor guns have no right to impose their will on peaceful gun owners. So long as peaceful gun ownership poses no harm or substantial risk of harm to others, it ought to be a protected activity like all other peaceful activities conducted by competent adults.

Attempting to punish everyone for the acts of one or several deranged lunatics is immoral. Like most AR-15 owners, my AR-15 ownership has always been peaceful. Seeking to deprive me of my AR-15 because others have irresponsibly used theirs is akin to revoking my driver's license because others have irresponsibly driven drunk resulting in tragedy. People need to be

held accountable for their own actions, but not for the actions of others.

The Idea of Banning Guns is Foolishness

"They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." *Ben Franklin*

It is estimated there are approximately 300 million guns in the United States. I suspect that estimate is conservative. The nature of criminals is such that they do not comply with the law. As such, we can predict, with absolute certainty, that the violent criminals who currently possess guns will not comply with any law requiring them to relinquish their guns. Additionally, I suspect many peaceful gun owners would similarly never comply with any law requiring them to relinquish their guns. As such, any law banning guns would be entirely ineffective and would actually make matters worse. All peaceful law abiding gun owners would be disarmed and more vulnerable to violent criminals.

We already have laws absolutely prohibiting convicted felons from possessing guns. As a criminal defense attorney, I regularly represent such people deemed “prohibited possessors” for the crime of simply possessing guns. Nobody working in the criminal justice system could seriously assert that laws banning guns for felons have been successful. A deranged lunatic, named William Spengler, ambushed and murdered two firemen in upstate New York on December 24, 2012. He was a “prohibited possessor” who previously served 17 years in prison. The law absolutely banned him from having guns. He had several. Thankfully, Mr. Spengler terminated his killing spree by shooting himself after being confronted and engaged by an off duty armed police officer who happened to be present. There is no doubt many more would have been murdered had an armed man not been present.

Even if we strained our imaginations to think banning guns could result in abolishing all guns currently in existence, a gun ban would still be futile. If the failed war on drugs has taught us anything, it is that making something illegal, when there still exists a demand for the illegal item, absolutely results in a lucrative black market. There is no doubt a lucrative, vibrant, and violent black market in guns will immediately grow to whatever size is necessary to manufacture and supply violent criminals with guns. Such violent criminals would be enticed to engage in even more criminal endeavors knowing their law abiding victims are entirely unable to defend themselves against such aggressions.

Whether we like the conclusion or not, like marijuana, guns are here to stay. The facts of reality are such that bad guys with guns are an

Continues on Page 38

Continued from Page 37 -I AM A PEACEFUL AR-15 ASSAULT RIFLE OWNER

unfortunate fact of life. Our focus should be on how we deal with this fact rather than wishing the fact was otherwise.

Gun Regulations Never Reduce Gun Violence and Usually Increase Violent Crime

"The constitutions of most of our States assert that all power is inherent in the people; that ... it is their right and duty to be at all times armed; ...

" *Thomas Jefferson*

I realize it seems counter-intuitive, but it is true. The same unintended results occur in many other contexts as well. Just like minimum wage and rent control laws hurt the poor,⁴ banning alcohol results in more alcohol related problems,⁵ raising taxes sometimes results in less revenue for the government,⁶ government spending results in fewer jobs,⁷ banning guns usually increases gun violence and never reduces it.

The examples of gun control resulting in increased gun violence are easy to find. In 1976, after Washington D.C. instituted the toughest gun control laws in our nation, its murder rate increased dramatically during a time when the nation's overall gun related murder rate decreased by 2%. Washington D.C., the nation's leader in gun control, became known as the nation's murder capital.⁸ A comparison of states which allow legally concealed guns to states which outlaw concealed carrying of firearms reveals no difference in overall gun related violence.

In 1982, when Kennesaw, Georgia passed a law requiring a firearm in every home, not only did crime not escalate, but violent crime sharply decreased⁹ and has remained that way for decades. Indeed, Kennesaw, Georgia claims to have the lowest crime rate of any comparable city its size in the nation.

These counter-intuitive results are not limited to examples within the United States. Australia boldly banned all semi-automatic firearms, including many rifles and shotguns, in 1997. Indeed, it was a gun grabber's dream; approximately 640,000 firearms were confiscated and destroyed. This misguided Australian policy resulted in an armed robbery increase of 69%, an assault involving firearms increase of 28%, a gun related murder increase of 19%, and a home invasion increase of 21%. Violent criminals love gun bans.

I realize the proponents of gun control also offer statistics. However, when our most respected, unbiased and professional scientific and research organizations analyze the issue, their

4 See, <http://cameroneconomics.com/Books/unintendedconsequences.pdf>

5 See, <http://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa157.pdf>

6 See, the Laffer curve. Higher taxes inhibit economic growth and encourage people to conduct business in the black market. I am never in favor of higher taxes, and I always favor less revenue for the government.

7 For a short video on this point see, <http://www.cato.org/multi-media/cato-video/government-spending-doesnt-create-jobs>

8 See, <http://gunowners.org/sk0601.htm> for an interesting but informal investigation into the efficacy of Washington D.C.'s gun control efforts.

9 Kennesaw City officials claim an 89% drop in the overall crime rate.

conclusions do not support the gun control advocates. In 2004, the National Academy of Sciences reviewed 253 journal articles, 99 books and 43 government publications evaluating 80 gun-control measures. Researchers could not identify a single regulation that reduced violent crime, suicide or accidents.

In 2003, the Centers for Disease Control analyzed ammunition bans, restrictions on acquisition of firearms, waiting periods, registration, licensing, child access prevention and zero tolerance laws. After their analysis, the Centers for Disease Control concluded there was no conclusive evidence that any gun control laws reduced gun violence. Foreign researchers have also come to the same conclusion. In Australia in 2008, a peer reviewed study at the University of Sydney reached virtually the same conclusions as both the National Academy of Sciences and the Centers for Disease Control. Gun control measures simply do not reduce gun violence.

Although President Obama appears excited about the notion of banning guns, I have not heard him order a ban on the very guns used to protect him. Apparently, when it comes to his protection, President Obama prefers to be protected by people armed with guns. Indeed, I suspect none of these gun ban advocates would hesitate to call 911 and request help from people armed with guns if they were faced with an intruder in their homes in the middle of the night. I fail to understand why we can't all agree that guns save lives.

Our Culture of Violence

"Democracy is two wolves and a lamb voting on what to have for lunch. Liberty is a well-armed lamb contesting the vote!" *Benjamin Franklin*

Unfortunately, we do have a culture of violence in America. It did not spontaneously arise. It is entirely our fault. There are several contributing factors.¹⁰ The single biggest contributing factor to our culture of violence is that our society no longer adheres to the once basic notion that initiating force against non-aggressors is wrong. We no longer recognize the sovereignty of the individual. Our laws are replete with instances of legal trespass against peaceful people. Rather than living in a democratic republic where most decisions are left to the property¹¹ owner, we now have an unfettered democracy where anything goes so long as the majority of voters agree. This is not what was intended by the founders of our country, and it has no connection to freedom. Without freedom, there simply is no opportunity for peace.

Democracy and freedom are not the same. To some extent, they are incompatible. Freedom

10 We have too many absentee parents. A cradle to grave government does not replace a set of involved parents. Our society is too de-sensitized to violence and wars and not interested enough in fostering peace. We have strayed from the old school values of hard work, individual responsibility, honesty, integrity, discipline, tolerance, patience and respect. The government can't fix this problem.

11 I refer to "property" in its most general sense to include one's body, money, possessions and time.

Continues on Page 39

Continued from Page 38 -I AM A PEACEFUL AR-15 ASSAULT RIFLE OWNER

requires that the owner retains jurisdiction over his or her own body, time, money and other property. Democracy puts the voting majority in charge of whatever is up for a vote. Said another way, democracy is akin to mob rule. At the infancy of our country, few things were subject to majority vote via democracy. Today, virtually anything and everything can be put to a vote. The jurisdiction of government has far exceeded anything envisioned by our founding fathers.

The drug war is a fundamental example of government, or the voting majority, immorally exercising its jurisdiction over the bodies of competent adults. Despite the laws, many competent adults insist on controlling their own bodies. This has dramatically increased the amount of violence and conflict in our society. Indeed, until the drug war ends, and we once again start respecting the sovereignty of the individual, there is nothing that can be done to effectively end the culture of violence destroying our society. The good news is that by simply ending the drug war, we can immediately and dramatically reduce the culture of violence.

To be sure, few countries have such an intense war on drugs as we have in the United States. Indeed, our drug laws are entirely draconian, and we imprison far more people than any other country in the world. Our spending on the drug war will soon be approaching 100 billion dollars per year. As a result of all this drug war generated violence, we have a very high corresponding rate of gun violence. I have personally represented many clients charged with violent gun related crimes resulting from drug war related issues. Indeed, much of the gun related violence I see, as a criminal defense attorney working in the justice system for the past two decades, stems from the drug war.

The United States does not have the highest rate of gun violence in the world. It should not be a surprise that several countries at the forefront of the drug war have an even higher rate of gun related homicide than the United States. The firearm related homicide rate, as a percentage of population, is higher in Mexico, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala and Paraguay. The United States spends millions of dollars ramping up the drug war in these countries. There is no doubt that several other drug war involved countries have even higher firearm related homicide rates than the United States as well.

I would be remiss if I failed to point out that these awful homicide rates in other countries persist despite much stricter gun control laws than in the United States. Indeed, Mexico has some of the strictest gun control laws in the world. Its laws effectively prohibit gun ownership. Not only do guns remain widely available in Mexico, but their gun related homicide rate outpaces ours. The same can be said of all these drug war countries.

Attempting to blame our culture of violence on the availability of guns is entirely erroneous. Canada has a gun culture similar to the United States. Indeed, their ratio of gun ownership as compared to the United States is roughly equivalent. However, Canada enjoys a firearm related homicide rate dramatically lower than in the United States. It is noteworthy to point out that people who live in countries like Switzerland and Israel have greater access to even fully automatic weapons and have higher rates of gun ownership than in the United States, but enjoy much lower firearm related homicide rates. The number of guns simply isn't the problem.

Our culture of violence is more directly attributable to anti-freedom government policies which diminish and disrespect the rights of the individual. Guns, like other tools, can be used for both good and bad purposes. Demonizing the tool, while piling on more anti-freedom regulations and laws, without getting to the root cause of the violence, is exactly the wrong approach. We will never achieve a more peaceful society until we recognize that competent adults own themselves and the drug war is reduced to an awful historical mistake.

How to Stop a Bad Guy with a Gun

"To preserve liberty, it is essential that the whole body of the people always possess arms and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them." *Richard Henry Lee*

Dangerous violent people should not have guns. Additionally, people should not shoplift. We already have laws against both. Notwithstanding our laws, dangerous violent people continue to, and always will be able to, obtain guns. Likewise, people continue to shoplift. Regarding the shoplifting problem, major retailers have accepted that shoplifting remains a fact of life and they have endeavored to combat the problem with private security guards, cameras, RFID chips, etc. As I often represent such people accused of shoplifting, I know these rational combative measures against shoplifting are reasonably successful.



As a society, we need to accept the reality that bad guys will continue to get guns notwithstanding our laws. We need to devise appropriate, rational and effective measures to combat this foreseeable reality. Well intentioned and famous Hollywood actors simply saying, "Never Again!" or simply passing more gun regulation laws will not combat the problem.

As the tragic shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary in Newtown, Connecticut proves, the passing of more laws is entirely the wrong approach.

Continues on Page 40

Continued from Page 39 -I AM A PEACEFUL AR-15 ASSAULT RIFLE OWNER

Federal law prohibits the presence of guns in schools. It is clear the deranged Mr. Adam Lanza was entirely undeterred by this federal law. Indeed, this law may have encouraged Mr. Lanza to work his horrific violence at the Sandy Hook Elementary School knowing federal law provides that nobody could have the capacity to stop him. One unintended consequence of this federal law has been to create a guaranteed victim zone, comprised of children, who are unprotected sitting ducks for any deranged lunatic such as Mr. Lanza.

Additionally, Connecticut's gun control laws also proved to be entirely ineffective. By stealing his mother's gun, Mr. Lanza exempted himself from any laws regarding background checks, waiting periods, permits, licenses, etc. Neither unarmed security at the front door nor the presence of heroic yet unarmed adults at the school had any chance of stopping Mr. Lanza's murderous rampage. Even the courageous school principal, who dashed toward Mr. Lanza in a heroic effort to protect her innocent students, had absolutely no chance and was therefore also tragically murdered.

There can be no legitimate criticism of the local police. Their trained and armed police officers arrived as quickly as one could reasonably expect upon learning of the tragedy. However, by the time they arrived, the incident was completely over. They were not able to save even one life. The only thing that stopped the deranged Mr. Lanza was the deranged Mr. Lanza himself. One can only wonder how many more lives would have been needlessly taken had Mr. Lanza decided to continue shooting others rather than shoot himself.

I wish I could have been there that day with my AR-15 rifle or even my .40 caliber handgun. This story would have had a different ending. What a shame that not even one peaceful, responsible, trained and armed teacher or parent could have been present, when Mr. Lanza arrived, to do the one thing that actually could have avoided this tragedy; shoot him. I can say, with absolute certainty, that one well placed round from a gun could have saved the lives of everyone at the Sandy Hook Elementary that day.

I don't know if that well placed round would have been the first shot fired, but I do know at least there would have been a chance to stop Mr. Lanza before he decided to stop himself. As a parent of five children in school, I prefer that my children are no longer unprotected sitting ducks at a federally mandated gun free zone in school. The only way to stop these types of gun related tragedies is by force.

I recognize that some parents feel differently than I do. For reasons I do not understand, they prefer to have their children at school totally unprotected in federally mandated gun free zones. I respect their rights to have their children at schools which comply with whatever rules they deem appropriate. However, the current state of federal law prohibits parents from choosing schools which could actually protect their children against the horrendous acts of deranged bad guys like Mr. Lanza. Just like at my home, I would prefer to have my kids in schools where responsible adults, with adequate training, have

immediate and safe access to firearms. I, like many parents, don't want my kids to be unprotected sitting ducks while they are at school.

WHICH OF THESE SIGNS WILL PREVENT ANOTHER TRAGEDY?



I fail to understand why the anti-gun people find it appropriate to thwart my choice as a responsible parent. As I have stated, I respect the rights of the anti-gun parents to send their kids to schools without guns. I have heard their protestations that my plan to have armed people at school would not work. I don't know why their judgment should be substituted for mine regarding the safety of my kids.

Some of those parents claim that armed people at the school could make no difference if such a shooting was to occur. They are entirely wrong. There are many examples of occasions where armed people successfully terminated some deranged person's gun rampage. Here is a short list of some notable examples compiled by the Libertarian Party:

- A 1997 high school shooting in Pearl, Mississippi was halted by the school's vice principal after he retrieved the Colt .45 he kept in his truck.
- A 1998 middle school shooting ended when a man living next door heard gunfire and apprehended the shooter with his shotgun.
- A 2002 terrorist attack at an Israeli school was quickly stopped by an armed teacher and a school guard.
- A 2002 law school shooting in Grundy, Virginia came to an abrupt conclusion when students carrying firearms confronted the shooter.
- A 2007 mall shooting in Ogden, Utah ended when an armed off-duty police officer intervened.
- A 2009 workplace shooting in Houston, Texas was halted by two co-workers who carried concealed handguns.
- A 2012 church shooting in Aurora, Colorado was stopped by a member of the congregation carrying a gun.
- At the recent mall shooting in Portland, Oregon the gunman took his own life minutes after being confronted by a shopper carrying a concealed weapon.

Continues on Page 41

Continued from Page 40 -I AM A PEACEFUL AR-15 ASSAULT RIFLE OWNER

Moreover, the internet is full of videos documenting peaceful armed people thwarting a violent criminal's attempt to victimize others.¹² I fail to understand why the anti-gun crowd refuses to acknowledge guns save lives. It is estimated, and there are several scholarly studies to support, that guns are used to prevent crimes between 700,000 and 2.5 million times each year.¹³ While I agree there are examples of bad guys doing bad things with guns, we should also agree there are millions of armed good guys who successfully and frequently stop bad guys with guns as well.

Three Reasons Americans Have a Right to Own Guns

"Are we at last brought to such humiliating and debasing degradation, that we cannot be trusted with arms for our defense? Where is the difference between having our arms in possession and under our direction and having them under the management of Congress? If our defense be the real object of having those arms, in whose hands can they be trusted with more propriety, or equal safety to us, as in our own hands?" *Patrick Henry*

There are three main reasons why Americans, or any free people, should have a right to keep and bear firearms. First, free people have a right to self defense. This is the most basic of all rights. Although government can legitimately act as one's agent to assist in protecting against another's aggression, the individual need not delegate or rely upon another person or entity for the exercise of that right. To deny a free and competent adult the right of self defense, is to deny such a person their sovereignty. No society can be considered a free society, or even a civilized society, without the basic right to individual defense of one's self.

The second reason for a right to keep and bear arms is to deter possible foreign invasions. I acknowledge we live in a world where mass destruction is an option for many foreign governments. However, history has shown that foreign governments generally like to advance on territory they seek to make their own. As such, a radioactive wasteland is not the preferred trophy of most hostile governments.

During World War II, Hitler's Germany advanced against much of Europe. However, Switzerland, despite its vast gold resources making it an extraordinary prize, was not one of those places advanced upon by Hitler. One rational explanation for this lack of aggression by Hitler was the reasonable conclusion that Switzerland, with its exceptionally high proportion of civilian gun ownership, would have been an unusually difficult target.

During the same time period, it is speculated that Japanese Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto reached a similar conclusion regarding a possible invasion of the United States. Some have attributed the comment, "You cannot invade the mainland

¹² For one example that occurred on July 13, 2012, see <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hpBXkvgads> I enjoyed watching how fast the two armed bad guys scrambled to leave when the senior citizen with the handgun emerged to protect everyone present. I bet the other people were glad this peaceful and heroic man thought to bring his loaded firearm. We can only wonder what tragedy was avoided that day.

¹³ See *Armed: New Perspectives on Gun Control*, New York: Prometheus Books (2001) Kleck and Kates.

United States. There would be a rifle behind every blade of grass" to the Japanese Admiral.¹⁴ Given our high proportion of civilian gun ownership, it also seems a reasonable conclusion.

Indeed, it gives me a sense of pride, as I know it does many other veterans and other proud Americans, to know that in the unlikely event our country ever was invaded, we would not need to sit idly by, helpless, to assist in defending our country. Rather, much like the other civilian militia that was so instrumental in assisting to win our independence from King George III, we may also be able to assist in some way.

The third reason for a right to keep and bear arms is, as Thomas Jefferson stated, "The strongest reason for people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government." Citizens have a right to keep and bear arms as a defense against their own government. Further, Mr. Jefferson also stated, "When the people fear the government, there is tyranny. When the government fears the people, there is liberty."

The founders of our nation believed people must always preserve their right to resistance and revolution against their own government. "And what country can preserve its liberties, if its rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms....The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time, with the blood of patriots and tyrants." *Thomas Jefferson*.

