

The CAROLINA FREE PRESS

Winter, 2001 Volume VII Issue 1

Electronic Version

<=====➔

MILITIA PERSPECTIVES

Behind The Bush

THE UNORGANIZED MILITIA

A Refresher Course

HUMAN RIGHTS WEEK 2000

Carding The Wool

THE GREAT MILITIA

Article by Dave Delany

BARNYARD FABLES #43

The Recruiter's Visit

BOOK REVIEW

"Take That You Commie"

BOOK REVIEW

"On Killing"

IN THE WIRE

Mid-East Peace

The Ashcroft Hearings

Small Victories

READERS COMMENTS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

"Liberty has never come from government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of government. The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of government power, not the increase of it." Woodrow Wilson, September 9, 1912.

MILITIA PERSPECTIVES

New Year Resolutions:

Some of us quite naturally got together over the holidays to reminisce over things past, speculate about the future, swap sea stories and spit over the back fence. New Years found a group of us huddling around the wood stove in anticipation of getting some authentic martial arts

instruction on TV before the official festivities. One thing led to another and soon we were off on New Year's resolutions.

Clyde made the first resolution which was quickly adopted by acclamation. He maintained that this being the digital age and in view of his accomplishments toward socializing America, each of us ought to extend a digit to King Willie to celebrate his departure from office. That got things moving. Then Mike showed off his new genuine "collectable" presidential commemorative coin purchased from a TV advertisement. Sure enough, it shows the likeness of both George Jr. and Al Gore in "spectacular" color. We couldn't help but be impressed. There it was, proof positive, the two primary "presidential" contenders nothing more than opposite sides of the same coin.

Coming in with an armload of wood, Ralph complained that the only honest reporters on the tube anymore were weatherman. And, if that wasn't bad enough, he maintained, even they were right only about half the time.

Quickly grabbing the soapbox, Mike reminded us that the primary purpose of government directed "education" was to provide a common culture to facilitate control of the population. The idea, Mike continued after pausing to spit out a bit of tobacco, was a lot like the government in his bee hives. Under the pretext of education, government was turning children into so many conforming drones, suitable only for serving the greater good of the hive. I don't know all of the answers, Mike said, but he was encouraged that so many more so-called ignorant "redneck" militia folks like him were breaking the mold of conditioning by daring to think independently.

Dave, the group optimist, cynically pointed out that things weren't all that bad and didn't the President himself say the economy was booming. NAFTA and GATT, he explained, were more than meeting official expectations and our trade deficit was bigger than at any time in history. With major companies announcing over 175,000 layoffs in December alone, he anticipated a tremendous boost to the economy from the business generated for all those out-placement service companies. And, he reminded us, not to forget the wonderful pool of labor now available for those high-paying jobs at fast food establishments.

Well, so it went. No telling what our intellectual exercise might have produced in time. But, professional wrestling was next up on the tube and, determined to resist the apathy gripping most Americans, we sure didn't want to miss out on our joint martial arts training for the month.

The Clinton Legacy:

A number talk shows of late been cheerfully debating the many accomplishments of president Clinton in an attempt to define his "niche" in history. Many have noted some of his remarkable achievements. Some of the more notable include: indictment without conviction, numerous indictments for cabinet members and officials, an unprecedented number of administration-related murders, the burning of a church and mass murder at Mt. Carmel, Texas, the sale of political favors and nuclear technology to China, the evisceration and demoralization of the armed forces, mass theft of natural resources in the name of the environment, engendering the contempt of the world by spreading war, death and tyranny to other countries, and bringing new and lower standards of morality and ethics to public office.

Our list of Bill's achievements would still be far from complete if we did not include such activities as his efforts to accelerate the global socialist agenda, economic manipulation, the

unbridled expansion of government laws and regulations, institutionalizing public manipulation through political “newspeak”, and making a mockery of the “rule of law”.

Yet with all these leftist “achievements” our past president has indeed brought about some positive initiatives. Our nomination for the Clinton legacy is based on a realization that the success of his socialist agenda was dependent upon massive corruption throughout his administration, each branch of government, and with [active or passive] willing accomplices throughout the military and civilian bureaucracy. In boldly expanding the war on American citizens, by dropping all pretense of maintaining our constitutional republic and actively promoting a Marxist based “democracy”, this president has done what no other president has been able to do. Clinton has provoked the re-emergence of the unorganized, citizens militia.

This then is the Clinton legacy. He has motivated a significant minority of free, armed Americans to indicate by their simple preparation and organization, that the sellout of America to socialism and world government will not go unopposed.

An Election Proposal:

Those willing to see learned a lot from the Florida election debacle. For example, even in America it doesn't take a lot of people to manufacture a banana republic election. First you start with a general population unfazed by political corruption, mesmerized by “newspeak”, and terminally apathetic. Enlist the services of a few saintly political hacks experienced at raising the dead, arranging voting privileges for the insane and unqualified, who can determine voter intentions by the intuitive examination of chad and otherwise perform minor miracles of vote manipulation. Next, thoroughly alienate voter groups with blatant misrepresentations by the news media. Mix well in a political blender with a few loyal-at-any-cost state Supreme Court justices. There you have it... Hegelian cake and public acceptance of the lesser of two evils!

In an attempt to take full advantage of the Hegelian opportunity, a move is afoot to do away with one of the few remaining obstacles to democracy, the electoral college. Not content to let the election muddle settle, Senator Hillary proposes to legislate the electoral college into oblivion. On the other side of the political aisle the “good cop” element of the Hegelian conspiracy proposes that we expand on the “drive through” voter registration concept. It involves changing to a democratic system of electronic voting. The voting machines would be connected by modem to a central national computer system. The system, of course, will be run by the same folks we trust the least, next to professional politicians, i.e., the national media. State and national election results, with this electronic system, would be instantly available to a demanding public. Of course, that such a system would be irresistible to would-be manipulators who could perform their deeds virtually undetected and without any pretense of accountability.

Given the above, there is yet another, even more cost-effective alternative. That is, tele-voting. Why spend billions more. We need only look to our nearest telephone. It may take a little longer to program the entire telephone system, but after all, if a little corruption is acceptable, why not give everyone the opportunity to vote as often as they like?

Behind The Bush:

Quite a few in the conservative socialist have worked themselves into a virtual euphoria anticipating that newly sworn King George the Lesser will make all things right, brashly assuming a new political “dawn” has arrived and all the world will soon be at peace. Also overlooked is the perfect Hegelian “good cop” counterpoise to the Clinton administration.

These true believers celebrate Bush as an all around “good guy” whose actions are motivated by “compassion for others”. Great. But what the country needs is a pragmatic and intelligent president, not an emotional sop. Americans don’t need more government or more compassion ... socialism is killing us.

OK, let’s assume Bush is the long awaited political messiah of the conservative right. The Clinton administration didn’t take the garbage with them when they left. It’s still there along with the stench of corruption. Yet according to a fawning media and Republican pundits, we are led to believe the fix is in. Among the most reassuring disclosures is the alleged relief of congress on learning the new president will be busily occupied during his first days revoking some of those nasty Clinton Executive Orders. Of course, the Republican majority could have done it too, but they didn’t. Then we have the reassurances of Colin Powell, our new Secretary of State, who has indicated the new administration will [no kidding] pursue a national missile defense system and back away from the international criminal court.

Perhaps the past election may have bought the nation a slight reprieve from the encroachment of national socialism and global governance, but did it really? King George the Lesser remains a CFR Trilateralist, handpicked for office because of his commitment to the globalist New World Order agenda. He may not be a scandalous sweet-talker like Clinton, but you can bet your posterity he not only owes a lot of political favors and compromises, but his fundamental loyalty is to those who placed him in office. And what politician has ever delivered on all the promised freebies to a gullible public?

