

# The CAROLINA FREE PRESS

March/April, 2000    Volume VI Issue 2  
Electronic Version

<=====➔

MILITIA PERSPECTIVES  
Spies and Lies

THE CANNIBALS PERSPECTIVE  
The Dissenting Opinion

WAVE GOODBYE TO YOUR CHILDREN  
A Tale of Subtle Seduction

CHAPLAINS CORNER  
Unholy Alliances

SMITH \$ WESSON  
A Surrender To Fascism

DEVELOPMENT OF RESISTANCE FORCES  
Combat Employment of Guerilla Forces

THE RISING  
Poetic Inspiration

BARNYARD FABLES #39  
The Raid

BOOK REVIEW  
Starship Troopers

READERS COMMENTS

IN THE WIRE  
Marines Invade Swansboro  
The Million Mom March  
Opportunity Knocks

---

"Why are the nations of the world so patient under despotism? Why do they crouch to tyrants, and submit to be treated as if they were a herd of cattle? Is it not because they are kept in darkness, and want knowledge? Enlighten them and you will elevate them. Shew them they are men, and they will act like men. Give them just ideas of civil government, and let them know that it is an expedient for gaining protection against injury and defending their rights, and it will be impossible for them to submit to governments which, like most of those now in the world, are usurpation's on the rights of men, and little better than contrivances for enabling the few to oppress the many." Richard Price, November 4, 1789 from A Discourse On The Love of Our Country.

---

## MILITIA PERSPECTIVES

### Spies & Lies

#### Making Friends The Hard Way:

In the last few months the world has been entertained with revelations of government, corporate and institutional spying. Echelon, the government (US and Great Britain) sponsored program of world-wide digital spying is now common knowledge. Much to the chagrin of European governments and corporations, the world now knows that literally every form of communication is monitored, recorded and digested for intelligence purposes. And not only are government agencies in the US falling over themselves to spy on American citizens through phone and internet, but an active movement is gaining momentum for recruiting children into the spy network, weaning them from parental authority and cultivating conscripts for the emerging socialist state. Surveillance and propaganda are two of the key ingredients of chaos stew. Throwing in children for spice and turning up the gun control heat with the Smith & Wesson fiasco indicate that the comrades behind the scenes are working overtime.

The European Union, among other parties, is mightily upset over the Echelon disclosures. While assured by the US that its spy systems do not collect proprietary commercial information but focus on crime prevention there is this little problem of credibility. No doubt recognizing that the credibility of the US and Britain are no better than theirs, the European parliament is considering whether to conduct a full investigation into the matter. According to The Financial Times (March 31, 2000), Portugal's interior minister, Fernando Gomes, informed the European parliament that the Council of EU Justice Ministers could not accept any type of [surveillance] system that "doesn't respect the legal requirements of member countries".

Assuming for a moment that the massive Echelon system is *not* involved in commercial espionage it would still appear that the aspect of crime *prevention* does not justify the degree of surveillance Echelon represents. That leaves us with government spying on government. Little wonder the EU members are so disturbed about the revelations. Further speculation appears warranted. Could this be the deciding factor in the development of an EU army to balance NATO? Will the US be able to retain its influence in the UN? Does the US still have friends in Europe? Does trust and character count in the international arena?

It's no comfort that the political pasture on the other side of the pond is no less red than our own

"Our scientific power has outrun our spiritual power. We have guided missiles and misguided men." Martin Luther King, Jr.

#### So Color Us Red:

An article ([www.mrc.org/specialreports](http://www.mrc.org/specialreports)) by Media Research Center analyst Geoffrey Dickens illustrates that the comrades and fellow travelers in the media have also been hard at it in the propaganda department. Dickens reviewed 653 gun control related stories from ABC, CBS, CNN and NBC which aired from July, 1997 to June, 1999. Summarizing from his report of January 5<sup>th</sup>, Dickens notes:

- Stories supporting more gun control outnumbered stories opposing gun control 10 to one.

- In evening news shows anti-gun stories outnumbered pro-gun stories 8 to 1; Morning shows promoted the anti-gun position at a frequency of about 13 to 1.
- The most biased morning news show was ABC's Good Morning America; ABC and CNN were the most slanted evening shows.

The leftist agenda of the media focuses heavily on emotional themes. Factual analysis, logic, and objectivism which document the downtrend in firearms violence are notably missing. To conclude from this data that the public media has a bias in firearms related issues is shortsighted and myopic. This bias reflects only one aspect of a broad program of intellectual subversion. It reinforces the necessity of viewing anything represented as "news" by the major media with healthy suspicion. But we knew that already.

### Things Aren't Always What They Seem:

Propaganda is, of course, only one aspect of political warfare and warfare in general. In reflecting on a December, 1994 article from the Marine Corps Gazette, entitled "Fourth Generation Warfare: Another Look", we might observe that the concept of Fourth Generational warfare may not be limited to the simplistic vision of a technological war arising out of "cultural conflict" outside the nation-state framework. While it may be true in some areas of the world, any pending conflict in the US it is not likely to be a contest of technology versus low-intensity conflict but an interesting mix. The question is whether it will be limited or total war in scope.

It is interesting to note that the above referenced article maintains that advanced technology warfare is "largely ineffective against terrorist/LIC opponents". That is to say that the application of advanced technology, in combination with propaganda and other forms of technological warfare, is not the conclusive solution to low intensity conflict some in authority suggest. A practical example of this premise may be evident in the avalanche of subtle [propaganda] attacks on the illusion of centralized power which is having significant success in shifting the loyalties of citizens away from the "bureaucratic state". The relative importance of these perspectives on modern warfare will have a profound affect on the shape of future conflict and will be resolved only through field trials. We should expect that modern American natives might engage in a more interesting and complex contest, at least in America, than the Fourth Generational proponents might anticipate.

So what? For one thing the postulate of the article that a primary cause of the supposed "cultural" changes resulting from the collapse of our Judeo-Christian culture may be premature. Certainly the cultured and elite of our society have abandoned Christian tenets for the religion of moral relativism (humanism) and aspirations of world dominance. We would maintain that the building may be dilapidated, but the foundation remains intact. Another perspective worthy of comment is that the "loss" of traditional values may only be temporary and, on a generational basis, is part of a naturally evolving cyclical process. Yet another point is that while the segment of society imbued with traditional values may remain a political minority, it is significant to note that it is a very well-motivated minority. Motivation makes a world of difference.

We can agree with the author that the nation-state is indeed losing, or abdicating, it's monopoly on force. However, at least in the US, the unorganized militia may have what it takes to fill the power vacuum intended for the UN. The powers-that-be are continuing to implement disarmament programs as they grasp for yet more social control. Even during "peacetime" these things require a lot of effort. It will be interesting to see if the degree of political control remains sufficient to grease the skids to our subordination to the UN during the pending economic and political turmoil. "Perhaps" is the operative word, if the unorganized militia is to occupy at least part of the power

vacuum it demands a few minor attributes not yet well developed: persistence, organization and preparation in depth.

### Dead Reckoning In Arizona:

That brings us to the inevitable speculation as to where the dark and narrow path through the deep woods might lead. The Arizona state legislature has evidently considered the evidence and is contemplating the issues as evidenced by pending Arizona Concurrent Resolution HCR 2034. This resolution proposes "the dissolution of the federal government of the united States of America if certain conditions occur". More specifically, under this resolution the state will act if:

- The Constitution is declared suspended or abolished by any entity
- The president or any other federal entity attempts to institute martial law without official declaration in one or more states without consent of that state
- Any federal order attempts to make it unlawful for individuals to own or confiscate firearms

The resolution, if passed, would require Arizona, when joined by 34 other states to reassume all state powers and state sovereignty, and reestablish the Constitution under a new federal government.

Interesting, huh? But what about a major disaster, perhaps a nuclear first strike against America. In order to ensure their survival would the states throw out globalist oriented leaders and enlist the aid of the [constitutional] militia. Perhaps, but it presumes quite a few things including that state legislators are better informed than the average citizen. The issue will obviously remain problematical and contentious. Even if such circumstances were to occur and states reconstitute the militia under constitutional authority, would they be employed in a manner compatible with our republican form of government?

Maybe in Arizona, but such a political change isn't likely in North Carolina, at least not any time soon. Heck, Governor Jim Hunt has endorsed Al Gore for President! You know... among other notorious accomplishments Gore's the man who worked tobacco and learned to plow behind a mule as a child. As an adult he reportedly described the US military as a "fascist, totalitarian institution", earned the coveted moniker "Captain Planet" for his screwy environmental views, invented the Internet and the "parents protection page" concept to limit Internet access to children's sites, and became the inspiration for the movie 'Love Story'. If that weren't sufficiently "illuminating" (to borrow a phrase) he actually admits to helping Bill Clinton develop and implement national policies. Yup, his endorsement is a pretty good clue as to the degeneracy of our state's political value system. Do we hear any "nays"?

Ahhh, 'tis a sad day indeed when we place more faith in the weatherman than our leaders.

### Upping The Ante:

From the "things you need to know category" it is interesting to note that all members of the North Carolina National Guard have also been attending mandatory training classes designed to warn members of the growing threat from terrorists such as the militia. Contact with the militia in particular is strongly discouraged as "career threatening". From our perspectives several things are apparent. The first is that the threats are not working. The second is that if contact with the unorganized constitutional militia is prohibited, National Guard members who are sworn and dedicated to the very same constitutional principles as the unorganized militia, have a much more serious problem with their own leadership which by default must be anti-constitutional. In related

matters, it may be of interest to point out that a number of National Guard units in the state are in the process of acquiring a substantial number of new SAW's, not to mention some new vehicles and technologies. Do you suppose the hunt for Eric Rudolph is going state-wide, or is larger game afoot?