The founding fathers of our nation were keenly aware of the potential for governments to ban guns, then curtail liberty, enslave, torture or even murder their own naïve and trusting citizens. One can only wonder what the founding fathers would say had they been aware of the human slaughter suffered in the 20th century by unarmed people at the hands of their own gun grabbing governments.

In the 20th century alone, the death toll resulting from governments murdering their own disarmed citizens after guns were legally banned is estimated at 56 million.¹⁵ Our founding fathers knew any government, including ours, has the potential to become tyrannical and even deadly towards its own citizens. I suspect many or even most of those 56 million murdered by their own governments believed *their* government could always be trusted. Let's learn from history.

"If ye love wealth greater than liberty, the tranquility of servitude greater than the animating contest for freedom, go home from us in peace. We seek not your counsel, nor your arms. Crouch down and lick the hand that feeds you; and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen."

Samuel Adams 

Marc J. Victor is the owner of Marc J. Victor, P.C. and a certified specialist in criminal law AttorneyForFreedom.com.

¹⁴ There is some controversy regarding the legitimacy of this quotation. However, the fact remains that a high proportion of civilian gun ownership may have discouraged the Japanese and would certainly act as a deterrent to any potential invading force.

¹⁵ The Soviets murdered 20 million from 1929-1953; the Chinese murdered 20 million from 1948-1952; the Germans murdered 13 million from 1939-1945; the Turkish murdered 1.5 million from 1915-1915.

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Second Amendment



Is For Everyone!

www.SecondAmendmentisForEveryone

.org & .com

www.Safegunowners

.org & .com

Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid "The Man"

By Michael W. Dean

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



WHY ENCRYPTION?

You have a safe for your guns, right? Computer encryption is a safe for your *thoughts*.

Other than owning the means to physically protect yourself against physical aggression, and knowing how to use those means, one of the most effective things you can do on a personal level to protect yourself from danger is using computer encryption.

I cannot stress this enough. I'll even put it in tough-love terms that might piss you off: If you are not yet using encryption and you spend your next hour listening to some talk radio show that's just bitching about the gub'mint (even if it's *my* talk radio show), instead of installing and testing one of the encryption methods shown below, **YOU ARE A TALKER, NOT A DOER.**

NOTE: If you're using Hushmail and *think* you're actually using secure encryption, you're not. Keep reading....

Even if you say "But I have nothing to hide!", you should be using encryption. Because what's considered "illegal" expands every day. One reason for this is lawmakers. Lawmakers have to keep making more laws or they're out of a job.

A lot of us talk a lot about "LibPar", that is, "Libertarian Paradise." We speculate what life might be like if the government would just get out of our damn way. LibPar may come next year, or it may come in 500 years. But by using encryption, you and your friends can literally create government-free temporary autonomous zones *today* where you can hang out and not be hassled....Where you can say whatever you want without some sub-literate gov-goon hired off a pizza box reading your every thought. It's a freeing thing to do, it keeps you safer, and reduces the amount of fear in your life. And less fear is a good thing we could all use more of in these crazy times.

Many liberty people seem far more interested in spreading fear than doing anything about it. This statement isn't singling out any individual people, and there are exceptions. But many people are far more into yelling "THE SKY IS FALLING!" than putting on a virtual hard hat to protect their head from falling sky pieces.

This was very apparent to me the day I finally left Facebook for good. The straw that broke the antelope's back, for me, was the difference in responses to two things I posted on the same day...The first was a link to an article about new ways the government is planning to read

your e-mail. The second was a link to an article we wrote on setting up encrypted e-mail *so the government can't read your e-mail*.

The thing about government reading your e-mail got 170 likes and 76 shares. The piece about actually **DOING SOMETHING ABOUT IT** got 10 likes and 3 shares. To me, that says all you need to know about Facebook and why you shouldn't be on there. Most people on Facebook would rather live in a fear-spiral echo chamber than actually **DO ANYTHING** to protect themselves. I call it "Fear porn", and it's not a type of porn I'm interested in consuming.

This is true outside of Facebook too. A lot of "liberty media" is concerned with spreading the latest "tyranny today", showing the latest news of how the gub'mint is screwing everyone this week. But after a few years of this you realize "Yeah, governments screw people over. That's what they *do*. But what can I do, I'm just one person?"

One of the easiest answers, of course, is to **USE ENCRYPTION!** And get your friends to use it too.

If you haven't left in a huff to go check your Facebook and complain about the government, here are two tutorials, one on using encrypted e-mail, the other on encrypted instant messenger.

Licking The Envelope (An easy guide on how to use PGP ENCRYPTED E-MAIL)
by [MWD](#)



—A collaborative tutorial by [freedom feens](#) Link Porterfield, Adam Witthauer and Michael W. Dean. Tech checked and improved by [Randall Perry](#) and [Randy Jasky](#). This is **PART ONE** in an ongoing series on the Freedom Feens Blog on easy computer security for honest people who just don't like gubmint idiots hired off an ad on a pizza box reading their love letters and chats about the weather.

Many people would rather spend hours a day complaining on the Internet about how the government is constantly deleting our rights (like PRIVACY) than spend an hour or two learning to actually PROTECT their privacy. Learn to keep your e-mail PRIVATE while doing so is still legal:

Continues on Page 43

Continued from Page 42 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid "The Man"

The so-called "Patriot Act" has shredded the US Bill of Rights. The US Government is building [a giant data center in Utah](#) to spy on every electronic communication every American makes all day, every day. (We call it, and the ideology behind it, "The Central Scrutinizer.") [Cops are demanding e-mails and text messages be kept longer and longer](#), "just in case." [Police in Michigan](#) and [California](#) are even doing traffic stops and copying the contents of people's handheld internet devices and phones WITHOUT A WARRANT. If state and federal mucking around with your Internets isn't enough, [The United Nations is trying to take over the Internet](#), right NOW, and doesn't want you to know they're doing it.

All of this has caused some who don't normally question the Central Scrutinizer's legitimacy to reflect on the privacy and security of their own emails. Most freedom feens like us are already likely to question why it takes little more than a subpoena, or sometimes just a friendly (or not so friendly) phone call to an email service provider, for law enforcement (at any level) to obtain *all* of your email. After all, it is potentially the digital equivalent of making off with all the letters and parcels you've received in your lifetime, and such action would at least require an all too readily issued warrant from a judge for any paper mail seized from your house to be admissible in court proceedings.

The good news is you can do something easy RIGHT NOW to make sure that the Central Scrutinizer winds up with nothing but gibberish when it snacks on your email.

You don't have to be a "criminal" (i.e. "actual violent bad guy") to need to hide your tracks. It's getting to the point where completely moral, normal things seem suspect to the Central Scrutinizer. LEARN TO USE [PGP](#), AND USE IT! DO IT NOW!

Today we're going to teach you how to "lick the envelope" on your email. You may not think of it as such, but your email is like a postcard. OpenPGP encrypted email seals your message in an "envelope" to keep the contents shielded from prying eyes. OpenPGP is not some lightweight airmail envelope. It is one of those Tyvek envelopes that resists being opened even at knife point, if you cased a Tyvek envelope in diamond-hard steel.

While sending a "digital postcard" may initially seem just as innocuous as sending a regular postcard, there are some special considerations in the digital world. After all, your postman could likely care less about the mundane stuff you would be willing to put on a postcard. But in the digital world, you don't have to worry about just a few "probably too busy and don't care" postmen handling your postcard. Your "digital postcard" contains data that can be effortlessly collected and stored indefinitely, and easily mined by search algorithms for certain key words. This is not paranoia; this is something Gmail and Facebook already do with targeted marketing. They already mine data from

your emails and profile to determine what ads you would be most interested in. Ever send an e-mail by Gmail and talk to your friend about fishing, and then get ads for fishing gear on the next site you view from a Google search? That's how they do it. Ever send a private message to a friend on Facebook about some band, and then get ads on Facebook trying to sell you tickets to that band's next tour? That's how they do it. Facebook isn't even a mere postcard, it's more like standing in the town square with a bullhorn talking to a friend across a crowd of people.

"But isn't email encryption just for hackers and conspiracy freaks?" "What if I have nothing to hide?" There's a military term that has come into the mainstream since the beginning of the global war on terror: PATTERN OF LIFE ANALYSIS. The easiest way to describe pattern of life analysis would be to ask and answer the questions "What is normal day-to-day behavior for this person or group of people? Are they behaving normally today?" If email encryption is left just to hackers and conspiracy freaks, then email encryption practically becomes a crime in itself, if not probable cause for suspicion. If you wait until you "have something to hide" to begin using email encryption, you have just established that your pattern of life does not include email encryption, and therefore beginning the use of email encryption would establish a change in pattern of life...which warrants a closer look.

Occasionally someone will also make the claim that "It doesn't matter, the government has supercomputers that can crack any encryption." Most computer scientists, mathematicians, and cryptographers will claim that OpenPGP is, for all practical purposes, unfeasibly computationally difficult to crack; they will also generally tell you by how many orders of magnitude. But let's humor the worrier here: What if the government does have a cluster of supercomputers that could crack a OpenPGP message, with current levels of encryption, in say 1 hour? If there are only a handful of encrypted messages out there, their super-cluster could (and probably would for aforementioned purposes) catalog all OpenPGP messages they could find. But if a lot of people are using OpenPGP to talk about things like their cats and the weather, the problem becomes much more computationally unfeasible...a needle on a clean tiled floor has now become a needle in a warehouse of haystacks. That is why it's important to make OpenPGP a "normal thing." The good news is that once you have set up OpenPGP, using it for encryption is as simple as sending a message. While OpenPGP is a powerful tool that runs on a variety of computing platforms and email clients, we will be using Thunderbird with Enigmail on Windows for this lesson, though it will work equally well on Linux or Mac. (Note, on Linux, you can usually skip the step about adding GP-G4Win, because most Linux installations come with PGP installed by default.)

Don't wait "until things get bad" to get up and running with this. That's like saying "I'll get a gun when the poop hits the fan." When the poop

Continues on Page 44

Continued from Page 43 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid “The Man”

hits the fan, you won't be ABLE to get a gun, let alone learn to use it. And with electronic surveillance, things already ARE bad, and getting worse every day. Get used to using this stuff now, and use it even if you're just talking about fishing (which is actually becoming more and more regulated every day anyway, and once something is heavily regulated, the activity itself approaches being illegal, Mr. “I have nothing to hide.”) The more people using encryption, for everything, the less attention individuals using it will attract. And learn to use it combined with a good VPN (we recommend [Boleh VPN](#)), for added security and untraceability.

“But what about Hushmail?” Hushmail is web-based encrypted e-mail. It's easier to set up than PGP, but it has security flaws. Hushmail is kindergarten encryption. And moreover, the owners [will comply with law enforcement requests to turn stuff over](#). Why have your encryption handled badly by someone else when you can do it yourself and have total control of it? It's my opinion that the same can be said of some [“grandma-ware” encryption being sold as Apps for the iPhone](#). Partly because that encryption program isn't open source, which means that pro-freedom white-hat hackers can't look inside of it for [backdoors](#). (PGP is open source and has been fully vetted and proven as backdoor-free for over two decades). And also because an iPhone, by design, is NOT a secure computing environment. It's a closed system, no one can see how it works, you can't use non-Apple approved software on it, (without [jailbreaking](#) it, and once you do that, you've [broken the law](#) AND it's not really an iPhone anymore) and Apple is MORE than happy to hand over all sorts of stuff about you to any law enforcement person who asks. Richard Stallman, co-inventor of GNU/Linux, said “Steve Jobs made jail cool.” He meant that Apple is a closed “jail” that tries to lock you into their services only. But that could also be re-envisioned by some as meaning “Apple doesn't care if using their products puts you in jail.”

VERY IMPORTANT TIP!!!!!!: Using BAD encryption is WORSE than using NO encryption, because it only gives you an *illusion* of security. The way the world is headed, that's like going into a war zone with a “magic” protection amulet instead of bullet-resistant body armor. Screw web-based encryption. Do it all on your end. No one should have your private keys and passwords but you.

So let's do it, and do it RIGHT:

PART ONE – INSTALL THE REQUIRED SOFTWARE

You will need to download and install [Mozilla Thunderbird](#) to get started.

Run the Thunderbird installer file, run through and if you don't know the answer to the question, the default will be fine. The real “meat and


potatoes” is when you open Thunderbird for the first time.



Default settings are OK here too. One nice feature Windows users will appreciate is now you will have a default email client; in other words no more harassment from MS Outlook when you accidentally click an email link!



Assuming you already have an email account that you want to use with Thunderbird, just click “Skip this...”



I'm going to include one with my actual Gmail address, since the wizard does some nice things when it identifies your email domain:

Enter the address for your existing email account, as well as its password. Thunderbird will use this to log into your email. You may want to un-check the “Remember password” block, unless you feel comfortable saving your password on your computer. Then just click Continue.



Continues on Page 45


Continued from Page 44 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid “The Man”

Thunderbird is fairly smart in knowing what mail settings you need for Gmail, Hotmail, and other common web mail providers. Unless you know what you’re doing, or unless you’re using an email provider that Thunderbird doesn’t automatically provide settings for, you’re best off just hitting “Done.”

At this point your email account is all set up, and you can read or write emails from Thunderbird! Your email account is on the tree on the far left pane. After you first set it up it will take a while to sync up everything and download your email, so grab a beer or other suitable beverage.

Note: If you want to have two different e-mail addresses, one for normal mail and one for encrypted only (like Michael Dean does), or if for some other reason you do NOT want Thunderbird to be your default e-mail program and can’t change it from within Thunderbird (sometimes it grays out the option to uncheck that), the Windows tutorial on how to set the default e-mail program is [HERE](#).


One last thing you’ll want to do is set Thunderbird up so you can see the menu bar. With version 17.0 the menu is hidden by default, but it’s much easier to get around in Enigmail with the menu bar. To turn on the menu bar, just right-click in the menu area and select “menu bar,” or to get the menu bar to display one time only hit the “Alt” key next to the spacebar.



Next download and install [GPG4Win](#). There are several downloads available. While any of the four should work, I suggest the current (not beta) light version. The light version contains everything we need. It does lack the instruction manual, but that is available for both online reading and as a standalone download on the Documentation section of the GPG4Win site. Don’t panic when you reach the screen marked Define trustable root certificates. Just check the box and click next. (See following screenshot.)



Open the Add-ons Manger in Thunderbird (Tools/Add-ons) and search for Enigmail. Install it.



From here just type in “enigmail”. That’s what you want. It’s the first result that comes up. Now click “Install.”




Click the handy “Restart now” link to start Thunderbird with the Enigmail add-on.




PART TWO – CONFIGURE THE SOFTWARE

Start by opening Thunderbird and opening OpenPGP/Setup Wizard leave the first choice set to Yes and click Next.




Continues on Page 46


Continued from Page 45 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid "The Man"



You can leave the next setting at Yes, since signing your emails won't pose problems for any recipients.



Up next you will set whether to encrypt all of your emails by default. Since you are likely just getting started with OpenPGP, most of your email recipients are unlikely to have public keys yet. Leave that selection at the default of No. (Be sure to send this blog post to as many people as possible. Not only is more people using PGP more useful to YOU, it's more useful to all good people of the WORLD.)



"Yes" here will make things easier if you let the Setup Wizard change some of Thunderbird's default settings. If you want to know what settings are being changed, click Details.

Once you have everyone you regularly email using PGP, you can adjust your Message Composition Defaults to Encrypt messages by default: Edit/Account Settings/OpenPGP Security then click "Encrypt messages by default, and hit "OK." (No screenshot needed.)



There is an unlikely chance that the Next button may now trigger a message that the Wizard cannot find the GnuPG executable. Skip to the next step if you did not encounter the warning pictured in the screenshot below. Otherwise browse for the GPG program on your computer at C:\Program Files\GNU\GnuPG\pub\gpg.exe



Now generate a key pair.




Pick a good password during this step. It shouldn't be easy for someone to guess, or a machine to crack, but it is important that you don't forget it either. There is a wealth of information online covering passphrase selection and we haven't time to cover it all here, so I recommend this quick read on [picking good passphrases](#).

Unlike with most other memory-intensive computing operations, while your key "cooks", it will go FASTER not SLOWER if you do something else, like surf the web. Computers are an interesting mix of science and voodoo.....



It's a good idea to generate and save a revocation certificate now, too. You will use that let the world know your key should not be used in the event it is lost, stolen, has had the password compromised, etc.



With the Setup Wizard finished you now need to add at least one public key to your key ring. There are a few different ways to do this. All will start in the OpenPGP/Key Management window where you just made your new key pair. I suggest one of the first three methods to keep things simple for now.

There are several ways to manage your keys from various screens, but all key management
Continues on Page 47

Continued from Page 46 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid "The Man"


functions are available from the key manager. This is found under the OpenPGP menu.



With the key management menu open, make sure to click "Display all keys by default" so all of your keys show up automatically.



If you already have a saved public key file choose File/Import Keys From File.




You can copy a public key in plain text format then use Edit/Import Keys From Clipboard. (Include the

—BEGIN PGP PUBLIC KEY BLOCK—

and the version info at the beginning, then the key block (random numbers), all the way through the

—END PGP PUBLIC KEY BLOCK—

at the end.)



If you were sent an email with an attached public key, right click the message and pick OpenPGP/Sender's Key/Import Public Key

You can also search for keys online with Key-server/Search For Keys (use a Key ID in hexadecimal, for example: 0xABCDEF12)

Assign trust to the key you just imported. You will want to do this because deliberate (or inadvertent) impersonation is trivial to accomplish, and Enigmail won't let you encrypt to an untrusted key. This can be done quickly by enabling OpenPGP/Preferences/Sending/Always Trust People's Keys, but it will leave you able to readily encrypt email to a forged key. (You will need to Display Expert Settings to see that option.) A more deliberate use of key trust mechanisms will better protect you from impostors. I recommend confirming the key fingerprint with the key's owner via another channel like the telephone, or an alternate email account, a text message, or encrypted Instant Message. Then you can sign the key which will make it trusted. (OpenPGP/Key Management: right-click the key & select Sign Key) When you sign the key you are essentially vouching for its authenticity. You will be presented with the choice of creating a local or an exportable signature. This setting just defines whether anyone else may rely on your signature to assign key trust on their keyring. (Suppose Michael Dean and I have already exchanged and verified keys, and I want to send Neema some OpenPGP email. When I import Neema's key, I can view signatures and see that it has been signed by Michael's key, and know that the key is authentic. Personally viewing Michael's signature on Neema's key isn't required for the key to be trusted. OpenPGP will already be aware of it.)

PART THREE – START SENDING OPEN- PGP ENCRYPTED EMAILS!


You can manually encrypt individual messages by selecting OpenPGP/Encrypt Message (or clicking the picture of a key in the bottom corner of the message). The OpenPGP/Sign Message option (or the picture of the pen in the bottom corner of the message) will sign your message, so the recipient knows it is authentic. You can attach your public key public key so the recipient can easily encrypt his reply or verify your signature. (OpenPGP/Attach My Public Key) Alternatively you can generate per-recipient rules (OpenPGP/Edit Per-Recipient Rules) to always sign, encrypt, or both. You will need to Display Expert Settings in the OpenPGP Preferences to get the Edit Per-Recipient Rules to appear on the OpenPGP menu.

