

# The CAROLINA FREE PRESS

July/August, 2001    Volume VII Issue 3

Electronic Version

<=====➔

## **MILITIA PERSPECTIVES**

Summer Heat

## **SURVIVAL OF THE MILITIA**

Peek-A-Boo!

## **SERE TRAINING**

Casual Weekend In The Deep Woods

## **ALLIANCES & SUCH**

The Herd Instinct

## **UNITED AMERICA PARTY**

Considering The Alternatives

## **UNITED PATRIOT RADIO**

Shadowing The Unorganized Militia

## **BARNYARD FABLES #45**

Burnt Offerings

## **BOOK REVIEW**

*The Marauders*

## **IN THE WIRE**

Surplus .308

Something About Fred's

Hot Buttons

## **READERS COMMENTS**

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

---

*"There are worse things than dying for your country. Many Hungarians and Czechs can testify that if you won't fight for your country, it may not be worth living in."* Rear Admiral Daniel V. Gallery, Ret., *The Pueblo Incident*, 1970, p. 131.

---

## **MILITIA PERSPECTIVES**

Summer Heat

Organizational Crisis:

We had an organizational crisis here in the Sandhills Division. It began when we first learned from a militia *expert* that we were not a bona fide part of the “*real*” militia. We obviously had little recourse but to follow the *official* guidelines for re-organization.

At our very next meeting we obediently asked everyone who was not a *good* Christian to fall out (those pesky minor Constitutional requirements are sometimes so inconvenient). Everyone but the Chaplain promptly headed for the snacks.

The Chaplain paused long enough to explain we were all sinners. And, he continued, if we needed *really good* Christian soldiers we’d find them in churches fervently praying that Almighty God, by whatever name, would release them from any actual responsibility for securing the safety and security of their nation, families or God-given rights.

At the second re-organizational meeting we announced our intention to rent a couple of buses and get some *quality* out-of-state training obviously not available from our own veterans. There, we were assured, we would realize the benefit of *real* leadership and get *genuine official* sanction and recognition as a “*real*” militia. We figured about eighty buses would be about right for the state if we centralized our pickup points.

Some know-it-all smart ass pointed out that the constitutional authority of the unorganized militia, when not called to national defense with few exceptions extended only to in-state activities. Without compelling reason, he reasoned, why would we compromise our claim to legitimacy? So we made the smart-ass an officer, cancelled the bus trip, and held a recruitment drive for sinners of all persuasions.

The records of our debates will no doubt be liberally quoted in posterity, especially the impassioned deliberations on limiting militia membership to those descended from left handed, native Americans and indentured European stock. However, reason prevailed and we deferred to incorporate all citizens qualified for the unorganized militia by virtue of citizenship and their dedication to the defense of the constitution and the republic.

That certainly did a lot to relieve the suspicions about our sanity held by the general membership. However, the tension wasn’t completely relieved until a precocious recruit pointed out that since none of the leadership in the “*real*” militia expects anything useful from the independent minded “*paper*” militia we don’t need to worry about meeting anybody’s expectations!

With that, a relieved and thoroughly amused CFP staff retired to prepare a couple thousand more handouts and manuals for public distribution and the rest wandered off debating where to get the best deal on another pickup load of part for their FAL’s.

### Summer Reality Check:

Summer finds us well into silly season. Even many in the militia have stated the proverbial “to heck with it” and paused to take a break. Breaks are generally good things; we all need to pause, contemplate and take time to live real lives. But in contemplating our own indolence we should remember that the enemy never sleeps.

From our perspective, through our gun show presence and general correspondence, we have continued to observe the most remarkable aspect of militia participation. That is, interest and participation in the militia originates overwhelmingly from people with families. Most of these

are ordinary people from average backgrounds, the bedrock of America, who have grasped the reality that in the proposed globalist society there is no room for a prosperous middle-class.

We are encouraged that most are ordinary people for whom simple association with the unorganized militia is an act of courage. Their interest is focused on preserving America and its culture, to ensure a future for their children.

While most don't have a sophisticated understanding of history and law, they do have a keen sense of right and wrong and understand the insidiously evil nature of the proposed UN socialist society. They understand that freedom does not come cheap and that they too not only have a vested interest but also an important responsibility to help preserve our republic. Regardless of their degree of participation and interest we have gained a tremendous respect and appreciation for these quiet soldiers of the republic.

As the militia continues to accumulate resources in anticipation of an almost inevitable conflict many have the difficult double duty of preparing for their families. In considering preparations for a society in decline some maintain it is impossible to accumulate sufficient materials to survive the worst of times even in the best of times.

In the way of encouragement we recollect that early writers of the survivalist movement during the seventies recognized that the most important possession a person could have during hard times was education. That is, practical knowledge on how to make, store and independently do constructive things such as gardening, mechanical repairs, foraging, sewing, and a host of other important skills. These writers considered such skills more important than material goods.

Readers, particularly those with families, are strongly encouraged to continue their efforts for long-term food and essential item storage. Call us if you need references or information on this topic. But keep in mind that education and the accumulation of practical how-to skills are still relatively cheap and available to anyone with the interest and drive to pursue them. Now, before the need is critical, if your evenings aren't already busy get a library card and use it to advantage before the book-burnings begin in earnest.

#### Corporate Christians:

Attorney General John Ashcroft has demonstrated a remarkable ability for someone holding a prestigious government office. That is, the ability to read. After thirty years of diligent study the Justice Department has concluded that the Second Amendment preserves an individual right to keep and bear arms. We should not get carried away in the belief that Ashcroft has rediscovered Christian scruples. Justice Department staff continue to support existing gun laws based on Ashcroft's opinion that Congress retains the authority to restrict firearms ownership for "compelling state interests".

Reading and comprehension obviously do not go hand-in-hand in the halls, conference rooms and offices of the Justice Department. Where else could the words "shall not be infringed", an absolute limitation on government authority, be completely reversed to assert unlimited license on the part of government?

