All issues of The RESISTER are archived on I BBS in Minneapolis.
Not just another pretty board. (612) 885-0512 - 14400 bps - 24 Hours.

The RESISTER

The Official Publication of the Special Forces Underground
Volume I, Number 2. Autumn 1994

Post Office Box 2723, Hagerstown, Maryland 21741 Copy XXXX of XXXX Copies

NEW WORLD ORDER COMBAT ARMS SURVEY

Question # 46
"I Would Fire Upon U.S. Citizens..."

The RESISTER has confirmed that US Navy SEAL platoons, including SEAL Team Six, Marine combat veterans stationed at Twenty-Nine Palms, CA, and Marine basic trainees at Camp Pendelton, CA, have been administered a questionnaire asking, among other things, if they would "...fire upon US citizens who refuse or resist confiscation of firearms banned by the US government."

The questionnaire was first administered to operators by the commanders of SEAL Team Six on 15 September 1993, then subsequently to the remaining SEAL platoons throughout September and October. Rumors began circulating in November that US Army DELTA operators were given the same or similar questionnaire. The SF Underground had been aware of the questionnaire since late September but our observers had been unable to secure a copy or confirm other than its substance consisted of questions pertaining to the subordination of the US Military to the UN and confiscation of the firearms of US citizens. In early January, 1994, we obtained a copy of the questionnaire from one of our DOD sympathizers but lacking corroboration we ran the story in Vol.I, No.1 of The RESISTER as a rumor.

On January 22, 1994, one of our observers copied a chilling message off the Internet from Petty Officer 2nd Class W. Kelly, US Navy Special Warfare Team Six, to D. Hawkins, Re: Gun Confiscation. Kelly began by stating that the questionnaire was "...to find out if we would follow the orders of commanding officers without question." (Kelly omitted the fact that the questionnaire assumes "commanding officers" gives equal authority to UN officers commanding US forces.) Kelly continued; "If you wish to find out how I answered, I said yes I would fire and kill all persons attempting to resist...we aren't around to be the good guys." Remember, Kelly is referring to American civilians.

In February, 1994, MODERN GUN magazine ran a story on the elusive questionnaire which was subsequently circulated by various patriotic citizens groups. Then, on 10 May, 1994, the questionnaire was administered to Marine Desert Storm veterans at Twenty-Nine Palms, CA. A Marine smuggled a copy of the questionnaire out of the testing center and mailed it on 15 May, 1994, with a cover letter, to the editor of THE NEW AMERICAN, which ran the story in their July 11, 1994, issue. THE NEW AMERICAN quotes the Marine's impression that the questionnaire "was just research for this (Navy) commander's(sp) degree." The RESISTER obtained a copy of the Marine's letter, which actually states: "A Navy Commander came before us and said he was working on his masters degree and he was writing a paper about giving up our military's soverenty(sp) to the United Nations Secretary General."

The official DOD lie surrounding the questionnaire entitled "Combat Arms Survey," supports that of the Navy Commander. Significantly, the Combat Arms Survey was first given at the time Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 25 was being prepared. The RESISTER's correspondent in the Pentagon staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff confirms that PDD 25 surrenders control of the U.S. military to the United Nations. (A cursory survey of articles written by MACOM commanders and staff members in official military journals for the past year reveals a universal acceptance of U.N. control of the American military.)

The RESISTER has been eliciting responses to the questionnaire for the past year. Frighteningly, among service members with less than 10 years of service, 63% agree or strongly agree with question #46: "I would fire upon U.S. citizens who refuse or resist confiscation of firearms banned by the U.S. government." Among new recruits almost 90% give the response: "If it's the law and they order me to do it, I guess it's okay." Our federally controlled public schools have done their job.

Of those with more than 15 years of service, 87% replied "disagree" or "strongly disagree." Responses by members of the Special Forces Underground were unprintable; basically, there will not be many officers who give that order more than once.

The RESISTER has enclosed a copy of the Combat Arms Survey with this issue. As you read it pay particular

attention to the qualifiers and their relation to recent articles in the official publications of the Department of Defense, the civilian media, and the policies of the federal government. *

Editorial Note:

The enclosed Combat Arms Survey is a true and accurate reproduction of the contents of the questionnaire. We altered the format to accommodate the The RESISTER's layout.

--THE EDITOR

COMBAT ARMS SURVEY

This questionnaire is to gather data concerning the attitudes of combat trained personnel with regards to nontraditional missions. All of your responses are confidential. Write your answers directly on the questionnaire form. In Part II, place an "X" in the space provided for your response.

Part I. Demographics

1. What service are you in?

2. What is your pay grade? (e.g. E-7, O-7)

3. What is your MOS code and description?

4. What is your highest level of education in years?

5. How many months did you serve in Operation Desert Storm/Desert Shield?

6. How many months did you serve in Somalia?

7. What state or country did you primarily reside in during childhood?

Part II. Attitudes

Do you feel that U.S. Combat troops should be used within the United States for any of the following missions?

8. Drug enforcement

( ) Strongly disagree ( ) Disagree ( ) Agree ( ) Strongly agree ( ) No opinion

9. Disaster relief (e.g. hurricanes, floods, fires, earthquakes)

( ) Strongly disagree ( ) Disagree ( ) Agree ( ) Strongly agree ( ) No opinion

10. Security at national events (e.g. Olympic Games, Super Bowl)

( ) Strongly disagree ( ) Disagree ( ) Agree ( ) Strongly agree ( ) No opinion

11. Environmental disaster clean-up

( ) Strongly disagree ( ) Disagree ( ) Agree ( ) Strongly agree ( ) No opinion

12. Substitute teachers in public schools

( ) Strongly disagree ( ) Disagree ( ) Agree ( ) Strongly agree ( ) No opinion

13. Community assistance programs (e.g. landscaping, environmental clean-up, road repair, animal control)

( ) Strongly disagree ( ) Disagree ( ) Agree ( ) Strongly agree ( ) No opinion

14. Federal and state prison guards

( ) Strongly disagree ( ) Disagree ( ) Agree ( ) Strongly agree ( ) No opinion

15. National emergency police force

( ) Strongly disagree ( ) Disagree ( ) Agree ( ) Strongly agree ( ) No opinion

16. Advisors to S.W.A.T. units, the FBI or the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (B.A.T.F.)

( ) Strongly disagree ( ) Disagree ( ) Agree ( ) Strongly agree ( ) No opinion

17. Border patrol (e.g. prevention of illegal aliens into U.S. territory)

Do you feel that U.S. combat troops under U.S. command should be used in other countries for and of the following United Nations missions?