MAKING YOUR KEY PUBLIC SO ANY- ONE CAN SEND YOU ENCRYPTED E- MAILS

Continues on Page 48

Continued from Page 47 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid "The Man"

If you copy and paste your key into an HTML or text document, then upload to the web, it may malform, and scroll, looking like this:



That will probably not work. What you want it to do is look like a block, like this:



You can do that in any HTML editor by adding the HTML tag <pre> before the block and </pre> after the block. Those tags should not show up in the browser. You can even do that without a HTML editor, in Notepad. When you save, just use the drop-down menu in Notepad to change the file type from "Text" to "All files", and change the extension from ".txt" to ".htm" (without the quote marks.) Then upload to your web server and give people the link.

You can also just post it into a WordPress page, as I did at the very end of this post to show what they look like in WordPress. That should format fine, unless you use a template with wide margins, then the key block may scroll. As long it doesn't add extra line breaks, it will be a useable key.

NOTE: Do not keep your passphrase unencrypted on any computer. Memorize it.

Further reading:

[GPG4Win instruction manual](#)

[GNU Privacy Guard How To at Ubuntu](#)

[PGP article at Wikipedia](#)

[Gnu Privacy Guard article at Wikipedia](#)

[Pro-Liberty Information About PGP & Encryption](#)

[PGP FAQ](#)

[PGP Attack FAQ](#)

[Diceware random strong passphrase generation technique](#)

[GRC's Interactive Brute Force Password "Search Space" Calculator](#)

ADVANCED INTO ON CHANGING THE PASSPHRASE REQUIREMENTS: By default, Thunderbird will ask you to type in your passphrase for EVERY encrypted e-mail you read. You can change this. In Thunderbird, go to Tools/Add-ons/Enigmail/Options/ and change the option. 600 minutes didn't work. But 120 minutes did seem to work for me (On Linux. It may not work on Windows, see below if it doesn't). You still have to type your passphrase once in a while in less than 120 minutes, but you won't have to type it EVERY time for every e-mail. Keep in mind though that the longer you have to go without typing it, the less secure your e-mail will be. But that is mostly only an issue if you walk away from your computer and other people have access to it and could just sit down and read what's on the screen. Also keep in mind that if someone manages to put a [keylogger](#) on your computer, they can get your passphrase.

If you want to TOTALLY eliminate having to type your passphrase more than once per session (remembering that it makes you less secure if anyone has physical access to your computer), you can adjust the timeouts in GPG agent. You should be able to re-run the GPG4Win installer and select only the GPA component to add it to your system. You can then adjust your GPG Agent settings by running GPA from your Start menu. [This mailing list message](#) has some brief, but useful information on that setting.

--==--==

Link Porterfield is a networking and systems consultant with [QPG](#). His current PGP key can be found at that same link.

Adam Withhauer is a graduate student at Iowa State University. His current PGP key can be found at

<http://www.public.iastate.edu/~adambomb/PublicKey.txt>

[Randall Perry](#) started writing code in 1986 and started his first tech company in 1995. He's held adjunct Professor positions at several colleges and universities.

Michael W. Dean is a [tech writer and filmmaker](#) and does the [Freedom Feens Podcast](#) with Neema Vedadi. If you don't know Michael, his public key is none of yo' damn business! (While

Continues on Page 49

Continued from Page 48 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid "The Man"

the nature of public key cryptography is such that a public key can safely be made available to anyone, Michael just likes to be left alone.) Just kidding, his public key is [HERE](#), (note the e-mail address, it's not Michael's usual one). It's also pasted below:

-----BEGIN PGP PUBLIC KEY BLOCK-----


Version: GnuPG v2.0.19 (MingW32)

```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=gsp/
```

-----END PGP PUBLIC KEY BLOCK-----

==.==.==.==.==.==.

How to Do Encrypted, Off-The-Record Instant Messenger with Pidgin by [MWD](#)



Written by Michael W. Dean, [Freedom Feen](#). Most screenshots by Aida_Aida. Tech testing and proofreading by Link Porterfield/[QPG](#), amifreetogo, feendaveoh, [Adam Witthauer](#) and [Skippy](#).

The Freedom Feens recently wrote and published an extensive and kick-ass tutorial on setting up encrypted e-mail, [here](#). However, e-mail isn't always the best tool, especially if you're going back and forth in a conversational manner. But there is a way to set up encrypted instant messenger, OTR (off-the-record) Pidgin. OTR Pidgin is more instant than e-mail, better for back-and-forth conversations, keeps no record and leaves no trace. It provides actual [Plausible deniability](#) (to borrow a phrase from the CIA). I don't use OTR Pidgin for everyone, only like eight people I trust and know really well, but it's even better than PGP mail because there is no record, the only record of the conversation is *in the heads of both people involved*.

With e-mail and a public key, if someone can get your passphrase, they can read any saved e-mails. But with the OTR Pidgin, NOTHING IS

SAVED. Again: **The only record is IN THE BRAINS of the two people talking.** And it's even better if you're using it over a [VPN](#) or [Tor](#).

The OTR plugin was created by Cypherpunks. More on them and OTR is [here](#). I showed this tutorial to [Cypherpunk](#) Ian Goldberg, who *invented* the OTR Pidgin plugin. He made a few suggestions for changes, and I made those changes. He added: "If you use OTR and also something like Tor, you can break the link between the username and your physical identity, but **only** if you always use Tor with that IM account, even when creating it...If you need to break the link between the username and your identity, you need to use an anonymous communications network such as Tor in addition to OTR (they're designed to work well together!)."

Setting up OTR Pidgin is a lot of steps, but each step is simple. The problem with getting more people to use encryption is there's no way to do it that's as easy as picking up a phone or using Skype (both of which are uber NOT secure). And so far, the really easy ways of doing encryption (like Hushmail) are not secure. The problem is human stupidity and State evil. Most people say "I have nothing to hide", and governments don't want people using encryption. In a real [LibPar](#) (without governments, and with all "power" removed from idiots and returned to each honest, smart person), encryption would be in all Internet programs by *default*.

Instead we get shit like Facebook, where if you're one of their users, they add a chat bar EVEN IF YOU DON'T WANT one. And if you set it to go away, it randomly comes back from time to time like a stalker ex. They WANT you chatting on their un-secure chat program, and they're a company that will give any information to any law enforcement entity without a warrant. [I recently left Facebook](#), and if you're interested in security, you should too. You should also use Internet security programs like PGP e-mail and OTR Pidgin, EVEN IF YOU HAVE NOTHING TO HIDE. Because these days, not matter how "legal" or "ethical" your conversations, intentions and actions are, governments around the world (as well as some individuals, and almost all corporations) will try to use what you say against you. The repercussions of this can run the gamut from being spammed to being *imprisoned*...even if you think you're not breaking any laws. We're in a post-Patriot Act world, where [doing things that one branch of the government tells you to do](#) (like having a stockpile of food) can get you [targeted as a suspect by another part of the government](#).

VERY IMPORTANT NOTE: There is a lot of "fake security" these days. For instance, the "Off The Record" option in the Google Talk client is **not** OTR. (They explain that [here](#).) And as I said in our PGP tutorial, using BAD encryption or no encryption when you THINK you're using encryption is far WORSE than using NO encryption and knowing it, because it only gives you an *illusion* of security. The way the world is headed, that's like going into a war zone with

Continues on Page 50

Continued from Page 49 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid “The Man”

a “magic” protection amulet instead of bullet-resistant body armor. Screw web-based encryption. Do it all on your end. No one should have your private keys and passwords but you. OTR Pidgin is secure. It is not fake security. So, let’s set up OTR Pidgin....

The first step (on Windows, though you can also do this on Linux from the same link) is to download Pidgin ([here](#)) and the OTR plugin (latest Windows version, 4.0.0-1, is [here](#). If you want to check for a newer version, check [here](#), where it says “OTR plugin for Pidgin.”


Many flavors of GNU/Linux actually ship with Pidgin AND the OTR plugin installed. But if you’re using Linux, you probably already *write* encryption software to relax, and wouldn’t need this tutorial. And if you’re on Mac, oh well. But as Richard Stallman said “Steve Jobs made jail cool.”

But if you’re on Windows (the PC jail – see Footnote 1):


Install Pidgin:



Accept the license. Then accept all the default installs:



Pick your destination folder. The default should be fine:



You will get this screen when it’s done installing:



Install the Pidgin OTR plugin:



Accept the license, let it install, and when you’re done you’ll see this screen:



Now you need to configure your Pidgin Account. You may notice that Pidgin looks almost exactly like the old AOL instant messenger. Well, it was branched off of that project by the guys who wrote it for AOL, but they didn’t like working at AOL, so they went off on their own and made it into Pidgin.

Also notice that while Pidgin comes up as a program in your program list and/or task bar, the OTR plugin does not. That’s normal. the OTR plugin is not a stand-alone program, it’s a behind-the-scene add-on for Pidgin. We’ll configure it later, from within Pidgin. But first you need a Pidgin account. Click Add Account:



Continues on Page 51


Continued from Page 50 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid “The Man”

There are three tabs. The first we’ll configure is the Basic Tab:



^ (I’ve blurred out all contact info and keyprints in these screenshots, for security reasons.)

Under protocol, pick XMPP. **This is very important.** None of the other protocols will work in a truly secure manner, and many of them (like Google and Facebook) will send your info through servers of companies that gladly bend over for “The Man” without so much as a warrant. So use XMPP. Do NOT use “Facebook XMPP”, it’s not secure. Use the one near the bottom that just says XMPP:



You can use a gMail *address*, if you must, breaking the user name and domain up into the two boxes (username, and @gmail.com), but I prefer to use Rayservers. Rayservers is a VPN run by a cool security-minded guy named Ray (more on his VPN is [here](#)), and Ray allows cool people

to set up free jabber accounts for OTR messaging. You can set up an account right through the Pidgin interface.

Pick a user name that is unique, and somewhat anonymous. Don’t use your real full name, or a nickname that can be absolutely tied to you. Pick something your friends would recognize, but not something that can be proven to be you. Enter it in the username field. For domain, enter

jabber.rayservers.com

Leave “Resource” blank. Enter a password. (Info on picking a good password is [here](#).) Make sure “Remember Password” is checked. (Might be best to NOT check this if for use on a laptop that you travel with frequently, where physical access to your computer could easily be denied to you, and someone could log on and pretend to be you. But if you do not have it set up to remember password, you’ll have to manually enter it each time you start your computer. Remember, computer security is always a tradeoff between privacy and ease of use.)

Leave Local Alias blank, keep New Mail Notifications unchecked, and you can either accept the default buddy icon, or add your own. For this example, we’ve added our own.

Make sure “Create this new account on the server” is checked. Do NOT yet click “Add”, we’ve got a few more things to set up. Go to the Advanced tab:



Setting for Connection Security should be “Require Encryption.” “Allow Plaintext auth over unencrypted streams” should NOT be checked.

Continues on Page 52

Continued from Page 51 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid “The Man”

Connect Port should be 5222. Leave Connect Server blank. File Transfer Proxy should be left as

proxy.eu.jabber.org

BOSH URL should be blank. Show Custom Smileys should be checked. Now go to the Proxy tab:



Proxy Type should be “Use Global Proxy Settings.”

Make sure “Create this new account on the server” is checked, then click the “Add” button in the bottom right. You will get this window:



Go ahead and accept the jabber certificate, even if you get a message saying it’s out of date or cannot be trusted. Trust me on this. SSL certificate issuance is controlled by government monopolies, and if you issue your own without paying The Man, the SSL cert is still valid, but SSL cert notifications try to scare you. Ray’s Cert is self-issued, but solid. After you click “Accept”, you will get a window with these certificate details :


SHA1 Fingerprint=20:A8:54:9E:BA:60:93:5C:2A:0F:CE:6E:43:B5:FB:13:E7:D6:20:1B

(That certificate is good to year 2020. After that, if this stuff isn’t either freely included everywhere automatically already, or punishable by death, there should be a new cert on Ray’s site when this one stops working, and you should get a notification from Pidgin when it is no longer any good.)


Hit “Close” and you will get this window:



go ahead and click Register, and you will get this:




You now have an account. But we’re not done yet. Go to your Buddy List window and click on Tools/Plugins:



Scroll down to “Windows Pidgin Options”, Single click on it, then click “Configure Plugin” at the bottom:



Make sure “Start Pidgin on Windows Startup” is checked. (It’s fine to leave Pidgin running all the time. It takes very little memory and will not affect your computing performance. It’s about as memory intensive as having Notepad running.)



Continues on Page 53

Continued from Page 52 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid “The Man”

Do not check anything else, then click “Close.” Now go back to your Buddy List window and click on Tools/Plugins. This time, single click “Off-The-Record Messaging” and click “Configure Plugin” at the bottom:


(Do not check “Require Private Messaging” if you plan to be chatting with any people who are not using the OTR plugin, but in my opinion, you should not be chatting with those people. lol.)




Hit Close. Then in the Plugins window hit Close. Then on your Buddy List window, go to Tools/Preferences:



You’ll get this window:



UN-CHECK “Log All Instant Messages”, “Log All Chats” and “Log all status changes to system log.” THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT, even though you’ve already set this in “Default OTR Settings” . For some reason, you have to do it both places.



It should automatically generate a key. If it doesn’t, it will say “No Key Present.” In that case, under where it says “No Key Present”, click the “Generate” button. When it’s done generating a key, you will get this message:





Then hit Close. You are now set up for OTR encrypted instant messaging.

ADDING A BUDDY AND TESTING:

Under “Default OTR Settings”, make sure these are checked: “Enable Private Messaging”, “Automatically Initiate Private Messaging”, “Require Private Messaging” and “Don’t log OTR conversations.” In other words, check EVERYTHING. Also check at the bottom under OTR UI Options where it says “Show OTR button in toolbar.”

On your Buddy List window, go to Buddies/Add Buddy:



Continues on Page 54

Continued from Page 53 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid “The Man”

Add the Buddy’s user name under “Buddy’s Username.” This will be info you get from the person you’re trying to contact. It will be in the form of TheirUserName@domain.com (or .net or whatever.) If they’re on Rayservers, it will be TheirUserName@jabber.rayservers.com

We’ve actually got a few volunteers who have set up TEMPORARY THROW-AWAY TEST ADDRESS FOR YOU TO TEST THIS WITH US. For a limited time, when we’re online, we’ll accept requests, type a little with you to confirm that it’s working, and then delete you as a contact. We do this for free, because we’re the Feens, and we care about Freedom.

You can try any of these test address, one of us should be online:

carrierpidgin@jabber.rayservers.com

gumbo@jabber.rayservers.com

amifreetogo2@jabber.rayservers.com

otr-test@jabber.org

feendaveoh@jabber.rayservers.com

And you’re welcome. Please note, we will not accept file transfer tests, just text chat tests.

So, add your buddy’s username (with domain) or our test address. You can add an alias if you’d like, but it’s optional (like a person’s nickname if their username is a bunch of random letters and numbers). Then click “Add.”


If they’re offline, they will appear grayed out:



It will also be grayed out if they are online, but if they are online, within about 30-60 seconds, the gray dot will turn green to show that they are available.

You can ONLY communicate using OTR when both parties are online. If the other party is on-line, and have their status set to “Available”


(which is the default), they will appear as a green dot:



To initiate chatting with them, double click on their green dot in your Buddy List. This will open up a chat window:



You’re still not chatting securely. Note that it says “Not Private” in the bottom right, above the chat area. You need to click on the OTR icon near the top right, and click “Start Private Conversation”:



Continues on Page 55

Continued from Page 54 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid “The Man”

It will say “attempting to start conversation”, and then within several seconds, you’ll be secure, and it will say “Private” in the bottom right.


(If it already says Private, then click on the OTR icon near the top right, and click “Refresh Private Conversation”)



Note that you are now OTR and encrypted, but not yet Authenticated (verified). Authenticating is proving that you are talking to who you think you’re talking to. You only have to verify a user once. You both authenticate each other. This is done by typing a text request with a question/answer response that only the other person would know. This is best done while in the same room in person, or on the phone, so you know by the voice that you’re talking to who you think you’re talking to. Even better is doing it with a person you know in real life, where you both share a secret that only you each would be able to answer.

To Authenticate, click on OTR/Authenticate Buddy:

You’ll get this window where you are to type a




question and an answer. The answers are case sensitive:




Your buddy will get this message, and should choose “Authorize”:




You’ll get this message while you’re waiting for your buddy to answer your secret question:



And this message once they’ve successfully answered:



Hit “OK”, and you’ll be prompted to do the same process in the other direction:



You should. Authentication is a two-way street.


KEEPING THINGS PRIVATE

If set up properly, as in this tutorial, Pidgin OTR is secure if you do a few things:

1. Refresh your conversation every half-hour or so. Do this by clicking on OTR in the top right of a chat window, and click on “Refresh Private Conversation.”

Continues on Page 56

Continued from Page 55 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid "The Man"



In addition to the OTR menu in the chat window, you can click the "Not Private" button to initiate private chat, refresh private conversation, authenticate buddy, etc.

2. Keep your computer free of spyware and key-logging bullshit. This is obvious, but even though the conversation over the Internet is encrypted, if someone is logging your keystrokes on your computer (or over your network, if you're in a corporate environment), they're going to see what you're typing. Same is true if they are taking screenshots of what you're seeing on the screen. The best way to avoid this is to use Linux and never click on anything you don't need or understand. Second best is using Windows with anti-spyware, anti-virus software, keeping up to date and running scans, and never click on anything you don't need or understand.

It can be useful to have hidden motion-sensing cameras in your computer area, uploading encrypted to a non-public web folder. This is not only useful if you're robbed, it's also useful if someone does a "sneak and peak" where they break in while you're gone, and without leaving a trace, physically add keylogging software to your computer. Most virus programs have deals with governments to NOT detect government keylogging software and backdoors, so cameras could be the only way you'd know that this had happened. The Feens will be doing a tutorial on security cameras in the future.

True Freedom Feens never click on anything we don't need or understand. Many people will, but that's not how or why we use computers. We use computers for communication, real communication, two-way with people we know, and one-way to the world. But this is not the way most people use computers. The way most people use computers is more like running naked through the town square yelling "LOOK AT ME! INTERACT WITH ME! TOUCH ME! LOOK AT THIS CUTE CAT PHOTO! LOOK HOW THE GOVERNMENT IS HARMING YOU, BUT DON'T TAKE ANY PRECAUTIONS TO PROTECT YOURSELF! AND LOOK AT THIS OTHER CUTE CAT PHOTO!"

Doing this is not wise, but most people do it. If you do, please re-think it, you're putting yourself in constant danger of everything from spam to blackmail to arrest.


3. Have an anti-rubber hose decryption "I'm in trouble" secret phrase with people you know, and establish this phrase when you know you're secure, that is, you know there's no one holding a (literal or figurative) gun to either of your heads.