It make take us a while to see what he is selling or giving away and to whom, but it is clear that he is stacking the deck. George Jr. has promised us “change” and “a new direction” yet he has surrounded himself with those committed to the old and dangerous. Besides Colin Powell, George Tenet (CIA) and Louis Freeh (FBI), for example, are all political “insiders” with intimate knowledge of government cover-ups and illegal activities. The Red Chinese connection may very well be maintained in the Bush administration through Secretary of Labor nominee, Elaine Chao, who is reported to have long-standing and intimate connections with Red Chinese leaders. In summary, Bush is surrounding himself with some new faces as well as many carry-overs from past Republican administrations, almost all of whom carry the same globalist, New World Order philosophies and goals. Of course, we could charitably assume that these appointments are simply political compromises, that Bush is “his own man”. Yet even in this “best we could hope for” scenario, if this were true we can be assured that his handlers will find some way to quickly curtail any independent aspirations Bush might have. In politics, we understand, nothing happens by accident. It’s January, and the tracks are plain in the snow.

If you consider yourself a committed Republican, stop drooling for a moment and pay attention to some insightful and sobering comments from the Joel Skousen’s World Affairs Brief newsletter (www.joelskousen.com) of January 19, 2001:

“The conservative facade of the new Bush administration continues to disintegrate in their head-long determination to placate a liberal media and Senate in the name of “bi-partisanship” and “unity”. *Unity* is a code word meaning: “everybody moves to the left till we reach unity.” No right-ward direction is allowed nor even a meeting in the middle ground. Once conservatives buy into this unspoken definition of unity, the press holds them hostage to it, exacting ever greater compromises. In reality, the Bush administration knows exactly what is going on. Bush’s top CFR strategists are purposefully allowing themselves to be bound by this political sophistry because it gives

them the excuse they need **NOT to deliver on the conservative agenda** Americans expect. How else can they excuse their failure to overturn Clinton's rash of executive orders and bad laws, when they control both the presidency and Congress?"

Remember your abysmal disappointment of the last, "no new taxes, New World Order allegiance pledging" Bush that held the presidency? If so, what makes you think these new guys are your friends?

Economy Class:

One of these days we hope to trade in our official militia transport (the old pickup) and upgrade to economy class, maybe even to something in OD green with a roof. Given the times we occasionally take time out to evaluate the state of our economy. Our in-depth evaluation, no doubt very much like yours, involves both micro and macro analysis. On the micro level we give the coffee can bank a hardy shake to verify the security of our financial reserves and check the newspaper to verify that our company hasn't announced its' relocation to the Ukraine or some other workers paradise while we were asleep.

On the macro level our latest survey was somewhat interesting. Mr. Federal Reserve himself, Alan Greenspan, warned in December that this years' economic growth will be more modest. He explains:

"In periods of transition from unsustainable to more modest rates of growth, an economy is obviously at increased risk of untoward events that would be readily absorbed in a period of boom."

We suppose he means that, since the boat is loaded to the gunnels, it won't take much rocking to sink it. Mr. Traficant, Representative from Ohio, appears to clarify matters for us in his presentation to the House of Representatives on December 5th:

"Mr. Speaker, America's trade deficit for September hit \$35 billion for one month, \$35 billion. America is heading for a \$420 billion, 1-year trade deficit. Unbelievable. If this continues, America will have a crash that will make 1929 look like a fender-bender. What is even worse, China is now taking \$100 billion of cash out of our economy, buying missiles, and pointing them at us. Beam us up, all of us. We must be stupid. Ronald Reagan almost destroyed Communism, and the Clinton administration has reinvented it, is not subsidizing it, and is not stabilizing it."

But, but ... didn't Bill recently reassure us that now, thanks to his economic programs, the country is enjoying unbridled prosperity, that we have repaid \$600 billion on the national debt and may eliminate it within 10 years? Of course, its "newspeak", we aren't supposed to understand.

Situation Report:

Year 2001 continues with the "new" political paradigm. On one hand we still have the "West" seeking world domination based on the premise that the control of money and political pressure are sufficient to mold the world into a New World Order based on power politics. War, they suggest, cannot be effectively pursued without financial resources which they control.

In the "East", communist and other totalitarian countries cling to the age-old principle that political power emanates from the barrel of a gun, i.e., might makes right. Both are represented by unprincipled tyrants with the same objectives, world subjugation. Whether they wear business suits or not, both sides agree that the end justifies the means. As citizens we are caught between the bear, the dragon and the vultures.

Sooner, rather than later, the validity of the new paradigm will be tested. In the meantime, we have Team B to guide our national descent into the socialist gulag.

On the inside, for the last few months we've been working overtime doing what good militia groups do, making hay so to speak. We've gotten a little behind in our publication schedule. Most people understand what we're about so we're certain our paying subscribers wouldn't mind, if we had any. Our distribution list runs into the thousands; we figure somebody must like to see it. So we'll just call this our winter issue and see where we go from here.

"On every question of construction [of the Constitution] let us carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text, or invented against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed." Thomas Jefferson, letter to William Johnson, June 12, 1823.

THE UNORGANIZED MILITIA

A Refresher Course

History:

With the adoption of the Constitution in 1789, congress was granted the authority to "raise and support Armies, .. provide and maintain a Navy; ...make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces;". There was no need to authorize or create a citizens [unorganized] militia. The militia had already been in existence throughout the colonies for over one hundred years. During that time it had become universally accepted as an essential element of security to the colonies, and it was armed citizens, acting in the capacity of the militia, which literally made the new country possible. In doing so the militia literally provided for the "security of a free state", thereby enabling the formation of a limited constitutional republic. With authority derived from the people, this new government was granted enumerated powers to secure the rights of citizens, and in general provide for domestic order.

The Constitution affirms the existence and legitimacy of this militia or citizen-army in Article 1, Section 8. There, in paragraph 15, it authorizes the federal legislature to call up the militia for three purposes, that is, to "execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions". To accomplish this end it also authorized the legislature to provide standards for "organizing, arming, and disciplining" the militia and regulating that part of the [organized] militia which were employed in federal service. The Constitution reserves to the States [legislatures] the "Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress".

If the federal and state legislatures fail to exercise their authority, in this instance with respect to the militia, the individual and collective right to self-defense or to act in common cause as the

militia does not expire, cease to exist or become invalid. As the repository of all authority, under the common law system of government outlined by the Constitution, the responsibility to secure the “blessings of life, liberty and property”, is “retained” or “reserved” to the people themselves.

“All political power is vested in and derived from the people; all government of right originates from the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the people.” Section 2, Constitution of the State of North Carolina (as amended to 1975).

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.” Declaration of Independence, paragraphs 2 & 3.

As a restrictive document the Constitution provides both actual and implied limits to federal authority over the militia. The militia could be called to federal service only within the borders of the country and only for those purposes listed. Further, congress was given no authority to prohibit, disband, redefine, or disarm the militia. And, since government derives its “just powers from the consent of the governed”, other than for support and standards, the citizen-army was intended and remains outside the direct control of government except for that portion which may be temporarily called to service for Constitutional functions.

During the debates over the ratification of the Constitution advocates of a strong central government (“Federalists”) argued that the constraints placed on the federal government were sufficient to limit its authority to delegated powers and to guarantee rights retained by the citizens and the States (legislatures). Aware of the predisposition of governments throughout history to corruption and exploitation of their citizens, advocates of de-centralized government, the “Anti-federalists”, sought to further ensure that the guarantees of the Constitution would be clear and unambiguous. To “prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers” they demanded and secured as a condition of ratification, the addition of certain “declaratory and restrictive” clauses known as the Articles in Amendment to the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.