### Final Thoughts:

A few of us were lingering in the CFP offices after hours the other day using our newly acquired orienteering skills to locate the front door. Just by chance we caught a sitcom on the tube in which the freedom related political issues near and dear to our hearts were being hammered without mercy. At first our irritation grew with the actors merriment. Every liberal gun control myth was paraded as an excuse for more laughter. Finally, even we caught on, realizing that the actors, likely never owning a firearm themselves and not privy to the dirty little secret, were only setting themselves up as the real victims. We didn't realize it was possible to shoot yourself in the foot with humor.

---

"For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of Patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same Religion, Manners, habits & political Principles. You have in common cause fought & triumphed together - The independence & liberty you possess are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts - of common dangers, sufferings and successes." George Washington, Farewell Address, 1796.

---

## **THE CANNIBALS PERSPECTIVE**

### The Dissenting Opinion

Not too long ago a regular visitor to the CFP offices, while attempting to cross from one side of a room to another, casually asked if we actually had a floor in the facility. The visitor went on to recommend the creation of something called a "library" using a form of data storage technology called "shelves". Not easily intimidated, we explained that we had replaced our "can on a string" intruder alert system with a superior low-tech alternative. This more subtle arrangement is compatible with the superior mind of the modern militiaman. It utilizes the crackle and crunch of crushed paper and musty piles of old books for concealment as a cost efficient, constantly varied, and obviously tamper-proof system. It blends perfectly with the image of a modern office environment. OK... never too humble to learn new techniques, we got the idea from our sister publication, the Independent Grit Gazette.

Later that day while running a yellow lifeline through the D-rings on everyone's belt (a concession to our lost visitor) we had time to reflect on often heard criticisms of the constitutional militia. Of course the criticisms didn't start with the War for American Independence. However, we recalled the British retreat after the battles of Lexington and Concord and the resulting events on Breed's Hill. The militia lost the initiative largely due to lack of supplies and cooperation, a condition no doubt fueled by that darn independent streak in the colonials: everyone wanted to be his own general. Logistics and organization were so lacking if the term SNAFU was not already in common use it must have been invented shortly thereafter.

That got us to thinking. Knowing our own mindset is only half the social equation. Finding a solution, and the resolve to implement it, also requires us to know the mind of the opposition.

As self-examination is a healthy and necessary exercise, let's consider whether the militia really is an unnecessary evil, a necessary evil, or an essential compromise of a free society.

After a successful bid for independence, the Founders recognized not only the need for good government, but the need for a mechanism to preserve it. Regarding the latter, they opted to maintain the tradition of the trainband, or unorganized militia, despite its many shortcomings which became evident through the course of the war. The employment of the unorganized militia declined progressively until its use was generally discontinued with the Dick Act of 1903. That Act recognized the state militia (the National Guard) as part of the organized militia. It is unclear whether the shortcomings of the unorganized militia, the needs of a more complex world, political expediency, or the incompetence of politicians themselves contributed most to this decline. While each was likely a contributing factor, the deciding factor in today's world is most certainly the current attempt to consolidate political and economic power into a socialist world government. Under current visions of global governance not only is the concept of an armed populace politically inconvenient, it is militarily unacceptable.

But, we speculated, there must be some argument or body of "logic", however specious, which poses as rational thought in the minds of the liberal masses which justifies the paranoia of the left against the unorganized militia. There must be some explanation which serves politicians as an excuse for not honoring legal requirements as they relate to the militia. After all, if the militia concept was "broke" why not fix it within legally established parameters; what was it about the reserve militia those in political control found so repugnant? Again, understanding the why is the first step in knowing what to do about it.

One such source for the liberal anti-militia argument is provided by Louis Smith, author of *American Democracy And Military Power* (University of Chicago Press, 1951). Smith claims to be an advocate of the constitution, but is also an apologist for the United Nations and global governance. He claims that political change in the world justifies the need for "interpretive flexibilities and executive devices" on the part of the Executive. Further, that the importance of maintaining civil control over the military, of necessity, carries with it the authority to make such changes as may be politically expedient. We of course recognize the latter as the traditional rationale of the would-be tyrant.

The central premise in Smith's articulate arguments against the militia is what he calls the "myth" of the militia. That is, he maintains, the militia is not necessary to the existence of a free state. With an authoritarian perspective worthy of the pure federalist, he supports the concept that civil authority in a modern state must of necessity be absolute. He maintains that the complex issues of government in general and the complexities attendant with total war and national survival are not only beyond the capability of ordinary citizens, but also the 18<sup>th</sup> century militia model. Political and military power, particularly during wartime, argues Smith must be consolidated into the capable hands of the Executive.

At the risk of being overly simplistic, Smith's justification for a strong, centralized administrative leadership and against the "outmoded" militia concept can be summarized as follows:

- \* Good foreign policy can often settle disagreements and resolve conflict without military intervention. Therefore, we need to rid ourselves of the militaristic mindset of an armed society (the "garrison state") which tends to produce unacceptable military rather than diplomatic solutions.
- \* Military organizations (the unorganized militia) established to meet 18<sup>th</sup> century national and state security requirements are inadequate for the demands of the modern world.

- \* Only a strong federal government can adequately marshal the entire nation to respond to "total" war and manage its' execution. The speed and complexity of modern war require centralization of military power in a President for effective management.
- \* The fears of the Founders of an oppressive military have not materialized and the checks established to prevent government tyranny are no longer required. The Founders, Smith explains, may have exaggerated the importance of the constitutional check and balance system.
- \* The original intent for legislation intended to maintain a citizens militia, despite fears of a despotic government, were merely "ceremonial". And, since never actively pursued, demonstrate the obsolescence of the militia concept.
- \* According to the constitution, the federal government retained "almost unlimited powers to raise and support armies...". This, Smith implies, indicates there is no need for either an unorganized or state militia.
- \* It is the natural inclination of Americans, "steeped as they were in the traditions of individualism and liberty", to accept military rule or subordination.
- \* The US must rely on "vast strength" to prevail in modern warfare which is not available or manageable through a militia system.
- \* The concept of the "right of revolution" as eloquently expressed in the Declaration of Independence is obsolete. He argues that with the pacification of the Indians and lawless elements of our society "the necessity for the citizen to bear arms in his own defense disappeared". Further, that the tools for such defense have now become a "menace to the community" and therefore pose a serious potential problem for "continuing civil control".
- \* Under the police power of the state laws have "generally limited this right of keeping and bearing arms until it is almost meaningless." He argues that the technological changes in warfare have "rendered the citizen with a mere rifle impotent against skilled professionals using the latest mass killers".
- \* Historical faith in the concept of a militia has led to underfunding of the proper organized military forces.
- \* When in federal service the militia could only be commanded by the President and could only be legally employed for purposes established by the Constitution. Smith explains a prime reason for the Dick Act of 1903 making the [organized] state militia the National Guard was to ensure that it could be used for extra-territorial service.

In summary, Smith argues that in the case of national security against armed aggression or progressive security against a "garrison state", the armed citizen "offers no deterrent whatever". He does not directly argue that the militia is an obstacle to global governance, but maintains that the "military crisis of our time must be eliminated". The military crisis, of course, is the tendency of American citizens to cling to a military tradition of bearing arms in concert with a small standing army. To achieve the desired end, Smith maintains, requires elimination of the "garrison state", "confidence in the continuing perfectibility of mankind" [humanism], and improvements in mass living conditions [redistribution of wealth/fascism]. It also requires "peaceful social change on the basis of intelligent planning" through the mechanisms of "traditional diplomatic methods or by the action of such a collective agency as the United Nations".

Such changes, if implemented as Smith suggests, would not allow even a vestige of a viable militia capability to remain. Smith fails to point out that once these improvements were achieved, a government would not require the consent of the governed to impose its will on the populace.

Wait a minute, there's more.

The book "Bayonets In The Street: The Use of Troops In Civil Disturbances", edited by Robin Higham (University Press of Kansas, 1969) is another thought provoking books that argues for the subordination of the militia and the armed citizen for the advancement of more efficient government control. It's focus is on justifying the role of the armed forces [organized militia] as "peacekeepers", particularly as they relate to civil disturbances.

The editor argues that military intervention in domestic civil affairs is both reasonable and acceptable. Further, that when used to provide physical assistance to citizens during natural disasters there have been few if any objections by the public or the media. While often maligned as "brutal agents of repression" when used to quell civil disturbances, the army, Higham maintains, is essential to the maintenance of civil control. The legitimacy or the corruption and incompetence of civil government which give rise to such disturbances conveniently remain external to the discussion. Implicit in the argument to justify the use of the military for civil control is the presumed inherent correctness or lack of government culpability.

Higham, in building his case for increased use of the military for civil control blames, in part, independent minded Americans themselves. He explains that the "Walter Mitty" attitudes of Americans (a national characteristic) leads citizens to believe many solutions to domestic problems can be achieved through violence rather than by compromise and government intervention. America, the author states, was settled by "opportunists and escapists" which resulted in a culture and tradition of violence. (The Calvinists and Puritans of colonial America are turning over in their graves). He argues that in the US "authority is not respected, but is supported only when it is useful."