#### Ghost's of The Revolution:

An anonymous letter entitled "A Call to Arms" was reportedly mailed to five individuals including Pastoral Business (see [www.TupperSassy.com](http://www.TupperSassy.com)) on or about August 10<sup>th</sup>. The well-written letter

but not polished letter is unsigned except for the appellation "Ghost's of the Revolution". It describes the IRS as a "criminal organization" which, in concert with the collectivists and socialists in government, is destroying America. It further outlines a course of action which is to begin on September 1<sup>st</sup> to include destruction of IRS facilities and property and the targeting of IRS personnel.

Of course, it could simply be a hoax by mean-spirited individual(s), but perhaps it has more significance. It is hardly the work of someone in the tax-protest movement. Their upcoming showdown with the IRS, if allowed to proceed, is almost bound to publicly reveal at least some of the lies behind the Income Tax system. Only government blows up buildings and targets innocent people, so obviously it's not a product of the militia, at least not the mainstream militia as represented on most internet sites.

It is no doubt intended as a form of provocation. Yet its implication of dangers to citizens is hardly something expected of the militia. Genuine bad guys don't threaten, they just do whatever it is they set out to do and the objective is usually clearly focused to achieve some sort of goal or objective. Obviously someone is stirring the pot.

Fact of the matter, the only entity that stands to gain, whether genuine or hoax, either way from such offensive acts is government. It's timing and structure ensures that it can be used as a catalyst to create opportunities for more government mischief. No doubt many comments will be appearing on the web in abundance during the next few days and weeks. It might be a good idea to pay attention to this one. Some clues to the direction of events might be telegraphed by the media response, if any. How often do we get to critically observe the development of what may be a classic psyops program. Is the witching hour upon us?

---

*"From the institution of government, I may argue thus, that power and government which is not of God, may be resisted. The tyrant's power and government in breaking charters, overturning laws, subverting religion, oppressing subjects, is not of God, therefore it may be resisted."* From an essay, *Defensive Arms Vindicated*, by Stephen Case, 1783.

---

## **SURVIVAL OF THE MILITIA**

Peek-A-Boo!

Shortly after the Branch Davidian massacre, a terrorist act by any definition, in so many words Janet Reno bragged that within six months she could solve the militia problem by having them fighting each other. Evidently there is yet another more current rumor floating around the BATF that a similar effort may be underway. Make no mistake, we are in the preliminary stages of a war, which will determine whether America will remain a free nation. And, while things appear quiet on the surface, the psyops continue in part by design and in part by our own inanity as we continue to gain supporters with one hand and shoot ourselves in the foot with the other.

The NWO is not done with us, not by a long shot, and the war of words is only getting warmed up. As time passes it will become even more important to understand a little about the "politics" of the militia and what makes the NCCM different from other militia organizations. The issues are fundamental to the question as to which (not whether) and in what form the unorganized militia will survive.

The general trend in militia organizations (at least in the east) these days appears to be strongly focused on efforts to consolidate leadership and organizational activities through alliances,

training, grand meetings, and so on. While the NCCM believes in maintaining good communications with other “open” organizations we generally do not participate in these activities despite all the external “encouragement”. While we are acquainted with some fine militia leaders from other states, it is our consensus that such activities are largely gratuitous for the militia and but pretty good intel opportunities for the opposition.

A few would-be *generals* of the movement consider our survival instinct a mark of agency involvement. This has apparently become a constant source of frustration to a few of the “leaders” who take offense at our wretched inability to be directed or guided. Why this should matter to out-of-state “leaders” and those brilliant souls otherwise concerned with larger issues than North Carolina is beyond us. Fortunately, we have a very good sense of humor... and an excellent sense of historical precedent.

The NCCM has determined that it is not necessary or even desirable for all militia organizations to be “open” military organizations. The original groups forming the NCCM collectively agreed to adopt a cell structure of organization. In making this decision group representatives recognized that certain limitations are inherent in adopting such a structure. To some extent we would necessarily forgo the benefits associated with a centralized command structure, consolidated communications system, etc. It is our belief however, that the benefits of a cell structure far outweigh the disadvantages.

Many of our members would no doubt enjoy the flash, pomp and dramatic flair of participating in a formal open militia organization. Far more importantly, our member groups are absolutely determined to survive and, reasonably assured that they will be compelled to open conflict, prudent enough to understand that the NCCM must use the methods most suited to enable it to prevail.

The history of warfare has amply confirmed that resistance movements which adopt a cell type structure are far more successful than those, which do not. We presume the militia movement is well infiltrated by numerous NWO socialist sympathizers. The NCCM recognizes that security is absolutely essential for the survival of our groups (although the “organization” may not) and the best way to assure most of our “cell” groups and their leadership will survive the arrests and attacks likely to precede a general movement against them is to remain relatively anonymous. It is up to those of us helping to organize the NCCM to set the example in this regard. After all, as independent and self-sufficient leaders, the men and women of the NCCM are united behind ideas and principles and their own officer corps. General officers holding public positions must be considered expendable.

For that purpose we make it our duty to specifically avoid public identification of group leaders, member names, etc., and limit access to the information and contacts we are authorized to maintain. When we say that we do not keep lists take it literally. Unless other arrangements are made we don’t keep mailing lists; it’s up to you to keep up with us. We do this because it is absolutely essential that as many individuals and groups as possible remain secure even from us working to coordinate NCCM efforts should we fail in our duty.

NCCM also seeks to decentralize rather than consolidate leadership. As the privates in charge of letters and ciphers, we are not in the business of claiming leadership but in helping to create and empower leaders and helping others build and equip viable units. This we supplement with substantive efforts toward education, training and preparation. We stay far too busy to pursue general officer ranks. That won’t win this kind of war. (Stop here if any of this begins to make sense.)

A highly centralized, public command structure is hardly likely to survive a concerted assault. Its means of communication, marginally effective at best, will be stressed and compromised, and its ability to command, let alone control, inexperienced citizen-soldiers likely ineffective. With that premise we avoid wasting time and the necessity of dealing with extemporaneous issues and having to sort through reams of rumor, politics and intelligence?