18. Drug enforcement

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

19. Disaster relief (e.g. hurricanes, floods, fires, earthquakes)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

20. Environmental disaster clean-up

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

21. Peace keeping

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

22. Nation building (Reconstruct civil government, develop public school system, develop or improve public transportation system, etc.)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

23. Humanitarian relief (e.g. food and medical supplies, temporary housing, and clothing)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

Do you feel that U.S. combat troops should be used in other countries, under command of non-U.S. officers appointed by the United Nations for any of the following missions?

24. Drug enforcement

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

25. Disaster relief (e.g. hurricanes, floods, fires, earthquakes)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

26. Environmental disaster clean-up

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

27. Peace keeping

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

28. Nation building (Reconstruct civil government, develop public school system, develop or improve public transportation system, etc.)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

29. Humanitarian relief (e.g. food and medical supplies, temporary housing, and clothing)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

30. Police action (e.g. Korea, Vietnam, but serving under non-U.S. officers)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

Consider the following statements:

31. The U.S. runs a field training exercise. U.N. combat troops should be allowed to serve in U.S. combat units during these exercises under U.S. command and control.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

32. The United Nations runs a field training exercise. U.S. combat troops under U.S. command and control should serve in U.N. combat units during these exercises.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

33. The United Nations runs a field training exercise. U.S. combat troops should serve under U.N. command and control in U.N. during these exercises.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

34. U.S. combat troops should participate in U.N. missions as long as the U.S. has full command and control.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

35. U.S. combat troops should participate in U.N. missions under United Nations command and control.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

36. U.S. combat troops should be commanded by U.N. officers and non- commissioned (NCOs) at battalion and company levels while performing U.N. missions.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

37. It would make no difference to me to have U.N. soldiers as members of my team. (e.g. fire team, squad, platoon)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

38. It would make no difference to me to take orders from a U.N. company commander.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

39. I feel the President of the United States has the authority to pass his responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief to the U.N. Secretary General.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

40. I feel there is no conflict between my oath of office and serving as a U.N. soldier.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

41. I feel my unit's combat effectiveness would not be affected by performing humanitarian missions for the United Nations.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

42. I feel a designated unit of U.S. combat soldiers should be permanently assigned to the command and control of the United Nations.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

43. I would be willing to volunteer for assignment to a U.S. combat unit under a U.N. commander.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

44. I would like U.N. member countries, including the U.S., to the U.N. all the soldiers necessary to maintain world peace.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

45. I would swear to the following code:

"I am a United Nations fighting person. I serve in the forces which maintain world peace and every nation's way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense."

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

46. The U.S. government declares a ban on the possession, sale, transportation, and transfer of all non-sporting firearms. A thirty (30) day amnesty period is permitted for these firearms to be turned over the local authorities. At the end of this period, a number of citizen groups refuse to turn over their firearms. Consider the following statement:

I would fire upon U.S. citizens who refuse or resist confiscation of firearms banned by the U.S. government.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

*

Our civilian readers maybe wondering why the Combat Arms Survey was circulated so heavily within the Department of the Navy. The reason is simple; the Navy is not subject to USC Title 10 Posse Comitatus prohibitions against using federal military forces for domestic law enforcement. This includes the US Marine Corps.

Just thought you would like to know.

--THE STAFF

EDITORIAL

The Lie of Equal Opportunity

The Equal Opportunity Program of the United States Army claims that it formulates, directs, and sustains a comprehensive effort to ensure fair treatment of all soldiers "based solely on merit, fitness, capability, and potential, which supports readiness." This policy is stated to be based on "fairness, justice, and equity." But the simple fact is that if the Equal Opportunity Program were based solely on merit, fitness, capability, and potential there would be no need for it. The EO policy officially sanctions, by its very existence, unfairness, injustice and inequality.

The philosophical premise of all equal opportunity programs is egalitarianism. Egalitarianism is the belief that all men are equal. If "equality" is held to any serious or rational standard, as in the realm of politics and law, egalitarianism is the principle of individual rights which cannot be repealed by democratic majority, subverted by minority machinations, nor infringed by government legislation.

But political and legal equality are not the intent of equal opportunity programs. Equal opportunity programs seek nothing less than METAPHYSICAL equality; the equality of ability, competence, industriousness, and intelligence. Equal opportunity programs, by their very existence, defy the objective reality that all men are not equal. They seek to abolish some perceived "unfairness" that does not permit the inept, incompetent, lazy, or stupid to succeed.

Note how the goal of equality is achieved.

Since equal recognition for unequal performance would be too obvious an injustice, equal opportunity egalitarians prohibit unequal performance. (Read and OER or NCOER.)

Because some men are to accept responsibility faster than others, the egalitarians deny the notion of "merit" and substitute the concept of "seniority" for promotions. (Study the results on any promotion board.)

Since some men are more intelligent than others, the egalitarians forbid individual excellence and subordinate it to the collective mediocrity of "consensus building" and stultifying institutional group-think. (Observe the workings of any committee or "team.")

Since some men have greater ability and study more conscientiously than others, the egalitarians abolish objective standards based on achievement and substitute outcome-based 'standards' that equate the lame to the fit and the moron to the intelligent. (Attend any school.)

Equality of opportunity has nothing to do with equality or opportunity. It is the official doctrine of racism, tribalism, and collectivism. It is but one premise of the unconscionable evil of altruism. Equal opportunity is the official sanction of the hatred of the good BECAUSE it is good.

If the Army's Equal Opportunity Program were truly based on individual "merit, fitness, capability, and potential," personnel records would be purged of all references to race and ethnic origin, the Official Photo would be eliminated, and commanders would again have local promotion authority above Staff Sergeant.