Hingham recognizes that a "uniformed force's power is largely psychological in that it is the symbol of authority". Regardless, he maintains, citizens should not contest the role of civil authorities in controlling civil anarchy as long as they are using legal and reasonable means to protect life, and property. Government would naturally determine what is reasonable. The fundamental argument posed by Higham is, of course, that the ends justify the means. In partial response, readers might well contend that honesty in politics might be the point of departure for planning to mitigate civil disturbances before they occur. But the problem of demanding accountability from governmental officials is a story for another day.

Author Robert Coakley (Bayonets In The Street, Chapter 1), cites historical precedents from Shay's Rebellion, which was resolved fairly quickly using the unorganized militia (the militants presumably reluctant to start a civil war solely based on a tax on whiskey) and other uses of militia through the Civil War period. While generally a national success, the employment of the unorganized militia was accompanied by many problems. Among the more persistent problems cited relating to the use of the militia were:

1. Inadequate training (well regulated) and equipment
2. Retention was allowed for unacceptably short periods of service; they were insufficient in numbers, and limited in usefulness due to lengthy mobilization times
3. Loyal to and reluctant to confront fellow Americans.
4. Difficult to coordinate through individual state governors; militia use became inconvenient due to political disagreements
5. Not as readily available as the regular [organized] militia which was under direct control of the federal government, and available on short term notice.

According to Coe equally the increasing use of state [organized] militia was primarily driven by two overriding considerations: efficiency and control.



Hill (Bayonets In The Street, Chapter 3) also notes that the Dick Act of 1903 provided for federal recognition of the "volunteer" state National Guard as an organized militia. Since that time the National Guard has been progressively brought under control of the federal government. He observes that this act basically usurped constitutional "authority" by allowing government to substitute the lawful functions of the unorganized militia with the organized militia. In effect, congress overrode the constitution in assigning the regular [organized] militia with the responsibility of the armed citizen. Yet, he maintains, the constitution remained in force thereby leaving the function of unorganized militia intact to this day.

A final but interesting perspective can be gleaned from author T. Alden Williams (Bayonets in the Street, Chapter 7) regarding the "dilemmas" of the professional soldier when forced to choose between competing loyalties and career. Williams states that such destructive conflict does not exist in the American military and is only a remote possibility. Obviously this perspective is outdated. The subversion of the military into a United Nations army should now pose almost irreconcilable problems for any patriotic soldier. The author provides no explanation as to how the modern soldier or law enforcement officer, having been effectively brought under federal/UN authority, can reconcile the usurpation of the republic with their traditional responsibility to preserve the republic.

Of course this summary is but an overview of the objections of the statist minority to a viable unorganized, or reserve militia consisting of a generally armed citizenry. Some of the arguments at first blush have the appearance of reasonableness. Where does that leave the militia? Should we pack up and go away? To do so would signal the end of the republic.

Many of our readers can more eloquently summarize key points which illustrate the importance of the constitutional unorganized militia. Some can no doubt list others; but here are some of the more important contributions of the militia to our republic:

1. The armed citizenry is perhaps the most important obstacle to a forced change from our form of government. If it were not, the subversive element in government would already have the guns.
2. At the very least, the citizen militia is a symbol of individual liberty and freedom. The rights inherent in firearms ownership and assembly are, whether exercised or not, a constant reminder of our heritage and responsibilities. As much as government would like militia and armed citizens to go away to facilitate consolidation of power under a global government, the unorganized militia is protected by the Constitution. Its removal by any process would not be tolerated.
3. Government is neither omnipotent nor obliged to provide adequate defense for the individual citizen or family. It is a function only available to the armed citizen who retains the responsibility, authority and moral obligation to do it.
4. Legitimacy of government is maintained only so long as it enjoys the consent of the governed. Only the militia, organized and unorganized, is charged with the duty and retains the capability to defend it.
5. Citizens proficient in the use of firearms inherently contribute to the defense of society and country. An armed society remains a polite society and is inherently a deterrent to the domestic and international criminal element.

6. The armed citizen imbued with a martial spirit is the most loyal, motivated and committed guardian which can be enlisted for the defense of the republic.
7. The unorganized, or reserve militia, remains the reservoir or pool of qualified members for the organized militia. The quality of the organized militia is intimately associated with the availability and quality of enlistees. No conflict is won until armed men hold the ground. The rifleman remains the backbone of our armed forces. Recent conflicts in Vietnam and other places demonstrate that it takes more than technology to hold ground.
8. Ultimately, no political power is wielded without the means to enforce it. A disarmed society is a society of victims.
9. Upon full implementation of the planned program of national disarmament as outlined in PL 87-297 the unorganized militia may remain the only armed force capable of any form of national defense loyal to the Constitution.
10. The armed citizen as the reserve militia acknowledges the political reality of the frailty of human government. It provides a balancing force to the natural tendency of all forms of government to gravitate to tyranny.

In summary, we can readily conclude that the unorganized militia, for all its bumps and warts, has an essential stabilizing effect on our free society and republican form of government. We also might conclude that the armed citizen, collectively recognized as the unorganized militia, will remain viable and a part of our culture until the people themselves decide that it is no longer necessary.

The pending Constitutional test of the militia will no doubt provide a benchmark in history. We will find out if the armed citizen will remain a viable stabilizing social component of free society in the modern post-industrial era. As an unknown and unquantifiable force, the militia remains a problematical issue to those who would force a totalitarian form of government on America. Time is on the side of a free society; citizens soldiers are mobilizing in opposition to the destruction of America. The question remains is whether the militia can become a viable mechanism in the cause of liberty.

For the unorganized militia to become viable without a governmental support mechanism it must become "well-regulated" in the real military sense. History has shown that the initiative necessary for this fundamental aspect of participatory citizenship occurs only under extreme duress. In the short term, it's not going to happen. Then again, the militia will not simply go away. Americans are too contrary and independent minded to give up their tradition and freedom so easily. At this point in history, too many armed citizens have been effectively alienated by government to simply go away.

But will the unorganized militia become sufficiently well organized to provide effective response to pending physical usurpation. Probably, but not before it gets the crap beat out of it a few times.

---

"Towards the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to

undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of Governments, as of other human institutions - that experience is the surest standard, by which to test the real tendency of the existing Constitution of a Country - that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypothesis & opinion exposes to perpetual change, from the endless variety of hypotheses and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests, in a country so extensive as ours, a Government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of Liberty is indispensable - Liberty itself will find in such a Government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest Guardian." George Washington, Farewell Address, 1796

---

## **WAVE GOODBYE TO YOUR CHILDREN**

A Story Of State Seduction

After World War I and during the depression years of the waning Weimar Republic over 2000 youth groups sprang up throughout Germany. Many of these groups enjoyed tremendous popularity by providing children opportunity for training in wilderness living and self-sufficiency. Many also adopted a military style organization including uniforms and a system of ranks.

Early in his political career Adolph Hitler recognized that his goal of a totally obedient population would of necessity require the total commitment of a generation of enforcers. This youth movement provided a ready made resource for the early Hitler Youth groups. First by recruitment, later by legislation and compulsion, the Hitler Youth organization soon supplanted all other youth groups in Germany. In 1923, youth group leader Kurt Gruber introduced the first Hitler Youth style uniforms featuring brown shirts and black shorts with a unique arm band. Eventually, total domination of its membership by the group ensured the orders of the group took precedence over parental authority.

Hitler had a seven point plan to deal with the German people. Three of these points involved education. The intent of his educational program was to inculcate youth with the spirit of National Socialism, to teach revisionist history, to purge the politically unreliable from schools, and to supplant the family by demanding total loyalty to the state.

The purpose of this training was to ensure the Nazi legacy endured to future generations. The goal was to produce the perfect committed National Socialist party member. Children were mandated to enter the program as young as age six. At the age of fifteen they officially became Hitler Youth. As Jungvolk, the entry level organization, the boys were required to swear an oath indicating that they were literally willing to give their lives for Germany and Hitler. Evidently it worked, in later years children as young as ten years old were fighting on the front lines in World War II.

Hitler Youth eventually played an important part ensuring the election of Hitler to political office and eventually they effectively functioned as an internal police force, essentially junior Gestapo. They were required to serve as political agents and encouraged to denounce politically incorrect parents and associates. Simply put, one of their prime functions was the destruction of the family to ensure the success of the socialist state.

"He alone, who owns the youth, gains the Future!" Adolph Hitler, 1935

That brings us to the new North Carolina children's political, create-a-snitch, indoctrination curriculum inappropriately named the Working Against Violence Everywhere (WAVE) program (<http://www.waveamerica.com>). The program was developed by the private security Pinkerton Services Group in Charlotte, NC in partnership with the Center for the Prevention of School Violence at North Carolina State University. FBI and BATF involvement have been reported and expected, but not substantiated for this report.

The WAVE program encourages students to report "threats" or circumstances which could affect school security through an "anonymous", 24-hour, 7 days/week hotline. Anonymous reports are encouraged for real or imagined "crimes" (including thought crimes) such as threats of violence, aggressive behavior, those who talk about or have access to weapons, drugs or alcohol, harassment, prejudiced or intolerant attitudes, those who "get really angry", and "anything else harmful to you or your school".

The program explanation is replete with all the right touchie-feelie buzz words intended to placate the uncertain and encourage unquestioned obedience and support by parents and teachers. It purports to be intended to raise awareness, and promote respect, responsibility, ethics and safety. Problem is, it will do the opposite of what it claims.