What this means: With Pidgin OTR, you can be absolutely sure you're talking to the COMPUTER of the person you think you're talking to. But if that computer is seized by authorities, they could log in and chat as your friend and try to trick you into giving up information. Or, authorities or some other criminal gang could kidnap your good childhood friend, and threaten him/her with incarceration or torture and make them chat with you via Pidgin OTR and trick you into giving up some detail you would only give that friend.

You should have a pre-planned innocuous-sounding crypto-safeword to use if you're typing under duress. Like calling the person "bro" if you never do, or saying "what up?" or using the word "indubitably"...basically anything you would never normally say. Don't use those examples, find your own. Protecting your friends against being tricked by someone typing on your computer would be harder, but perhaps you could also have some pre-planned innocuous-sounding phrase you ALWAYS use.

For total safety, you should have a different phrase with each person you do OTR with. This could get complicated to remember, which is one more reason to not have a lot of people you do OTR with, keep OTR for real friends, and use PGP e-mail for everyone else.

4. CLOSE YOUR CONVERSATION WHEN YOU'RE DONE. And if you're talking about particularly sensitive information, do that anyway every half-hour or so and start a new conversation. OTR Pidgin does not log chats internally when set up as above. But as long as you have a chat window open, if someone kicked in your door and your computer was still on with a Pidgin conversation open, they could scroll up and see both sides of the conversation. Close a conversation by going to Conversation/Close in the chat window. Once that is gone, the only record of what you've said is in your head and in the head of the other person.



Continues on Page 57

Continued from Page 56 - Using Encrypted E-Mail and Encrypted Instant Messenger to Avoid “The Man”

Note: BOTH sides have to close the conversation to have it fully gone. Closing it on your end still leaves a record of it on the other person’s side until they close it too!

PIDGIN TIPS AND TRICKS

You can have two or more secure conversations with two or more different people at the same time, but there is no way to have a three-way or more-way secure conversation in Pidgin.

When you add a second conversation, it will open up in a second tab, like this:



You will have to close each one separately to leave no record.


Sending Files

While in a conversation, you can send a file to another authorized Pidgin buddy, but this is NOT secure, per the readme, so we do not recommend it. Lines 237 & 238 of the README file in the current source code says:

“This plugin only attempts to protect instant messages, not multi-party chats, file transfers, etc.”


PIDGIN NOISES

Pidgin, by default, makes a lot of notification sounds. It lets you know things like when a buddy goes online, when someone changes their availability status, when they try to start a conversation with you, and when they send you a new message. The noises are useful, and they’re rather pretty sounds. I got used to it really fast. But if you’d rather not hear them, you can turn them off. In your Buddy List, go to Tools/Preferences/Sounds, and turn off what you don’t want to hear:



CHANGING AVAILABILITY

Sometimes having people constantly pinging you with Pidgin can interpret your work flow, or your life flow. lol. But you can set yourself as “not available” by clicking on the green “Available” button at the bottom of your Buddy List window and changing the status:



CONCLUSION:

As white-hat hacker god [Smuggler](#) said in his [interview on Anarchy Gumbo](#), “Security is a process, not an event.” It’s something you need to constantly work toward improving and perfecting. But using Pidgin OTR is a great start, and it’s kind of neat to

be able to install something in under an hour that the biggest governments in the world cannot crack. Using Pidgin OTR gives you security that was only available to the CIA, MI6 and KGB not that long ago, and it’s free.

There’s really no reason NOT to use OTR. And get your friends to use it. Encryption used to be considered “munitions”, and it really is like guns in a few ways. One way is that the more people using encryption, the harder it is to stop, and the less “odd” casual use seems.

–MWD

Footnote 1: regarding my use of the phrase “the PC jail” for Windows, Richard Stallman, the inventor of the GNU part of GNU/Linux, said when Steve Jobs died “I’m not glad he’s dead, but I’m glad he’s gone. Steve Jobs made jail cool.”

My feeling is this: I know PCs are a jail too, but I get really irked with people who are religious about Macs but hate PCs. One is not “freer” than the other. They’re both jails because they have too many rules, try to keep you in their “pen”, and actually cooperate with governments in a way that can LITERALLY get you put in real jail for doing things that do not aggress against anyone. I look at it that Apple is like tyrannical Democrats, Microsoft is like tyrannical Republicans, and GNU/Linux is freedom-loving libertarians/anarchists. That is, anyone who is arguing the value of the Apple jail over the PC jail is a total sheepish statist. And the only real argument is for GNU/Linux. Though I tend to write tutorials for PC, because of the large installed user base. And Linux users are smart enough that they don’t need my help. lol. 🌸

Article intro by MWD. Tutorials done with help from some other freedom feens, credited in each tutorial.

Michael W. Dean is co-host of Freedom Feens podcast (with Neema Vedadi), where there are in depth discussions about market anarchy, the digital police state, self-defense, real money, activism, DIY media, sex, pets, and rock ‘n’ roll. Visit their webpage and posdcasts at [Freedom-Feens.Com](#)

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Buy Guns While You Still Can

By Chip Saunders

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



A series of educational articles for people new to the gun scene.

PART 1: A Beginner's Guide To The Gun Panic of 2008/2009

So, we now approach the era of the new FDR. An era in which those in the Democrat Party see an opportunity to hammer American government and society against the anvil of Democrat dominance in power in order to forge and shape our homeland into one more to their tastes.

Key among their most fervent desires is to make it safer for them to do so. Something our Founding Fathers absolutely had no intention of. This is because the degree and level of change they ultimately desire is so extensive and opposed to what even the most apathetic non-voter would find acceptable, in the end, armed rebellion is likely if not prevented early on. Just as nature abhors a vacuum, so too does collectivism abhor an armed citizenry. For the utopian vision of anti-liberty politicians like Obama, Clinton and all the other vermin soon descending upon the seats of power to succeed, the citizens must be controllable. They must be suppressible. They must be disarmed.

Many of you reading this have known this for some time, and others are just becoming aware of it. Many of you reading this already are armed, but some, while having supported in principle the idea of right to arms, have not previously felt the need to personally own a weapon, . . . yet. And for more and more of late, that is changing. As you might already be aware, guns have been selling briskly since Nov. 4th, on well-grounded fear that the worse round of federal gun-control legislation in our history is on the near horizon. In fact, so many guns are being bought that the federally required forms one must fill out when purchasing from a federally licensed dealer are in short supply. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (BATFE) had previously insisted that only genuine forms received from them were allowable for the recording and processing of transactions. (It is unclear as to why. Typical bureaucratic BS.) But with the national stockpile of these forms nearly depleted, and gun shops around the country on the verge of running out and being forced to shut their doors, BATFE has temporarily relaxed the rule, allowing dealers to use photocopies of forms.

Doing something just because everyone else is perhaps seems to be not well thought out. And usually, that might be true. But imagine you are at the zoo, and suddenly all these people are running away from the area with the big sign that reads "PREDATORS". It just might be prudent to head in the same direction.

This is the first in a series of articles wherein I shall attempt to illuminate you as to what choices you have in purchasing weapons. Weapons are nothing more than power tools. Like any tool, it is only as effective at its job as the user of the

tool. A skilled user of tools recognizes that they may need several types of tools to perform different tasks. Believe it or not, this is also true of weapons. To understand what weapons you may one day require, you need to understand what weapon-related tasks you may need to perform. Only you can answer as to what those tasks may be. But I will try to help you imagine what situations the future may hold for you, so that you can arrive at your own conclusions. And based on these conclusions, I hope that you may be better informed (and soon) about what type of weaponry you ought to set about acquiring if you haven't already. But tools are merely hardware. And hardware cannot run without software. Even if you end up acquiring an arsenal of weapons that would make the **Terminator** drool, . . . if you cannot effectively use them, they might as well be a bunch of hammers. Invest in quality weapon handling instruction. This is perhaps even more important than having the guns. Also, you will need ammo. A car cannot run without fuel, and guns cannot run without ammo. Imagine if you had to have a federally issued license to buy gasoline, but had to show a clear and convincing need for the gas you sought to buy. What if that gas cost \$20 a gallon? Or \$200? Ammunition may soon be regulated in such a way.

What Is Available?

Let me first lay out for you what the types of weapons are that can currently be bought in the United States at this time:

HANDGUNS: All handguns are portable, but not all are easily concealable. Handguns are notoriously poor tools for stopping an aggressive attack against you. That is because, of necessity, they are chambered for calibers that can be managed when merely held in the hand. Handguns are prevalent in American society because the task they are effective at is portability and concealability, . . . not lethality. Which is not to say handguns aren't lethal. But of the classes of personal arms available, they are the least lethal, least accurate, most misunderstood and easiest to mishandle. People have been shot multiple times by handguns and lived, more often than you might be aware. Armies have not considered the handgun to be of much importance on the modern battlefield, and there is ample reason why. Yet, due to their size, it is easy to always have a handgun at hand, while the same cannot always be said of other weapons. After all, the first rule of a gunfight is: "Have a gun."

RIFLES: While people shot with handguns often survive, that is not so true nearly as often when rifles are involved. They can be chambered for a wider variety and power level of cartridges, and are inherently more stable and accurate. This is why armies use them. Subclassifications of modern rifles are:



Continues on Page 59

Continued from Page 58 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

Assault Rifles: Purist gun people will inform you that true “assault rifles” are select-fire; which means that the shooter can choose between shooting it as a machinegun or by merely firing once every time the trigger is pulled. And while that is technically true, most people today refer to any rifle which looks like an assault rifle as such. Assault rifles do not use the most powerful cartridges - fire 20, 30, even up to 100 times without reloading – tend to be shorter than most other types of rifles – are not made to the same levels of fine craftsmanship as more traditional guns.



Battle Rifles: These can look similar to assault rifles and often have many of the same features. However, “battle rifles” are rarely select-fire, chambered in heavier more effective cartridges, made to slightly better standards (sometimes much better) and meant to be able to engage targets at further distances than assault rifles.



Precision Rifles: Sometimes spoken of as “Sniper Rifles” or “Marksman Rifles”, these can include all manner of types and styles. Some assault rifles have been refined into precision rifles, though it is more common with battle rifles. But until very recently, a precision rifle was usually a bolt-action rifle, which 100 years ago was the design of choice for a military arm. But some are single-shots, while others are auto-loaders. They all have a magnifying optic or scope.




.50 Caliber Rifles: Usually simply referred to as “fifties”, these are rifles of any style that fire a specific military round known as the .50BMG (Browning Machine Gun). Half inch diameter is the largest rifled bore diameter citizens may own without requirements under federal law that the weapon be classified as a cannon and thereby

more heavily regulated than a mere rifle. This class of weapon truly scares gun-control advocates and is threatened to the same degree as assault rifles.



Sporting Rifles: This category includes just about anything else that isn't in the other categories, has none of the offending features that Congress dislikes and is therefore generally not considered a “weapon of war”. Which is not to say that sporting weapons cannot be used in warfare. They are simply not considered the preferred tools for the modern version of that task.

SHOTGUNS: Other typical firearms throw a single projectile and try to do so with as much accuracy as is possible. The word “shot”, while also having other meanings, in this instance refers to a payload of multiple projectiles within a single cartridge. Thus, “shot”guns are guns which fire shot, and do so from a smooth bore rather than a rifled one. (There is specialty ammo available for shotguns which fire single projectiles with some accuracy and there are even rifled barrels available, but that will be covered later.) As a result of this design, these guns will throw shot much as you might throw a handful of pebbles;...the group expands and opens up into a cloud of projectiles the further it travels. Thusly, their effective range is short. As a class, shotguns tend to be considered “sporting arms” and are at the least risk of federal regulation, but not all of them. The sub-categories of shotguns are:



Single-barrel: These are hinged designs (called ‘break-opens’ or ‘break-tops’) that only fire one round at a time, opened and loaded by hand between each shot. They are considered sporting arms.



Double-barrel: Essentially the same as a single-barrel, but with 2 of course.



Continues on Page 60

Continued from Page 59 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

Pump-action: These are repeating guns, capable of holding 5 or more rounds in a feed tube under the main barrel, which cycle by means of a shucking/pumping of the foregrip. Most of these are considered sporting arms, however, some are designed as fighting tools and called “Riot guns”.



Autoloader: Similar to pump-actions, except the cycling of the action is performed by utilizing the energy of the fired round. Many of this design are considered sporting arms, however, as with pump-actions, some are designed for combat.



Riot guns: Modified for combat, either pump-action or autoloaders which have barrels 20 inches or shorter, feed device capacity of greater than 5 rounds, and sometimes even means of mounting bayonets. Some riot shotguns have been fully automatic and held 20 rounds! Early combat shotguns in WW1 were nick-named “trench brooms”.

MACHINEGUNS: Yes, although they are more heavily regulated and not available to the citizens of all states, machineguns are legal to own in the U.S.,...for now. They are more expensive than “normal” guns, for reasons that will be explored later. But many people don’t use the word properly. Most believe it merely means any gun which fires more than 1 round with a pull of the trigger. Within this group, the sub-categories are:



Crew-served: Also most commonly referred to as “belt-fed” (think Rambo), though not all feed from a belt of linked ammunition. These guns were meant originally to simply pour fire on entire areas of the battlefield more like artillery than like aimed rifle fire. They still do that, but have evolved as well. Early models required mounting on tripods due to their size and weight. They fire rifle ammunition of different types and power levels. In military circles, this is the type of weapon referred to when they say “machinegun”.



Sub-machineguns: These are smaller more portable fully automatic or select-fire guns, which usually fire pistol caliber cartridges instead of rifle rounds. (Think of the Thompson “Tommy-gun” from gangster movies.) Simpler to manufacture, more were produced in times past, and they are correspondingly cheaper than crew-served machineguns. In fact, some are among the simplest guns of the modern age and can be fabricated with unsophisticated tools (just ask the Brits, Israelis or Vietnamese). Due to their pistol calibers and other design traits, these are usually employed at distances of less than a football field.

DESTRUCTIVE DEVICES: This catch-all category is one of two BATFE uses to regulate things such as grenades, short-barreled shotguns, cannons, rocket-launchers, flame-throwers, mortars and explosive weapons. Yes,...all of those things I just listed can be legally bought by qualified citizens. But they cost a lot, and are pretty much beyond the scope of this series. But we’ll touch on them briefly later.

SHORT-BARRELED RIFLES: Heavily regulated just like machineguns and destructive devices, short-barreled rifles are nothing more than exactly as the name implies. According to federal law, any rifle with a barrel less than 16 inches.

“ANY OTHER WEAPON” (AOW): BATFE’s other catch-all category that includes certain types of short-barreled shotguns not classified as destructive devices, as well as disguised weapons such as pen-guns and cell phone guns. Due to a bureaucratic difference in interpretation, while still regulated heavily, these are more affordable than all other federally regulated weapons.



SILENCERS: More accurately and properly known as “suppressors”, while not actually a firearm are none the less treated by federal law as such. They are also so very key and unique that we will devote some time to this category.

Supply And Demand

We will begin to delve into why and how to choose a weapon or weapons suited to you in our very next chapter. But for now, lets understand the market for firearms.

Everything has a price, and that price is affected by supply and demand. There is ALWAYS a supply and there is ALWAYS a demand. Prices are merely the expression of the degree to which these two forces are opposed. Regulation and prohibition only affects supply or demand, but NEVER eliminates either. Where there is little or no regulation, prices are reasonable. Where there is prohibition, prices are quite unreasonable. What we are experiencing in the firearm market right now is similar to the fear gripping Wall Street. Bad news for the market looms on the horizon, and everyone feels it coming. But while on Wall Street this drives prices down, with firearms, the prices go up. On Wall Street, if eventually nothing happens, prices will go back

Continues on Page 61

Continued from Page 60 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

up. While with weapons, if eventually nothing happens, prices will come back down. And both are affected by who's running government.

And just as there are past financial troubles to refer to for study of what to expect, so too are there past examples of bad news for access to guns, which explain a lot of the current panic in the firearms market. Let's examine them:

GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968 (GCA 68):

Prior to that year, guns could be sold to anyone of any age, and could be ordered through the mail. Surplus guns from wars around the world were often advertised for mail order in backs of magazines. As easy to buy as any other hardware store item. But the fear that permeated the turbulent 60's created unique opportunity for gun-haters. Key political and cultural figures had been assassinated. Youth culture and drug culture seemed alien and threatening to those outside of them. But most importantly, blacks were organizing and on the move. Militant sub-groups within each of these had shocked the nation. To the average citizen, it seemed lawlessness and disrespect for patriotic establishmentarianism was threatening to consume the nation. Playing on these perceptions, the GCA was sold as measures to fight militarism and violent crime. Among the measures the GCA instituted: all commercially sold guns now had to be sold by federally licensed dealers – no more ordering of guns through the mail, importation of surplus war weapons ceased (introducing for the first time into gun law the concept of whether a gun had a “sporting purpose”), explosives could now only be bought through similarly licensed dealers, and many wall-hanger surplus or war-trophy guns that had previously been considered “non-guns” because they had been rendered inoperable were re-interpreted as “readily repairable” to be functioning machineguns and were therefore actual machineguns (which had to be registered for “tax” purposes).

As a result, some interesting things happened. Many criminals who used to merely buy weapons at the hardware store like everyone else began to steal them instead. Thusly, while guns had always been among the items of value a burglar might steal from a home, their value had increased, guaranteeing they would be taken. The cheap surplus guns from around the world suddenly became collector pieces since the supply had been cut off. Old German pistols and rifles left over from both world wars that used to sell for under \$100 were now commanding several hundred dollars. Many poor folks suddenly had to pay more to get guns. Much of prejudiced white America thought this was fine, since armed poor inner-city ethnic minorities was the principle group blamed for America's problems. But rural working poor folks also had to pay more for their guns too.

NOV. 1981 BATF MACHINEGUN RULING:

Fear of war with the USSR and of economic collapse due to the inflation and poor economy of the past several years had created the “survivalist” movement that began in the late 70's. People began to fear a future they saw as uncertain and began to arm themselves with military style weapons at a pace some found alarming. The poorly conceived War On Drugs had been going on enough years by then to have raised the stakes considerably, so violence in the drug underworld was on the rise. They too used military style weapons. One of the weapons popular to both survivalists and the drug thugs was a style of handguns and short rifles based on sub-machineguns that operated from an “open-bolt” design. This design of operation was simple and

cheaper to produce than “closed-bolt” designs. But partly due to their simplicity, “open-bolt” designs were easily modifiable with simple tools to operate fully automatically as a machinegun. Some had been used in high profile underworld killings. So, just as the Tommygun had in the alcohol prohibition days, the MAC-10 (the most common of the “open-bolt” designs) brought about new regulations. But this time, an act of Congress was not needed. With powers granted to it by the GCA of 68', BATF made a regulatory declaration that it had determined that these “open-bolt” designs (although they had been previously approved by BATF for sale in the U.S.) were so “readily convertible” to machineguns that they would no longer be allowed to be manufactured. As when any supply suddenly becomes limited to only those which already exist, prices for the existing “open-bolt” guns in private hands went up considerably. A simple MAC-10 prior to Nov. of 1981 sold new for \$180. But by 1984, if you could find one for sale, they were usually \$500. Today, if you find one for under \$1200, you are doing quite well.