--Richard Crossman

AN OPEN LETTER TO OUR READERS

For the past two months our observers have been reporting that some readers are questioning the integrity of

contributors to The RESISTER because they choose to be known by pseudonyms rather then their real names. This is a legitimate concern and it deserves to be answered at length.

First, no contributor is obliged to use a pseudonym, as anybody who has actually READ the first issue can tell you. Second, the decision to require staff members and regular contributors to use pseudonyms was an OPSEC issue, not an ethical one. Third, there is a historical precedent we follow which, if not already familiar to you, in all likelihood never will be, and is therefore none of your business. Fourth, publishing The RESISTER is a security risk in its own right, let alone referring to in tradecraft and organization. Really, what DO they teach you guys in the Q-course these days?

The RESISTER is a response to the altruistic cannibalism which is consuming the principle of inalienable individual rights upon which this nation was founded and which have been served-up in sacrifice to the mob god of democracy, the minority god of tribalism, the nature god of environmentalism, the slave god of collectivism, and the statist god of socialism.

Do you want to know who we are? We are the individuals who conceive the ideas the cretinous mob calls "the team effort." We are the individuals whose excellence is subverted by the racist policy of "equal opportunity." We are the independent, innovative, and creative who have been enslaved to serve the "greater good." Without us you would still be prying roots out of ground with a pointed stick.

It would be a great comfort and convenience for the myriad unconstitutional federal agencies to note us, categorize us, and file us away for future "reference." We will not give them an early chance, nor will we be goaded into identifying ourselves by sneering comments about anonymous writers.

Every whim based, undefined, un-judicable law it passes; every unconstitutional gang of armed badge wielding thugs it deploys; every unconstitutional agency it creates; every incomprehensible special interest regulation it mandates; every dime extorted through taxation and redistributed to the incompetent and undeserving; every American life lost in some altruistic war, humanitarian assistance, or peacekeeping operation, demonstrates the illegitimacy of the federal government.

The federal government is not "of the people," it is the instrument of pull-peddlers. It is not "by the people," it is the toady of special interests. It is not "for the people," it is the exercise of force for the sake of force.

Pass laws against us; we will not obey. Regulate our activities; we will not comply. Legislate our behavior; we will not consent.

We are freemen. We will not be subjugated. We have the guns to prove it. --THE EDITOR

CORRESPONDENCE

Is The RESISTER For Real?

As I write this letter the various comments I have heard concerning The RESISTER return to mind. The first one is, "Are you for real?" The converse being that your publication is a U.S. Government plant to entrap members of the SOF community into revealing themselves. Secondly, why not print the names of the contributors? To me that is obvious, but I'll let you explain.

Thought I would let you know I got a big kick out of the "Personals." Reminds me of WWII and the French Resistance stories I have heard and read. Also the commo block was a nice touch.

If you are an actual paper I hope you have the space to print this letter. It will as least show some of the doubting here at the Special Warfare Center and School that there is someone out there. Please feel free to use my name and office as I see no need to use a non de guerre. SFC David R. Hall
USAJFKSWCS

Yes. See RUMORS. We will: See Vol. I No. 1, p.6, col. 3, para. 3, in. 16. It is impolite to discuss tradecraft. Read--Secret Forces: The Technique of Underground Movements, by F.O. Miksche. We assume you mean "non de plume." --THE EDITOR

CONSERVATIVE REVIEW

I have received a xerox copy of The RESISTER, Vol. I, No 1. I like it! Can I be on your mailing list?

Dr. Susan Huck
Associate Editor
Conservative Review
1307 Dolly Madison Blvd.
McLean, VA 22101
(703) 893-7302

For obvious (to us) reasons we do not keep mailing lists. We will however, see to it that you are included in the distribution scheme and receive a grey copy. We do ask that if you intend to mention The RESISTER in your publication that you have the professional courtesy to let us review said material first. Mail reaches us through a rather indirect and laborious route, so give us at least four weeks to respond. --THE EDITOR

NEW WORLD SLAVERY

Has anyone considered that if the United Nations possessed sufficient power to enforce world peace they would also have the power to enforce world dictatorship? Apparently this fact does not trouble our government.

Since 1961 the United States Department of State has been negotiating away our national sovereignty in the name of "World Peace" consistent with the provisions of the Kennedy

administration document entitled "FREEDOM FROM WAR." I am no major league historian but I am old enough to remember that "peace" was the communist catch phrase meaning one-world communism.

Does anyone else stop to consider that the United States is the only non-socialist country in the world and United Nations edicts on arms control, environmentalism, and 'human rights' are always focused on, and contrary to the interests of the United States?

"FREEDOM FROM WAR" outlined a three-stage evolution designed to make the UN the sole legitimate user of force on the face of the planet. Keep in mind that this was the US Department of State's vision for the future of country in 1961.

Phase One essentially eliminates the notion of national sovereignty by enforcing unilateral disarmament while strengthening UN "peacekeeping" powers.

Phase two reinforces UN "peacekeeping" by transferring all legitimacy for the exercise of military force to the United Nations. We are already there. Note that regardless of the sovereign interests of this country during DESERT SHIELD president Bush went groveling to the United Nations for permission to act.

Phase three will permit nations to retain only those forces and armaments necessary for the maintenance of internal order. Only the UN will maintain arms and forces necessary to wage offensive war under the control of it's "Peace Force."

Now, the US has endorsed a working paper seeking global gun control submitted to the UN Disarmament Commission by Patti Londono, a Columbian UN Diplomat. On May 9, 1994, The United States allowed consensus adoption of the working paper which puts domestic gun control on par with nuclear disarmament.

George Prescott
USAJFKSWCS

THE DANGER OF PRECEDENCE

I hope you have been following the O.J. Simpson case at least through the preliminary hearing. The key issue was Fourth Amendment rights. For the sake of clarity the Fourth Amendment states:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Now that we're on the same sheet of music, some of the arguments made by O.J.'s council make better sense. The Fourth Amendment says in essence that, if you want to search a residence, you need a warrant. Quite plain and simple. It says nothing about exigent (urgent or critical) circumstances nor does it infer them.