WAVE goes well beyond reasonable means for problem resolution. It encourages children to reject traditional avenues for comfort and assistance involving parents, pastors, teachers, relatives and trusted confidants, and look to the state for comfort, security, reward and ... retribution. It uses an award system of "prizes" as a means of bribery or incentive for encouraging reports.

Do statistics warrant treating each school as part of the penal system and each student as an inmate? Professional Safety magazine for March, 2000, in an article entitled *Terrorism & Violence In Our Schools* promoting statist intervention, provides some clues. In the period of 1996-1997, according to the article, no crime at all was reported in 43% of all public schools. At least one serious or non-violent crime was reported in 47% of schools, leaving only 10% reporting at least one serious crime. More specifically, out of 424,110 total violent incidents, only 2.6% involved a physical attack or fight with any kind of weapon.

No analysis was provided for that 2.6% indicating the nature or root cause of the incident, perhaps because many may likely reflect a failure of the school system itself. Instead of examining self-incriminating failures of the system, advocates of statist intervention continue the search for external causes even as they abandon traditional concepts and methods proven to work. Children and parents alike remain the unknowing dupes of a system designed to ensure the problems continue. This situation is not just reminiscent, but exactly like the disingenuous and abysmal failure known as the "war" on drugs.

Given the actual numbers, it appears the potential for abuse of the WAVE program far exceeds any real threat. Has anyone really considered the downside of this program for creating our own home-grown junior Gestapo? What happens when children are encouraged to participate in a program with the potential to destroy lives and families? This partnership with government and law enforcement undermines the family and parental authority, the church and respected community support mechanisms. In return it provides a means for creating a culture of snitches and facilitates punitive reporting and vindictive harassment. Assurances of confidentiality and anonymity can and will most certainly be abused by the state.

Looking beyond the warm fuzzy words, it becomes pretty evident that the primary intent of this invasive program is not security, it's control. It will create a culture of para-military surveillance

using children as surrogate government agents. Inevitably will come the police raids and shakedowns, confiscation of homes and personal property, and the destruction of families. Isn't this how one creates a police state ... from the bottom up?

The WAVE program is nothing short of Orwellian in nature. Its convenience belies its invidiousness. It utilizes the innocence of children to mislead, entice, manipulate and entrap. It provides the mechanism for children to be coerced to incriminate themselves, their friends, teachers, parents and others based on the imperfect impressions of a child. Equally destructive is the intergenerational hostility it provokes which destroys respect.

"Thinking about the future isn't some conspiracy constructed by those who only wish they were young and strong." WAVE promotion.

Are there alternative solutions, certainly. First must come the realization that whatever problems exist are exacerbated by government meddling. In addition to disassembling the WAVE concept, positive actions include restoration of mandatory coursework in civics and governmental ethics, and the restoration prayer and freedom of religious expression in school. We must recognize that moral and ethical values don't spring out of some mythical fountain head of morality in Washington, DC or a psychiatrists couch. To instill character requires character. Schools must eliminate government sponsored use of behavioral drugs. Parents must insist on the maintenance of an academic environment; schools are not day camps for the maladjusted we once called juvenile delinquents.

It's not easy to summarize the scope and breath of such an insidious program. As we see it the WAVE program is a system of social indoctrination designed to manipulate the most immature, irresponsible, emotionally unstable and impressionable members of society for the basest of purposes. As incentives to compel compliance it utilizes bribery, jealousy, technology, peer pressure and the endorsement of "authority" figures. Those deriving the greatest benefit from this social program are the most aggressive, self-aggrandizing and subversive agents of our political system whose intention, in whole or part, is to wage cultural and political warfare on the most naïve, unsuspecting, vulnerable and gullible element of society, the family unit, for the purposes of political control and revenue enhancement. That about sums it up.

Hopefully, the parents in our semi-moral society will encourage their children to shun the WAVE system thereby leaving participation with the social misfits, pathological liars, frustrated emotional hysterics and maladjusted elements of junior society and their elder counterparts. Children by definition often tend to act irrationally, exercise poor judgement, and are innately insecure. Training them as informants is nothing less than criminal.

The bottom line is if you want your children to have and respect traditional values you MUST immediately remove them from the public school system. If you wish your children to belong heart and mind to family and not the state you must educate them on the fundamental moral values only found in the practice of religion. The alternative is to capitulate and simply WAVE goodbye to your children for their future loyalty and respect will be to the state and the paramilitary groups to whom they will report.

North Carolina do-gooder socialists are determined to give neo-Nazi groups a good name.

---

"There can be no beneficial union among members of a community, where these great principles of righteousness and truth, integrity and the fear of God, are not maintained, both among themselves, and towards all mankind. Any number of men, confederated together

in wickedness and injustice, can have no strength, but what they derive from being faithful to one another. Such a combination may exist among robbers and pirates: but their agreement ought not to be dignified by the name of civil union: it ought rather to be esteemed a wicked conspiracy against the rights of mankind, which can never be justified by number, nor on any pretense of public good." Pastor Elizur Goodrich, May 10, 1787.

---

## CHAPLAINS CORNER

### Unholy Alliances

"One great obstacle stands in the way of the final triumph of this global evil [communist /UN takeover], the Christians of America. In all of history God alone has been able to turn back the advances of evil. No "religion" has been capable of freeing man and exalting the worth and dignity of the individual as has Christianity." Abandonment Theology, John W. Chalfant, pg. 81.

#### Background:

During the War for American Independence there was a core group of men whose courage, leadership and heroism was absolutely critical to the cause of freedom and independence. Without their support the war may have been lost even before it had begun. These men were the American clergymen collectively known to the British Loyalists as the "Black Regiment".

Armed with courage and conviction, the men of the "Black Regiment" so distinguished themselves by their leadership that the clergy, elders and deacons of colonial churches formed the nucleus of Washington's officer corps. Yet, it was both the spirit and subject matter which they preached to their congregations that provided their greatest contribution to the cause of liberty.

From their classical education they developed a profound appreciation of Biblical law. They understood that obedience to God requires the teaching, understanding, and obedience to all God's laws. Why was this so important? Much like today, colonial ministers provided moral and Biblical instruction on man's relationship to other men and man's relationship to God. But quite unlike today, they also spoke long and eloquently on God's laws pertaining to government.

"The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." 2 Samuel 23:3

The ministers of colonial times understood the Biblical responsibilities of government to the governed and of the governed to government. Therefore, they also understood that rulers [government] which followed God's ordinances were lawful and ordained by God; the obedience of citizens is required. Conversely, the recognized that oppressive government acting contrary with Biblical law is not ordained by God. Citizens, to avoid becoming party to the evil of oppressive government, must resist it.

Consistency with Biblical law therefore determines the legitimacy of government and rulers. The colonial rally cry "No king but King Jesus!" reflects the belief of the colonial Christians that the allegiance of their church was to God alone, and that the legitimacy of the king and his magistrates existed only so long as they respected the natural or God-given rights of citizens.

"For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; he will save us."  
Isaiah 33:22 KJV

The colonial church provided moral instruction, leadership, encouragement, men and resources to the revolutionary effort. They endorsed the conflict as a "just" war in full harmony with Biblical tenets. In contemplating the War for Independence they drew a clear distinction of right and wrong in government, and found vindication for their belief in absolute Biblical values. The early American churches became a tremendous motivating force for the colonial militia and the nemesis of the British military. No wonder the British often used colonial churches for stables and barracks.

So imbued with an understanding of the importance of religion were the anti-Federalists that they insisted that the very first amendment to the constitution include the provision that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;..."

How is it then that in this period of ever increasing world disorder the church, whose Christian values formed the basis for our constitution and which owes allegiance and obedience to God alone, has become servant to the state? How is it that what the Founders sought so hard to ensure has resulted in just the opposite?

### Change & Consequences:

Approximately 87% of the churches in the US, according to the General Accounting Office, are incorporated as tax exempt religious organizations. Our churches no longer belong to God, they now belong to government. What prompted this capitulation? Did God or His laws change? Has there been some remarkable change in human nature, or perhaps some divine revelation which prompted churches to surrender to mammon? Has God failed us, or have we failed God?

We are in what some socialists today call the "post-Christian" age in which the dominant political philosophy is socialism administered through an all-powerful state (statism). This philosophy embraces the concept of moral relativism which holds that there are no absolute values of right or wrong, no absolute truth, and that intellect alone will ensure the perfectibility of man. This ego-centric value system is in direct contrast to traditional Christian values and Biblical law. Once again, we see the age-old cycle of conflict between good and evil; a tyrannical ruling elite attempting to supplant God and natural law.

In contemplating the consequences of this dramatic shift in religion [Christianity vs. Humanism], columnist David Kupelian, WorldNetDaily, recently speculated about the future of an unmoral America. He observes:

"Just as America has the noble tradition of liberty, but not nearly the substance it once had, so do many nominal Christians of today have the appearance and words of faith, but deep down are no different than the "heathen" they wish to evangelize. If you disagree, tell me how, with something like 80 million evangelical Christians in the United States, an immoral, lying sociopath like Bill Clinton could have been elected president -- twice."

Kupelian correctly observes that Christians have lost their spiritual discernment. He postulates that they [Christians] see themselves as having "a sort of diplomatic immunity" which gives them license to do that which previously would have been considered evil.