History has shown that the fate of nations often rests on the actions of a dedicated few. Therefore, our purpose is to encourage, educate, motivate and prepare leaders and to provide them with some tools for critical thinking necessary for independent action and responsible judgment. We're not focusing on armchair warriors but those who are natural born achievers, leaders capable of incredible but focused mayhem should it be required of them. Our real strength will come from many leaders endowed with the capacity, native intelligence, motivation, and discernment, who are capable of independent decisions and actions.

We do not encourage other states or organizations to follow our lead. It is not our place or decision to make. Nor do we question their selection of leaders. We understand that some require organizational identity to corroborate their decision to participate or that they gain confidence in group associations and become stronger for their involvement. For some it may be a good decision.

We recognize from our study of history of conflict that the rational and deliberate will eventually prevail over the rash and impetuous. Leadership based on emotional appeals must eventually give way to the pragmatic dedicated citizen soldier. Frankly, we believe that only the latter will survive. The militia units that do will have leaders capable of individual analysis and independent action. We need to create as many as possible in the time available and are encouraged that so many in the NCCM have shown themselves capable.

That we do this job so imperfectly is not unexpected. It has been over 200 years since this type of organization has been demanded of the American people and, while a number of us are veterans, we are not professional soldiers.

As we contemplate the future it strikes us that the most effective means the powers-that-be can use to discredit and destabilize the militias' of the various states would be to place within their ranks spokesmen and/or "organizers" with the ability to gather intelligence, sow dissension, promote an inconsistent message, and cause general membership to question the quality, sanity and commitment of militia leadership. No doubt these type activities are underway in one form or another, no doubt by both incompetence as well as design, and they will continue and grow in intensity. It's often easy to fool a few without sufficient discernment and intellectual awareness; it's much harder to change the direction of a movement.

As a side note it has also apparently become fashionable on the part of a very few to allege federal complicity on the part of anyone who disagrees with the popular organizational agenda. The appendage "fed" is the modern militia equivalent of a four-letter word. It doesn't matter whether the allegations are true, it sounds good and elicits the requisite knee-jerk emotional response. By its use the promoter avoids the necessity of either substantiation or of using a more likely and relevant term such as incompetent, irrational, intractable, or irresponsible, which might redirect attention back to the originator.

Evidently the unorganized militia does not have the intellectual capacity or will to police or censure our own. We therefore, on a state and unit basis, we must also do double duty to

maintain both image and substance. This handicap makes it more difficult to attract the experienced and best leaders. Therefore, a critical part of our job will be to ensure organizational integrity and continuity. Apparently it's going to be a test of sorts to see who will survive and remain viable for the almost inevitable conflict.

For a moment let's grapple with yet another dilemma. It takes little forethought to realize, at least in the initial stages of conflict, all the help we are likely to expect will be from within our own or from neighboring groups. More to the point perhaps, our tactics will likely capitalize on this dispersal of resources. It is imperative that we get to know our neighboring group contact(s) now. As realists we ought to understand that resources of all types are so limited and the geographic areas so large the "organizers" and leaders will have no real authority or capability to functionally allocate assistance on any basis. That is, there's nobody on a white charger coming to your rescue Bubba and there'll be no second chance to prepare.

Long after the command structure of most unorganized militia organizations have disbanded many of the individuals and units will remain. If their integrity is not our primary focus we will have failed. But if we can survive our own inanity most of us will make it to the firing line to surprise the NWO on unfriendly terms. It will be more difficult if we take our leadership too seriously and neglect to take up our own responsibilities. It would be nice if more of our "leaders" would be a bit more... well, "professional". But if it can't be so, let us pray for guidance, harder.

In the final analysis does it really matter what militia group you decide to join... only if you take the time make an informed decision. (But if you're not sure, go with the other guy.)

---

*"The West was tolerant to a point. When tolerance reached its limit, there was usually a rope or a bullet waiting."* L. L'Amour, The Cherokee Trail.

---

## **SERE TRAINING**

### Casual Weekend In The Deep Woods

During the weekend of August 12<sup>th</sup> four units of the NCCM met in rural North Carolina to participate in SERE (Survival, Evasion, Resistance & Escape) training and field exercises hosted by the 1<sup>st</sup> Company, 44<sup>th</sup> Regiment.

Beginning shortly after the crack of dawn the morning session of day one began with a deceptively easy program. The equipment evaluation and review portion of the program included a hands-on assessment of each existence pack and field kit, a relatively easy task, but our decisions on pack content would shortly be tested to extremity.

The morning session continued with a series of lectures on improvised tools and shelters, fire making, food gathering, resistance, survival kits, camouflage and concealment and a variety of related topics. To help ensure that participants would retain as much of the information presented as possible each participant received an excellent three-ring information binder. Very well done, thanks Tom!

The outdoor classroom session ended with a hasty luncheon of pack-your-own-or-starve gourmet MRE's, a mission briefing and OPORDER. The subsequent exercise was to include a leisurely stroll through some of the most scenic (and rough) backcountry the state has to offer. The heat, thunderstorms, abundant water, thick vegetation and mud provided a good dose of

reality to the field exercise. With faces and exposed skin areas more or less effectively painted field exercises began in earnest.

Day one included ample opportunity to practice techniques for crossing danger areas, defensive formations, and individual and unit movements. The opportunity for each unit to test the effectiveness of their ability become invisible in the deep woods provided dramatic evidence of the efficiency of their technique. The day ended with a mountainside bivouac and the construction of field expedient shelters.

Day two provided even more opportunity to test our equipment, skills, endurance, and patience. By the time most were thoroughly exhausted we enjoyed a refreshing “swim” in the form of a deep river crossing through strong current using ranger harness and rope line. Admittedly some of our techniques were somewhat less than textbook by the time we reached the pickup point.

Overall, the 44<sup>th</sup> Mountain Division put on an outstanding training program. And aside from the specific training the opportunity for individual discussions regarding equipment, organization and current events, the program was very educational. We found much in common from equipment to philosophy, purpose and deployment concerns. Having the same orientation and basic skills, we also found that unit integration was surprisingly easy.