The argument of exigent circumstances has developed from "legal precedence." An analogy for precedence is as follows: Your mother tells you to stay out of the cookie jar or she will beat your butt. You get into it and get caught. Mom is in a good mood and doesn't beat you. The next time she catches you she's angry but you plead __precedence__ to prevent your beating. You got away with it the first time so why not this time?

It is the same with the legal system. When the police violate the Constitution, and get away with it, new case law follows and precedent for the action is established.

What about exigent circumstance? It has become a standard police tactic to subvert the intent of the Fourth Amendment prohibitions against unwarranted search and seizure.

I am not here to say the police should not enter a place if a true crisis is taking place. However, the limit of their action though should be to stop the disturbance, secure the scene and request a warrant if probable cause exists. But a tiny blood spot on a vehicle door should not be brought before the court as the basis for the police or district attorney's claim of "exigent circumstance."

Neither this, nor the claim of someone else in danger, holds any credence. The police did not race to the home of Nicole's "friend" and crash in to see if everyone was safe. What about equal treatment under the law?

O.J. Simpson's Fourth Amendment rights were clearly violated. You may not care for Simpson or you may even say, "he is guilty so who cares how he was brought down." That attitude is precisely the problem. It is better for a guilty man to go free than have our rights trampled upon by the minions of so-called justice. If any government is allowed to do whatever measures it deems necessary to bring order, you can rest assured that it will be totalitarian and brutal.

"Lexington"
USAJFKSWCS

HORROR FILE

Crime Bill Defines The RESISTER as Instrument of Terror

Senator Joseph Biden's SB 226, now incorporated into the Crime Control Act of 1993, (passed by both houses of Congress soon to signed by Clinton), would make publication of The RESISTER an "intent" to commit a terrorist act.

Section 8 of Biden's SB 223 'defines' intent in this context as "appear to be intended (1) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; (2) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion."

This includes, but is not limited to; demonstrations, pickets, computer bulletin boards, publications, assemblies, and speech.

First Amendment Trial Balloon

Harry W. Marrerro (JD) is being "detained" in a maximum security federal prison, without bond, for producing and selling a video tape about the Constitution entitled "Sovereignty vs Slavery."

Mr. Marrerro was indicted by a federal Grand Jury on charges of conspiracy, wire fraud, and mail fraud because he poses a "danger to society" for spreading "propaganda." Mr. Marrerro's message? The primacy of the individual.

The federal crime bill designates anti-government speech, such as proclaiming the desirability of revolution against tyranny, as "material support to terrorism," and makes RICO forfeiture possible for statements made up to 4 years PRIOR to the enactment of the bill.

This is EX POST FACTO legislation.

Equal Opportunity Poverty

The decent middle class neighborhood you live in has now been designated by the federal government as a "low poverty area." This means your neighborhood is unfairly divided from inner city slums by a lack of "income integration."

HUD now considers almost every neighborhood in America as an unfair housing market, liable to forced integration by the whim of the federal government. If you own property in a middle-class neighborhood you are now guilty, by default, of the undefined charge of racism.

Between 1970 and 1976 HUD transformed Detroit and Chicago into giant slums by redistributing welfare moochers and their criminal, gang, and drug addict hitchhikers to affluent neighborhoods. HUD secretary Henry Cisneros and HUD assistant secretary Roberta Achtenberg figure that was not good enough.

Altruist egalitarianism demands that everyone live in equally crime-ridden slums.

"This Isn't Something You Need to Have in Your Library"

Major Mark Prugh, acting on the instructions of Colonel Richard Seim, Command Judge Advocate, United States Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School, confiscated the USAJFK Special Warfare Center and School Marquat Memorial Library's well thumbed reference copy of The RESISTER. (For the edification of our civilian readers the Command Judge Advocate, COL Seim, works exclusively for, and acts on behalf of, Major General William Garrison, Commander, USAJFKSWCS.) What is particularly obnoxious is that it was a grey copy; in other words, an original. This outrage occurred Thursday, 25 August, 1994.

Our observers report that MAJ Prugh asked for the desk copy of The RESISTER and, having obtained it from the unwitting duty librarian, turned to walk out the door with it. When advised that the issue in question was the library's only reference copy and was not to be removed from the premises Prugh returned to the desk and scrawled a note stating who he was and that he was acting "per COL Seim's instructions," while stapling his card to the note. When asked why he was taking the library's only copy he replied, "The isn't something you need to have in your library."

We will point out that the Marquat Memorial Library contains the collected works of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Hitler's Mein Kampf, and at least something representing the philosophy of every brand of collectivism, socialism, statism, tribalism, and anarchy. Obviously, the Chain of Command considers those works perfectly acceptable reading for our soldiers.

The RESISTER's message of strict constitutionalism, isolationism, laissez-faire capitalism, individual rights, and republicanism, is considered subversive.

It is tempting to hold MAJ prugh accountable for his action, but know that he was just an "errand boy sent by grocery clerks;" an errand boy who held __mandatory__ "Homosexuality Sensitivity Training" for all USAJFKSWCS instructors and staff throughout August, 1994.

Major General Garrison's address is:

Commander
ATTN: AOJK-CO
USAJFKSWCS
Fort Bragg, North Carolina
28307-5000
(910) 432-4404

RUMORS

The RESISTER a Government Plot?

Major Robert Tiffany, FA, Doctrine Division, USAJFKSWCS, has opined that The RESISTER is published by the Clinton adminstration as a vehicle designed to "smoke out" dissidents and subversiveness in the military.

NICE TRY BOB, NOW THAT YOU'RE RETIRING WE HOPE YOU DON'T HAVE TO MAKE A LIVING BY YOUR ANALYTICAL SKILLS.

--THE STAFF

U.N. Fomenting Insurgencies

An interesting tidbit surfaced in THE NEW FEDERALIST, dated June 13, 1994. It seems the United Nations Human Development Program has been 'studying' the internal conditions of various Third World countries.

In the case of Mexico, the UNHDP conducted an exhaustive study of "human conditions" in State of Chiapas

during the spring of 1993. Seven months later, in January 1994, Mexico was faced with an insurgency in that state, led by the masked (and alleged homosexual) pipe smoking Marcos.