This concession to secular humanism is a form of escapism. Confused by the dialectic and intellectually barricaded inside a self-righteous cocoon many Christians find safety and security from confrontation on Biblical principle and practice in compromise and platitudes. With such moral instability it is not surprising that the church would so easily be lead astray nor difficult to find

a modern example of what happens to a society bereft of moral guidance. For this we need look no further to the churches of Nazi Germany which readily capitulated to Hitler's terror with tragic consequences to the fabric of that nation, its church and family structure.

Once we are able to acknowledge that modern churches are well off track in addressing the responsibilities of government, it is instructive to take a look at the mechanism causing this derailment.

### The Church Bites The Apple:

Government no longer feels bound by the First Amendment which forbids it from regulating the establishment or free exercise of religion. This guarantee been perverted through the mechanism of "public policy" and misconstrued by the "doctrine of separation" [of church and state] carefully refined through years of judicial gerrymandering. This public policy perspective has been developed to ensure that Christian values are as far removed from government and public life as possible. In turn it strengthens the manipulative potential and authority of the state by diluting the influence and moral authority of the church.

So it is then that church leadership has over the years abdicated its responsibility. It's clergy no longer respond to a "calling" from God, but answer to directives from government. In doing so, such churches have become creatures of the state and have effectively transferred their allegiance from the God of the Bible to the god of commerce. The lure is twofold, the promise of financial benefit and relief from bureaucratic harassment.

The bauble attracting "fishers of men" to the bait of mammon is found in Title 26, Internal Revenue Code, Section 501 (c) (3). This section of the Uniform Commercial Code provides exemption from taxation on corporations, and any organization organized and operated for religious, charitable, scientific, and educational purpose. In short, by the process of incorporation, churches legally become "tax exempt religious organizations".

According to the IRS, the agency does not *require* any church to register under Section 501 (c)(3) to be exempt from Federal Income Tax or receive tax-deductible contributions. Still, the majority of all churches in the United States have organized as non-profit tax exempt corporations under this provision of the IRS code.

To qualify as a "exempt" religious organization the organization must demonstrate to the IRS that:

1. "the particular religious beliefs of the organization are truly and sincerely held, and
2. That the practices and rituals associated with the organization's religious beliefs or creed are not "illegal or contrary to clearly defined public policy."

As a condition of incorporation, the IRS reserves judgement as to whether a "religious" organization is also a "church". That is, "the organization's activities in furtherance of its beliefs must be exclusively religious, ..." [i.e. metaphysical]. This insidious requirement is intended to ensure that the Biblical laws governing the relationship of man and God to government are excluded from religious teaching. Further, the circuitous provisions which maintain that incorporation is not necessary for an organization to be a First Amendment "church" circumvent the Constitution by also stipulating that full compliance with IRS incorporation requirements is mandatory to gain that recognition.



In becoming incorporated a "church" [tax exempt religious organization] gains "official" IRS recognition by becoming a "qualified organization". It thereby qualifies for the government privilege of "limited liability", and exemption from income taxes. It may expect to avoid state harassment, become eligible for non-profit postal rates and gain relief from taxes on certain products. In exchange for this "public" recognition it earns the privilege of being able to advertise its tax-exempt status as an economic incentive for membership. More importantly, the state grants it a privilege to exist as a fictitious legal entity called a "church", or more properly, a "tax-exempt religious organization".

As the saying goes, "there's no such thing as a free lunch". The cost and consequences of this moral sell-out are profound.

### The Secular Consequences:

Texe Marrs, author and pastor of Living Truth Ministries (<http://www.texemarrs.com>) has for some time struggled with IRS attempts to gag "politically incorrect" churches. Based on his experience he has identified thirty-five (35) things which "tax exempt" Christian churches are prohibited from doing. Consolidated for convenience, the forbidden activities include:

- \* Criticism of the New World Order or New Age Movement
- \* Criticism of any politician, government agency, or government institution
- \* Encouragement of political activism
- \* Support the Second Amendment or the citizen's militia
- \* Discouraging abortion
- \* Discussion or identification of threats to Christianity
- \* Criticism of the United Nations or other globalist oriented groups
- \* Support home schooling or alternative health care
- \* Promoting biblical teachings which may be "politically incorrect"

In short, the incorporated church is forbidden from any religious activity which teaches or implements any aspect of Biblical law involving the requirements of good government or the obligations of citizens regarding God and government. This of course, effectively eliminates freedom of speech in such state authorized churches and bans a significant portion of the Bible from public discussion. So much for the First Amendment as it relates to freedom of religion.

For those not gifted with common sense or the ability to differentiate between right and wrong, this minor compromise proves no obstacle to membership in the corporate church. Christians with a sense of Biblical obligation, however, chafe at the consequences, in this world and the next, that this betrayal represents. Actions have consequences. Those evident in the secular world include:

- Confidence in "mainstream" corporate churches is undermined; Biblically educated Christians flee to "free" churches, the apathetic majority readily compromise to secular humanism.
- Clergy and members alike are intimidated by the psychological barrier presented by government constraints imposed on the corporation.
- A culture of religious ignorance is encouraged and maintained.
- Any potential to change is effectively discouraged by financial as well as social considerations.
- Social and political activism, including civil disobedience, based on Biblical principle is constrained and discouraged.

Evidently it is not enough to make members unwitting accessories to the deification of the state church. With incorporation also come members of the clergy ready and willing to proselytize non-Biblical secular humanist themes to the apathetic and ignorant membership. Among the more contemptible social arguments posed by the humanist clergy is that there is no room for patriotism in the practice of religion. These "clergy" would have Americans abandon their God-given rights, shun confrontation with evil, and embrace pacifism in the name of Christianity. The prudent are warned that there are those in the clergy that would readily use the power inherent in God's word as an instrument of tyranny in support of unjust government.

Many citizens understand the threat of emerging tyranny. Yet in contemplating confrontation the docile sheep retreat in religious denial, ready to embrace an alternative theology, desperate to avoid both responsibility and consequence. Few question why God should be expected to do the impossible for the able but unwilling.

In accepting *all* government as established and ordained by God the humanist apologists of the clergy also ensure the complicity of Christians in maintaining corrupt and immoral governments as well as those sanctioned by God. Churches whose first allegiance is to the state, do so in rebellion against God, the only possible head of the church. Under such leadership the sheep are much more likely to be led to Hell than greener pastures.

While the secular implications of church incorporation are profoundly destructive, for the Christian the moral and religious consequences are even more significant. As we consider these aspects of incorporation we might well ponder why the Biblical remnant is always the intransigent 10% who refuse to compromise on absolute values.

#### Moral & Religious Consequences:

In consecrating a church, its members enter into a covenant, or contract with God. God is affirmed as the head of the church and the church bound by His law. Through consecration the church affirms its intent to abide by Biblical law and teaching and commits to standing for Christian principles, i.e., all that is good and right in the eyes of God.

"For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body." Ephesians 5:23

Through incorporation a church legally binds itself to the state. The God-given rights secured to the church by the First Amendment are surrendered and the corporation becomes a fictitious, or artificial "person" under the law, fully subject to the state, in exchange for privileges granted to the corporation. Under this relationship the state demands, and in practice succeeds, in ensuring its laws and regulations supercede those of God. In ceding its identity as a creation of Christ to a creation of the state the church endorses the corrupt values of the state over those of God.

What Christian in good conscience can rationalize that in granting the state the authority and obedience owed to God, a church does not also abdicate its covenant with God and thereby the benefit of His blessing? In surrendering its identity as a church of God to become a fictional entity to the gods of state does not the corporate church also as a consequence become a fictional entity in the eyes of God?

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."  
Matthew 6:24 KJV

Yet among the worst affects of incorporation is the moral corruption attendant with subjection to the gods of state. As necessity demands invention, there is no limit to the creative excuses that can and have been devised to excuse Christians from duty and responsibility.

Capitulation to mammon has always been marked by creative excuses. Humanist philosophy has prompted numerous non-Biblical ideologies calculated to circumvent commitment and responsibility in the interest of preserving the financial interests and social status of the "believer". Among the more creative is the invention of the pre-tribulation "rapture" doctrine, a non-biblical proposition conveniently discovered after being overlooked through 1800 years of Biblical study by ecclesiastical scholars, apostles, saints and laymen.

The moral bankruptcy of those who would use religion for political manipulation is perhaps nowhere more evident than with those that claim God, in allowing the establishment of government, ensured that all government is ordained by God and must be obeyed. In endorsing this un-Biblical spiritual and physical surrender, religious manipulators neglect to recognize the intimate cause and effect relationship of natural [God's] law. God ordains only rulers [government] who abide by His laws, he allows oppressive rulers when people, led to excess, stray from His law. The "punishment" [tough love] persists until the problem is resolved and the solution [moral rectitude] is restored. The intent is to provide incentive to repent. In short, evil government is allowed because we failed in our responsibility to prevent it. And it will last until we accept moral responsibility for the problem and fix it.

Christ demands that we choose sides, there can be no middle ground. Not choosing is not an option. Silence is the sound of bondage. The corporate church has chosen to side with the allies of humanism and global governance. Recognizing that a problem exists is inescapable.

"His authority and power over us is unlimited and uncontrollable, and cannot be denied, or opposed without our being guilty of the highest crime of rebellion." Samuel Sherwood, Minister, August 31, 1774

If we look at professing corporate Christians and clergy of today in contrast to those of our colonial period we see that something vitally important and fundamental to our system of government is clearly missing.