Some of our errors and weaknesses were readily apparent from our after-action report (AAR) discussion. It was significant however that our equipment, techniques and cohesiveness were among our notable strengths owing in large part to the “can do” attitude and determination of the groups and individuals represented.

---

*“By this, Sir, you see that their control over our last and best defence, is unlimited. If they neglect or refuse to discipline or arm our militia, they will be useless.”* Patrick Henry, speech on June 5, 1787, On The Ratification of the Constitution, The Anti-Federalist Papers, p. 206.

---

## **ALLIANCES & SUCH**

### The Herd Instinct

Turn around twice these days and someone is wondering why your militia group is not falling over itself to join another “alliance”. The compelling need for our participation is usually based on some vaguely defined necessity to coordinate activities between groups, promote better communication, to rally behind a political cause, to demonstrate *solidarity*, or simply to do *something* to promote the patriot “cause” in one form or another.

While we are certainly not versed in contract law it might still be helpful to simply apply a little common sense to the issue. Perhaps in doing so we can identify some measures which will allow us to determine if there is any substance to the various proposals that may be presented for our consideration.

Readers should note that we are making absolutely inferences regarding specific organizations in these comments. After all, NCCM is also an alliance of sorts. That said, we might start with the observation that, except in very special circumstances, we are long past the day when a handshake is sufficient to seal a verbal contract. Where does that leave us? Here are some points for consideration.



Alliances, as history has amply demonstrated, can be used for good or ill. To be successful, an alliance, whether a simple agreement, contract, or formal treaty, is generally based on mutual need, requires an element of trust, and inherently implies agreement not only on the means, but on defined and mutual goals and objectives. We might also presume that the more complex the objectives and the more people and resources involved, the more complex the agreement.

Presume for a moment we have been requested to enter into an alliance with another group representing some well-meaning nationalist cause. At least initially we understand that our participation will consist primarily of affixing our signature to some general statement of commitment, that is, a contract of sorts.

It's easy to sign paper; we readily do so on a daily basis with little consequence. Therefore, in our enthusiasm to support a worthy cause we may not take the time to consciously identify and consider the various individual elements of our hypothetical alliance. But if we did, we might look to see if the proposal includes basic information such as:

- \* Clearly defined goals, objectives or purpose statement
- \* The justification or lawful basis for the proposed activity
- \* Credentials or qualifications, if any, of the sponsoring group or individuals
- \* A description of the scope of the project including measures of success or failure
- \* Work elements and methods to be utilized or developed to achieve the objective(s)
- \* The basis on which assignments will be made
- \* Schedules or timetables including a termination or closure clause
- \* Selection of leadership and defined duties or responsibilities of participants
- \* Organizational resources of the sponsor
- \* Known and respected individuals who may be supporting the proposed activity

We might also consider other things such as the risk or consequences if the task(s) were or were not implemented and the relative benefits participating parties may gain from a cooperative effort.

That much might get us started, but as they say, the devil is in the details. Therefore, before actually signing an unclear or open-ended agreement we might be inclined to be a little more cautious. Our curiosity might be satisfied in part by asking:

- \* Are the goals and objectives practical and realistic?
- \* Will the agreement require a short or long term commitment?
- \* Will we be bound to the product or outcome if we do not agree with it?
- \* If information is requested, is it personal or invasive in nature; will it potentially compromise the security of our group?
- \* If the agreement is open-ended or vague, why?
- \* Do the organizers have a verifiable track record of accomplishments?
- \* Do they have sufficient resources in the way of staff, specialized knowledge, etc. and adequate for the task(s)?
- \* Have the sponsor(s) demonstrated some competency, such as communication skills which justifies their organizational or leadership role?
- \* What will bind the parties to perform their obligation(s)
- \* What is the potential that our involvement might land us in jail?

Even with this brief listing, which excludes the possibility of ulterior motives on the part of alliance organizers, it should be obvious that potential pitfalls abound. Looking beyond the emotional rush, a sober assessment might lead us to pay a little more attention to the fine print.

Consider one example for illustration. The unorganized [constitutional] militia is inherently a state-oriented organization. Except for certain clearly defined purposes, the authority of the militia is limited to the lawful boundaries of that state. Forming alliances, joint training, etc, by out-of-state armed groups, particularly when not under common threat during a state of war, raises serious issues about the lawfulness, i.e. constitutionality, of such activities. Might such minor details have significant consequences to signatories of alliances created to promote such activities?

The purpose of an alliance, we remember, is to allow individuals and/or groups to combine resources and efforts toward a common goal. Our signature not only implies concurrence with the principles proposed, but also our commitment and participation. Perhaps that explains why proposals unique by their superfluous or open-ended nature seldom merit or gain popular support.

To be completely honest in our evaluation, in contemplating an alliance prudence dictates that we also consider our own motivations. Tempting it is to simply abdicate our individual responsibility and run with the "herd" in order to maintain the appearance of involvement by endorsing a patriot cause. And quite frankly, quite a few in the movement are simply too long on idealism and too short on dedication.

Even if our motivations are noble, the commitment implied by a signature should be given in good faith. Participation out of a necessity to engage in make-work activity, to soothe our vanity or satisfy a need for corroboration, companionship or identity is a disservice to the participants and the proposed group effort.

As long as we're being honest with ourselves we also might question whether our actions are motivated by emotionalism associated with the real or imagined "excitement" of involvement with people who are really doing "something". And, while the project or the ideals represented by an alliance may be personally rewarding, more to the point will our personal participation, or the alliance in general, be detrimental to the overall patriot cause? If so, perhaps we should look elsewhere to make a contribution.

Then again perhaps on examination we are really not contemplating an "alliance" but simply a mere petition, mailing or funding list, or possibly a "leader" searching for a group to lead. Yet, perhaps there is yet another perspective.