1986 MACHINEGUN BAN:

Since the GCA of 68', all guns imported to the U.S. had to meet the silly “sporting purpose” clause of the act. This included machineguns and sub-machineguns. But as long as one was willing to pay the \$200 tax and go through the onerous registering procedure, you were still able to buy machineguns made in the USA, or as some did, build your own from various surplus parts available. Prior to 86' it was possible to buy a cut up surplus British STEN sub-machinegun for \$20, pay the \$200 tax, and fabricate a newly reincarnated WW2 weapon used by the allies in Europe. Attached as a poison-pill rider to the Gun-Owner's Protection Act (GOPA) of 1986, which was actually meant to undo various gun-control schemes, it got passed anyway. The rider simply banned any further manufacture of machineguns for civilian sale, but left the existing supply legal to be bought and sold. Once again, prices began to climb. By 1989, that \$20 STEN was \$500, without the tax. By 1996, it was \$2500. Today, just try to find a transferable STEN for less than \$5000! In fact, federally registered machineguns have the best investor record of any and all commodities.

1989 ASSAULT WEAPON IMPORT BAN:

After the mentally disturbed racist Patrick Purdy used an imported Chinese semi-automatic AK-47 rifle to shoot up a kindergarten playground in Stockton, California that year, President George H.W. Bush by executive order banned further importation of assault weapons, leaving only those made in the USA available for new retail purchase. Suddenly, that same affordable Chinese AK-47, raised in value. Previously available for just \$269, overnight they were \$600 or more. Some of these same models today, because of their collector value (although other models of AK-47s are available) sell for \$900 or more. Some of the more exotic European arms, like the the Steyr AUG, which sold for the incredibly expensive sum of around \$850 prior to 1989, now sell for over \$3000.

THE 1994 ASSAULT WEAPON BAN:

With a fake Republican like Bush as President, gun-control proponents were gaining ground. While cheap imported assault weapons had been eliminated, some of those same banned models were now being assembled from parts here in the U.S. and sold as made in the USA. So thanks to the singular sell-out Republican Sen. Jon Kyl of Az., the 94'AWB passed. Drawing on the

Continues on Page 62

Continued from Page 61 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

silly “sporting purpose” language first fostered in the GCA of 68’, semi-automatic rifles could still be produced and sold, but they could have no more than one of any of a list of features said to be characteristic of assault weapons;...flash-suppressor, bayonet lug, pistol grip, detachable feed device capacity of more than 10 rounds, or muzzle-launching attachments. Again, “pre-ban” examples of these guns began to skyrocket. A U.S. made version of the Belgian FN/FAL battle rifle was sold by Springfield Armory prior to 1994 for about \$675. By 1995, they were \$1100 or more. Although the 94’ AWB had a “sunset” provision in it that automatically repealed the ban after 10 years, many individual states not friendly to gun ownership passed their own bans, and in some of these states, only assault weapons made prior to the 1989 or 1994 federal bans are legal to be sold or traded. As a result, the prices for these “pre-ban” examples are still high, because they are all that some people can legally buy.

So from these examples in recent history, we see a regular and repeating pattern. The supply is restricted, but the demand remains (or even increases), and so the prices go up.

Have prices ever come down? Yes, on occasion, but not nearly as often as they have gone up. Two examples come to mind – **1988 “Dole Amendment”**: Many sportsmen had long been exasperated by the provision of the GCA of 68’ which banned surplus war rifles from importation and had been pushing for years to at least let some of these now (by modern standards) low-tech arms to be imported again. In 1988, Sen. Bob Dole attached a rider to a bill favored to pass through Congress which did exactly that, and surplus bolt-action rifles from countries around the world began coming into the country again. Some of these rifles that could no longer be had after the GCA of 68’ had appreciated quite nicely were now depreciating as their brethren could once again be had for as little as \$50. - **Expiration of the 94’AWB**: When the 94’AWB expired in November of 2004 and domestically manufactured assault weapons were once again available new for retail, the market for “pre-ban” arms reduced somewhat. But since in some states they were still all that could be sold, they did not depreciate fully, and instead simply became items of interest to a wholly separate market, while folks in western states (primarily) bought new rifles at newly reasonable prices.

So while it is possible that money you spend on a firearm today may at a future date become diminished in value, the likelihood is that in the future many gun folks dread is on the near horizon, that money spent on guns will instead retain value at the very least, and very probably increase. In fact, having learned from mistakes they made in the text of the previous bans that still allowed a limited amount of loopholes through which a few assault rifles were still able to be made and sold, the gun-haters fully intend to make the next versions more restrictive and more onerous than before. And permanent, they have willingly admitted. Some consider it likely that assault weapons will be made a new class of weapons included in the National Firearms Act (NFA) registry, just like machineguns and cannons, along with the \$200 transfer tax whenever they are sold to new owners. Likely they too would receive a permanent cap on their production, with only those already in existence to ever be allowed. Which of course would only be a temporary bargain until it is later decided to ban and confiscate everything.

As a result of the certainty many feel about what is going to be coming in the way of legislation from the Obama Administration, prices have begun to go up and some items are scarce already, before the man has even taken office. It will only get worse. Those of us in the gun community who have lived through these other examples of price fluctuations and increases I have mentioned are ourselves in full panic-buying mode, spending even money we don’t have to acquire every last bit that we can before they are “grandfathered” and no more allowed to be made. Paranoia, you say? Perhaps. But a foreign-born black man is President and the Cardinals are in the Super Bowl, so Hell has definitely frozen over. Dinosaurs could be roaming the earth tomorrow. Anything is possible.

PART 2: WHAT GUNS SHOULD I BUY? ASSESSING YOUR NEEDS/RISKS/THREATS (To know what to buy, know why to buy)

Should you buy an AK47,...or a shotgun,...or a Glock pistol? Heck, maybe a silencer? Well, they are all available, and all it takes is money. But are any of these suitable for you?

You are reading this article because you already know that there is an uncertain future out there which troubles you and which causes you to ponder whether getting into guns is finally a move you want to make. There are really only 3 categories of reasoning to buy guns, some with sub-categories:

- 1.) **Pleasure/sport/recreation/hunting**
- 2.) **Investment and monetary gain**
- 3.) **Self-defense**; sub-categories of self-defense include A.) Defense from crime/assault, B.) Defense against government (domestic or foreign), C.) Societal and economic collapse, which although related closely to both A and B, is uniquely separate.

Category 3 is likely what concerns you, and it is the focus of this article.

DEFENSE AGAINST CRIME

Criminal assault happens everywhere, but where is it likely to happen to you? Wherever it happens, you cannot resist it with a gun unless you have a gun handy at that moment. If you don’t go out much and are always home, you might not need an easily portable gun. But sooner or later, everyone leaves and has to go somewhere, and sometimes those places are not safe. This is why handguns are so popular;...because they are so easy to always have at hand. They are also concealable, which can be important for many reasons. For portability and ease of travel, nothing beats a handgun. For going about your business discretely, without scaring others needlessly about your possessing a weapon, again, nothing beats a handgun. The first rule of a gun fight is “have a gun”, for which handguns make it easy to observe the rule.

But as I mentioned in the first article of this series last week, handguns are notoriously poor fight-stoppers. They certainly are capable of lethal results,...just not always immediately enough. There can be times when a more lethal gun is desired; something more immediately final; something bigger. Typically, the more preferred guns for combat are rifles and shotguns. Shotguns for close range only, rifles for all distances.

Continues on Page 63

Continued from Page 62 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

Since they are not able to be carried down the street in today's society without creating a lot of fuss, these are often kept in the home.

Shotguns have been erroneously touted as the ultimate home defense gun because supposedly any fool can effectively use one. You don't even have to aim, the myth goes, because since they throw a handful of projectiles in a pattern, all you have to do is point and pull the trigger. Well,...that's almost true. But you CAN miss with a shotgun. Where shotguns are uniquely better suited to home defense, however, is in the choice of shells they can fire. This is because the interior walls in your house, unless you live in an entirely adobe home, are not much resistance for a bullet in flight. Even mere handgun bullets can easily penetrate completely through your home's interior walls and possibly to the outside. Drywall and fiberglass insulation matting are no contest for a hunk of lead traveling at 1200 feet per second (or faster). If you are ever forced to shoot at someone in your home, any bullet which misses your attacker could perforate into another room and kill someone you love my mistake. But some shotgun rounds meant for hunting birds throw, instead of 9 or 12 large pellets, about 200 little BBs (often called "birdshot"). At distances the length of an average home's hallway, these rounds are still devastating on a person. Yet, because of their reduced mass individually, this payload of shot will not blast through nearly as much wall material as regular bullets. They also will not exit the person being shot, as regular bullets often can.



The two weapon types just described are the traditional guns relied upon for defense of home and self from the more common criminal assaults. Police have been armed primarily with these for decades and decades. But assault rifles have their place too. In rural areas, especially in the southwestern border states, criminal assaults involving more than a single attacker have become more common than in years past. Although home invasion robberies are primarily an urban phenomenon (also on the rise), they occur in remote places as well, where there is no help for miles around and perhaps an hour away. Many home invasion raiders are increasingly not only dressing like police, but wearing body armor as well. Handguns and shotguns do not do much against body armor, but rifles usually do. While domestic upheaval in the form of economic or political turmoil would certainly be experienced to greatest measure in urban areas, rural communities would not be immune. Which brings us to our next section;....

SOCIETY COLLAPSES

We have been very fortunate to live in a very stable society and economic system,...so far. And hopefully, the future will not be one of wondering where our next meal will come from or who will next week be fighting over our neighborhood as their turf. But human history has shown

over and over and over again that even in the most advanced societies of their time, upheaval has come not only to every style of government ever known, but usually happens with amazing quickness once certain events gain a momentum. Untold millions of people have deluded themselves into thinking bad times were not coming, while unstoppable forces bore down upon them to change their lives forever. These events can be economic, political and especially natural (such as earthquakes, hurricanes and volcanoes). But the common thread between them all is that once polite society is unable to function and satisfy people's needs in peaceful ways,...many people become predatory, and take what they need or don't have enough of. Suddenly, "might makes right" to those who are starving, need medicine, a means of escape or just a place to sleep. Some simply believe, even in their daily lives now, "do unto others before they do unto you".

Our nation is the closest to economic collapse right now than it has ever been. Understand that when I say "collapse", I am referring to something much worse and entirely different than "The Great Depression". Back then, much of America still possessed some degree of self-reliance. Food was grown more locally. Most of our everyday products were still made here. Much of America still got by without electricity, running water or a telephone. The infrastructure then was enhanced by modern conveniences, but not built upon and depending upon them. Our infrastructure today that supports our daily lives is one which, if it were to temporarily stop running for some reason, is not capable of just firing back up the next day. Imagine if the dollar was worthless tomorrow. Who would sell anything to anyone trying to buy with it? Would cattle companies ship cattle for greenbacks they couldn't spend? Would farmers sell grain if what they got for it couldn't buy fuel for their tractors? Would workers in all industries and occupations continue to show up for work when they could not be paid? The whole machine could come to a horrible halt. And then soon, in a few days, the chaos would start. People would need food, medicine, fuel, all the basic things,...and soon they would begin to take them. While some sort of transitioning to a more stable system that could deliver basic goods and services would undoubtedly occur, it simply can't be known how long such would take.



A recent example of this behavior was observed in New Orleans in 2005 after Hurricane Katrina. We've all seen what happened, so it doesn't need re-hashing here. But suffice to say that the neighborhoods where the residents banded together and were heavily armed sustained little or

Continues on Page 64

Continued from Page 63 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

no loss of their meager supplies of necessities, and neither did they suffer any violence, with the exception of a little bit of random ineffective gunfire thrown their direction by frustrated looters. And good thing they banded together too, because they weren't the only ones who joined forces. So did the bad guys. We'll never know if or how many individual armed survivors in New Orleans were overwhelmed by the roving bands of armed criminals that were going up and down many streets taking what they pleased. Because no one has survived to tell their tale (if such a thing happened). But there are at least a few stories out of that disaster of individuals who were left alone by people they knew were sizing them up as they evacuated or stayed, by themselves, and were left alone because they openly displayed and made known that they had an assault rifle.

While a handgun or shotgun may do okay when shooting is only occurring the distances found in your home or driveway, things get very different out in the larger world. If defending your block against looters for instance, someone might be shooting at you from far down the street and you need to shoot back. Only a rifle could effectively counter such a threat. Perhaps, instead of staying and hunkering down for the duration of some calamity, you decide you must flee. Perhaps roads are impassable and you must walk out of the area. You would be out in the open for anyone to attack if they were of a mind to do so. Walking out might takes days. The limited shelter you take at night might not be very defensible. Maximum firepower, capable of warding off multiple attackers would be essential. In urban terrain, even at close distances, attackers could be able to hide behind cars, walls and other objects. While in the home over-penetration is often a bad thing, in open-distance engagements, being able to perforate cars, walls and fence posts is often a good thing. And speaking of fleeing on foot, when Hurricane Katrina blew through New Orleans, the bridge that spans the Mississippi River from New Orleans to Gretna was one of the few ways out, until police from Gretna used force to stop pedestrians from crossing it. You read that correctly. The Gretna local police stopped residents of New Orleans escaping over the bridge. Those that made it across were rounded up at gun-point. (See picture.)



WAR

This is a threat most people think they understand. But likely you do not. Even if you have spent time as a soldier, your experience was that as part of a gigantic team with support of all kinds and heavy firepower to back you up. But for citizens, whether facing a foreign enemy or a domestic one, the situation is uniquely different. Whether facing a foreign government or your own, the firearm is likely going to be rarely employed. The reason is that there will always be more of the enemy than your side has, and they will always have bigger and more terrible weapons than you. Going up against them face-to-face will be avoided at all costs. As an **offensive** weapon, the gun will only serve on occasion. Mostly assassinations and small raids.

(Explosives and explosive weapons would be the main tool.) But it is as a **defensive** weapon that firearms will be incredibly important. Any war waged against partisans or a rebellious population, even with today's technology, still requires soldiers to seize locations and seek out the people participating against them. There is no substitute for "boots on the ground" as they say, and sooner or later individual soldiers and citizens face off against each other. The absolute minimum fighting tool the soldier you may face will have is likely an assault rifle. So at the minimum, you should have one too. Even if your only objective in such a situation is to escape, maximum firepower is your friend.

As a partisan (whether against a foreign government or your own), the American civilian combatant cannot expect any supply of ammunition beyond that which they have on hand whenever the excrement first hits the fan. Not only is it a good idea to have a stockpiled supply of ammo for you and your friends and family (that may have to last a **very** long time), but thinking ahead, it might well be prudent to chose guns that use ammunition that might likely be captured and usable in the course of such an unfortunate time. Today, the only foreign troops ever likely to be engaged against Americans on their own soil in the foreseeable future would be as part of a multi-national peacekeeping effort in the wake of social or political upheaval. Those troops would likely come from primarily NATO and western countries. Almost all of those armies field guns in a very few calibers standardized upon by NATO decades ago. So while the Russian-designed AK-47 is a cheap and affordable gun that is effective and proven, it might be hard to feed in such times. And if the future enemy is ever our own government, weapons chambered for the same ammo – and even the same weapons – would be ideally suited to the time at hand. So what are these calibers, and which should you choose?



5.56mm NATO (AKA .223 in civilian form, far right in picture): This is the caliber the U.S. military currently uses as the primary caliber for individual assault rifles carried by soldiers. It is also the primary caliber of most western countries including not only NATO member states, but others as well. However, its predecessor as the main cartridge for "battle rifles" and many crew-served machineguns is;...

7.62mm NATO (AKA .308 in civilian form, far left in picture): This caliber is a heavier and more powerful one than 5.56mm and was the standard caliber for most NATO countries up until the mid 80's. However, even in those armies, it is still fielded by some units, such as the U.S. Navy SEALs, and is also the caliber still used in

Continues on Page 65

Continued from Page 64 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

NATO belt-fed machineguns. Yet in others it is still the main caliber. Mexico, Greece and Norway are such an examples.

7.62x39 (Cartridge on middle left in picture): Not to be confused with the 7.62mm NATO round, this is the caliber for which the famous AK-47 was first designed and which it was produced in greatest numbers for decades. This caliber is fielded by armies and police forces throughout the world, and can be encountered on every continent. But in 1974, the Russians designed a new cartridge;...

5.45x39 (Cartridge in middle right of picture): Similar in performance, and its design inspired by the 5.56mm NATO, the Russians renamed the Kalashnikov rifles that were made in this new caliber. The AK-47 had been first produced in 1947. This new variant, redesigned in 1974, was thus named the AK-74. Although not yet having been produced in the same numbers as its predecessor (which were handed out as party favors to revolutionaries everywhere for decades, and still are), the 5.45 caliber AK rifles are the types currently fielded by most eastern European countries, such as Russia, Romania, Bulgaria, and is found in police forces from Africa to India to El Salvador.

Those are the main 4 military calibers available to American shooters. There are others that are not as common, such as the 6.8 SPC, 6.5 Grendel and the Chinese 5.8mm. But while these others might have been designed to be more effective (and are), there is insufficient surplus of them on the market to say that any supply of such calibers might be had in a future calamity. If you are able to salt away thousands upon thousands of rounds of these odd ducks, then feel free. But otherwise, stick to the widely adopted and proven calibers.

Along that same line of thinking, consider whom else you might be allied with in a future where war is waging here at home. There may well be many others like yourself who are seeking to fight or defend. But perhaps they have no supply of ammo. Perhaps their supply ran out, or maybe it was seized. Ideally, you should have ammo that (if you choose to) you can share with friends and/or family.



(And in sufficient quantity to do so.) If you secured a big stockpile of the latest custom caliber before the unseen troubles began, that's all well and good for you. But what of others?

In Part 3 of this series, we shall cover that series of weapons currently most threatened by federal gun-grabbers;...the Evil Black Rifle (EBR) known as the "assault weapon".

PART 3: A BRIEF SUMMATION OF A LARGE SUBJECT - ASSAULT RIFLES & BATTLE RIFLES (The endangered species)

So you have heard about how "Assault Weapons" are now soon to be controlled, banned, licensed, regulated or otherwise made more difficult to acquire or own – whichever the new Obamunist Congress is able to achieve. Should you get one?

Or two?

First, understand that as much as the gun-haters would like to merely ban guns or certain kinds of guns, the law stands in their way. Not for long, if they can help it,...as they certainly seek to modify the law to allow them to ban guns. But they haven't even been able to banish machineguns from civilian ownership – only regulated them oppressively – because the 2nd Amendment still has some recognized power. So bear in mind that the federal scheme of machinegun control is the current zenith example of the kind of federal gun control that can be currently gotten away with. That means if you buy an AK-47 today, and tomorrow Congress ads it as a specially recognized firearm under the same rules they use to regulate machineguns,...then as described in Part 1 of this series, the supply has been capped, prices for existing supplies begin to climb, and you have 2 things: 1.) a useful weapon of great utility, and 2.) an investment that has out-performed the stock market even in the best of times and especially in bad times.