#### Whither We Goest:

The unorganized militia is not a religious organization, yet it is important for it to consider the viability of the church in our society. No apology or explanation should be necessary. The foundation of our government rests on a Constitution which is based on Biblical law. The foundation of our nation depends on the stability of family and society which is regulated, directly or indirectly, by the absolute values of right and wrong found in the Bible and affirmed by the Constitution. Under the law [Constitution], the armed citizen retains the ultimate duty and responsibility to ensure the security of the republic.

Many, if not most participating in the militia profess to be Christians. They look to the church for instruction and example regarding the moral and ethical relationships between men, God and government. Most consider it a moral duty to participate in and support the church of their

choosing. Churches in turn encourage and accept this voluntary relationship and assume the responsibility to be faithful caretakers of the apostolic charge.

In this custodial role the church the clergy are required to instruct its members, looking to Biblical example on the proper relationship of Christians to government. Magistrates and rulers must be instructed in their obligations to administer the law and justice consistent with Biblical principles of good government. Citizens also require guidance. They must understand the requirement to remain obedient to just government, their obligations to resist oppressive government, the frailties of human nature, and they must receive instruction on discernment so they can readily tell the difference.

Just as there is a time for peace and obedience, there is a time for resistance and conflict. Ministers of God have been instrumental throughout history in determining the need and legitimacy for [just] wars. As recently demonstrated by our nations' actions in Kosovo, the current government is incapable of marshalling the moral justification for a lawful war. More significantly, the oppressive hand of government has long exceeded the train of abuses which raised the ire of the Black Regiment prior and during the War for American Independence. So where are the Christian soldiers, the Black Regiment today? They are few and far between. But, thankfully, there are enough and they can be found.

They are not to be found in the corporate church of state. The corporate church, as we have demonstrated, is legally bound and it's first duty is obedience to the state. As the incorporated church has abandoned God, it has also abandoned its people to the whims of the humanist state. Where then will we look to find and draw upon the moral strength, faith and resolve necessary to overcome our frailties and confront the evil in our land. It won't be the state church. It is not only forbidden to support the citizen soldier but, lacking courage and conviction, is obligated and tacitly obliged to support the humanist values of the state even as it loudly proclaims its sanctity. It has voluntarily traded Almighty God for the almighty dollar.

A 501(c) church is a church without conscience. As citizen-soldiers, Christians are bound by Biblical law, duty and conscience to make a choice, to resist evil and defend our God-given rights. The members of the Black Regiment understood their duty to God and country. It is fitting that we take time to contemplate whether we, as a new generation of Americans, sufficiently appreciate what we have to defend it.

"... Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man."  
Ecclesiastes 12:13

We may attend a corporate church, taking comfort believing we are in league with God and like-minded souls. But many of us have, in the process, unknowingly participated in an unholy alliance with the state. We are in perilous times and many of us understand that unrestrained tyranny does not lead to a humanist/socialist utopia, but Hell on earth. Our need for discernment and firm insistence on clear values of right and wrong are imperative. We must make certain that which we are call good is not merely an image [a fiction] of good. We must be able to confront the moral relativists posing as clergy and assure them that there is no commandment which says: Thou shalt compromise and negotiate that which is right and wrong.

Today, right now, as a Christian citizen-soldier we are charging you with a mission. The fate of a nation hinges on your decision. This is it.

"... choose you this day whom ye will serve..." Joshua 24:15 KJV

---

"Cultivate, my friends, a martial spirit, strive to excel in the art of war, that you may be qualified to act the part of soldiers well; and, under providence, be helpful in vanquishing and subduing the enemies of God and this people; and be numbered among those who shall be worthy to wear the laurels of victory and triumph." Pastor Jacob Cushing, preached at Lexington, April 20, 1778

---

## **SMITH & WESSON:**

### A Calculated Gamble

The British owned Smith and Wesson company, ostensibly capitulating to political blackmail (or was it a globalist payoff?), recently struck a deal with the Clinton administration. In exchange for immunity from prosecution in the various frivolous lawsuits winding their way through the court system against firearm manufacturers, Smith and Wesson agreed to adhere to a set of voluntary "safety" measures and to impose the same measures on all those dealing in their products.

The agreement mandates for Smith and Wesson and their dealers:

- No gun show sales without background checks for all firearms
- Customers must have evidence of mandatory safety training before a sale
- All sales must be reported to the BATF
- Maintain an electronic inventory tracking system
- All employees must receive BATF-approved training
- Dealers must have liability insurance
- Persons under 18 must be accompanied by an adult
- Dealers must refuse to sell high capacity magazine or "assault" rifles, including those by other manufacturers
- Require that purchasers prove they are not buying for another person
- Agree to additional determinations made by a public/private oversight commission

Politically, it was a win-win strategy for the administration, and a lose-lose deal for Smith and Wesson. The administration would either realize a political windfall in gaining what it could not legitimately achieve through legislation or the bankruptcy of one of the largest firearms manufacturers. Either outcome would serve the aims of the confiscators.

In seeking political acceptance Smith and Wesson gambled that appeasement would lead to a greater market share and public acclamation. Unfortunately, they overlooked a few simple marketing truths: the government can't guarantee a market share, there's only so many slices in the federal agency contract pie, its economically hazardous to undermine or dictate to your customer base and, reputation counts.

Presumably not entirely stupid, Smith and Wesson is likely counting on the natural forgetfulness of the shooting public to overlook its indiscretions. In the short term it is unlikely they have learned that you can't lie with swine and not get dirty, nor run with wolves and not get eaten. Lest we become tempted to empathize with Smith and Wesson, we need to remember they had a choice. They could have retained their honor at the risk of bankruptcy and harassment, or they could collaborate in a classic attempt at extortion and manipulation of the firearms market.

Smith and Wesson chose to side with the globalist interests. It is therefore our business to make sure that the Smith and Wesson Company finds its way to the economic dust bin of history.

It is considered poor manners, to say the least, when a company dependent on the gun culture undermines the Second Amendment. Others have recommended and, in fact, have initiated a boycott of all Smith and Wesson products. We maintain that this alone is insufficient. Smith and Wesson must not just be hurt, it must be boycotted to bankruptcy. Absolutely, no purchase should be made from any dealer which sells any Smith and Wesson product.

The issues however are not simply confined to a blatant attempt to strong-arm the company into backdoor manipulation of the firearms industry. If Smith and Wesson prevails and the administration realizes effective control of the firearms market think of all the wonderful new black market opportunities for entrepreneurs and revenue enhancing sting operations. No doubt the Administration will also claim credit for the secondary job opportunities created. More significantly, if the Administration succeeds in this criminal endeavor, no industry or activity of any kind will be secure from the arbitrary dictates of the gangsters on capitol hill.

The only common sense response for gun owners as stake-holders in the process of freedom is to boycott all Smith & Wesson products. The boycott must have real teeth, there can be no compromise. Here's the opportunity to make a point that absolutely must be pressed home.

---

"Decent Americans are paving the road for tyranny just as the Germans did. In the name of one social objective or another, we are creating what the Constitution's Framers feared - concentration of power in Washington and the creation of a superstate. The Framers envisioned a republic. They guaranteed it in Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution, making an individual state's authority competitive with, and in most matters exceeding, federal authority. Now it's precisely the reverse. In the pursuit of lofty ideals like health care, fighting crime and improving education, we Americans have given up one of our most effective protections against tyranny - dispersion of political power." Walter Williams, columnist, Creators Syndicate, from Grim Reminders of Government Power.

---

## **DEVELOPMENT OF RESISTANCE FORCES**

### Combat Employment of Guerilla Forces

In the previous two issues of the CFP we summarized key points from the first three chapters from the Special Forces Officer Correspondence Subcourse entitled Development of Resistance Forces, Correspondence Subcourse 702, Introduction to Guerilla Warfare. The purpose of this review is to build awareness of some of the more important strategic and tactical elements of guerilla warfare. As such it is but a simple introduction to this complex topic which will have little value if only read and considered in the abstract.

In summary, in the two prior articles several points were emphasized including the importance and need for:

- \* Clarity of purpose, mission and goals
- \* Security in both organization and operations
- \* Ongoing moral and material support by the civilian population
- \* Simplicity in organization and methods
- \* Unit independence and decentralization with unity of command
- \* Economy of force and resources

The perspective of the Special Forces is to utilize guerilla forces only as an adjunct to conventional forces and only for the duration of hostilities. Following the conflict, demobilization of the guerilla forces is considered essential. We will skip this aspect of militia "management" in this discussion.

In this chapter guerilla forces are recognized for their utility and value in areas of intelligence gathering, harassment, infiltration, feint/deception and as support and combat supplement to conventional units. Utilizing examples from several past wars the text illustrates limitations in guerilla operations based on faulty communications, coordination and leadership.

Some of these observations as they relate to guerilla activities need to be modified depending on the character of the culture and individuals participating in partisan groups. In a more modern society the partisan organization may, in large part, be made up of ex-military personnel or individuals who are otherwise educated, well-equipped, and organized into groups. This characterization is somewhat different than in many historical insurgencies in which the resistance forces were poorly equipped, poorly educated, but resourceful.

The modern guerilla may have a lifestyle only distantly related to self-sufficiency. This separation from the land by culture and technology leaves the modern guerilla with disadvantages which may only be partially offset by education, training and resources. The organizational differences are striking. Balancing these disparities, Special Forces activities are intended to ensure that guerilla operations do not remain autonomous, but are guided or channeled into actions which may or may not be compatible with the political objectives of the guerillas.