We have reproduced an article leveling the charge of UN sponsored insurgencies by a Mexican journalist, Linda de Hoyos, on page 12. Normally, we care less what happens in Mexico. But because American soldiers are now routinely deployed to dung heaps by our socialist government to "help" miserable, starving, Third World abstractions at the behest of the United Nations, we thought you should see what you're getting into and why. --ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Primer Shortage

For the past eight months it has been almost impossible to buy primers in any reasonable quantity. The RESISTER began quietly canvassing manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers to find out why.

Retailers and wholesalers were patiently waiting for cartridge manufacturers to finish their annual production which they (the distributors), said usually reduced primer availability until early summer. When we talked to the manufacturers they said the U.S. government had placed orders for ammunition SIX TIMES their normal annual commission. Some quick fourth-grade math completed the story.

In a normal year, the federal government purchases approximately 1.7 million rounds for its myriad unconstitutional law enforcement agencies. This excludes the various arsenals which produce ammunition for the military. This year the federal government purchased over one BILLION rounds. It gets uglier. This year the federal government began arming the IRS and the EPA. The Fed's are also expanding the FBI's HRT, the BATF's enforcement branch, and DOE's private army. Juxtapose this with the federal government's determination to abrogate the Second Amendment.

If anyone has information pertaining to this issue write us. --THE EDITOR

National Forest HLZ's

When units are deployed on JTF-Six missions they are routinely required to locate and survey Helicopter Landing Zones within National Forests which are then turned over to the National Forest Service during the post mission AAR. The official explanation is that these HLZ's will be used by future missions as MEDEVAC dust-off sites.

Debriefs of personnel returning from JTF-Six missions indicate that the purpose of the National Forest HLZ surveys is not quite so benign. The PIR and IR for JTF-Six OPORDs frequently require units to report on the locations, numbers, dress, and types of arms carried by civilians within National Forests, and specifically address reporting any type of "paramilitary" activity. This information is included in the post-mission INSUM which is then turned over to JTF-Six J-2 and is accessible by Operation Alliance; in other words, the FBI, BATF, US Border Patrol, DEA, among others.

Counter drug or internal security? If you have been recently deployed on a JTF-Six mission or an RSU rotation and some of your mission and reporting requirements did not quite squire with the official lie, write us. --THE STAFF

FIELD REPORT: SECOND AMENDMENT RALLY

by

Alexander Davidson

Washington D.C., 14 August, 1994

One of the oddities of political demonstrations is that those who do not actually work for a living have the time, supporting front organizations, and resources donated by altruists, do-gooders, and other socialists, communists, and influence peddlers to form mobs to protest this or the other perceived inequity while carrying cardboard placards demanding that groundless theories, mindless philosophies, and range of the moment whims be given the same status as fact, reason, and reality.

Those of us who actually work to earn our living do not have the idle luxury to demonstrate in defense of our inalienable objective rights.

The Second Amendment Rally drew, we estimate, about 2,000 people. (Our estimate is based on the area covered divided by approximately 3 square meters per person given the area covered and mean dispersion). Bus loads of people arrived from Ohio, Illinois, and North Carolina. Individuals drove from as far away as Colorado and Alabama.

We admit being a little disappointed in the turnout when we heard the first reports from our observers at the rally. But upon reflection we quickly came to realize that people who are in the right seldom think they are compelled to prove it to others. It is the liar who must shout down the truthful to be heard, the incompetent who must denigrate the work of the competent to be recognized, and the inept who must enslave the able to feign success.

While the numbers of honest, competent, and able citizens who came to the rally may not be remarkable, the fact that most of them were willing to miss the following day of two of work to defend their right to bear arms against government tyranny is.

The media was conspicuous by their absence, Not one news agency arrived to record and report on a rally by law abiding citizens opposing government abrogation of their rights. If an equal number of homosexuals, drug addicts, communists, bean curd eaters, animal worshipers, minority tribalists, or common street garbage had staged a rally the carrion eaters of the media would have been there in force clucking their tongues wondering how these people could have suffered for so long.

Of the distinguished guests who were invited to attend

only G. Gordon Liddy appeared and spoke. His message was clear and succinct: "You have no moral obligation to obey unconstitutional laws. When they tell you to register your firearms--don't. When they tell you to turn in your firearms--don't." No argument form us.

Rush Limbaugh was too busy signing books in Colorado.

There was a consistent underlying theme that brought these people together to take a stand for their rights, unified them in their outrage against our unconstitutional federal government, and kept them focused on the very reason why the Second Amendment is the keystone of the Bill of Rights--Waco.

Waco defined in one act, the federal government's true position on the rights and individual liberties guaranteed to all freemen by the constitution.

Waco put the fear of tyrannical government into every rational person in this country. If there was a war cry to mobilize resistance to the vagaries of the federal government, the non-objectivity of our undefinable, un-judicable, and therefore unjust firearms laws, that war cry is **"REMEMBER WACO!"**

There is a small but growing segment of the American public who are aware that the BATF thugs who assaulted a community of Christian law abiding citizens were trained and advised by members of 3rd Special Forces Group (Airborne), under the auspices of Operation Alliance and Joint Task Force - Six. It was with great interest that our observers at the Second Amendment Rally learned that Mr. James Pate, a free-lance journalist who uncovered that fact and broke the story in SOLDIER OF FORTUNE, would speak at the rally.

Mr. Pate began his speech at a disadvantage; everything he had to say about Waco had already been said by Kirk Lyons, from Black Mountain, NC, one of the defense attorneys for the Waco defendants. But then, Pate paused, held above his head a grey document and announced:

"There is a crisis of command in our standing army. I am holding a copy of The RESISTER: The Official Publication of the Special Forces Underground. This letter, written by a soldier from the 7th Special Forces Group, expresses the concerns of some members of the Special Operations Community about a government and it's appointed officers who order them to oppress the citizens of this country:

> My friends and I are all in agreement; our government is getting out of control and the first time we are given an order to disarm the citizens of this country we are going to desert and join whatever guerilla movement demonstrates it is fighting to restore the principles this country was founded on..."

As our observers edged their way out of the crowd under the cover of HC and violet smoke, mixed, to their break in contact, they heard the crowd roar it's approval.