“A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.” Second Amendment.

“A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; and, as standing armies in time of peace are dangerous to liberty, they shall not be maintained, and the military shall be kept under strict subordination to, and governed by, the civil power...” Section 30, Constitution of the State of North Carolina (as amended to 1975).

The Second Article in Amendment (both federal and State) recognizes the militia as separate and distinct from the “armies” and Navy (the “organized” militia) referenced in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution. Its very inclusion in the Articles unequivocally demonstrates the resolve of the Founders to preserve the natural right of the people to collective and individual self-defense. In insisting that an armed citizenry was and is “necessary to the security of a free state”, the amendment affirms that without the existence of the armed citizenry the State (legislature) does not possess the means to ensure the freedoms of its citizens. Conversely, by rejecting or

neglecting to acknowledge or sanction the Constitutional militia the State telegraphs a message with chilling implications to its citizens, i.e., that the armed citizen is superfluous to its authority.

Composition Of The Militia:

The “militia” is not specifically defined in the Constitution leading some to define its membership based on political expediency. Upon examining the facts, there is little room for debate. The Founders themselves were articulate and unambiguous in defining the militia.

“I ask you, sir, who are the Militia? They consist now of the whole people...”. George Mason, drafter of the Virginia Bill of Rights.

“A militia when properly formed are in fact the people themselves ... and include all men capable of bearing arms... To preserve liberty it is essential that the whole body of people always possess arms... The mind that aims at a select militia, must be influenced by a truly anti-republican principle.” Richard Henry Lee of Virginia, Additional letters From The Federal Farmer, 1778.

“Who are the militia? Are they not ourselves? Congress have no power to disarm the militia. Their swords and every other terrible implement of the soldier, are the birthright of an American ... The unlimited power of the sword is not in the hands of either the federal or state governments, but, where I trust in God it will ever remain, in the hands of the people.” Trench Coxe, The Pennsylvania Gazette, February 20, 1788.

The composition of the militia has been clearly defined by a number of credible bodies. In the language of the Supreme Court, the militia consists of:

“all males physically capable of acting in concert for the common defense” expected “to appear bearing arms supplied by themselves,” arms of “the kind in common use [by the organized militia] at the time,” “part of the ordinary military equipment,” bearing “some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well-regulated militia.” (U.S. vs. Miller, 1939.)

In less contentious times the federal government defined classes of militia in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Of particular interest is the grouping of the National Guard into the organized militia under federal control and as equivalent to the army authorized in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution. The constitutional militia is recognized by a “term of art” as the “unorganized” militia. A statutory creation of the legislature, the National Guard was structured to specifically circumvent the service limitations of the unorganized militia:

“(a) The militia of the United States consists of all able-bodied males at least 17 years of age and, except as provided in section 13 of title 32, under 45 years of age who are, or have made a declaration of intention to become, citizens of the United States... (b) The classes of the militia are: 1) the organized militia, which consists of the National Guard and the Naval Militia; and 2) the unorganized militia, which consists of members of the militia who are not members of the National Guard or Naval Militia.” Title 10, United States Code, Section 311.

“That the National Guard is not the “militia” referred to in the second amendment is even clearer today. Congress had organized the National Guard under its power to “raise and support armies” and not its power to “Provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the

Militia.” From “The Right to Keep and bear Arms”, Report of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 97th Congress, 2nd Session, (1982).

It is relevant to note that “membership” in the constitutional [unorganized] militia is automatic or involuntary. Qualified citizens have no requirement to “join”, they become natural members as a function of citizenship. Participation is a right, duty and obligation, however, at present there are no penalties for failure to participate except those inevitable consequences associated with the failure of citizens to exercise “eternal vigilance”.

The Select Militia:

State militia organizations, including those organized as “State Defense Forces” (e.g. State Guards, State Reserve Forces, etc.) identify themselves as the only legitimate constitutional militia. In fact, they have mission statements which parallel that of the constitutional [unorganized] militia. Militia organizations such as the North Carolina State Guard Association, which we understand has been dissolved, are not prohibited by the State or federal constitution, but may be organized under the powers reserved to the States (legislatures).

“The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” Ninth Article in Amendment

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” Tenth Article in Amendment.

SDF organizations are generally dedicated to constitutionally recognized or exempt functions, but they are not the unorganized militia of the Constitution. The State Guard Association (SGAUS) for example, is organized as 501(c)(3) tax exempt organization and as such it is incorporated under and subject to federal regulations as a business. A State military organization by any name is a *select* militia, not forbidden to the States, but understood to be part of the organized militia. It’s membership does not inherently include all qualified citizens, a constitutional requirement of the unorganized militia, and their organizational viability is solely dependent upon recognition, or authorization of the legislature (or executive). The constitutional militia, as previously noted, is an integral part of the nations military organizational structure. Its existence, like the Second Amendment, is not dependent upon legislative approval or support.

Duties & Responsibilities:

The first duty of the constitutional [unorganized] militia is to be well-regulated, that is, to be subject to basic standards of discipline, uniformity, and trained to bearing arms. Historically, the term “well-regulated” was never intended to apply only to State [select] militia organizations or to imply that State recognition is a necessary criteria for legitimacy. To accept such interpretation would mean that the right to bear arms was solely a collective right reserved to the State and not also an individual right. It would also infer that political power is not “vested in and derived from” the people, but that it originates with and is retained by the State itself. This is a purely statist interpretation which is not substantiated by fact, Constitution, or the Founders.

“It requires no skill in the science of war to discern that uniformity in the organization and discipline of the militia would be attended with the most beneficial effects whenever they

were called into service for the public defense.” Alexander Hamilton, Federalist Papers No. 29, p.2.

The now obsolete Uniform Militia Act of 1792 which remained on the books for 111 years, or until 1903, provided the first set of general standards for the militia. Then as now, by virtue of citizenship all qualified citizens are members of the unorganized militia. As such, voluntary association of citizens as the militia for strictly constitutional purposes, particularly in the absence of legislative oversight, are therefore not private “associations” or “private” militia groups, but represent an exercise of those fundamental and unalienable rights of all citizens to assemble for the purpose of ensuring the “security of a free state”. Those that disparage or who would otherwise deny citizens these rights have a political agenda incompatible with the Constitution and themselves constitute a threat to the “security of a free state”.

While the militia is temporarily responsible to the State or federal legislature when called for Constitutional or other lawful purposes, the ultimate responsibility of the militia is to secure “the blessings of Liberty” to the people themselves. When not specifically called for duty by the legislature, the militia must remain “well-regulated” under the direction of elected officers, pursuant to the authority retained by the people, or under the general direction of State officers, if appointed. Regardless of the regulating authority, the militia cannot be called upon to perform unconstitutional, illegal or unlawful acts and is lawfully bound to reject such orders or requests.

In the broadest sense, the people themselves are the owners of the Constitutional contract. It is they who have granted enumerated powers to federal and State government to provide for their security and liberty. In the absence of legislative accountability, they reserve to themselves the authority and duty to preserve the domestic tranquility, protect life, liberty and property, and the responsibility to protect the nation from all enemies “foreign and domestic”. And, in the event of legislative insurrection, the people themselves, acting in their capacity as the militia, are accountable for the preservation of a republican form of government (Article 4, Section 4, of the Constitution). Regarding the latter, the duty and responsibility of the militia is clearly affirmed as follows:

“If the representatives of the people betray their constituents, there is then no recourse left but in the exertion of that original right of self-defense which is paramount to all positive forms of government...” Alexander Hamilton, Federalist Papers No. 28.