Missions appropriate for guerilla forces are outlined as including:

- \* Interdiction and/or destruction of key targets to interrupt communication, transportation, or operation of key installations
- \* Psychological operations to help win civilian support and/or affect the morale and efficiency of the opposition
- \* Recovery of friendly personnel through escape and evasion
- \* Combat support including blocking and harassment missions
- \* Reconnaissance, security, occupation and communication support operations
- \* Counter-guerilla operations

At the conclusion of active combat operations standard army policy is to regard guerilla units as a potential threat to the new civil government. By necessity, their disarmament and demobilization is anticipated. In anticipating such actions in foreign countries, the text notes that such demobilization must be accomplished in a manner which ensures the stability of the new government and is "in harmony with the long-rang political objectives of the United States...". Of interest is that some of the same techniques employed against the opposition, in particular psychological operations, may be used against the supporting guerilla units to effect their demobilization.

What can we learn from this discussion? In considering some of the key facets of special operations we have the potential to gain a better understanding of the factors and activities which guide this unique form of warfare. It helps us understand that political manipulation even among allied groups remains an important factor in guerilla warfare. Finally, it helps us develop purpose and vision in contemplating the need for universal acceptance of clear goals and objectives, the character of highly variable operations, versatility in operations and concept, the need for a

balanced overall strategy, and an anticipation for the potential for political gerrymandering even during operational phases.

This concludes our synopsis of this Special Forces subcourse on Development of Resistance Forces.

---

"... That it is not rebellion, I declare it before God, the congregation, and all the world, and I would be glad if it reached the ears of every Briton, and every American; That it is no rebellion to oppose any king, ministry, or governor, that destroys by any violence or authority whatever, the rights of the people. Shall a man be deem'd a rebel that he supports his own rights? It is the first law of nature, and he must be a rebel to God, to the laws of nature, and his own conscience, who will not do it. A right to the blessing of freedom we do not receive from kings, but from heaven, as the breath of life, and essence of our existence; and shall we not preserve it, as the beauty of our being?

Do not the birds of the air expand their wings? The fish of the sea their fins? And the worm of the earth turn again when it is trod upon? And shall it be deem'd rebellion? Heaven forbid it! Shall Naboth's disputing with King Ahab, respecting his vinyard, be deemed rebellion? Or the people sending home their governor in irons some years ago, be deemed rebellion?

It is no more rebellion, than it is to breathe." John Allen, sermon to the Second Baptist Church in Boston, December 3, 1772)

---

## THE RISING

Inspiration

John Peter Muhlenberg, a minister in Woodstock, Virginia was elected colonel of a Virginia militia regiment prior to the War for American Independence. He was a fervent patriot. Following the reports of the opening conflicts between the colonial militia with the British at Concord and Lexington he made a farewell sermon to his congregation before preparing to travel north to join the fray. At the conclusion of his impassioned farewell sermon he threw off his clerical robes and stood before his congregation in full regimental dress. At his call to arms almost every man in his congregation enlisted under him at the church door. Colonel Muhlenberg went on to become a famous and successful general in the American army.

Muhlenberg and his famous sermon are honored in a poem by Thomas Buchanan Read. This excerpt from "The Wagoner of the Alleghenies" is from McGuffey's Fifth Eclectic Reader, Revised Edition, 1920. That we all might be blessed with an understanding of the call to arms:

1. Out of the North the wild news came,  
Far flashing on its wings of flame,  
Swift as the boreal light which flies  
At midnight through the startled skies.
2. And there was tumult in the air,  
The fife's shrill note, the drum's loud beat,  
And through the wide land everywhere  
The answering tread of hurrying feet,  
While the first oath of Freedom's gun



Came on the blast from Lexington.  
And Concord, roused, no longer tame,  
Forgot her old baptismal name,  
Made bare her patriot arm of power,  
And swelled the discord of the hour.

3. The yeoman and the yeoman's son,  
With knitted brows and sturdy dint,  
Renewed the polish of each gun,  
Recoiled the lock, reset the flint;  
And oft the maid and matron there,  
While kneeling in the firelight glare,  
Long poured, with half-suspended breath,  
The lead into molds of death.
4. The hands by Heaven make silken soft  
To soothe the brow of love or pain,  
Alas! Are dulled and soiled too oft  
By some unhallowed earthly stain;  
But under the celestial bound  
No nobler picture can be found  
Than woman, brave in word and deed,  
Thus serving in her nation's need:  
Her love is with her country now,  
Her hand is on its aching brow.
5. Within its shade of elm and oak  
The church of Berkley Manor stood:  
There Sunday found the rural folk,  
And some esteemed of gentle blood.  
In vain their feet with loitering tread  
Passed 'mid the graves where rank is naught:  
All could not read the lesson taught  
In that republic of the dead.
6. The pastor rose: the prayer was strong;  
The psalm was warrior David's song;  
The text, a few short words of might, --  
"The Lord of hosts shall arm the right!"
7. He spoke of wrongs too long endured,  
Of sacred rights to be secured;  
Then from his patriot tongue of flame  
The startling words for Freedom came.  
The stirring sentences he spake  
Compelled the heart to glow or quake,  
And, rising on his theme's broad wing,  
And grasping in his nervous hand  
The imaginary battle brand,  
In face of death he dared to fling  
Defiance to a tyrant king.

8. Even as he spoke, his fame, renewed  
In eloquence of attitude,  
Rose, as if seemed, a shoulder higher;  
Then swept his kindling glance of fire  
From startled pew to breathless choir;  
When suddenly his mantle wide  
His hands impatient flung aside,  
And, lo! He met their wondering eyes  
Complete in all a warrior's guise.
9. A moment there was awful pause, --  
When Berkley cried, "Cease, traitor!, cease!  
God's temple is the house of peace!"  
The other shouted, "Nay, not so,  
When God is with our righteous cause:  
His holiest places then are ours,  
His temples are our forts and towers  
That frown upon the tyrant foe:  
In this the dawn of Freedom's day  
There is a time to fight and pray!"
10. And now before the open door -  
The warrior priest had ordered so -  
The enlisting trumpet's sudden soar  
Rang throughout the chapel, o'er and o'er,  
Its long reverberating blow,  
So loud and clear, it seemed the ear  
Of dusty death must wake and hear.  
And there the startling drum and fife  
Fired the living with a fiercer life;  
While overhead with wild increase,  
Forgetting its ancient toll of peace,  
The great bell swung as ne'er before:  
It seemed as it would never cease;  
And every word it ardor flung  
From off its jubilant iron tongue  
Was, "WAR! WAR! WAR!?"
11. "Who dares" - this was the patriot's cry,  
As striding from the desk he came -  
"Come out with me, in Freedom's name,  
For her to live, for her to die?"  
A hundred hands flung up in reply,  
A hundred voices answered, "I!"

---

"Our only fear is lest you may shrink. May God give you virtue enough to save the liberties of your country." Letter from Philadelphia to Boston Committee of Correspondence in anticipation of Boston Tea Party, Sam Adams's Revolution, Cass Canfield.

---

## **BARNYARD FABLES #39**

### The Raid

Psst, pssst...", the loud hiss could be faintly heard coming from the high loft in the barn.

"Ralph... Hey, Ralph, wakeup, don't ya hear the Dog alarm goin' off up at the big house?", asked Fred with a sharp peck on his partners head.

"Sounds suspicious", replied Fred cocking his head critically out the loft door to the sundial in the side yard below. "Yup, moon on the sundial says it's only half past dark," confirmed Fred.

"There! There!", whispered Ralph with a sharp croak, his rigid beak pointing to the quick gray forms dashing past the corn silo.

A chorus of yaps and the shrill cackle of a Hen provided audible evidence that the tin can alarm sliding down the taut string to the Coop arrived too late.

The dull thuds of shutters and bars quickly muffled the sound of the terrorized Flock cackling and cawing in frantic confusion as they scrambled under the bars of the roost. Seconds later beady eyes firmly fixed to peepholes attested to the Home Guard taking positions.

"Got ya surrounded!", shrilled Red Fox prancing back and forth in front of the Coop, "An we got a hostage, too!".

"We want all yer pea-shooters" barked the Fox, "An we're here to negotiate"

"Corn-fritters!", Ozzie, crowed from inside the Coop taking note of the significant absence of the normally curious farm Animals, "Yer gonna have to come git em'!"

"Don't ya want ta keep peace on the Farm?" barked Red Fox, "Nobody else, 'cept maybe the Wolves, got the means and smarts to keep us all safe!"

A loud "Yelp!", broke the pre-dawn silence as a pea-shooter found its mark from behind the walls in answer to the demand.

"You Birds is Fowl creatures!" barked the Red Fox, "You want this here Bird back you better negotiate". "All the Critter's round here know them pea-shooters is dangerous to Chicks."

"Enjoy yer meal, Red ... the answer is NO!" crowed Ozzie.

"Come on now," reasoned Fox, "Surely we can compromise, maybe half would be OK. We may be Predators at heart, but we're pretty reasonable for Canines. Them wolves ain't so easy to deal with ya know...", the voice of Red Fox reasoned from outside the Coop walls.

"Ahhh, we know yer stripe. You Foxes is traiters to the Law of Nature. Didn't we catch ya puttin' barbecue sauce in the water jus' last week?", responded Ozzie.