APPROVAL. For the first time in 200 years elements of United States Army openly publicize their intent to resist the policies of the federal government and American citizens publicly demonstrate their approval.

Why? Because most people are afraid of the government. It is a very subtle fear. It is a fear resulting form the uncertainty of legal status born of the incomprehensibility of our laws and their whimsical application and enforcement.

One of our staff members has remarked that his mother persistently says, "Don't say things like that over the phone!" Another points out that most people are afraid to join politically active organizations because they want to wind up on "their" list.

The RESISTER has one answer to those and other objections to resisting tyranny--"You behave like someone who lives in a police state."

During their debriefing one of our observers stated, "I don't know how he (Pate) got hold of it (The RESISTER). When he mentioned Special Forces there were murmurs of 'traitors,' and 'Quislings.' But when he read the letter from 'John" the crowd went crazy because they found out we (The Resistance) were with them. It may take twenty years, but we're going to win...I know that now.

AMEN

"Assault Gun" Ban Analysis
by
"Minuteman"
3rd SFG

The recent ban on military style semi-automatic weapons is far more onerous than even pro-Second Amendment organizations presume. Placed in context with Clinton's April 19, 1994 remark, "...there's too much personal freedom." and Senator Biden's recent statement that the federal government will decide what the "people need," the purpose of the ban is clear.

Semi-automatic firearms cost hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars. The majority of these weapons are not owned by collectors, who are relatively well off, and who obtain them for their own esoteric purposes. Nor are they owned by "the poor," who could not hope to splurge on an $800 to $3000 firearm. They are owned by the middle class; hard-working, law abiding property owners.

Some possess them out of nostalgia for their military service, some for weekend plinking, some for competitive shooting, some for self protection, a few for hunting. Their motive is irrelevant because it is their Constitutional and natural right to own them.

Now, consider the legislative assaults against the middle-class for the past thirty years. Environmental laws are Anti-property. Economic laws are anti-capitalism. Civil rights laws are anti-individual. Education laws are anti-reason. The sole purpose of federal anti-gun laws is anti-resistance.

There is a growing movement throughout America to form local militias. This movement is not universal, nor is it well advertised, but it is expanding with the growing

recognition that the myriad incomprehensible laws passed in the last thirty years were never intended to serve their stated purpose.

If you are not a member of a non-state approved militia, join one. If there is none where you live, form one--in secret. When the time comes we will find you and assist you.

*

Blind Transmission Broadcast

Melvil:

Paragraph 2 by sentence. Thank you. You're not the only one. We call them "tobacco spitters." Whom, lately, has said, "No?" WE know that. I knew him; he fell into the same trap as the "centurions." Paragraph 3, start sentence 2. You are correct, we're working on it. We know. Your 're right; we will when it's possible. We know. Thank you. P.S. So are many others.

SGM:

Reference our telephone conversation of 18 August, 1994: Want to put theory into practice?

Bruce:

It is impolite to discuss tradecraft. Re: 1) He wouldn't; 2)Yes, yes, no; 3) No; irrelevant; 4) You mean NOM DE PLUME. Would you take the chance? You mean: AGENTS PROVOCATEURS.

Kyle:

Your plumbing business and advertising are going to compromise you. It's time to start behaving as you believe.

Kevin:

You can do more for us outside. Mr. Charles Peterson will contact you soon. You are in a unique position. If you are interested inquire about Mr. Peterson's reading habits.

Michael:

Brief resume required.

"Sentinal"

We need to talk. Details forthcoming. Do not tell anybody. Do not invite friends.

PEACEKEEPING: What For?

Joseph Thomas

The recent orgy of articles about United Nations peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance in SPECIAL WARFARE magazine reveals a great deal about where the United States military in general, and Special Forces in particular, is being lead.

Instead of focusing on the defense of this nation and the protection of vital United States interests the U.S. military has become a slave service for the wealth redistribution schemes of internationalists and gangs of weeping do-gooder mystics. One need simply note the circling of media carrion-eaters to predict in which Third World toilet these altruists will next flush hundreds-of-millions of tax dollars and the lives of U.S. service men.

Peacekeeping is a monumental fraud. It has nothing to do with peace and even less with keeping it. Peacekeeping , and it's bastard offsprings-- peacemaking and peace enforcement--constitutes nothing less than the abrogation of national sovereignty. The insinuation of U.N. agencies into the political fabric of the nations it "helps," the expropriation and redistribution of property and wealth, and the establishment of "democratically elected" socialist governments are actions that speak louder than the mushy rhetoric of U.N. cheerleaders in the federal government.

In Somalia eighteen American slave-soldiers under U.N. command died, and seventy-seven were wounded, for exactly NOTHING. They were not heroes, they were sacrificial animals. At the same time the circus sideshow man hunt for Adid was in full swing, the United Nations was paying him over US$ 100,000 monthly in protection money so altruists could deliver food to hoards of starving irrelevancies. Vice President Gore consoled the parents of the victims by telling them their sons died "in the service of the United Nations." (The RESISTER is reliably informed it is a good thing he had his Secret Service hoods with him at the time.)

Sergeant Major Steve Burback, a U.N. toady, conveniently sidesteps these facts in his groveling January 1994, SPECIAL WARFARE article: THE BLUE HELMETS: A HISTORY OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FORCES. Burback considers Somalia a success.

During the U.N. sponsored Korean War (which the socialist Truman called a "police action"), military orders and directives sent from the NCA and the Pentagon to commanders in Korea were routinely briefed to U.N. Military Staff Committee members. This information was then relayed to the North Koreans and the Chinese communists by their allies, the Soviet Union. Lin Piao, commander of communist Chinese forces in Korea gloated, "I would never have made the attack (across the Yalu, ED.) and risked my men and military reputation if I had not been assured that Washington would restrain General MacArthur from taking adequate retaliatory measures against my lines of supply and communication." The number of American soldiers who died as a result of this federal government treason cannot be calculated.

The true intent of United Nations "peacekeeping" is best illustrated by the 1960 - 1964 ONUC (Operation des Nations Unies au Congo), in what is the archetype U.N. client state and IMF money sewer, Zaire.