“That whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness...”. Declaration of Independence

In recent years it has been the argument of certain political factions that the unorganized “militia” is illegal, outmoded, improperly defined, or unnecessary in this peaceful world. These statist arguments are purely political, self-serving and constitutionally incorrect. Such arguments reflect the inherent friction between common and statutory law or, more properly, the struggle to determine who will exercise sovereign authority in America, the State or the people. The issue is legitimacy. The ultimate stumbling block to the usurpation of the Constitution, i.e. the “people”, remains the armed citizen, collectively recognized as the [unorganized] militia. The existence and function of the militia remain to this day non-negotiable.

“No free government was ever founded or ever preserved its liberty without uniting the characters of the citizen and the soldier in those destined for the defense of the state.

“Whenever governments mean to invade the rights and liberties of the people, they always attempt to destroy the militia, in order to raise an army upon their ruins.” Rep. Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, Floor debate on the second amendment, I Annals of Congress at 750, August 17, 1789.

Consent & Control:

Officers who may be appointed by a State legislature over the militia are first and foremost responsible to the highest law of the land, that is, the Constitution, and in doing so, serve the interests of the state, i.e., the people. Such officers are responsible to the legislature only so long as their direction remains consistent with Constitutional authority. No doubt due in part to these limitations, the federal and some State legislatures find recognition of the unorganized militia politically repugnant. Declared federal intent to unilaterally subrogate our Constitution and constitutional republic to United Nations governance, thereby depriving citizens of their rights and freedom, demonstrate that the fears of the Anti-federalists were well founded.

State legislatures have the authority to prohibit assembly and demonstrations by armed groups, and particularly those organized for unlawful or other unconstitutional purpose. However, they have refrained from attempting to abolish the militia. Any such attempt to reserve to the State a monopoly on force would constitute a declaration of intent to supplant the power vested in the people and consolidate all political and police powers in government. That, of course, is the definition of tyranny. While legislatures and agencies have focused much attention on watching the unorganized militia, in reality, given the numerous abuses of Constitutional authority over the years at every level of government, it is even more essential for citizens to watch the legislature to ensure that they and the agencies under their jurisdiction remain within lawful Constitutional bounds.

“The people have a right to assemble together to consult for their common good, to instruct their representatives, and to apply to the General Assembly for redress of grievances;...” Section 12, Constitution of the State of North Carolina (as amended to 1975).

“A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty.” Section 35, Constitution of the State of North Carolina (as amended to 1975).

Given the abdication of legislative responsibility for the unorganized militia, the question arises as to who can call up the militia in times of need. Historically, the authority under common law to call out the unorganized militia has resided with elected officials. However, as plainly demonstrated by Paul Revere and others who alerted the countryside prior to the revolutionary battles at Concord and Lexington in 1776, any responsible citizen can, and has a duty, to call out the unorganized militia if there is sufficient need to do so. Of course, prudence and legal constraints dictate that such authority only be exercised when justified.

The Future:

Author R.A.I. Munday, in an essay entitled “On Liberty” reminds us that “For the duration of recorded history, serfdom has been the norm for most of mankind.” (Safeguarding Liberty, p.

97.) Today we see the shadow of approaching serfdom in the exercises of professional soldiers in our towns and cities preparing to assault our homes and communities, as they do in other nations, to enforce unconstitutional control over citizens and firearms. We also plainly see encroaching tyranny in the ongoing efforts of government to change our constitutional republic and subject us to the control of a foreign power, the United Nations.

In his essay on “The Dutch-American Guerillas of the American Revolution” found in the book *Safeguarding Liberty*, author William Marina observes:

“...revolutionary warfare is primarily a question of psychology and politics, often including ideology. But all great theoreticians of revolutionary war have recognized that it is a struggle over legitimacy.”

The State, having done much to undermine classical education, has failed in its [unconstitutionally] assumed responsibility to educate the people as to the duties and responsibilities of citizens and government. But there should be no doubt as to the legitimacy of the unorganized militia. While delegated as a function of government, it is the people themselves as armed citizens who retain the ultimate authority to provide for their safety and security. Conversely, the federal government, in its efforts to force unconstitutional changes on America and merge it into a global socialist society, is perilously close to abdicating any claim to political legitimacy. That, of course, is why a dishonest government fears armed citizens communicating and acting in concert as the constitutional [unorganized] militia.

Fortunately the Founders of this nation had the foresight to give us the tools as well as the benefit of their insight to deal with the evils of this world, if we only have the wisdom to grasp them.

“The possession of arms is the distinction between a freeman and a slave. He, who has nothing, and who himself belongs to another, must be defended by him whose property he is, and needs no arms. But he, who thinks he is his own master, and has what he can call his own, ought to have arms to defend himself, and what he possesses; else he lives precariously; and at the discretion.” James Burgh, English writer quoted from *The Embarrassing Second Amendment* by Sanford Levinson.

HUMAN RIGHTS WEEK 2000

Carding The Wool

Passing by almost unnoticed, Bill Clinton, in Presidential Proclamation 7386 of December 9, 2000, recognized the week of December 10th as the designated period for observing Human Rights Day, Bill of Rights Day and Human Rights Week [65FR78075]. The “rights guaranteed by these documents”, he proclaims, “such as freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom from arbitrary arrest, are such an inherent part of America’s history and national character, we at times may take them for granted.” These documents, he continues, “are not merely proud words preserved on paper; they are a pledge written on our consciences and to oppressed people everywhere, so that they too will some day know the meaning of dignity and the blessing of human rights.”

The idea that there is some sort of parity or equivalency between the Bill of Rights and the UN Declaration of Human Rights is deceitful, divisive, and contemptibly absurd. Bill Clinton and the boys in Washington know that, but how many of you are taken in by the globalist scam?

At the time the Constitution was adopted many state representatives, called by some the anti-federalists, familiar with historical tendencies of government through the centuries, remained suspicious of a strong central government. Human nature, such as it is, guaranteed that people would never be completely moral nor those in the legislature solely motivated by public interest.

They believed that a Constitution which reserved all rights to the people, limiting government to only specified (enumerated) powers would be insufficient to check the appetites of legislators for power and influence. Government, they understood, over time would not be constrained within any legal bounds set upon it. They also understood that a Constitution containing implied, but unspecified, rights of the people which were not specifically enumerated would also be insufficient to discourage aggrandizement of power to a central government. In time, those in power would also contend that rights not specifically defined were not protected by the Constitution. Finally, fearing the divisiveness of special interests in a large republic, they insisted on an explicit bill of rights which would have to be incorporated into the Constitution as a condition of its approval. Such a bill of rights they hoped would remove any ambiguity about implied rights or enumerated powers which could eventually be misconstrued by a government bent on mischief or tyranny. It was their intention that this bill of rights declare:

“the people’s “unalienable and fundamental” rights in such a way as to set limits to the power of government and to serve as an alarm when legislators and rulers overreached their proper bounds.” Patrick Henry, speech in the Virginia convention.

Frankly, they had absolutely no trust in the legislature to secure the life, liberty and property of their posterity into the future. This perspective is clearly reflected in the preamble to the Articles in Amendment to the Constitution [Bill of Rights]:

“The Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution:”

The Bill of Rights incorporated additional, unambiguous clarifications of the rights retained by the people. It was to serve as a reminder to the legislature of its limitations and its responsibility to protect and secure these individual liberties as a condition of its continued existence. As such, these rights were recognized as “unalienable” and beyond the legitimate authority of the legislature to modify, redefine, or revoke. Further, the Constitution recognized various mechanisms, such as the armed citizenry [the “militia”], as “necessary to the security of a free state...”.

In modern times the anti-federalists have been proven absolutely right. The legislature and leadership of the federal government continue to strike at the foundations of the republic by undermining the intent and meaning of the Articles in Amendment. The attempted subrogation of the Constitution to United Nations rules and initiatives is clear evidence of such intent. To state or even imply that there is some level of parity or legitimacy in such comparisons can only be made by a man who does not love his country or seek to protect its citizens and institutions. It can only be made, and remain unchallenged, by those who despise it and what it stands for.