"Hey!", barked Red Fox, "With a little effort you Birds could be jus' like all the other peaceful Critters 'round here. An if y'all agree to be polite an' submissive, we might go easy on ya," concluded Red.

"Cowpies!" crowed Ozzie with a defiant note in his crow, "Why.... why," he stuttered for words, "If we gave up our pea shooters we'd be no more than jus' .... Livestock!", he concluded.

---

"It has been observed that a pure democracy if were practicable would be the most perfect government. Experience has proved that no position is more false than this. The ancient democracies in which the people themselves deliberated never possessed one good feature of government. Their very character was tyranny; their figure deformity."  
Alexander Hamilton, June 21, 1778

---

## **BOOK REVIEW**

### Starship Troopers

Finally, it's time for some educational distraction, a diversion from books with an intellectual bias. It's possible to learn about something important while also being entertained. Robert A Heinlein first copyrighted Starship Troopers [ISBN: 0-441-78358-9] in 1959 indicating that it has stood the test of time. As a good yarn it was relevant then, it is more relevant today.

The general story line is essentially the same as in the recent movie by the same name, but that is where the similarities end. The movie version has bastardized the theme of the book to reflect a future world which is "federalized" in the manner of a benevolent statist dictatorship down to the quasi-Nazi uniform and symbols of a controlled state. The future of the movie comes complete with a gender-neutral army and, of course, an underlying sexual theme.

The book is far superior and interesting than the movie version. It features a future Mobile Infantry which uses mechanized armored spacesuits in a role reminiscent of the current armored recon platoon concept. It is the story of a young man, Juan (Johnny) Rico who enlists in the Mobile Infantry and survives the toughest boot camp in history to move up through enlisted trooper to officer rank in a series of off-world engagements.

The story involves hardship and combat in a strange world of planetary environments using a variety of novel weaponry. However, the most interesting aspect of the story is that of citizenship. Full citizenship in this future world, replete with voting rights, must be earned through military service. Two classes of citizens are recognized, citizen and legal resident. The author develops a perspective on "rights" quite different than that of today's society. In his future world the "right" to exist conveys no rights to the decision-making process of government.

Through the authors eye we gain some perspective regarding his conception of an army dedicated to duty and service. It is an army totally dedicated to performance, without politics, where stripes and responsibility are earned. The boot camp in the book is not about games as in the movie, but focuses on discipline, basic soldiering, and the fundamentals of survival.

Politics is where the book critically differs from the movie. In the book the characters review the philosophical concepts which demolish Marxist theology, illustrate the importance of the right to property and expose the fallacy of democracies. The author describes a society which understands how to deal with capital crimes, and has reconciled the need for corporal punishment for criminal offenders and discipline for children as a means of instilling social virtue.

Without pushing religion, Heinlein's characters discuss the premise that man does not have an instinct for moral behavior and that a moral sense must be cultivated in individuals for society to

survive. He explores the concept of "rights" and, as an answer to why men fight, explains the virtues of citizenship and the essential nature of a sound moral code in society.

Heinlein offers this explanation of the elements of a workable society to illustrate the basis for the motivation and intellectual justification which would compel the characters to participate in the dangerous undertakings anticipated by off-world combat. But it is not simply the moral virtues of citizens which capture the mind of the reader. Heinlein also propounds on the necessity and the elements required for a free society. Of all the images of the movie, none are more profound than his perspective on freedom as expressed in the book:

"Liberty is never unalienable; it must be redeemed regularly with the blood of patriots or it always vanishes. Of all the so-called natural human rights that have ever been invented, liberty is least likely to be cheap and is never free of cost."

Oh, did I mention, it also has great amount of action. The author gives due attention to the anxiety, thrill and exhilaration of combat. Through the story the reader becomes intimately familiar with central character and those in support roles while stressing the central theme, the price and importance of responsible citizenship.

This book is every bit as much an intellectual adventure as one of adventure and combat. Trash the video, read the book for the real story. Hell, if you were there the story would make you want to enlist.

---

"...democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths." James Madison, Federalist Papers No. 10.

---

## READERS COMMENTS:

*Sir: I would like to commend you on the job that you are doing and inform you that you have much more support than you might realize. I have never met you but have had several friends talk to you at gun shows and on the internet. I recently received a copy of the NCCM manual and I noticed that you made several references to Democracy and made it sound like Democracy was a bad thing. Why is this? Other than this I understand and agree with the contents of your manual and your mission. Thank you, John*

Editors Response: Thank you. Most people are quite content to have someone else walking point. It's good to know that the "army" is back there somewhere. Our pappy's told us never to volunteer, but we did it anyway. You may never see children that look like us, but we hope to leave tracks others can follow.

Several readers have asked us to respond to our stated disdain of democracy as a form of government. It's hard to turn around twice these days without finding some politician or political groupie hawking democracy. In asking your elected representative he will assure you that ours is not a "pure" democracy; that our form of democracy is consistent with the intent of the founding fathers and synonymous with "republic". He (or she) will not explain why Article 1, Section 4 of the Constitution defines our system of government as a republic, direct you to a written definition of what is meant by their use of "democracy", nor provide an explanation of where *their* democracy stops and where *our* republic begins.

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of Government."

In summary, democracy is simply rule by the majority. Under a democracy the citizen has no individual rights, only transient "privileges" granted by those who purport to speak for the majority. Democracy respects no property rights; all "rights" are negotiable based on political expediency. Democracy requires no morality, ethics, intellectual honesty or God-given anything. It is the system of looters, the trademark of the "might makes right" philosophy of the liberal/socialist, and the antithesis of a republic.

In leading us toward "democracy" our leaders are quite correctly informing us of their objectives. They understand the road to democracy leads to statism and communism. They sing a sweet melody; few Americans listen to the words, fewer still understand that the words have meaning.

The best summary statement we have seen describing the nature of democracy can be found in Volume II, No. 4 of *The Resister* (Spring, 1996). For the perspectives of the Founders serious readers must review at least the indexed references to democracy in both The Federalist Papers and The Anti-Federalist Papers. For a contemporary perspective on democracy the writings of Mikhail Gorbachev are very instructive; start with Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World.

"We want more socialism and, therefore, more democracy." M. Gorbachev

The frequency at which the term democracy is used is a general indication of how close we are to the approaching demise of the republic. The Founders would most certainly advise us to fear any politician who promises us a democracy.

----->>

*Sir: How about some voting advice on these candidates. It is very hard to Find any real good hard facts on the mainstream media outlets. I would love to see something about it in the Carolina Free Press. Thanks, Pete*

*PS. Do you get the Resistor? and what do you think about it?*

Editors Response: Thank you for your inquiry. We have received several requests for election information and voting recommendations. Regretfully, our time and staff resources are too limited and our mission requires our attention elsewhere. If you, or someone with like "constitutional" spirit, were to submit a draft article summarizing the options it would certainly be considered for publication. Excellent voting perspectives are provided by several organizations such as Gun Owners of America ([www.gunowners.org](http://www.gunowners.org)) and Grass Roots North Carolina. Before we retreat under cover of cynicism, it may be significant to observe that there is no hope for relief at the national level. The opportunity for administrative reform, if there is to be any, must originate with the states. That therefore, is where your voting efforts should be focused.

Yes, we get The Resistor. We consider it required reading.

---

**IN THE WIRE**

Marines Invade Swansboro:

US Marines invaded Swansboro, NC for MOUT training on April 10-14. Ostensibly training for overseas assignments in urban environments the official press cites their preparation in anticipation of deployment to the Middle East. We wonder what city in the Middle East so resembles Swansboro as to justify training there. On the other hand, we also take note that like all good soldiers they train as they expect to fight. We should therefore expect them to fight in the environments in which they train.

The Million Mom March:

The Alamance Independent [www.alamanceind.com] reports that the much heralded Million Mom March against firearms being scheduled for the near future in Washington, DC appears struggling for identity. Organizers hope to attract as many as 50,000 participants. Although well funded by liberal sources, it appears that the ladies on the left may not quite have the grassroots support they hoped to realize.

Opportunity Knocks:

Nope, it's not there, we looked... twice. In addition to the only legitimate question on our Census 2000 form, the one about how many people live here, there are 52 others probing some of the most private aspects of our lives. The one we were looking for didn't show up. We figure it just stands to reason that the government that is "honest" enough to guarantee each of our communities a "fair share" of the loot ought to be honest enough to ask if we also want the socialist government required to do the looting. Yes indeed, there is little doubt we'll all get what's coming to us if the looting continues.

It's unfortunate the Census only wants to know how many folks will bunk here on April 1<sup>st</sup>; we plan to be out of town. The Bureau reports that they have a 61% return rate. We hope the Census is getting what it deserves. Tea will be served in the CFP offices after the census to everyone arriving suitably attired in paint and feathers.

+=====+

**COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS:**

The CAROLINA FREE PRESS gladly accepts your comments, suggestions, articles and letters. Those which best reflect the principles of freedom, independence, and republicanism may be published.

The CAROLINA FREE PRESS can currently be reached via:

NCCM Website: ncmilitia.org

Telephone: 828/456-8122

Mailing address: Carolina Free Press

P.O. Box 994

Canton, N.C. 28716

Copyright 2000, CAROLINA FREE PRESS - Permission to print/copy and distribute is granted as long as content is not altered and proper credit given. Electronic reproduction and distribution is encouraged.

-----  
END