But monetary value aside, should you get one? Which should you buy? Let us look to understand from a performance point of view what assault rifles do (and don't do) as compared to other guns. In this way, I hope you may come to understand what utility in some undesirable future event or era an "assault weapon" might have for the unique individual that is you, and your circumstances.

Developmental History

Entire libraries have been written about what I hope to sum here in a few pages. The study of arms can be quite complicated and involve a lot of reading. While this article might seem long, I endeavor here be brief and leave out a lot of extra stuff that might cloud the issue for those new to military guns.

Wars are of course the laboratories in which the science and art of battle is refined and advanced. In WW1, the first widespread use of machineguns (the heavy, entrenched and firmly mounted kind) exhibited the effect of voluminous "suppressive fire"; the practice of not necessarily taking careful aim with intent to kill, but simply massing such a withering fusillade of incoming bullets upon the opponent that they seek protection and are not focused on countering with return fire. Even better,...perhaps they flee. Certainly some are wounded. But on the occasions when such an affect was had upon the enemy, the rather immobile nature of these new high-volume guns made it difficult to capitalize on

Continues on Page 66

Continued from Page 65 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

the gain. By the time a heavy crew-served belt-fed machinegun was dismounted, loaded for transport by cart, mule or men, a new defensive hole dug in which to emplace it and the crew, mounted, reloaded and made ready,...well by that time the opposing force had collected their composure, perhaps even returned to their previously abandoned positions. Perhaps even before you and your machinegun crew were safely in your new advanced position. That could not only be disastrous, but was at the very least a frustrating tactical problem.



As in most wars, those who best learn the lessons taught by it are usually those who suffered defeat. And thusly Germany re-evaluat-

ed everything about land warfare. Toward the end of WW1, more mobile and portable belt-fed machineguns had begun to be fielded, with great effect on the battle. In the 30's, German arms engineers fielded a generational evolution of the lighter and faster belt-fed weapon, called the MG-34 (maschinen gewer or machinegun of 1934), and later, its wartime refinement, the MG-42. (As testament to German engineering, nearly unmodified variants of the MG-42 are still currently issued in most European armies today, over 60 years later.)



It was decided that the greatest limitation to reducing the suppressive fire weapon to a portable size was the feed by means of a continuous belt. The BAR merely used box magazines (feed devices in which rounds were inserted and held under spring pressure) of 20 rounds each, which could be rapidly changed out when empty. This reduced the weight to where it could be fielded by a single soldier. So while they were more mobile, the trade-off was that they could not pour out the same volume of fire. When it finally did see action against the Germans in WW2, the Germans appreciated how it could be effectively more rapidly mobile than even their beloved belt-feds, which still required at least one gunner's assistant to haul all the ammo. Yet, more was to come. At the same time the Germans were adopting the MG-34, the U.S. Army was adopting the first widely issued self-loading repeating rifle, the M-1 Garand, which historians regard as a landmark development in the history of warfare.

Until that time, the great majority of infantry rifles held only 5 rounds internally and required manual manipulation of the mechanism to ready another round to fire. To do this, the shooter often lost sight of his target as he fumbled to eject the spent case and load a new one, and while this could take but only a second, every second counts when the enemy is coming over the barricades at you with fixed bayonets. The new M-1 rifle, however, held 8 rounds (an increase of 60%) and could put those rounds downrange as fast as you could pull the trigger. And typical of American military doctrine of the day, it was an accurate rifle too. When the Germans began to face this rifle in battle, they came away very impressed. Perhaps they needed something like this?



Another U.S. rifle (a smaller one) impressed the Germans too. This one was called the M-1 Carbine. Not to be confused, it was a totally separate design from the Garand. It used an odd little cartridge that was not quite the short-range type found in pistols and sub-machineguns, nor was it the powerful long-reaching sizzlers fired in most rifles. Instead it was neither, and can be called the first ever "intermediate cartridge".



It held 15 rounds in a detachable box magazine, although later in the war a 30 round magazine (or "mag") was devised. Decidedly lighter and easier to lug around while pursuing the enemy (or running for your life), the U.S. actually manufactured and fielded slightly more of the M-1 Carbine than they did their "main service rifle", the M-1 Garand. While initial versions only fired one round for every pull of the trigger, they did however have slightly more effective range

Continues on Page 67

Germany (as had the rest of the world, actually) had also become infatuated with the sub-machinegun. Although less powerful and with less ammunition capacity than the heavier belt-fed weapons, these were able to be fired and fielded by a single soldier. At the short ranges involved in overrunning or "assaulting" an enemy position, they were very handy and a force multiplier, not only in their actual depositing of rounds toward the enemy, but the panic and destructive effect on morale of the enemy. These two new refinements of the soldiers' weapons defined major reorganization of the order of battle for how Germany was to fight later wars.



America too, had re-evaluated its weaponry after the war, and decided some new advanced infantry firearms were needed. In the role of a portable suppressive fire weapon, the U.S. Army adopted at the end of WW1 (though not in time to see action in the field) the Browning Automatic Rifle (or BAR).

Continued from Page 66 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

than the sub-machineguns (SMGs) that were commonly encountered in German hands. Once the select-fire version of the Carbine (called the M-2) began reaching soldiers, along with the new 30 round magazines, the German soldier with his SMG was usually at a disadvantage .

And so it was that the Germans developed a hybrid between the type of weapon seen in the M-1/M-2 Carbine, the traditional rifle, the machinegun and the sub-machinegun. It was the first ever true “assault rifle”, and was known as both the Stg-44 (sturmgewer or storm rifle of 1944) or the MP-44 (maschinen pistol of 1944). Lack of materials and need for speedy and cheap manufacture dictated that it be made primarily of sheet metal pressings wherever possible that were welded or riveted together, giving it a rather crude and utilitarian look. It used 30 round detachable mags, was select-fire, featured a pistol grip like those usually found on SMGs, was lighter than something like the BAR, yet held more rounds and could still provide effective fire out to common distances at which modern mobile combat more usually occurred. And it fired a new type of “intermediate cartridge”. This cartridge was effective out to 300 meters, (previously, rifles were effective out to 600 meters and beyond, while sub-machineguns were effective only out to about 100 meters), but weighed less and kicked less than full power rifle ammo. A soldier could carry more ammo with him, and was not as fatigued from firing or carrying his rifle. In a pinch, it could fill the role of nearly all these different types of weapons from which it drew inspiration,...although it could do none of them particularly well. Jack of all trades, master of none.



After WW2, everyone, including America and the allies, were eager to finally get their hands on German engineering data and the engineers themselves in order to study and learn what they could about how they were able to design such “wonder weapons”. As well, tactics used in the war were evaluated in the aftermath and were the grist for the idea mills of military academies and war colleges. A consensus began to emerge that had the Germans come up with and fielded the Stg-44 earlier in the war, they would have been more effective in battle, and allied casualties would have been terribly worse. Beginning in the 50’s, armies around the world began programs to develop their own new rifles based on lessons learned from the Stg-44.

But in peacetime, armies proceed more bureaucratically, and there was great bias against abandoning the longer effective range capability of the more traditional full power rifle cartridges. So most new rifles of the post-war age were not true assault rifles, but another hybrid currently known as “battle rifles”. A good example of this is the U.S. M-14, adopted in 1957, which was essentially the same reliable and proven (and dearly loved by many GIs) M-1 Garand from WW2, but modified to now take detachable mags of 20 rounds and a flash suppressor added to the muzzle.

Although it had a new shorter cartridge, it was a near duplicate in power and performance of that previously used in the Garand. Under new laws proposed by gun-haters, the M-14 is simply lumped in with all other “assault rifles” because it has a high ammo capacity and the muzzle-flash is reduced somewhat by the flash-suppressor. Yet the previous design, the M-1 Garand, is not classified as one of these deadly and lethal weapons that threaten society. This is why many people who can’t own a semi-auto version of the M-14 in their state because it is an “assault weapon” under their laws, acquire an M-1 Garand instead.

However, the Russians were at that time taking a different approach, and copying the principles exhibited in the Stg-44 rather faithfully. A young tank commander wounded during the war named Michail Kalashnikov, while he was laid up in hospital in 1943 recovering, began sketching mechanical ideas for gun designs to pass the time. He came up with the base idea for a weapon, which when later refined by observations of battle similar to what the Germans had experienced, developed independently of the Stg-44 a weapon which shared most of its same salient features, even chambered for a very similar cartridge. This became the world famous Avtomat Kalashnivoka of 1947,...AK-47. Also considered one of the key landmark developments in weaponry, the AK-47 would soon meet the M-14 in battle in Vietnam.



Early in America’s military involvement with Vietnam, Marines and Army soldiers armed with M-14s came into combat with opponents armed with the AK-47. Originally designed for engaging and anticipated to be used against Russian soldiers on the European plains and steppes of the Slavic countries, where its fine accuracy and long range would have been an asset, the M-14 operated reliably in the jungles of Vietnam, but was not ideal. Its length made it sometimes difficult to weave through vegetation and it was needlessly powerful for the close ranges combat usually occurred in that environment. By comparison, the AK-47 was much shorter and easier to wield, its cartridge did not cause it to kick so badly when fired, yet was adequately powerful for nearly all distances it was employed. It had a 30 round reservoir in the magazine, while the M-14 had 20, and the ammo itself weighed less, so a soldier could take more into battle for the same weight as his opponent. And most uniquely at that time,...the AK-47 was purposely made to lesser tolerances of fit than most other weapons of the day. In the particular way this was done, the effect was that while the AK-47 was not capable of the same accuracy as the M-14 or other rifles, grit, dirt and other debris from



Continues on Page 68

Continued from Page 67 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

the jungle or other environs was not as likely to cause the mechanism to jam as in nearly all other designs. As a result, the AK-47 required little maintenance, and could withstand more abuse. This was very important to the peasant army of the VietCong, many of whom were illiterate farmers and country folk without a great deal of logistical support. It was also cheap to make compared to the craftsmanship and machining processes that went into making an M-14. For the cost of a single M-14, the Russians and Chinese could supply four AK-47s to the VietCong.

Even before the early lessons learned in Vietnam began to drive the points home, U.S. military arms engineers began to understand some of the M-14's limitations. They began to appreciate that a new weapon could be designed to fire an intermediate cartridge that was still effective out to distances at which combat usually did not exceed, yet reduced the soldier's load and increased the logistical supply train's ability to supply in greater numbers. The new rifle could be made of newer modern materials and be significantly lighter. It could be select-fire, and effective as a close-range suppressive-fire weapon. But U.S. military doctrine, as it always had, emphasized and stressed marksmanship, so accuracy must not be sacrificed. The resulting weapon, initially introduced by the Air Force in 1962, was the M-16. Making extensive use of alloys instead of steel and plastics instead of wood, it has been both loved and hated and remains controversial. This weapon has gone through many PIPs (product-improvement-programs) to fix deficiencies that later became apparent, but still serves with us today in the U.S. Current versions are called the M-16A2 (full-size) and the M-4 Carbine (shorter version). In the commercial civilian market domestically, it is called the AR-15 (full-size) or CAR-15 (compact model). Some companies market their CAR-15 copy as the M-4 to associate it with the current military version of the same name, which many have nick-named "M-forgeries".



The Art Of The Assault Rifle

Other developments have occurred with military rifles in the 80's, 90's and today. Bullpups (incredibly short rifles with the mechanisms set far to the rear) have become more common and reduced the size of rifles even more. They currently serve with Britain, France, Australia, China and other armies. They are using more plastic and less steel as science progresses and materials improve. Western countries have tended to place emphasis on ergonomics and a rifle that will handle easily, while former communist countries have kept reliability as their pinnacle goal, and often sacrificed ergonomics to achieve it. Also, ammunition development has progressed. All this has come together to make the market from which to select an "assault rifle" for your tastes a very rich one indeed.

As an individual American, if you ever are forced to employ your rifle in actual defense of yourself, community or loved ones,...unlike a soldier, you will likely not have back-up. Perhaps you may at most have friends or family engaged

in a common effort with you. Such as many New Orleansians who banded together against looters and thugs after Hurricane Katrina, perhaps. Or such as the Korean shopkeepers who used their guns to repel similar predators during the L.A. riots of 1992. But there will not be any helicopter responding to your radio call to pull you out of the jungle. (And even if they did, as residents of New Orleans found out the hard way, armed people were **NOT** taken aboard!) If you live along the southwestern U.S. border region, you know encounters with people involved with the drug supply importation efforts into the U.S. are becoming more frequent. Some of these encounters involve multiple gunmen, with some of them carrying "assault weapons" themselves. Just as on the frontier of the Old West, the six-gun was the great equalizer,...in today's world, it is the assault rifle.

The common choices

There are 3 main choices for the consumer in assault rifles on the American market. They are chambered (primarily) in 3 calibers pictured here. (From left to right; 7.62x39, 5.45x39 and 5.56NATO – aka .223)



They are, in order of their successful adoption by civilian shooters:



AK-47

The single most successful assault rifle in the world, as measured by production numbers, is clearly the AK-47. Over 50 million (some say 60 million) have been produced. This is due to 3 main reasons: 1.) they cost less to produce (and buy) than almost any other weapon of its type, 2.) is so simple, children can use them (and do), and 3.) with even a modicum of preventative maintenance they always go bang in the most severe of conditions. That just cannot always be said about other designs. Before the election panic that sent prices up, you could walk into a gun store and buy a civilian version of the AK-47 for \$400-450, plus tax. Compare that to the civilian version of the M-14, which was selling for about \$1200 or more. However, in the current panic, if you find an AK variant for \$650, you

Continues on Page 69

Continued from Page 68 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

are doing quite well. Ammunition magazines used to be \$10 just a few month ago, but now are \$25, if you can find them. While some will (rightly) criticize the AK47 for not being capable of fine accuracy, or being less than optimum to manipulate deftly, you just can't go wrong in owning a Kalashnikov. Even those who prefer the better and more expensive assault rifles and battle rifles usually own at least one AK-47, if for no other reason than as a back-up or secondary rifle. Perhaps as one to supply to a relative or compatriot in times of crisis. Even if you don't believe an AK-47 would be the optimum choice for you, consider it anyway, due to their cheap expense in comparison to other choices. The Vietnam-era AK-47 fires the original 7.62x39 caliber, while the later variant, the AK-74, fires the smaller and faster 5.45x39.



AR-15/M-16 Series

Known rather widely as "America's Assault Rifle", the AR-15 (civilian version of the M-16) has been nearly or equally as popular a seller in America as the AK-47. Partly this is due to the fact that it has been available here since the early 70's, while the AK only became available in the early 80's, and not affordable until about 1985. Originally designed by Armalite division of the aircraft manufacturing firm Fairchild, the AR-15 (which originally stood for Armalite Rifle #15) is constructed in a very modular fashion, in no small part due to the experience of its designers and fabricators in the aircraft industry. Thusly, unlike most other rifles, the base M-16/AR-15 series of rifles can have various styles and versions of parts pulled and replaced rather easily without the need of a depot-level specially trained armorer or gunsmith. If you have a full-length AR-15, but wish to have a shorter one, simply pull 2 pins that secure the upper section to the lower section (these are called receivers), replace with one of a shorter dimension, and suddenly you have a different version of the rifle. Likewise, with just a few specialty tools, the rear stock can be changed to a multi-position collapsible model, the barrel can be dismounted from the upper receiver and different ones installed. All manner of grips, scopes, handguards and other options have been designed over the years,...to the point where very few AR-15s in civilian hands look exactly the same, even though they are essentially all the same base gun.

Additionally, although the intermediate 5.56 NATO cartridge (also known as the .223 commercially) is not a very abusive round to shoot and has mild and controllable "kick", more than any other assault rifle design, the AR-15 tames what little recoil there is. Ladies and men of small stature prefer the design for this reason. Even kids can manage it without much fuss. Partly this is due to the recoil buffer assembly in the rear stock, but is also due to the how the barrel is inline with the shoulder rather than above it like in many other rifles.



But the lower receiver, which bears the mandated serial number and is considered by federal law the actual firearm in and of itself, is the real attraction for owners since the early 90's. That is because it is cheaper to acquire only the lower receiver up front. Federal excise tax on firearms is 15%. Instead of paying 15% of a \$800 or \$1000 purchase on top of everything else, buying an AR-15 receiver for (in 1993 dollars) only \$70 was also a great reduction in tax paid out. Later, buyers would order the remaining parts necessary to assemble a working rifle, which are themselves unregulated. If you buy just the lower receiver, you also still have the "gun" as far as law is concerned. Many people in the throws of the uncertain years for gun-owners that were the 90's invested first in several lower receivers, reducing the necessary initial investment and allowing them to have more "guns" in hand should they be "grandfathered" as the last of their kind allowed to be sold. Later they were completed into functioning guns.

In fact, as the 1994 Assault Weapon Ban was structured, if a version of a weapon no longer approved for new manufacture and sale was to merely have the offending characteristics of an "assault weapon" eliminated to but a single one, such a weapon was then legal to sell. Inventive and creative people devised versions of the AR-15 series that did just that. But the lower receiver of these new models that were legal to sell were absolutely unchanged. Thus it was still possible (though illegal) to buy a "sporter" AR-15 receiver, assemble the evil "pre-ban" parts kit on it and have your new assault rifle, despite the intent of the law to eliminate the supply. For those who feared that this was perhaps the only truly useful war weapons would ever again be available to them at prices they could afford, this was a godsend. Today, people who have been paying attention to this issue know the gun-haters were very upset and frustrated that this loophole existed and that they were unable to fix it. (Some states, like Commiefornia, were more thorough and were able to ban all such variants.) Such people also know that if/when the next assault weapon ban comes, our enemies will not make the same mistake. Accordingly, people are buying AR-15 lower receivers like mad, and they have gone up in price and are difficult to find. Even so, they are still much cheaper than investing in a complete and functioning AK-47. Prior to the election, lower receivers went for about \$115-140 depending on the make and other factors. They soon skyrocketed to \$250, and that price is likely no longer to be had, with some of the higher end ones commanding over \$300 even before the inauguration. But many kits to complete an AR-15 rifle (if you have the lower receiver) remain at normal prices. Costs can vary widely depending on the accessories and accoutrements that you might choose as part of your package, but \$650 is about the going rate for a standard kit in the standard caliber from a reputable supplier. So you can still complete a rifle for under \$1000,...for now. Another neat feature of AR-15 lower receivers is that other manufacturers have devised entirely new designs of different weapons that use the AR-15 receiver as their base. Consequently, one can order these other weapon sub-assemblies direct to their door without regulation because without the lower receiver, such assemblies are not considered actual guns. One such series of weapons we'll cover in another article is .50 caliber rifles.