When Moise Kapenda Tshombe, pro-west and anti-communist leader of Katanga province declared secession and independence from the communist regime of Patrice Lumumba, the United Nations, at the behest of American liberals and the Soviet Union deployed thousands of pro-communist thugs on U.S. transport aircraft to Katanga back into line. Thousands died in U.N. concentration camps,

whites were routinely murdered, civilian facilities were bombed by U.N. aircraft (flown by Czech and Russian "technicians") between July 1960 and January 1962. (See: REBELS, MERCENARIES AND DIVIDENDS, by Smith Hempstone, 1962.)

Never in it's history has the United Nations intervened on behalf of a pro-west, pro-capitalist nation under assault from communist subversion from within or socialist aggression from without. Where was the U.N. in Malaysia, Viet Nam, Laos or Cambodia? Objections that member states must appeal to the United Nations for assistance are irrelevant since their ideological aggressors, communists and socialists, controlled (and still control) the Security Council. The U.N. does not send peacekeepers to protect Israel, but to preserve the lunatic Islamic nations who attacked her.

For what reason should the United States throw away hundreds of millions of dollars in so-called foreign "aid" and risk the lives of American servicemen to "save" mobs of starving irrelevancies and hoards of suffering abstractions at the whim of the One World Socialists of the United Nations? So New World Order altruists can feel good about themselves.

There are many who view the mindless whimsy and senseless rationalizing of American foreign policy in general, and United Nations peacekeeping in particular, as an omnipotent conspiracy masterminded by some malevolent powerful giant. Lacking irrefutable facts in proof of this contention The RESISTER prefers to remain silent. If there is a conspiracy we believe it is more a conspiracy of philosophy that a conspiracy of men.

The RESISTER contends that the truth is far more horrible: at the bottom of the cloying fog of stench that surrounds U.N. peacekeeping and American foreign policy is a nest of scurrying cockroaches.

MOTIVE

If you believe the Official Lie that the various Third World tribes which provide the U.N. with peacekeeping forces do so out of the kindness of their heart, guess again. They do it for your tax money.

One example in particular is illustrative. When Zambia sent its hoodlums to Mozambique last year each soldier was paid US$ 300.00 per month by the U.N.. Of course, the Zambian government looted more than half that money, but the net result was that the deployed Zambian soldier's pay more than doubled. The added benefit was that it got some of their armed gangs out of the country for a while, thus reducing the threat of a coup.

There is an analogy to be drawn here. If the thugs and hoodlums of Third World sewers get well paid by their U.N. masters (at least by their standards), that at least makes them prostitutes--a known honorable profession.

United States peacekeepers get no extra pay. The RESISTER figures that this makes U.S. Peacekeepers little more than common street sluts.

U.N. PLAN: One World Government by 1995

Linda de Hoyos

The Human Development Report 1994, Released on June 1, 1994, sets forth a blueprint to destroy the sovereign nation-state and replace it with a One World UN dictatorship by March 1995.

The UNDP report, endorsed by UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, outlines plans for establishment of "world institutions" with powers to dictate policies to government, while simultaneously declaring war on nations of the developing sector.

under the ruse of a concept of "human security" designed to replace the imperatives of national security of sovereign countries, the UNDP report sets the agenda and protocols for the March 1995 heads-of-state summit on Social Development to be held in Copenhagen, Denmark. This summit is to follow this September's Cairo Conference on Population, where Boutros-Ghali et al. are demanding that nations agree to population reduction as the criterion of economic performance. The UNDP proposal, if implemented, would create the enforcement apparatus for such genocidal aims.

Specifically, the UNDP report calls for the creation of a World Court, with powers to subpoena nations; A World Police; A World Bank, which would give the International Monetary Fund sole power to enforce austerity on nations; A world Treasury; An Economic Security Council, with a mandate to interfere in those states that do not conform to UN protocols for "population reduction" or "free trade" liberalization; A World Trade and Production Organization, which would not only regulate "free trade" but would also dictate production quotas to nations.

To fund its One World government the UNDP report calls for global taxation. This is to include taxes on pollution, taxes on 'savings' from demilitarization, taxes on all foreign exchange transactions, and a global income tax on nations whose people average an income above US$ 10,000 per year.

Genocide: The Aim

The UN requires such global power of dictatorship, the report makes clear, in order to enforce population reduction. The biggest threat to "human security," the report states on page 34, is 'unchecked population growth." The report states that by the year 2015, world population must be stabilized at 7.3 billion. For this goal to be reached, nations must "commit themselves to ... participating in annual reviews of the 20:20 compact," to be held as joint donor-recipient meetings on each country as well as annual reviews in the Economic Security Council.

Further, the UNDP demands that, while the UN heightens its powers to militarily intervene in the sovereign territory of any nation, the militaries of developing countries must be dismantled, their national security stripped. The UNDP report

lists five cases in which UN Blue Helmet troops must be deployed into the internal conflicts of nations: "mass slaughter of the population of the state, decimation through starvation or the withholding of health or other services, forced exodus, occupation and the denial of the right to self-determination, (and) environmental destruction."

To understand what this means, at the behest of British Prime Minister Lord Palmerson, UN "Peace-makers" would have intervened to protect the secession of the Confederacy from the Union during the American Civil War.

At the same time, under the title "special contributions," the UNDP endorses a call by Oscar Arias, former President of Costa Rica and Nobel Peace Prize winner, for developing nations to fully demobilize their armed forces. Arias calls for a Global Demilitarization Fund, managed by the UN, that would dish out money to developing countries who make efforts to "disarm and demobilize their armed forces, reintegrate military people into society, and promote gun control." Through the Economic Security Council, demilitarization would become a new condition for any sid or loans to developing nations.

Demand for Disintegration

The UNDP report has already drawn the wrath of some developing countries for the inclusion in the report of a "hit list" of countries which the report says are either in a state of crisis, or on the verge of crisis, and therefore warrant UN "preemptive action."