Is there already an effective alliance in place in the patriot community? Virtually every group and member of the unorganized militia has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution and the republic. Our common goal and oath are symbols of our alliance, the restoration and maintenance of constitutional republican government is our common purpose. The means are clearly defined, and general lines of authority established. Our cooperation should be assured without the necessity of another and perhaps superficial alliance. Are we not already united in purpose and on a sound lawful foundation?

Is the question of alliances then unnecessarily complicated?

We might conclude with a healthy dose of skepticism that simply to demonstrate solidarity with a group or idea without a well-defined purpose and means is generally non-productive. Who indeed still believes that petitions, demonstrations, letter campaigns and such will deter the globalist agenda. Such efforts typically consume excessive time and energy without commensurate benefit. The possibility of an alternative agenda cannot be discounted. In the militia movement there have been constant efforts by a few to centralize or consolidate authority or transfer tangible or intangible resources to a single person or group offering *leadership* based on an appeal to emotional issues and blind faith.

One of the great attributes of the unorganized militia is its attraction to those capable of thinking and acting independently. While these perspectives are somewhat simplistic, you now have some basis besides an emotional response to a patriotic cause upon which to form a decision, if you choose to do so.

---

*“There are relatively few philanthropists who can, all by themselves, make a huge difference. Rather, it’s the individuals who give a little that truly keep most worthy programs alive.” Will Rogers.*

---

## **UNITED AMERICA PARTY**

### Considering The Alternatives

A few months ago NCCM was asked to consider supporting the fledgling United America [political] Party based in North Carolina. We distributed hundreds of flyers at gun shows and posted an introductory article on the NCCM website soliciting comments from members and NCCM leadership. Readers can still access this summary statement. In response we received numerous verbal comments, which reflected a surprisingly uniform agreement among both members and unit leadership.

Points of agreement were clear. That is, there has been a general failure among third party groups to mount a viable or unified challenge to the existing party system. Secondly, that there is not only a need for a political party that not only respects the Constitutional principles, including the concept of a citizen militia, but that such organization would eventually be essential to the reestablishment of honest republican Constitutional government.

As a whole those commenting did not question the motivation, patriotism, core values, dedication, need or intent of the UAP or its organizers. The universal concern was the perception that the preliminary “platform” of issues as defined on the UAP website does not reflect strict constitutional principles and delegated powers but includes endorsement of reworked democratic/socialist programs and reflects an overall inadequate understanding of the principles it maintains to defend.

Good intentions and constitutional posturing, while inspiring in presentation, are simply not, according to our commenters, sufficient criteria on which to pledge support hoping for change. Most felt they understood the *intention* behind the proposals but relied upon the *actual* wording and presentation to formulate their perspectives. Lofty language unsupported by clear and precise statements of constitutional values and position will not buy conservative confidence. Not one person or command staff commenter recommended formal endorsement or participation in the UAP or it’s proposed “alliance”.

The perspective of NCCM leadership included the presumption that the UAP has supporting “experts” who are thoroughly versed in the requirements of constitutional government. It is their opinion that the influence of these individuals is not reflected in the available materials. The consensus appears to be that citizens respect simplicity, honesty and dedication but they also understand that good political leadership must inspire confidence, reflect competence, possess a clear knowledge and understanding of issues and lawful government, demonstrate a command of language, and display a better than average level of intellect.

Based on their review and a consideration of comments by responding members it is the consensus of NCCM leadership to take no position at this time relative to the United America Party or the proposed “Declaration of Alliance”. At some future date the party platform may mature sufficiently to warrant formal endorsement. In the interim, UAP efforts might well be more effectively utilized in supporting local candidates, or better yet, for state office.

---

*“Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips.”* Psalm 141, v.3, KJV.

---

## **UNITED PATRIOT RADIO**

### Shadowing The Unorganized Militia

In our last issue, Volume VII, Issue 2 for Spring, 2001 we suggested readers tune in to the broadcasts of the independent United Patriot Radio (UPR) and, if found to be providing a positive contribution to the cause of freedom, to consider supporting its operation. In listening to subsequent broadcasts, it has become readily apparent that certain key perspectives promoted by the station are fundamentally incompatible with the principles of the unorganized [constitutional] militia. We apologize for our misdirection.

To be certain, the colorful bombast, rambling dissertations and provocative assertions are attractive to those frustrated by the apparent inability of the patriot community to make noticeable headway against the enemies of republican government. Yet over time, somewhere in the convoluted mix of popular constitutional issues and elements of a personal agenda, the character of the unorganized militia is obscured. The organizational concept that emerges is something more akin to a private army.

A number of people have expressed concern to us over the incongruities. They presume, as suggested, they must accept exclusionary and inherently divisive religious, organizational and unconstitutional compromises out of a necessity to demonstrate tolerance for free speech, to accommodate personal opinion, or simply out of a perceived need to “stick together” as the “real” militia.

We have likewise tried to make the case among ourselves that certain compromises are acceptable because of the need to work together in common cause. This need, as we are led to understand, justifies sweeping aside “minor” differences in the interest of cooperation. Unfortunately some of the “minor” differences we are encouraged to overlook in the interest of “good leadership” and “progress” are fundamental constitutional issues.

It’s difficult to focus on the crux of the issue as one contemplates the details. But several points should be addressed. The first is that once the armed citizen intentionally lays aside any part of the constitution, he also sets aside claims to constitutional protections and legitimacy. In so doing those condoning acceptance of such perspectives not only help validate the stereotype of

the “racist, right-wing radical militia” as we are portrayed by the media, but recklessly help others to prejudice the uninformed against the militia in the court of public opinion.

As individuals we may not care what others think; after all, we have a “right” to personal expression. However, as an organization dedicated to the preservation of the republic we trivialize the right and duty of citizenship if we ally ourselves with those who advocate the disenfranchisement of any group of otherwise dedicated Americans based on religion, culture or other artificial measure, including that of commitment. Whether done by allegation or even inference it is inherently divisive at a time when cohesiveness around constitutional principles is essential.