For all its lofty language the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly in 1948, is hardly a shadow of the Articles in Amendment. The Declaration contains no provision for individual self-defense, ownership of the means of defense, or right to defense from or to replace abusive government. There is no right to self-determination, to a free society, or the means to secure it. This then, so you learn to recognize it, is the subterfuge and legacy of the national socialists, the liberals wish to impose on to America. It's subtle, but insidious, because it undermines our history, our intellect, and our very future.

Semantics aside, the Declaration recognizes no rights at all, only privileges. All privileges are derived from and dependent upon the whim of government. Under the Declaration, privileges need only be awarded by government to the degree necessary to maintain power and control. Each of these noble privileges is subject to interpretation by ... government. And, everyone so privileged is endowed with the "right" to the benefits of socialism and an international order of governance. What a deal.

Those of us that have the Bill of Rights have it all, there is absolutely nothing to be gained from accepting the UN Declaration of Human Rights in any form except deprivation, subversion, and serfdom. Acceptance would require the abrogation of every real "right" possessed by Americans. Every citizen in each of the 188 UN member countries which subscribes to the Declaration has absolutely no more and no less than those privileges ceded by their governing authority, and no hope under the Declaration of achieving more. The power under the UN Declaration does not reside with the people, but solely with the governing authority with control over their enforcement apparatus.

As much as King Willie and the globalist cabal in Washington would like us to believe, the principles of the Articles in Amendment and the UN Declaration are diametrically opposed, mutually exclusive, representing opposite ends of the political spectrum. The verbal affirmation in the form of a Presidential Proclamation is simply a mechanism to place an artificial and unlawful government claim on the Articles of Amendment. It is a document owned by the people which places limits and constraints on government. The first step in removing it as an article of law is to remove its significance from men's minds.

The very fact that you did not hear it challenged is evidence that this pretense on "rights" has the tacit approval of the legislature and the Bush administration.

"... the armed man is not free. He is bound by duty. It is an old and established rule that a soldier who deserts his post in battle has committed an offense punishable by death. Without the armed man, bound by duty, there can be no free men at all. This is because freedom does not come before the fight for freedom. The fight comes first, the freedom comes after. Before we can have freedom we must have duty." J.R. Nyquist in "Force and Freedom", WorldNetDaily, Monday, January 1st.

THE GREAT MILITIA

by Dave Delany

The Militia is a "grass roots" tool of the people, designed to check the abuse of its own internal government, **and** to defend against the incursions of a foreign enemy. The struggles of war are best left to an army which is to be called up **only** in the event of war -- "called up," not "impressed." Standing armies have no place on American soil. The professional soldier is without purpose in a free society. He is, as John Hancock clearly pointed out, sometimes a man

unfit to live in society; a man who has no liberty, and despises it in others; a man who, for an extra penny in his paycheck, would gladly alter his allegiance.

We have seen the "professional" doing his work on our Citizens, and preparing for assault in our cities. Besides the assaults at Waco and Ruby Ridge, we have all read the accounts of soldiers training in our cities. It must be clear from the beginning that the fine young men of our history, and the outstanding officers who have been called up during our conflicts with foreign nations, have been the finest, noblest, best disciplined in the history of the world's defense of Freedom. We are now at odds with our history.

Standing armies are training to obey the word to act against the neighbors of their youth. Standing armies **have no place** on American soil!

"But," answers Hancock against the obvious question, "since standing armies are so hurtful to a state, perhaps my countrymen may demand some substitute, some other means of rendering us secure against the incursions of a foreign enemy."

Our military strength should be increased, and our military budget should be slashed. Our defense should be trebled, and our professional soldiers cut by thirds thrice. We should be prepared to take on the world, and not venture from our shores to do so.

Hancock continues: "But can you be one moment at a loss? Will not a well disciplined Militia afford you ample security against foreign foes? We want not courage; it is discipline alone in which we are exceeded by the most formidable troops that ever trod the earth." *That*, my friends, is why **you** are necessary in the Militia; and by reason, by intuition, and by God, you **are** in the Militia!

The Militia is not a few groups of local organization. That is unnatural. You cannot call up the Militia of Maine to defend your California home, and when the force directed against you is the army of the Federal Government, or one of its fingers, you can hardly call upon the hand of the Federal Government to protect you! Do you somehow think that the commander in chief is immune from the abuse of power? Rather than replacing the local Militia, the growth of the federal army requires the increase in the strength of the local Militia. The local Militia is the only defense against the tyranny of a standing army.

Josiah Quincy wrote in 1774, that standing armies are composed of men "whose interest and very existence, depend on an abuse of their power." Do you understand? Is that clear? "Booty and blind submission is the science of the camp."

The solution? Quincy sounds much like Hancock: "No free government was ever founded or ever preserved its liberty without uniting the characters of the Citizen and the soldier in those destined for the defense of the state. **The sword should never be in the hands of any, but those who have an interest in the safety of the community, who fight for their religion and their offspring; -- and repel invaders that they may return to their private affairs, and the enjoyment of freedom and good order.**

Such are a well regulated Militia composed of the freeholders, Citizen and husbandman, who take up arms to preserve their property as individuals, and their rights as freemen."

"A well regulated Militia:" a standing army? God forbid! They are naturally at odds with one another!

Joseph Warren spoke passionately against the professional soldier among the people. A great statesman, he saw that the professional soldiery are "taught to consider arms as the only arbiters by which every dispute is to be decided between contending states; -- **they are instructed implicitly to obey their commanders, without inquiring into the justice of the cause they are engaged to support; hence it is, that they are ever to be dreaded as the ready engines of tyranny and oppression.**

And it is too observable that they are prone to introduce the same mode of decision in the disputes of individuals, and from thence have often arisen great animosities between them and the inhabitants, who, **whilst in a naked, defenseless state**, are frequently insulted and abused by an armed soldiery."

Quincy: "An invasion and conquest by mere strangers and foreigners are neither so formidable or disgraceful as the establishment of a standing army under color of the municipal law of the land."

Are you swept up by the current foment against the local Militias? Forgive the brashness of the question, but . . . **Are you stupid?** I suspect not. You have probably assumed the best and most noble of our government.

Let me close by adding yet another figure from our nation's great and formative history, Benjamin Rush. He said, in 1787: "the American war is over, but this is far from being the case with the American revolution. On the contrary, nothing but the first act of the drama is closed." He was speaking then of the weakness of our nation. I am writing now of the weakness of our nation also. "Hear her proclaiming, in sighs and groans, in her governments, in her finances, in her trade, in her manufactures, in her morals and in her manners," (do you hear them?) "The Revolution is not over."

If we are to remain free, it never will be. God bless the Militia.

Copyright Sept. 1995: Dave Delany's Freedom House. To subscribe, send a post to freedomhse@aol.com, and include the message: "subscribe."

"The enemy is communism. Stalin is merely its high priest and Russia is merely its GHQ. The war was and is upon our concept of life, and the Communist generals know that there is only one stronghold to be stormed and taken. That is the United States of America. They know, too, that this is not to be accomplished just by war against our armies and upon the seas. They know it is to be achieved by war upon our system of life – our system of government and of economic organization. And they know that already there is here among us an army of foolish men – some of them instructed – who have come amongst us to teach us the great lesson of the "Good Life." But many more – far more – are those deluded Americans who agree with this diseased philosophy and who have learned from Europe, from its Red and its Black dictators – the Stalin's and the Hitler's and the Mussolini's – that there are numerous groups who can be incorporated in their social armies of discontent – all sorts of people, good and bad, mostly deluded, who can be captured by appeals to their hatreds and appetites."