Continues on Page 70

Continued from Page 69 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

Ruger Mini-14

One of the unique rifles that has escaped a lot of the assault rifle legislation of the 90's and might still do so yet is the Ruger Mini-14. Essentially a scaled-down version of the military M-14, Ruger has always sold it in a more traditional "sporter" form, without the offending characteristics that make up the list of items federal law has so far said define what an assault rifle is. It has the capability of accepting high-capacity magazines, but is sold with a 5-round hunting or sporter mag, has a regular wooden stock of conventional design, no pistol grip, no flash-suppressor or facility for mounting a bayonet. Yet, beginning in the late 70's when it was introduced and before the AK-47 was available in this country, various suppliers developed accessories to convert the Mini-14 into an assault rifle configuration. The Mini-14 was the most affordable such rifle at the time, selling for about 3/5 of what an AR-15 cost. It fired the same .223 (aka 5.56NATO) ammo as the AR-15. When the 94 AWB came, the Mini-14 was not on the list, nor did it make the list in California or the other states that passed even further reaching versions. Depending on how the next legislation is crafted, it might similarly survive untouched. An interesting option with the Mini-14 is that some were and are made in stainless steel, which is unusual and has not been done with any other combat rifle of that type. Used rifles are still around for as little as \$400, while new models in stainless steel go for about \$650 at retail. A variant that fires the Russian 7.62x39 caliber is also made, known as the Mini-30, but is not as popular.



Steyr AUG

I consider this rifle to be an exotic choice for the American shooter for a number of reasons, so I thought of excluding it from this text, yet it is unique in that it represents one of the few examples of the "bullpup" style of assault rifle that is even available. There are 2 different types of this design for sale in the U.S. and they are not all genuine Steyr products. A recently developed copy produced in this country to satisfy the demand for the no longer imported Steyr is called the STG-556, produced by Microtech Small Arms Research (MSAR). Aside from being so short, the AUG and its copies also sport an optical sight instead of the common "iron sights" most other rifles use as standard. Bullpups are known for having poor triggers, and trigger pull can affect accuracy. Still, its compactness solves issues such as entering and exiting vehicles and clearing homes, buildings and other confined spaces, and makes up for other features that may not be as well executed as in other guns. Being of NATO country origin, it fires the same 5.56 NATO round as the M-16/AR-15 series and the Mini-14. Expect to pay at least \$2000 for one of the U.S. produced copies and over \$3000 for a genuine Steyr imported from Austria. Due to it not being as common, yet highly prized by those who own them, prices on these may go incredibly high. Yet, due to that scarcity, over the coming decades, spare parts and accessories and

magazines for it may become harder to find than for other rifles, ultimately adding to the cost.

There have been many other assault rifles over the years, both imported and domestically produced. The Belgian FNC, the Korean Daewoo K-1, the original Bushmaster and the Bushmaster M-17 bullpup, the HAC-7, the HK-93, the Leader Dynamics AR-5, the SIG AMT, the FN P-90, the Beretta AR-70, the FN 2000, the SIG 556, the SIG Stg82 to name a few. All of them are good weapons, and all might be excellent investments from a monetary point of view. But from a utilitarian end-user point of view, due to the fact that they never dominated in the American market, they are potential liabilities as weapons to rely on in an uncertain future because magazines, spare parts and even simple service and user manuals could become difficult to obtain. For a few of them like the HAC-7 and Leader Dynamics AR-5, that is already the case.

Battle Rifles – (the assault rifle's big brother)

All the rifles in this category fire the more powerful 7.62NATO round, also known as the .308 in commercial form. It is the big one in the picture below.



There are 4 primary candidates for consideration in the battle rifle category. We shall go in order of those most widely used throughout the world.



FAL

Just as the AK-47 is the most successful assault rifle in history, the most successful big assault rifle or "battle rifle" has been the Belgian FAL

Continues on Page 71

Continued from Page 70 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

(fusile automatique legionnaire or automatic soldier rifle) from Fabrique Nationale. Though more AK-47s were produced and was provided to revolutionaries everywhere, the FAL was adopted by more nations around the world than any other modern weapon, and due to its extensive use by NATO member nations has earned the nick-name "the free world's right arm". Adopters at one time or another included Belgium, Britain, Israel, Germany, Canada, Cuba, Argentina, Brazil, Australia, India, South Africa, Peru and many others. Surplus parts and magazines are plentiful as a result. While perhaps the heaviest of the 4 battle rifles covered here, it is one of the most resilient, and individual examples lasted several decades of hard service. In recent years, as the design has been dropped by many armies who chose newer lighter intermediate cartridge assault weapons as their main infantry arm (which they had not done previously because the FAL was so rugged and lasted so long), surplus FAL parts have been cheaply available on the international market. Some gun builders a few years ago began assembling complete rifles from a mixture of new and used parts, which sold for very reasonable prices. One of these could be bought new just last year for about \$500. Currently, although they have not climbed as high as other rifles, they can still be found for under \$1000. Sometimes even under \$900. Like anything else, the better variants cost more than that. Among the different variants are the ones made from rifles of the former British Commonwealth (Canada, Australia, England and India). Slightly different, these are known by their British designation as the L1A1. As a curious note, magazines for the FAL will fit and function in the L1A1, but mags for the L1A1 will not fit or function in the FAL.



G-3/HK-91/PTR-91/CETME

Known by many different designations, this rifle was known to American shooters since the 70's as the HK-91, but to most nations as the G-3. The Spanish design from which these all originated is known as the CETME. Some of the engineers at CETME in the 50's were German engineers who had fled when Germany fell to the allies. Some of these had been involved in the Stg-44 program. Upon arriving in Spain as refugees, the main marketable knowledge they had was from their experience in manufacturing the Stg-44. In the mid 50's they set about to manufacture a better version of the basic Stg-44 outline, and the CETME was the result. Germany, who had initially adopted the FAL (which they called the G-1), later found the CETME promising, tweaked the design further and came up with the G-3, which is essentially the rifle available to us today as civilians marketed under various monikers such as the HK-91, PTR-91, SAR-3 and even just plain old G-3. Made like the Stg-44 from extensive use of metal pressings and welds where possible, the G-3 is one of the lightest battle rifles. That, and due to its unique method of mechanical operation (while reliable) is also one of the hardest kicking in its class. Only the AK-47 has a greater reputation for always working under adverse conditions. For this reason, and its reduced cost to produce compared to others in its class, this was the 2nd most widely adopted rifle in the free world during the Cold War. Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Portugal, Iran, Pakistan, Mexico and others have issued it.

Unfortunately, not all American gunsmiths possess the same knowledge to fabricate these successfully as they do designs like the FAL, and there have been some poorly assembled versions of these hit the market in the last 5 years. Anything made by Heckler & Koch (HK) can be counted on, and can also be counted on to command a premium price. The Springfield Armory SAR-3s and the PTR-91s are also well made and you can have confidence in them. But run away from anything made by FAC. Some Century International guns are just fine, while others are not. You may be able to find an example made by Century or FAC currently for as little as \$500, but I'd spend more and look for a PTR-91 for about \$1100. You'll be glad you did.



M-14

The U.S. M14, which was only the official U.S. main service rifle from 1957 to 1963, in that short time developed a fanatical following akin to a cult, which is itself merely an extension of the cult following the M-1 Garand fostered and which resulted in the M-14. There are people who will swear on a stack of bibles that dumping the M-14 for the M-16 was the worst mistake the Army ever made and a crime. No one besides the U.S. (with the limited exception of the Philippines) ever adopted it. It has found new life in the U.S. military since the 1st Iraq invasion 18 years ago due to the superiority battle rifles like it have over shorter range assault rifles in wide open areas like the desert. The few old remaining stockpiles of the gun that were not given away to U.S. allies in the cold war during the 70's like the Philippines have been pulled out of mothballs and refurbished for use as Designated Marksman rifles in the big sand box. Every platoon has at least one. Special forces units (most notably the Navy SEALs) have made sure they have a good supply of them since the nature of many of their missions is working deep inside Indian country where back-up may be very far away. When they want to hit something so goes down and stays down, SEALs bring along the M-14.

First introduced for civilian sale by Springfield Armory (not to be confused with the actual U.S. military's Springfield Armory where Garands were manufactured) in the mid 70's as the M-1A, this rifle is one of the most accurate of the designs covered here. It has been a favorite of shooting match competitors since it has been available. Springfield is the top recognized brand. Other manufacturers have made good copies, as have others made not so good copies. They have included Federal Ordnance, Smith Enterprises, LRB Arms, Enterprise Arms and even the Chinese firm Norinco. (Interestingly, the Chinese originally tooled up to produce it in order to supply them to communist rebel forces in the Philippines.) The ones made by Federal Ordnance are the most suspect, yet most of them are just fine. Enterprise Arms simply made and sold the receivers, which were later assembled into working rifles by the customer or their gunsmith, so quality may vary. The Chinese copies, while not exhibiting the same craftsmanship, have nonetheless proven to be acceptable guns, and are often the cheapest in price one can find. The M-14 cult shuns them, but they work fine. Smith Enterprises and LRB each spend extra time and attention to detail with their rifles, so they command a premium price.

Continues on Page 72

Continued from Page 71 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

Before the Chinese Norinco rifles were cut off from importation in 1994, they were available for only \$500, while Springfield Armory models were \$850. Today, though they are harder to find, a Norinco M-14 sells for about \$850-950, while a Springfield model runs about \$1350 and up. The various sniper and competition models run as much as \$3500. Part of the reason M-14 prices are so high is that ever since America began to reintroduce the M-14 for service in 1991, the only supply for spare parts has been the commercial civilian manufacturers such as Springfield Armory and Smith Enterprises. The demand for these parts since the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq has caused shortages of those same parts in commercial production for domestic civilian sales. Chinese rifles imported from 1989 to 1994, and domestically produced rifles made from 1994 to 2004 were originally sold either without the flash suppressor or with a dummy one that did not serve that function. Most have been replaced with real ones, but you might find a deal on one that has not yet been “restored”.



AR-10 series

The AR-10 was actually Armalite's predecessor to the AR-15, which evolved directly from it. The AR-10 was so “space-age” and futuristic in look, materials, fabrication techniques and design that it actually caused the design to be viewed with prejudice and bias when it was competing against the M-14 and FAL to be the new service rifle to replace the M-1 Garand in 1957. Many other military establishments viewed it the same way, and was only ever adopted in (limited numbers) by Portugal and Angola. The world just wasn't ready for the AR-10. But after the several decades success of its little brother, the M-16/AR-15 series, various specialty users of battle rifles began to wish the AR-10 hadn't gone away. Some enterprising American gun makers began to make their own new versions, and the rifle has found new life. In fact, while both the Army and the Navy SEALs have been clinging to their old M-14s, and will still do so for some time, they have both begun to augment and/or replace them with an excellent AR-10 type rifle made by Knight's Armament Corp. called the SR-25, which for the next several decades is scheduled to fill the Sniper and Designated Marksman roles. Many SWAT teams around the U.S. are using AR-10s in these same “Precision Rifle” roles.

Why the sudden new-found love for the “old” AR-10? For many of the same reasons shooters have been attracted to the AR-15. The alloys and plastics make it light weight. It's special recoil buffering system and low center-to-bore axis reduce felt recoil over other guns of the same caliber. With the new style of “free-floating tube” handguards, AR-10s produce some of the most amazing accuracy ever seen from an autoloading design, comparable to some of those expensive match-grade M-14 rifles, but for less cost and with less tinkering around with the thing. That last feature has really sold the Army and Navy on the SR-25s they are now fielding, but there is another;...due to the inherent similarity of the M-16 and the SR-25, the need for specialized training between the two types of weapon

are considerably less. They even use some of the same parts! It takes less time to train a soldier or police officer already familiar with the AR-15/M-16 series on an AR-10 type rifle than to do so with something entirely different and new. The same is true for civilian shooters. And those who can afford both an assault rifle and a battle rifle are increasingly choosing to have the related pairing of an AR-15 and an AR-10. (And I'm one of them.)

Since they were all developed independently from another, the various current rifles patterned after the original AR-10 are rarely compatible with each other. Though outwardly they look similar, parts do not interchange between the brands, with the usual exception of the trigger components, which are usually all also compatible with the AR-15 series. Knight's Armament designed their SR-25 to use the original magazines used in the Portuguese and Angolan rifles. DPMS decided the original mag design was best as well, so they use them too. But that's where the interchangeability ends. The SR-25 is the best of them all, but it costs the most too, at about \$2500. And good luck even finding one, because their production is currently going toward meeting their contractual obligations with the military. The Bushmaster AR-10s just recently went out of production about 5 months before the election. They were also very good and used cheap and affordable FAL mags, but their prices were higher than that of the DPMS and Armalite designs and they were not selling competitively. They were selling for about \$1500 before production ceased, and might be merely the same price now or just a little more. Shortly after Knight's Armament began producing SR-25s back in 1993, Eagle Arms (a manufacturer of AR-15s) bought the rights to the old Armalite name and started producing their own AR-10 years before Bushmaster and DPMS started doing so. They built them for considerably less than the Knight's Armament SR-25, so Armalite AR-10s have dominated until recently, and sell for anywhere from \$1300 and above depending on the variant. They use modified M-14 mags, and because of the short supply of M-14 mags (because of the war effort), Armalite AR-10 mags are expensive and hard to come by. But when DPMS began offering their AR-10 in 2001, it was the most inexpensive version yet. While mags for the DPMS and SR-25 version have been expensive in the past, they have come down, and are now cheaper than the ones used in the Armalite models. DPMS AR-10s before the election were available from only \$975, and currently are running about \$1150 or more, depending on the model.



Honorable mention: The Beretta BM-59

When the U.S. adopted the M-14, Italy thought it was a spiffy rifle and wanted it too. After all, they too were then using surplus M-1 Garands supplied to them by the U.S. after the war. The respected gun makers at Beretta were even supplied with surplus war-time manufacturing tooling from Winchester so as to build more and repair the ones already in supply. But with the country still in recovery from the war and the exchange rate between the dollar and the lira not very favorable, the cost of purchasing M-14s from the U.S. was simply too great to allow it. But the engineers at Beretta found they could use their expertise recently gained in manufacturing their own M-1 Garands to come up with a program of modifying their existing rifles into a configuration similar to that of the M-14. Doing

Continues on Page 73

Continued from Page 72 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

so would cost considerably less than buying M-14s from the U.S., and that is exactly what they did. Called the Beretta Modelo de 1959 (BM-59), it was a great success and the design served into the late 70's. When these rifles and their parts were surplused out on the international market, they were bought up by the company Springfield Armory that sold domestic versions of the M-14 and M-1 Garand. They didn't sell as well as the M-14, but not due to lack of quality or sound design. Surplus parts for these rifles are still available, and even today some shooters take an old worn out M-1 Garand and convert them over to a BM-59 for less than the cost of a Springfield Armory M-1A. However, the fly in the ointment is the very expensive magazines. Uncommon and hard to find, they tend to sell for \$75 to \$85 each, compared to only \$40 or so for the M-14 type. You might succeed in finding a BM-59 for less than an M-14 type rifle, but by the time you purchase a good supply of mags, you may actually have spent more.

Pistol Caliber Carbines (the red-headed step-children)

Although they are classified under U.S. law as "rifles", this odd class of "assault weapons" are bastardized modifications of sub-machineguns. The utility of the SMG on the battlefield is very limited and almost non-existent. Such guns are primarily today used by police and counter-terrorist forces. Usually, because sub-sonic ammo can be used in conjunction with a silencer/suppressor to make for a very quiet weapon, if but a short-range one limited in its effectiveness. But American recreation shooters have always found them to be fun, and initially, they were cheap, too. As originally designed for use in combat, they all had very short barrels, but a shoulder stock as well. Under American law, such a weapon, if it was semi-auto only, would still fall under heavy federal regulation as a Short-Barreled Rifle (SBR), so models for sale to the general public were fitted with 16-inch barrels (the minimum length allowable under U.S. law). In this longer configuration, they lose their principle asset, which is ease of portability and handling. In the opinion of the author, they are nearly worthless as an actual tool for defensive use. But we would be failing our duty to the reader if we did not cover them, so here they are, in order of their popularity with American civilian shooters;....



CAR-9

First introduced as a 9mm sub-machinegun variant of the M-16 in the mid-80's, it was intended to compete for gov't contracts against the reigning SMG champion in police and military sales, the HK MP-5. Its main benefits were cost savings over its competition and standardization of training for forces that also used the M-16 series of rifles. Colt offered their civilian legal "carbine" version to Americans beginning in 1985. For many of the same reasons covered in this article about the M-16/AR-15 series of rifles, the CAR-9 has had a smaller but dedicated following. Current examples, made by about 4 different companies, cost about the same as the 5.56mm caliber rifles from which they descend. And just as with the rifle caliber models, the 9mm CAR-9 can be constructed upon a universal lower receiver. Depending on the kit you buy to build your CAR-9, you may need to drill some additional holes in the lower receiver before you begin assembling the CAR-9. This is due to a slight variance between kit sellers as to how they modify the lower receiver to accept the smaller ammunition magazines.



The TommyGun

This gun is the iconic profile of "The Roaring 20's", and it has a great deal of romance associated with it. Known in slang by news journalists past as "The Chicago Typewriter", or by GI's as the "Chopper", the Thompson is pretty popular even today. Throwing big .45 caliber slugs, it is one of the more deadly in this class. But as an all steel "1st generation" design from just after WW1 (by Col. Thompson), it is a heavy pig.

Continues on Page 74

Continued from Page 73 - Buy Guns While You Still Can

While that weight makes lugging it around for more than a short distance a pain in the butt, it also takes what little kick there is out of the low-power ammo. Examples of the WW2 variant, the M-1, can be found for just under \$1000, while the 1927 (pictured here next to its shorter twin, the 1928 model) runs a couple hundred dollars more. If you want to have the big round drum magazine so often associated with this gun, you'll have to get the 1927 model, as the WW2 redesigned M-1 did not and cannot use them.



UZI

Another gun recognized even by many non-shooters, the Israeli-designed Uzi is ugly but functional. It has been produced throughout the world, and imported copies of it you may find in the U.S. include both genuine Israeli models and Chinese knock-offs. Domestically produced examples, using imported South African parts and U.S. made receivers were sold until just this year by Vector. Group Industries, was another former producer in the U.S. The Chinese Uzis are the most affordable, but they function perfectly well. They have a cruder fit and finish, but the entire gun is a rather utilitarian profile, so that is nit-picking. Receivers made by Group Industries that were never completed into full guns have been selling for the last 8 years to do-it-yourself hobbyist amateur gunsmiths to be assembled into working guns. Fortunately, due to the excellent engineering of the design, it has been hard to screw these up, so almost any Uzi you ever find will be good to go. But look over

the Group Industries models carefully to see if they exhibit any poor welds or fitting. (If you wish to just buy an unfinished receiver to build into a working gun, they are currently running about \$200,...up from \$60 just 6 months ago.) Current prices for the Chinese copies start at around \$750, while early import Israeli A-models sell for \$1100 or more. Parts kits to assemble on an uncompleted Group Industries receiver sell for about \$500.