A key question also asked is whether it is possible to find common cause and work with individuals having different opinions, i.e. aspirations, relative to the religious, cultural or political character of the nation and the composition of the militia outside of strict constitutional intent. The answer is a conditional “yes” if the question is whether the militia can accommodate those with contrary perspectives as individuals. However, that same latitude is unacceptable in those who assume, by appointment or circumstance, the mantle of spokesman, leader or representative of the militia.

As individuals we are free to be as irresponsible and pig-headed as we wish. More specifically, if the platform, in this instance a radio station, is personal property one is certainly free to promote a private agenda [belief] and endeavor to speak for and to the unorganized militia by design or even inference. But to solicit funding from the unorganized [public] militia to subsidize and promote, even in part, public acceptance and accommodation of an inherently divisive personal agenda on the back of an explicitly constitutional organization is an unrealistic expectation even in the broad-minded patriot community. More importantly, artful persuasion aside, one can’t long promote both a private agenda and speak for the unorganized militia (by intent or even inference) and retain any semblance of authority, credibility or confidence. Trust and respect are fundamental attributes of leadership. While perhaps heartwarming for those who share the personal views expressed by the programming, there will always be a serious question as to whether the guidelines or actions advocated are colored by that agenda and in the best interest of the militia and the nation as a whole.

By UPR definition such observations will no doubt qualify us as obstructionists. But not to comment is to condone by silence. In our rush to conflict must we all forget that the principles and natural rights for which we fight are well defined and applicable to all Americans? To argue otherwise, to suggest religious tenets may supercede constitutional requirements, that state militia jurisdiction transcends state borders, that militia membership must be exclusionary, etc., regardless of motivation, compromises our legitimacy, engenders discord and distorts the constitutional image of the unorganized militia. How then can we not comment and retain our self-respect?

Let us pose a few questions for general militia consideration. Should the unorganized militia have any standards, informal or otherwise, for those we support as representatives or spokesmen? Will just anyone capable of reaching a public forum qualify to “speak” for the militia? If the perspectives and generally mixed message of disenfranchisement are inherently disruptive or detrimental to the unorganized militia, even if pleasing to certain individuals and groups, is general support still warranted?

UPR listeners have been persuaded to overlook the “minor” issues, some of those little details that were so important to the founders. We maintain that it is the minor details that determine character. And, we believe that character counts.

We conclude that the idea of an independent electronic “liberty tree” is an excellent concept with great potential. While UAP programming reflects many legitimate perspectives of the unorganized militia, taken as a whole, it remains a liability to the patriot community. We reject the premise that we must tolerate the tyranny of religious or cultural bigotry to qualify for the fight against the government tyranny. Likewise, “compromises” made to justify extra-jurisdictional activities and other “minor” inconveniences, and which potentially compromises the legitimacy of the militia, are anything but “minor”.

We understand that the wheat and the tares must grow together. But we thank Almighty God circumstances so arranged themselves so as to have the NCCM excluded from the official “Militia List”. If it had not been so, most assuredly by now we would have so requested.

The host and speakers of URP certainly have a right to personal expression, and a right to privacy. Just as the right to bear arms implies an obligation to use them safely and wisely, we believe that, especially for an organization, the right to free speech also implies an obligation to ensure that it is used judiciously. Like bullets, tough talk may be appropriate when specifically aimed at legitimate targets, but otherwise the freedom to speak is not carte blanche license for rash and intemperate remarks, threats and innuendo.

Regardless of what compromises other militia groups may choose, we solicit the assistance of the NCCM membership in helping UPR enjoy an abundance of privacy. Neither our support nor attention are warranted. And that, thank you, is but a small portion of the opinion to which we are entitled.

---

*“Men can seldom bear contradiction. They bear it least when they are most demonstrably wrong; because, having surrendered their judgment to prejudice, or their conscience to design, they must take refuge in obstinacy from the attacks of reason. The bad, dreading nothing so much as the prevalence of pure principle and virtuous habit, will ever be industrious in counteracting it; and the more candid, rational and convincing the means employed in its behalf, the louder will be their clamor, and the fiercer their opposition. On the other hand, good men are often led insensibly astray, and very honesty becomes the guarantee of their delusion. Unaware, at first, of their inconsistency, they afterwards shrink from the test of their own profession. Startled by remonstrance, but unprepared to recede; checked by the misgivings of their own minds, yet urged on by their previous purpose and connection, the conflict renders them irritable, and they mark as their enemy whoever tells them the truth. From the coincidence of such a bias with the views of the profligate and daring, results incalculable mischief. The sympathy of a common cause unites the person engaged in it; the shades of exterior character gradually disappear; virtue sinks from her glory; vice emerges from her infamy; the best and the basest appear nearly on a level; while the most atrocious principles either lose their horror, or have a veil thrown over them: and the man who endeavors to arrest their course, is singled out as a victim to revenge and madness. Such, from the beginning, has been the course of the world. None of its benefactors have escaped its calumnies and persecutions: not prophets, not apostles, not the Son of God himself. To this treatment, therefore, must every one be reconciled, who labors to promote the best interests of his country. He must stake his popularity against his integrity; he must encounter a policy which will be contented with nothing*

*short of his ruin; and if it may not spill his blood, will strive to overwhelm him with public execration.*" From sermon preached by John Mitchell mason, The Voice of Warning To Christians, New York, 1800.

---

## **BARNYARD FABLES #45**

### Burnt Offerings

The stench of burned feathers and a lingering pall of smoke hung over the barnyard. Even the prideful Goose was momentarily speechless as he surveyed the surrounding mob of singing Birds.

"Thank ya, thank ya'll so much!" exclaimed Goose profusely. "It sure was nice of yu fellow Fowl ta git me up on this here high platform an outta that heat."

"By the way," casually remarked Goose, "Ya'll can untie me now an' I don't really need this here safety rope around my neck to keep me from fallin' off this here observation deck".

"Didn't yer Mama ever tell ya to keep a civil tongue in yer head?, asked a Rescuer, "Yu suppose she mighta had a reason fer that?"

Goose replied, "I figured you Birds wud never come home to roost, leastways not fast enuff fer me so I sort of got a little impatient."