"While we arm against Russia, we remain defenseless against the enemies within the walls. It is they, not Stalin's flyers or soldiers, who will destroy us." John T. Flynn, *While You Slept*, 1951, p. 186.

BARNYARD FABLES #43

The Gunny's Visit

The frantic drumming of a beak on the door found Ozzie, editor of The Independent Grit Gazette, asleep in front of his computer keyboard in a pool of warm sunlight streaming through the east window.

"Hey, Ozzie, git yer butt out here, we got a visitor in a tree waitin' to talk to us!", cried Ben hammering the point home with a peck to the skull.

Sure enough, guided by the incessant crowing, they soon discovered the Bird in the bottom branches of the bare pecan tree.

"Awwk!", cried the Bird to the growing crowd of Fowl in the barnyard, "My name is Gunny an' I represent yer good friends in the organized militia. We know this here's a hotbed fer you radical militia types an' since we's Birds of a feather, I'm here to recruit yer Chicks to join up."

"Yep," Gunny continued with an air of authority, "There's bad time comin' an' since so many of our best Birds is flyin' the coop 'cause er... 'cause, well just 'cause... we need yer Chicks 'cause that's the only way they can learn about real military stuff an' get good leadership."

"Hey Gunny," observed a Bird in the front row to a chorus of Bird calls, "Lots of us was doin' yer job before you was hatched!"

"If dangerous things need to be done, it's only gonna be organized an' patriotic Birds like us that will make a difference," cawed Gunny prancing back and forth on the bare limb. "Why", he exclaimed, "We got big guns, secret stuff and things that make lots of loud noises. An', you!", exclaimed Gunny, you crazy Birds is just plain *unorganized!*"

"Why, why", sputtered the elevated Fowl, "you Birds just can't make yer own army fer self-defense, the gummint won't allow it ... an' 'sides we'll jus' drive you crazy unorganized militia types into the hills and destroy ya!", crowed Gunny straining his neck straight as an arrow and fixing his beady eyes on the crowd below.

"Hey, Gunny, Sir," came the well known cackle of Nasty McFowl from the crowd, "We shore appreciate yer kind words of support an' friendship", cracked Nasty, obviously uncomfortable with speech-makin'. "We're just simple Livestock", continued Nasty, "But our Cockerels an' Pullets will flock to the right side once they understand yer good intentions. Fer instance, will they get to be poked an' used as Guinea Pigs fer deadly drugs jus' like real soldiers, an' will they learn to be peacekeepers so they can meddle in other lands, disarm and kill innocent folks so they'll be well-trained when they get home?"

"An' that's not all," continued Nasty, "We want yer guarantee they'll get the same opportunity to support Communist gummints an' take orders from foreign officers. Yeah, they want to be demoralized and get lots of time fer fraternization, not ta mention the best democratic indoctrination possible, same as you regular Birds!"

“That’s it”, crowed Gunny, “We’s invincible and don’t need no help from nobody. So long as you see things our way we is gonna be life-long buddies!”, announced Gunny to the crowd as he fluttered to a higher branch to address the growing Flock below.

“Ahhh, bamboo shoots and rice balls,” cried a feathered heckler from the crowd.

“Hey!”, shouted a brown Bantam, “Ain’t you that ‘New’ Bird that had the crow to stand beak to beak with them officers an refuse to wear them UN patches?”

“Naahhh,” cawed a Leghorn, “I seen them pictures. He looks like one of them in the back row what was busy sewin’ and salutin’.”

“Hold on you Birds”, called Ozzie flapping up to take a perch on the fence. “We got to treat every visiter civil even if he does think we’s hopelessly unorganized, lost, an’ irresponsible.”

“Come-on down Gunny !”, called Ozzie, “You ain’t gonna crack no corn with this Flock from up there. We admit it, it’s all our fault. There now... wouldn’t it be nice to have a few thousand friends in the barnyard anyway?”

“It is not easy to uncover the real moral and intellectual disease which took possession of the minds of so many men in places of power. It is easy enough to diagnose the case of those men who were outright Communists or half-convinced fellow travelers. They knew what they believed and what they were aiming at. The trouble lies in tracing the illness which possessed the minds of men who were neither Communists nor Socialist, yet who could be afflicted with some disorder that brought them down to a point where they saw our problems almost precisely as the Reds saw them, and led them to become, in some cases the deluded, and in some cases the completely blind partners of the enemy.” John T. Flynn, *While You Slept*, 1951, p.185.

BOOK REVIEW

“Take That You Commie”

“Take That You Commie” by Marlin Creasote is a new soft cover book published by Right Wing Books (USA). In our edition no ISBN or Library of Congress Catalog numbers are listed. The publisher notes that they are an E-commerce on-line web based source of books for the “conservative right wing” and that they can be contacted at www.rightwingbooks.com.

We’ve never been *asked* to review a book by a publisher. Our reluctance in honoring the request for reviewing this particular book was mitigated by an accompanying letter stating that while he hoped for a favorable review “... if you just can’t stand it please write a review and say whatever you wish about it;...”. We took him at his word.

The author indicates in the forward that “Take That You Commie” is a work of fiction. A self-described “nationalist”, he hopes that the story will help influence political leaders to abandon their current direction and work toward a civilization which is “fair to all”. He maintains that this can be accomplished only through formation of a political party “comprised of incorruptible men and women” who will “change America using the Constitutional system”. Creasote suggests that those, like himself, who remain a nationalist perspective will find in his book “solace ... and a direction for the future”, and that leftists and advocates of one-world government will condemn his work. In our humble opinion, it will do exactly the opposite.

The book depicts the authors vision of one possible future, of an America in collapse, a country divided by conflict into several political territories, primarily a socialist UN-based dictatorship in the east, a “free” west, and a contested middle ground. As one mechanism for emphasis, the author apparently seeks to stimulate consideration of social and political issues by using language and terms which are intended to offend all political and social persuasions. A style, we note which constitutes a base appeal to irrational emotion rather than the intellect. Nor does he hesitate to grapple with potential social and military issues. In doing so he outlines the tremendous pressures working to alienate and impoverish both the lower and middle classes. In his final chapter he sees no resolution given the current course of human events and no possible compromise between opposing sides. The ultimate outcome as envisioned by the author is the destruction of all civilization.

As suggested by the honorifics attributed to the author by the publisher, i.e., the “Right Reverend Professor Doctor Marlin Creasote” our first impression was that this book was intended as a spoof, or satire, of the inescapable consequences and conflicts associated with implementation of socialist government. Titles notwithstanding, while the author apparently attempts to deal with the subject matter in a serious manner, in reality the quality of the text makes it impossible to treat the book as a serious work. The author demonstrates this point repeatedly.

Some examples are in order. Even sympathetic readers will find empty humor with the statement on page 120 where we read: “Computers are a wonderful tool! They can do mathematics for the engineer and turn an illiterate into a writer with spell checking, grammar and punctuation guides.” The text, in fact, is riddled with spelling and grammatical errors. Syntax is often poor, cliché’s are abused, and the authors reasoning often vague or unrealistic. To simply observe that it is presumptuous on the part of the author to include a glossary to compensate for the frequent use of unnecessary two-bit words is being overly kind.

Details aside, we remain particularly unimpressed with descriptions of potential future conflict, particularly those involving “gorilla” warfare (p. 35). And, while we found a few interesting historical and political insights, we found more serious flaws. On page 16, for example, the author maintains: “Since the very beginning of time women have never been in charge of men.” In fact, matriarchal societies past and present offer some interesting and relevant perspectives regarding the conduct of war. On page 69 we are fascinated that the leaders of the new “West” built their new “democracy” based on the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Even the socialist left spends more than three sentences dismissing the virtues and relevancy of the republic.