Kel-Tec SU2000

During the 10 years of the 1994 Assault Weapon Ban, various makers tried ingenious ways to skirt the specific language of the ban. One which did so most successfully was Kel-Tec. While collapsible or folding stocks were forbidden, a folding gun was not. The SU2000 has a barrel which is hinged on the receiver. When activated for stowage, the barrel flips up and over the top of the rear portion of the carbine. It makes for a very portable and discretely hidden weapon. As a result, it was a wildly successful seller, and still is. It uses readily available 9mm Glock pistol magazines. Since this design escaped the previous ban, some feel it will also escape the next one. But others believe that this unique loophole in the previous legislation will be plugged next time around. Currently, this is one of the most affordable 9mm carbines, selling for about \$500 new, and about \$400 used.



[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)

Second Amendment



Is For Everyone!

[www.SecondAmendmentisForEveryone](http://www.SecondAmendmentisForEveryone.org)
[.org & .com](http://www.SecondAmendmentisForEveryone.com)

[www.Safegunowners](http://www.Safegunowners.org)
[.org & .com](http://www.Safegunowners.com)

Sandy Hook - Betrayal of Blood

By Joby Weeks

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



THIS article proves there were 2 to 3 shooters involved in the Connecticut Sandy Hook Elementary school shooting. Adam Lanza didn't have a motive to attack those kids (his mother turns out was never even a teacher at that school) because he was set up by two other shooters, the story of what really happened is finally starting to be revealed. Just like the Aurora Batman shooting, the evidence is piling up really fast that the Connecticut shooting was a staged false flag black op. Idahopicker proves it in his Youtube video below with eyewitness testimony, helicopter footage and police audio that there were 2 shooters besides Adam Lanza, who was a clumsy autistic kid and there was absolutely no way he could've pulled all this off by himself in under two minutes before the cops arrived. Autistic people always avoid crowds and chaotic situations because they cannot handle all the overstimulation. Does this sound like someone who would be capable of actually carrying out a mass shooting? Lanza was autistic and easy to manipulate, a perfect patsy for them to set up to take the fall, just like they did to James Holmes who was found passed out in his car drugged out of his mind behind the theater after the Aurora shooting.

Why have we not seen any CCTV surveillance camera footage showing that James Holmes even stood in line to buy a ticket, let alone that he entered the theater with everybody else like the official story says he did? In a crowded theater filled to the max with 400 people, there has been ZERO eyewitnesses report they saw a guy with BRIGHT ORANGE HAIR sitting down near the front row. And the man who Corbin Dates saw get up from his seat in the front row, open the emergency exit door and then signal somebody to come in, Corbin said this man had a goatee, James Holmes did not have a goatee! This theater was a state of the art modern multiplex with extensive video surveillance. If they actually had video footage of James Holmes buying a ticket, they would've shown it to everyone by now, which is why I believe James Holmes never entered the theater and he was sitting in his car drugged the whole time while two professional assassins shot up theater 9 and threw a flash bang grenade inside theater 8 which gave football player Zack Golditch "it sounded like a firecracker just hit the back of my head" and Gage Hankins life threatening shrapnel injuries, NOT gunshot wounds. Who threw the flash bang grenade inside theater 8 when the official story says James Holmes was the only shooter in theater 9? The shooter in theater 9 didn't have time to run out into the lobby and around the concession stands over to inside theater 8 to throw the flash bang grenade that hit Zack Golditch and Gage Hankins, so there had to be at least two people involved. Also, why did eyewitnesses report a second gas canister coming from another direction inside theater 9?

When James Holmes was initially brought into jail, he had no recollection of the shooting, and was asking the jail staff "why am I here?" Just like Sirhan Sirhan who was imprisoned for the assassination of Robert Kennedy back in 1968. Sirhan was another mk ultra patsy who was in a trance like state and could not remember firing his gun at Kennedy. Now 45 years later his lawyers are trying to get him released from prison because they have proof that the bullets from his gun didn't even hit Robert Kennedy, and there was a second unidentified gunman in

the crowd who fired the fatal shots. Virtually every significant mass shooting in America over the past 50 years has had several of these glaring inconsistencies and subsequent cover-up by the authorities, including the 1999 Columbine shooting in Littleton Colorado, where over 100 student eyewitnesses reported seeing other shooters who were distinctly NOT Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold. Go to Youtube and watch Evan Long's hour and a half documentary "The Columbine Cause" to see the compelling evidence behind this. One thing you almost never hear about from the mainstream media even though it happens all the time are citizens with concealed carry permits who stop mass shooters cold in their tracks at the very beginning. For example, the gunmen in an Oregon mall last week, after shooting 3 people, was confronted and stopped by a citizen who had a gun. It is quite interesting and fraudulent that CNN would omit and censor this entire heroic act from their reporting. Their pro-gun control agenda is so predictable and obvious it's laughable, they do not want people talking about how armed citizens save lives.

When James Holmes was on camera during his first court appearance, he was having trouble staying awake and he was clearly drugged out of his mind. Some people have tried to argue that he was faking it, but look at his eyes! His eyes were bugging out of his head and his pupils were very dilated. This is impossible to fake which means he was still under the influence of the drugs they gave him before he was set up. Also, look at his facial hair in his first court appearance on Monday and compare it to his facial hair in his first mug shot. It's exactly the same length, which means they took his mug shot right before his first court appearance on Monday. Why is this significant? They were unable to take his first mug shot two nights earlier when he was brought in immediately after the shooting because he was so drugged out of his mind he couldn't even stand up for his mug shot! Everything I just described above is only a small example of the gigantic mountain of lies and inconsistencies in the official Batman shooting story.



Back to the Connecticut school shooting, the reports of these other shooters are being scrubbed from the media and instead they're going with the standard "lone nut gunman" narrative, because multiple shooters is a big red flag that there was a conspiracy and the attack was coordinated and planned to incite an emotional reaction out of everyone to get them to call on the government for more gun control. Now as expected you have several clueless media pundits demanding more gun control, but what everyone has to realize is that psychopaths and mk ultra mind controlled gunmen don't listen to gun laws, thugs and murderers don't follow gun laws, which is why we must preserve the Second Amendment! It wasn't originally put in place for people to hunt, it was intended to be used for individual protection as a last resort against

Continues on Page 76

Continued from Page 75 - Sandy Hook - Betrayal of Blood

the police and a tyrannical government, as stated in the Constitution by the founding fathers. Time for a quick history lesson, how were the Bolsheviks and the Soviet Secret Police NKVD able to murder over 30 million Russian Christians during the Communist Bolshevik Revolution in 1920 - 1950 under Vladimir Lenin, Leon Trotsky and Joseph Stalin? It's because they confiscated everybody's guns and the citizens had no way to defend themselves! Just because guns are banned doesn't mean the citizens are protected. If a gun ban law is passed, do you think the thugs and murderers are going to obey those laws? No. Taking away guns leaves all the citizens defenseless.

Idahopicker Proves There Were Multiple Shooters at Sandy Hook Elementary School

Part 1 - Sandy Hook Elem: 3 Shooters (A CLOSE LOOK) - Video:



Part 2 - Sandy Hook Elem: 3 Shooters (A CLOSE LOOK) - Video:



Here's an excellent article by Scott Creighton below, start passing around this story everywhere you can, Scott has many other articles about the Connecticut shooting at his website with updated information. The cops arrived at the scene very quick, in about two minutes, which messed up their plans and they got caught. The two handcuffed shooters were wearing the same clothes as Adam Lanza (camouflaged pants and black jacket) because they tried to set him up, but the cops got there fast and they were apprehended outside the school. How did the initial story of the Bushmaster assault rifle being in the car trunk get released and why? That school had its doors already locked with a video camera buzzer door system, where you have to press a button and the staff inside looks at you on video before they let you in. Let's see the video footage of Adam Lanza busting in with a .223 assault rifle. Oh, they can't show it to us because it would show two professional assassins killing the patsy Lanza in the school, then doing the dirty work and got caught trying to escape. Spread this story everywhere, we can't



let the mainstream media continue to get away with their bullshit, especially when it comes to a terrible atrocity like this involving school children. -Nathan

One more thing, the fathers of James Holmes and Adam Lanza are both deeply connected to the financial elites. Robert Holmes is a senior executive at FICO and Peter Lanza is a vice president at GE Capital and a partner at the global accounting firm Ernst & Young. But so far there has been no credible verification that they were both going to testify in the LIBOR international banking interest rate rigging scandal, so who knows if this is true or not. Here is a link Scott Creighton's article,

[Sandy Hook Shooting: Victims Killed with Rifle Found in Car – Who Put it There? The Guy Arrested in the Woods?](#) - By Scott Creighton:

This story has just gotten so out of hand. Now the coroner from the area has come out and said that the majority of the victims were shot by "a rifle" but the only rifle we know of in this story was found in the car out in the parking lot and the suspect was found dead with two handguns on him.

Officially the story is that the first 9/11 call came in less than a minute after the suspect supposedly broke the window and gained access to the building and the police teams were on the scene less than two minutes after that. The suspect was not out in the parking lot, he was found dead in one of the rooms in the school from a self inflicted gunshot wound with two hand guns on his person. The rifle, from the beginning, was ALWAYS reported to have been found in the car.

Well that means this 20 year old autistic kid with no record of violence busted in the school, shot 27 people multiple times, firing over 100 rounds, killing almost all of them while wearing a mask and a bullet proof vest, then ran out to the car, put the rifle in the car, then ran back to the school to sit down, take off his mask, and shoot himself in the head?

All in the time frame of less than 3 minutes?

And of course we are supposed to forget the guy they arrested out in the woods who was dressed exactly like the witnesses described the shooter.

"The 20 children and six adults killed in the Newtown school massacre were all shot multiple times, **many with a rifle**, Connecticut's chief medical examiner said Saturday." [NBC News](#)

"Lanza forced his way into the school around 9:40 a.m. Friday, police said, about 30 minutes after the school day began. **The first 911 call was received by police one minute later.**" [Huffington Post](#)

Continues on Page 77

Continued from Page 76 - Sandy Hook - Betrayal of Blood

“NBC News hears word that Lanza actually had four handguns on him—not two as was initially reported. **A rifle was found in the car he used to drive to the school.**” [Salon](#)

Here is a brief early description of the police radio transcript and as you can see, the police were on scene in less than two minutes after the 911 call came in. Notice they also mention the “other shooter” heading toward the back of the building and the woods.

The first word of the horrifying Newtown school shooting went out over the town’s police radio at 9:36 this morning.

Two minutes later, a dispatcher reported the gunshots had stopped.

“Sandy Hook School. Caller is indicating she thinks there’s someone shooting in the building,” a Newtown dispatcher radioed in the town’s first report of the killings.

Less than a minute later, the dispatcher radioed:

“Units responding to the Sandy Hook School. The front glass has been broken in front of the school They are unsure why ...

“All units, the individual I have on the phone said he is continuing to hear what he believes to be gunfire.”

Amid the confusing situation, **officers can be heard reporting a possible second shooter headed for the rear of the school.**

“The shooting appears to have stopped,” the dispatcher radioed at 9:38 a.m. “There is silence at this time. The school is in lockdown.”

Moments later, an officer apparently at the scene is heard saying: “They’re coming at me through this wood.”

“This is it,” said another. [New York Post](#)

And what about that guy they found out in the woods dressed like the shooter? Could he have ditched the gun in the car on the way out and been caught by the cops? Is that a more likely story than “super flash Adam Lanza” doing it all in 3 minutes or less?

[The Telegraph described the man in the camouflage pants and Adam Lanza— \(who was wearing black “fatigues”\) as being two separate people.](#) This, of course, makes sense since Adam Lanza died in the school, and therefore couldn’t have been the man described in the video above.

“The gunman, wearing black fatigues and a military-style vest, was found dead in a classroom, but it was not clear whether he took his own life or was shot by police.



A second man wearing camouflage trousers was seen being handcuffed.

[Reuters, citing CBS News, along with several other news sources wrote that the man in the black camouflage pants had been found in the woods.](#)

“Another person was being held in police custody after he was detained in the woods near the school wearing camouflage pants, CBS reported”.

“2:25 p.m. CST — A [FoxNews report](#) said **witnesses said a handcuffed man, dressed in camouflage was led out of a nearby woods by officers who reported to the shooting.**” [Deadline Live](#)


“A witness tells WFSB-TV **that a second man was taken out of the woods in handcuffs wearing a black jacket and camouflage pants.**” [CBS](#)

What story makes more sense? They are currently trying to fashion a motive for this event as we speak. Word is that the “forth” person involved in a dispute with the suspect the day before was home yesterday and is now in with the Feds getting the story told to him I mean, telling the Feds what happened.

This is remarkable. They are still writing the story a day after the event and it’s still this bad.

Clearly he had no motive. That aside, there is no way that kid broke into that school, unloaded 100+ rounds, killed all those kids and adults and then ran back to his car to stash the gun just to run back inside and kill himself. Why would he wear a mask and body armor if he was planning to kill himself?

It doesn’t make sense. The story changes from hour to hour. They are pushing every social media button they can to pass some kind of gun seizure process as fast as they can before the bullshit becomes obvious.

Keep your ammo dry. 

Joby Weeks is an avid adventurer, world traveler, social entrepreneur, author and libertarian political activist! He people how to become financially independent while blessing tens of thousands of under nourished orphans around the world with cutting edge wellness technology. Visit his [Facebook page](#).

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



Second Amendment
SAFE
Is For Everyone!


www.SecondAmendmentisForEveryone.org & www.SecondAmendmentisForEveryone.com

www.Safegunowners.org & www.Safegunowners.com

Publisher's Backpage - Humanity Marches On

By Ernest Hancock

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#) • [Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)



Over the past decade it was common for the Freedom Summit to include speakers that would educate the summit participants about the options, and often the benefits, of expatriation. But no matter how attractive any particular location was at the time, it only took a short time for any target country to become unattractive to a freedom lover.

The idea of becoming a wandering nomad of the planet has great appeal to many. The idea that you should separate your physical person from your wealth and your businesses has many advocates, too. But these options are less viable for some.

Just last night, my wife Donna and I were talking and I pointed out that I could imagine a time when even a small stocked safe area, where we could enjoy 72 hours of peace as we waited out... whatever, would be greatly appreciated. But then what?

After the storm has passed and you were informed and/or lucky enough to have survived, what then?

This month's eZine theme is "Should we stay or go?". This month's cover by Athena Tivnan and me was to depict the likely future of some of the most adventurous of us. A space Station orbiting Mars and mining asteroids. Don't think so?



[Planetary Resources](#) and their [team of accomplished entrepreneurs](#) are already planning for the mining of asteroids by the mapping of valuable element bearing asteroids in near Earth orbit. Just a few days ago, NASA/Obama announced their desire to get in on the action by capturing an asteroid and [placing it in orbit around the Moon](#). Fortunately, there is little enthusiasm for such a government mission, but the ['Space Billionaires'](#) are serious.

Freedom's Phoenix has been covering the private space race [from its beginning](#) and has archived the chronology of many efforts ([Space Travel & Exploration](#)).



One of the co-founders of PayPal, Elon Musk, is the founder of [SpaceX](#) and now regularly launches payloads into orbit and has filled his company's launch calendar for years. But all of this is just a means to an end. Mr. Musk has already created the spacecraft needed for the [colonization of Mars](#) (which was his original intention).



Elon Musk



Jeff Bezos

Jeff Bezos, of Amazon.com, has been developing his own private space program in west Texas for years ([Blue Origin](#)) and is [aggressively hiring](#) for the company.



Blue Origin



The list goes on and on, but I would like to point out one more. [Bigelow Aerospace](#) is [also hiring](#) for their space program that includes two privately funded space stations that have been in Earth orbit since 2006 & 2007 (heard a lot about these on the evening news?). Robert Bigelow started his company in 1998 from the fortune he made as the owner of Budget Suites HQ'd in Las Vegas, Nevada and launched his Space Stations on Russian rockets (now he's [working a deal with SpaceX](#))

The fact that every 7 year old doesn't know all of this is a testament to what Peter Thiel (co-founder of PayPal) and Garry Kasparov (Chess Grandmaster) had to say at an [Oxford Debate in November of 2012](#) ("The Innovation Enigma" - Is the current growth crisis a result of decades of technological stagnation in a risk-averse society?). Thiel and Kasparov's presentation dovetailed into what Peter Diamandis ([X Prize](#)) had to say in his [presentation](#) for his [Singularity University](#) and what [Michio Kaku](#) (futurist and physicist) meant when he talked about [America's Secret Weapon](#).



Peter Thiel



Garry Kasparov



Michio Kaku



Peter Diamandis



In just the last couple of months many great innovators that refuse to be bound by the limited imaginations of others, are taking advantage of public events to share the concerns shared by many of us. And I'll sum it all up... "Freedom's the Answer,... What's the Question?"

Their concern centers around "bad policy" and "a risk adverse society" etc. It was clear to me that they were nicely saying that the government is totally worthless at best and more harmful than helpful.



My personal path to 'Original Discovery' via my efforts to create a [high capacity battery](#) with home grown [carbon nanotubes](#) is more than a personal project. It's a demonstration of how others can be inspired to hurdle mental

Continues on Page 79

Continued from Page 78 - Publisher's Backpage: Humanity Marches On

obstacles placed there by smaller minds fearful of what Generation Next might do with the wealth of humanity's accumulative knowledge available in the palm of their hand.

“Stay or Go”?... from what, to what? It's not a geographical thing as much as it is a systemic/philosophical virus filled fog enveloping the planet with a worship of Statism that reminds many of the worship of an evil entity. [Could it be... 'Statan' :\)](#)



Video:



I'm very willing to relocate if I can be convinced that my investment in time, effort and wealth would produce the life of liberty I desire for me and my growing family. Even a location to shelter from the peak of the storm might be an option, and stocking up on food and goodies NOW is a must IMNSHO. But I am increasingly becoming aware that the beast we fight dwells in

the hearts and minds of humanity, and it is there that we will win. Trying to alter the character of The State or its beneficiaries is a far less productive use of our resources.


I see the credibility of statist solutions to government created problems rapidly evaporating and the void is just as quickly being filled with solutions from the people themselves. Politicians and laws will follow the lead of the people... or not. I don't think it really matters since the current paradigm is unsustainable for reasons supported with simple arithmetic.

The problems and their solutions are becoming much more obvious to the real creators of wealth, and they are starting to realize that government participation, partnerships, blessings and permission slips are the manifestations of a lifetime of indoctrination that was the greatest deception of an entire planet's population.

Those that benefit as a part of the parasite class will soon realize that their host can no longer supply their needs and violence will be their default solution as desperation sets in.

This time period is what must be survived,... but on the other side I am hopeful. But where do we go so that we can simply keep breathing in and out long enough to help Generation Next realize humanity's potential? That will be the theme of next month's February 2013 eZine Edition from Freedom's Phoenix.

The **shared simple understanding** that “the market” is the best and freest path to human prosperity and happiness IS the battle. The rest will take care of itself. We just need to make sure we're still around to be part of the coming renaissance.

“In The End, Freedom Always Wins,... It just gets really messy first”. 

Peace,
Ernie

[Make a Comment](#) • [Email Link](#)
[Send Letter to Editor](#) • [Save Link](#)