"But I sure showed 'em I got rights to my say" continued Goose with unabashed pride, "Why, I been buildin' unity from coast to coast telling Folks stuff like who to kick outta the militia, an' how piss poor some folks is, and how they don't count if'n they don't do things how I say."

"We all agree yu sure got rights," replied a smouldering Bird patting furiously at a spark, "Looks like we'll all hang on yer every word."

"Well," said Goose, "I sure appreciate the unqualified support indicated by yer silence." "Why," persisted Goose, "Since we agree on nine outta ten of my best proposals I jus' bet we can cooperate on almost anything...right?"

"Oh, sure enuff," said a Bird struggling to balance on the guard rail without tail feathers. "We don't mind ya waggin' yer tongue but ya took something of ours we'd like back."

"Ahhh, Boys, this here safety rope round my neck is getting' a little tight," observed Goose nervously. "I appreciate yer concern, but in my inspired opinion this here rope is a little shy of ground level even allowin' fer the stretch factor."

"In our opinion," countered a hostile Bird wheezing from smoke inhalation, "It's just about right... think of it as representin' the other 10%."

"Hey!", exclaimed Goose, "Yer kiddin', right? Even them Foxes got rules sayin' yu can't do this. Why, even they'd be here to protect my rights if they didn't dislike me so much."

"Doubt it", claimed the blackened Bird holding the rope, "Why, them Foxes like you so much they's quotin' from yer speeches in their trainin' tapes!"

“Hey you Birds aint serious?”, asked the worried Goose peering over the edge of the platform, “Yu can’t do this to me, I got rights and they’s far more important than responsibility.

“Naaaw,” sickered the Flock in unison, “Yer a damned nice Bird, Goose, nuthin’ personal. We’s only kiddin’... don’t ya know when we’s just funnin’?”

“Heck,” cawed a Bird as the Flock turned to glide off the platform, “We ain’t had so much fun since we got roasted in Waco an’ Oklahoma City... an’ we wasn’t even there!”

“Hey fellow Birds.... Birds... Birds... didn’t ya ferget somethin’?”, honked the singed Goose getting prematurely lonely, “I promise ta give it back, honest... really...ahhhh, what is it?”, he called.

“... Our good name!”, crowed the Flock as it headed toward the aid station.

---

*“...I shall now come to the thing in hand, and endeavor to prove this truth, that it is a necessary duty for a people to endeavour, in the defence of their religion, lives, laws, and liberties; to resist and repress the tyranny of a king, using and abusing his power for subverting religion, invading the liberties, and overturning the fundamental laws of the country.”* From an essay, *Defensive Arms Vindicated*, by Stephen Case, 1783.

---

## **BOOK REVIEW**

### *“The Marauders”*

Sometimes while reading for pleasure or simply information we find ourselves with an unlikely treasure. This was the case with *The Marauders*, written by Charlton Ogburn, Jr. and published by Harper & Brothers in 1959 (An ISBN number is not available). It is a book not likely to be in print, but if it can be scrounged from library archives it would make excellent read and a very educational reference.

*The Marauders* is a first hand account the first expeditionary offensive operation of the American Army into the jungles of Burma against the Japanese during World War II. It chronicles a unique 23-day campaign, during the period from January 15 to May 17, 1944, which was quoted at the time by Time magazine as “one of the epic infantry advances of the war.”

The “Marauders”, officially the 5307<sup>th</sup> Composite Unit (Provisional), consisted of a hastily recruited force of approximately 3000 men, mostly volunteers, organized into three battalions. Their purpose was to disrupt Japanese communications and operations in Indochina and tie up men and materials that could be used to blunt the Allied offensives elsewhere in the Pacific Rim area. The expedition was called Operation Galahad. The Marauders were organized and led by General Joseph W. Stilwell around a relatively new concept of warfare. They were to be the first of series of Long Range Penetration Groups intended to bring guerilla type warfare to the Japanese. They were to operate independently behind enemy lines, assisted in part by indigenous tribesmen and re-supplied solely by airdrops.

What draws our attention to this excellent book is not only the first hand account of this bold operation but the practices and perspectives which are directly applicable to future wars and, in particular, that being contemplated by the unorganized militia. This respect the book contains an abundance of observations and experiences, many of which are no doubt common to other



wars. Yet they are described in such excellent detail and having taken place over so short a time period makes their endurance and successful execution seem absolutely phenomenal.

The organization of the Marauders was perhaps as unique as their campaign. According to the author it was an “organization never given the time to organize, that was caught up in historical currents and crosscurrents far beyond its control or even understanding...”. The selection process for the Marauders was as unique as it was hasty but not quite so much as specialized units. For example, part of the selection process for Intelligence Reconnaissance Platoons, charged with locating and “feeling” out the enemy was particularly unusual. Of 200 volunteers 55 were selected. A key criteria for their selection is outlined from the quoted journal of Battalion Commander Logan Weston:

“...they had been in a hopeless combat situation during which time they realized their own helplessness and their need of God. These men, with very few exceptions, had trusted the Lord to deliver them in combat and they composed the best all-around platoon in the United States Army, bar none on any front... But what I want to say about them is, that when they couldn't advance another step, then they went ahead on their knees (by prayer).” p.56.

The author also shares his own views on the selection of men for special assignment. In some ways his characterization approximates the general character of the modern militiaman:

“My theory was that to find men of daring you must look to those who hold this world in poor account, which includes both those who are outlaws of this world and in revolt against it and those whose thoughts and desires are fixed on the next, and that it does not much matter which you choose.”

Ogburn takes extraordinary pains to tell the story of the Burma campaign in vivid detail. From it we learn not only of battalion level maneuvers but details of patrols, scouting and a seemingly endless series of engagements with the enemy. He details a story of remarkable success under almost impossible conditions, but also of disaster, of troops not simply used, but used up, demoralized and decimated not only by combat but by the ambitions of command staff.