Overlooking these issues for the moment, the question remains whether we can find some redeeming qualities to applaud. We observe that in ten chapters the author identifies and addresses almost every conceivable inequity in society. In doing so he includes some interesting quotes and social observations. He also attempts to articulate what are presumed to be constitutional based remedies. These perspectives, as expressed by the characters, may be of interest to some due to either their matter-of-fact manner of presentation or that they reflect psychologically or politically satisfying solutions. Unfortunately, the solutions presented are not necessarily Constitutional or republican in nature and often represent but a variation on the same type of oppression which the author rallies against in describing problems associated with socialism and totalitarian government. “Take That You Commie” at best is no more than superficially conservative.

Some readers may find favor in the down-home style speech and common sense observations attributed to some of the characters. Researchers looking for evidence that even some in the conservative camp don't have much of a clue as to the Founders' intent for the republic will also find it here. Others, with no expectations of meaningful text, may simply get a "hoot" out of discovering its many grammatical and philosophical flaws. Those finding *comradeship* with the author will find his fan club at <http://clubs.yahoo.com/clubs/marlincreasotesfanclub>.

Of course, this commentary reflects only the opinions of the editor and staff of the CFP. To our mind, having read this review you have already invested far too much of your valuable time to this book. As for us, the value and significance of this book is directly related to its usefulness as kindling.

"Shall we expect a transatlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia and Africa combined with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years. ... At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, If it ever reach us it must spring up amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all times or die by suicide." Abraham Lincoln, speech before Young Men's Lyceum, Springfield, Illinois, January, 1837.

BOOK REVIEW

"On Killing"

"On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society" is a unique and fascinating book on the psychological aspects of killing. It was written by Lt. Colonel Dave Grossman and published by Little, Brown and Company in 1996 [ISBN0-316-33000-0]. It presents an intimate look at the reasons why people kill other people, as well as the psychological consequences of the act of killing both in a civilian and military context. While it addresses an unusual and uncomfortable topic it is as encouraging as it is informative.

Grossman provides perspective and a premise to his book by explaining that "peace will not come" until we have a basic understanding of the act of killing and its consequences. He acknowledges that killing has always been an act of life as it relates to the acquisition of food. But he explains that such killing has traditionally be performed almost as a ritual, with care and respect for the life taken. This book does not address the sensational acts of the sociopath in society noting that they represent but a minor 3% of the population for whom killing represents a psychological "disorder". More importantly he addresses the act of killing and its consequences in terms of common men reacting to uncommon situations. In this context he discusses the psychological aspects of killing including fear, obedience and authority, guilt, psychological trauma, the effects of distance, conditioning, behavior and a multitude of other related aspects.

Grossman explains that there is a natural resistance in most men to killing their fellow man. This repulsion is so intense that most men, even in combat and even at the expense of their lives, cannot directly bring fire to bear on individual enemy soldiers. The psychological barriers to this destructive aspect of human nature are controlled on both a psychological and intellectual level by a variety of factors including morality, environment, duty, honor and loyalty.

“There can be no doubt that this resistance to killing one’s fellow man is there and that it exists as a result of a powerful combination of instinctive, rational, environmental, hereditary, cultural, and social factors. It is there, it is strong, and it gives us cause to believe that there may just be hope for mankind after all.” p. 39.

On the other hand, he notes that, particularly with modern conditioning, under the right circumstances almost anyone can be motivated to kill. This conditioning, he explains, is particularly important as it relates to war on the modern battlefield. In this context he explores not only external factors such as cold, food, deprivation, isolation, mental and physical exhaustion but also uplifting factors including: duty, honor, comradeship, morality (legitimacy). The author also identifies some key elements to unit and individual efficiency, moral and integrity such as the role of leadership.

“A tremendous volume of research indicates that the primary factor that motivates a soldier to do the things that no sane man wants to do in combat (that is, killing and dying) is not the force of self-preservation but a powerful sense of accountability to his comrades on the battlefield.” p. 149.

Quoting from Gwynne Dyer in his book “War” Grossman agrees that:

“There is such a thing as a “natural soldier”: the kind who derives his greatest satisfaction from male companionship, from excitement, and from the conquering of physical obstacles. He doesn’t want to kill people as such, but he will have no objection if it occurs within a moral framework that gives him justification” p. 180.

However, Grossman clarifies the issue by observing that it may be more correct to conclude that there is a certain two percent of the male population that, “if pushed or given a legitimate reason, will kill without regret or remorse”. These “sheepdogs” of society who often gravitate to military organizations represent the latent warrior spirit in mankind and, “in times of danger a nation needs them desperately.” Of interest is the observation that these same men who have demonstrated proficiency in combat are never perceived as a threat when they return to society.

Still, the author observes that killing does not come easy to ordinary men and women and the affects of killing often have dramatic and telling affects on the perpetrators regardless of the legitimacy of the act. In this respect Grossman explores the repercussions of killing including external affects by others. For example, acts of atrocity and terror he observes have a profound affect on the nature of conflicts whether in civil or military environment. Using the example of the Viet Cong, Grossman observes that “There are many benefits reaped by those who tap the dark power of atrocity.” He also notes that such unnecessary killing can lead to the development of an intransigent and formidable opposition. In this regard, as reviewers we can’t help but reflect on the growth and continued viability of the militia movement largely in response the government massacres at Waco and Ruby Ridge and subtle acts of ongoing domestic terrorism.

Grossman recognizes the necessity of killing in legitimate conflict but he also acknowledges the contribution of those who voluntarily go in harms way but shy from active participation in the conflict. He maintains that such reticence to killing in those who can overcome the demands of peer-pressure, obedience and instinct for self-preservation provides hope for the future and represents the “latent potential for nobility” in mankind. But he also observes:

“The “good” that is not willing to overcome its resistance to killing in the face of an undeniable “evil” may be ultimately destined for destruction. Those who cherish liberty, justice, and truth must recognize that there is another force at large in this world. There is a twisted logic and power resident in the forces of oppression, injustice, and deceit, but those who claim this power are trapped in a spiral of destruction and denial that must ultimately destroy them and any victims they can pull with them into the abyss.” p. 227.

Grossman also provides some valuable insight to what motivates men to be efficient killers in combat. In particular, he contrasts the training received by soldiers in past wars and their relative performance with new conditioning methods used for soldiers training to fight modern wars. The benefits of such conditioning are significant. For example, we learn that poorly trained guerillas are often overcome by more highly trained modern soldiers based on the training soldiers receive to instinctively and effectively react to a confrontation. In such situations relatively untrained guerillas delay to their detriment, reacting ineffectively in common posturing mechanisms. The critical difference is apparently not simply in leadership, technological or fire superiority but perhaps more importantly in preparedness and effectiveness based on adequate psychological conditioning and training.

In summary, “On Killing” is an excellent book which should be read and re-read by unit leaders in the organized and unorganized militia, and all religious personnel. In addition, those who argue the case against gun control as well as those looking for answers to social violence will also find interesting observations to help explain and deal with these issues.

In a broader context the observations made by Grossman should help us all recognize the evil in the world around us. In obtaining a better understanding of those who use violence and terror as a means to an end we are better equipped to identify and deal with those on the “dark side” of human nature. On an individual level, through such understanding we can become better leaders more able to balance the use of deadly force with justice, legitimacy, honor, and conviction.

“On Killing” is essential reading for those who lead others. It is one of the most informative books you will ever read precisely because it deals with subject matter to which few of us have had any exposure. For officers in the unorganized militia it will likely be one of the most important books you will ever read.