Targeted are Afghanistan, Angola, Haiti, Iraq, Mozambique, Sudan, Zaire, Burundi, Georgia, Liberia, Rwanda, and Tajikistan. The report further cites Brazil, South Africa, Egypt, Mexico, and Nigeria as vulnerable to disintegration due to "unequal distribution of resources." Of these nations Egypt, Mexico, and Nigeria were also targets of the 1970's National Security Memorandum 200, written by Henry Kissinger, which declares that population reduction is a national security goal of the United States.

In the press conference which released the Human Development Report, UNDP index designer Mabubhul Haq, an IMF flunky and former Pakistani Finance Minister in the early 1980's, indicated that countries which do not submit to the parameters of the UNDP "Human Development Index" will be hit with insurgencies modeled on that of this year's Chiapas uprising of "indigenous people" in southern Mexico. Haq, in fact, revealed THE UNDP HAD DONE A DETAILED STUDY OF CHIAPAS SEVEN MONTHS BEFORE THE JANUARY 1994 INSURGENCY WAS LAUNCHED.

A mere coincidence? Haq further said the UNDP is now engaged in similar 'studies' of regional disparities in Egypt, Nigeria, and Brazil.

Despite the liberal distribution of the word "human" throughout the UNDP report human beings are not a high priority. James Gustave Speth, head of the UNDP, was the project director for the Carter administration's Global 2000 report which demanded that the world population be reduced to 2 billion by the year 2000.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF COMPULSION BY THE STATE
by Auberon Herbert

While not many people know his name, England's Auberon Herbert (1838 - 1906) was a profound defender of capitalism. He wrote eloquent, uncompromising, and philosophically insightful defenses of individual rights. Politics, he says, must be "the battle of the principles...the principle of liberty against the principle of force."

Herbert presents his views intransigently and articulate: "true liberty cannot exist apart from the full rights of property, for property is the only crystallized form of free faculties...The whole meaning of socialism is a systematic glorification of force...No literary phrases about social organisms are potent enough to evaporate the individual, who is the prime, indispensable, irreducible element."

Herbert readily applies these same principles to show the evils of unlimited democratic rule. "How should it happen that the individual should be without rights, but the combination of individuals should possess unlimited rights?"

But he does not regard the issue of force as a primary. Instead, he understands that it depends on something far more fundamental: the value of reason. "Force and reason--which last is the essence of the moral act--are at the two opposite poles," he argues. "The who compels his neighbor...treats him, not as a being with reason, but as an animal in whom reason is not."

Because of Herbert's commitment to reason, religion too is a target of his withering attacks; "Socialism is but Catholicism addressing itself not to the soul but to the sense of men." Both implore one to "accept authority, accept the force which it employs, resign yourself to all-powerful managers, give up the free choice and the free act..They both of them seek to sacrifice man." The basic difference, he remarks, is that socialism "is a creed even more denigrating than Catholicism, but it offers more tangible bribes for its acceptance."

Writing at the end of the 19th century, as attacks on capitalism began to stir, the uncommon thinker declares: "It is not laissez-faire that has failed. That would be an ill day for men. What has failed is the courage to see what is true and speak it to the people, to point to the true remedies."

PATRIOTS: The Men Who Started the American Revolution
by A.J. Langguth

Turn of the evening news, put down your novel, and read this book. The happenings in Patriots are as relevant as the day's headlines and as compelling as any "page-turner"--it

is the story of the events that created the United States.

America's unique revolution was a war guided by intellectual activists. The incidents in this book may seem similar to those covered by contemporary journalists--mass protests of unpopular decisions; legislatures wrangling over the imposition of new taxes; soldiers firing into a violent mob and inciting further demonstrations; a rebellious people taking over the government of a country. However, these events were driven not by blind emotions and apparently random whim issues--but by conscious adherence to the ideal of individual rights.

This history begins with the ideological foment of 1761. the use of "writs of assistance" --blanket search warrants, designed to curb smuggling and giving their bearers the right to search any ship or building they choose--was legally challenged as an assault on Americans' rights.

Langguth summarizes the case made by the British attorney: "Which was more important, protecting the liberty of and individual or collecting the taxes efficiently? Gathering public money must take precedence." On the other hand, James Otis, the attorney for the colonists, argued that "every man was his own sovereign...No other creature on earth could legitimately challenge a mans right to his life, his liberty and his property. That principle, that unalterable law, took precedence...even over the survival of the state."

When Otis finished, "something profound changed America"--i.e., individual rights had been invoked to limit state power.

The heroes who made the Revolution were men like Samuel Adams, the ascetic Puritan who inflamed the mob in Boston--Patrick Henry, the brilliant orator whose "Give me liberty or give me death" became the rallying cry for American troops--George Washington, whose patrician integrity inspired his soldiers while his aggressive tactics won the war--Thomas Jefferson, whose commitment to rights persuaded the Continental Congress to endorse his Declaration of Independence.

Reading this book will inspire you.

```
HRLER DTTIA LRCRT ABNRS WEIIP CSCIR
LIIHO AHUGN DITGI SPYEA MERYA HUYHT
KETTD ATRFM INRXF VUWQL THCAH WDTIA
XAMWA HBTMA NMWAP EISOT BROYA MIAPF
ZORTP JWVNJ ODSJU TYISN AKIRD BYDJC
LEBSU QVRFT OMSTG INYVR SCEGR RELRH
```

PERSONALS

Mr. Richard White's Texas ranch is ideally suited for the grazing large herds of cattle.

The King's Mountain Model Railroad Club will hold its quarterly meeting at the Charlotte address. Topic: Switching yards or spur lines, which is the greater modeling challenge?

Mr. Howard Devon, of Medford Wisconsin, wishes to announce the Medford Gardening Club will now hold their monthly meetings every third Wednesday. The nest meeting will be a seminar on sunflowers.

The Sand Hills Bird Watchers Society will conduct its 1st Annual Membership Drive throughout the month of October. Clara Miller, vice president, reminds prospective members to provide their own optics. The club's GUIDE TO BIRDS will be provided at no cost.

IN THE NEXT ISSUE:

* How the Second Amendment Will Be Abrogated By UN Treaty
* Why NAFTA is Anti-Capitalism
* How Democracy Subverts the Constitution
* The True Nature of Rights

-plus-

Our Usual Features

Ask for the Winter Issue in January; somebody will have it.