Through Ogburn's patient recitation of events we become privy to an endless number of problems overcome by the Marauders as they sought the enemy through hundreds of miles of forested mountains. We become aware of the vital necessity for literally tons of supplies and a critical logistics system necessary to maintain men in the field. In particular, we gain a new appreciation of their dependency on the ready availability of adequate water, food, medicines and especially ammunition, and the importance of weapons proficiency in combat.

Ogburn speaks of men strained by exhaustion, sleeplessness, and fear, yet inspired with an overwhelming desire to win despite the stress of combat, poor communications, and virtually no transportation short of shanks' mare and mules. He describes the affects of isolation and desperation and the stress of combat against an enemy almost always superior in numbers and how these factors lent a sense of desperation and urgency to their actions.

*“It was only the trail that could bring danger. You had to learn a reverse system of values. Trails, which you had always thought of as friendly, were here the enemies, while the nighttime forest, almost the symbol of childhood terror, not meant blessed safety. You had only to lie quietly in the darkness of the forest and you were back in the invulnerable refuge of childhood's bed.”* p. 92.

One point in particular captured our attention. He quotes Major Samuel Wilson, commander of an intelligence and reconnaissance platoon speaking to the nature of future war:

“It was guerrilla units that defeated the French in Indochina and the Dutch in Indonesia. In the next world war, if there is one, we are going to have to rely on Galahad-type forces – small, free-ranging units unhampered by fixed ties with their bases.”

On completing the book we come away with a profound appreciation for the sacrifice, dedication, determination and sheer ability of the men of the Marauders. From the beginning of the book we draw his conclusion:

“Knowing what the combat soldiers of Galahad had to go through, you cannot but wonder how it was done. How are men equal to this?”

If any reader takes the time to conduct a library search the time spent will be well worth the effort.

---

*“Being unready and ill-equipped is what you have to expect in life. It is the universal predicament. It is your lot as a human being to lack what it takes. Circumstances are seldom right. You never have the capacities, the strength, the wisdom, the virtue you ought to have. You must always make do with less than you need in a situation vastly different from what you would have chosen as appropriate for your special endowments.”* Charlton Ogburn, Jr., *The Marauders*.

---

## **IN THE WIRE**

### Surplus .308:

We have conducted some unscientific field trials with several brands of surplus .308 (7.62x54) ammunition. Our test rifles included the Springfield M1A and the HK-91. Samples tested include those from Venezuelan (Cavim), South African, British and Portuguese sources. The best overall performance in terms of accuracy and consistency was with the Portuguese, which fired as the cleanest and most accurate round, closely followed by the South African. Cavim rated good for overall consistency but the size of 100-yard groups was double that of the Portuguese. We concluded that the Cavim would not be suitable with semi-auto rifles for practical accuracy much beyond 200 yards. We got what we paid for with the British surplus ammo. It was the lowest in cost and mediocre in quality and reliability at best. Use it for blasting ammo. Readers who can improve on our very casual and subjective evaluation are encouraged to share their findings.

### Something About Fred's:

Readers of Shotgun News may recall the full page ad for Fred's Military M14 Rifle Stocks. Fred offers various types and grades of wood and synthetic stocks for the M1A/M14. Of particular interest to the militia are the camouflage painted synthetic stocks and stock painting kits. The ads tell us that these stocks are stronger than their wood counterparts and unaffected by temperature and water. What he doesn't tell us is perhaps even more important. The synthetic stocks will require a little fitting. Be patient. If you take your time you'll find that the resin works easily with a hand file and after a little touch up of the filed edges with paint it's fairly easy to get

a good fit. The weight and balance of the synthetic stock is basically the same as the wood stock it replaces but the forearm is a little slimmer making it much easier to grip and control. The paint on the camouflage models gives the stocks a stippled texture, which also makes them much easier to handle, particularly when wet, and several of the patterns are well suited to the Carolina woods. If you happen to own one of the best battle rifles in the world you might look them up at [www.shotgunnews.com/members/fred](http://www.shotgunnews.com/members/fred).

Hot Buttons:

A recent article from the Associated Press entitled "U.S. Denounces Israeli Policy of Targeted Killings" summarizes official US indignation that Israel might actually terminate the political leadership of an opposing country as a legitimate target of war. It just goes to show you how easy it is to offend political sensibilities these days.

+=====+

**READERS COMMENTS:**

E-Mail To CFP, Sat, 30 Jun 2001 16:53:42 -0700

"Hello I want to understand why the NCCM did not join with the southern alliance I have to ask?"

Dear \_\_\_\_: We correspond and coordinate with other militia groups when there is a demonstrated need. And, we have been remarkably easy to find by those who want to talk to us. Frankly, at this time we see little benefit to be gained by "joining" the Southern Alliance. This decision was reached by interdivisional consensus. There have been attempts to infiltrate, undermine or otherwise malign the NCCM and the militia in general by several persons over the years. Similar efforts are no doubt underway at the present time. For the most part, by design and intent, these efforts have been frustrated and limited in effect by our closed cell organization. We are in the process of building what we trust will be a true constitutional militia. But to remain effective it must first survive the infiltrators and detractors as well as all the would-be generals and experts which litter the patriot landscape and who demand without qualification, authority or sound knowledge of constitutional requirements to lead or direct our activities and allegiance. Our groups are secure in this closed cell approach, even from us should we fail in our part. Why would we want to depart from this formula and potentially compromise any of our groups by unnecessarily mingling with others for the sake of appearance, sociability, or simply to prove ourselves to satisfy someone's vanity?

As a "commander" I presume you are somewhat familiar with historical precedent and the principles of guerilla warfare. Understanding the necessity for this strategy you should not need to ask. Editor, CFP

-----

+=====+

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Readers who may be looking for a source of military manuals on line may be able to locate something of interest at:

- [www.doctrine.quantico.usmc.mil/](http://www.doctrine.quantico.usmc.mil/)
- [www.sirius.com/~hanson/manuals.html](http://www.sirius.com/~hanson/manuals.html)

+-----+

**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 be reached via:

NCCM Website: [ncmilitia.org](http://ncmilitia.org)

Public Affairs Officer: 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

---