“Looking another human being in the eye, making an independent decision to kill him, and watching as he dies due to your action combine to form the single most basic, important, primal, and potentially traumatic occurrence of war. If we understand this, then we understand the magnitude of the horror of killing in combat.” On Killing, p. 31.

IN THE WIRE

Mid-East Peace:

In an effort to salvage some sort of constructive “legacy”, in the final weeks of his term Clinton and cohorts have been frantically scrambling arrange a Mid-east peace agreement. Of course, the effort was doomed to failure from the first. We speculate that the failure was not so much due to the extreme polarization of the parties, but the rampant manipulation and corruption in the process, and in particular, with the brokers themselves. Given the propensity of the Clinton administration for lies, deceit and the disingenuous promotion of globalist goals, who in the

world, except perhaps for Tony Blair, would buy a second-hand peace agreement based on the word of Bill Clinton. There can be no trust between thieves and scoundrels.

The consequences of a mid-east war would no doubt have a dramatic, even if only economic, affect on the US. Whether all out war there can be averted or not we need to take notice of the ongoing strategy of orchestrated low-intensity warfare. No doubt promoted and manipulated as a means to encourage compromise, it also has a significant destabilizing effect which allows a multitude of Hegelian opportunities. Let us keep this in mind as we watch the developing conflict along our borders with Mexico.

Ashcroft Hearings:

From Associated Press writer Michael J. Sniffen, in the midst of hotly contested confirmation hearings we learn that “far right” conservative Attorney General candidate John Ashcroft has gone on record stating his official position on gun control.

“I don’t believe the Second Amendment to be one that forbids any regulation of guns, “...
“There are a number of enactments I would not prefer as policy but which I believe would be constitutional.”

As we celebrate the arrival of the new Republican administration, the one which is going to save us from the excesses of the late liberal corruption, it seems many second amendment supporters have literally become incontinent over the prospect of a gun rights proponent as Attorney General. Yet if we take him at his word, once again we have one of those genuine “right wing” conservatives who for some mysterious reason doesn’t quite understand the meaning of the term “shall not be infringed”. Perhaps it is we that are in error and don’t quite understand what it is to be Republican.

At the moment a number of groups, including those with further gun control aspirations, are waiting to testify against the Ashcroft nomination. No doubt the disingenuous efforts at opposition will make Ashcroft more appealing to the conservative right who accept him as a fellow constitutionalist. Well, before you all cut off your index fingers believing you won’t need them any more, remember that the turkey doesn’t bring himself to dinner.

Small Victories:

James Vicini, a writer for Reuters, reported on November 30th on a U.S. Supreme Court decision that the practice of using roadblocks to stop all vehicles as a means to apprehend drug offenders were unconstitutional. Such roadblocks, the court ruled, violated Fourth Amendment guarantees against unreasonable searches and seizures. However, the ruling apparently let stand the use of roadblocks as a means to control impaired drivers, illegal aliens, driver’s license and vehicle registrations ... in the interest of highway safety.

+=====+

READERS COMMENTS:

Reader: “Its been a while since we talked but I hope you remember me. With the possibility of a Constitutional crisis looming, please let us know of any strategy you may have in the event that things deteriorate. Thank you.”

Editor's Response: "Things" are deteriorating, for the most part incrementally, almost on a continual basis. What you may be looking for are threshold events which would prompt either a spontaneous or planned response by all or part of the militia. It is essential that the militia not be goaded into precipitous or imprudent activities or constrained in response by preconceived or inflexible alternatives. A "problem" must be defined before an effective strategy can be developed. Until then we can only consider events in a hypothetical context. Although somewhat simplistic, a few trends you might wish to watch might include initiatives to: curtail freedom of speech or assembly, register or confiscate firearms, arrest or detain militia leaders, enact anti-militia legislation, implement martial law, military actions involving border disputes, neutralize economic crises, vilify people or groups by the media, etc. At the same time you might also look for opportunities to constructively interact with legislators and the community. With your help we can all be more aware of developing events, evaluate them along with input from other militia elements, and adjust our activities accordingly.

Reader: "Sir: Has the time finally come? What are others thinking? Florida has shown to all of us what has happened to this country. I think it's time to take it to the streets."

Editor's Response: Things are seldom exactly what they appear. We think it's time to watch and see who the new players are. Political activists have been stealing elections for years. What makes this one so special that we should "take to the streets"? Why would we want to demonstrate in favor of a known CFR candidate? What would be the purpose of such a demonstration and what would be the desired outcome?

Reader: "Mr. Davis, I received an information pack from you sometime last year. I kept the information and recently went back through it. I know that I am not the only one feeling the emptiness growing inside due to what is happening in the political arena. I would just like to communicate with others who feel likewise and I do not know how locate such individuals. It kind of feels like I'm doing something wrong by searching, but I understand that I have been conditioned to feel this way along with the rest of America. We can't let things continue as they are, and I fear that the govt. has bigger fish to fry. I am not a psychopath, but I am not happy sitting idly by on the side lines. Any suggestions, if not, thank you for reading this far."

Editors Response: You would be surprised just how many people feel as you do. While there are literally thousands associated with the militia, many feel isolated, uncertain how to proceed, and short on constructive actions they can take. We feel some of the most beneficial short term activities include: preparation for defense and self-sufficiency, personal education (reading), locating at least one person with shared goals, and consistently identifying and implementing practical and reasonable goals. We should talk.

Reader: "Greetings. My name is (Name withheld)... I am a Socialist and member of the Puerto Rican Independent Party, pushing for sovereignty and independence from the U.S. I think your militia is great. But I am curious - where do you stand on Puerto Rico's independent/statehood status? Thank you. (I would just like to see your point of view)."

Editors Response: We have not considered Puerto Rico's independence as a militia issue but, if a consensus was sought, we would likely be happy to see Puerto Rico separated from the socialist teat of the US and, if socialism is your objective, let you wallow in self-induced social and economic cannibalism. Of course, as a socialist what you really want to know is if you can count on us to give you something for nothing. We'd be happy to give you the "boot".

“The normal American does not understand the ceaseless energy that drove the Russian leaders and their dupes in this country. Someone has said that the strength of communism lies in its relentless activity. There is an overpowering element of drama in its dreams, its burning passion for pushing those dreams, its relentless cruelty in method – murder, blood, violence, conspiracy, vengeance – all exalted from the level of evil into a lofty plain of flaming righteousness by the splendor of the great dream. It is precisely the same evil human disorder which has sent religious fanatics out with flame and sword and the rack to punish and exterminate heretics. It is a kind of malignant idealism ablaze with glorified mischief which goads the minds of its devotees into restless and hot activity. Thus, while the evil saints in the Kremlin and in Yenan, with their agents in Washington at the highest levels, plotted and contrived, our President, aflame with pure vanity, and the more or less normal and uninformed men around him were so many jumping jacks in Stalin’s hands. Meanwhile, our native contemptuous know-it-all’s, either through sheer ignorance or something worse, assured us that “the Communists have become a peasant party ... The Soviet Union stands for democracy” and “The Soviet Union cannot have any expansionist tendencies”. And our rather foolish agents in Washington swallowed it all.” John T. Flynn, *While You Slept*, 1951.

“I am trying mercifully to find an explanation of the curious surrender of so many men I have known well to the cult of complacency about Russia.” John T. Flynn, *While You Slept*, 1951.

+=====+

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

It may be timely to note that we have more inquiries than a small group can reasonably handle. When possible we refer questions and requests for information to a network of local contacts for response. Many of you have requested detailed personal replies to complex questions. We respond when time permits. We attempt to address many general requests for information through our articles. Hopefully, that will suffice for most. If you don’t receive a response as quickly as you might like, please be patient and remind us of your efforts. Better yet, volunteer to help.

+=====+

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 2001, 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
