

Liberty

Peter J. Mancus
Attorney at Law
Victorian Square
876 Gravenstein Ave. So., Suite 3
Sebastopol, CA 95472
(707) 829-9050
pmancus@prodigy.net
© Peter J. Mancus 2002

February 18, 2002

Note: *The author is pleased to acknowledge that Truman Wilson, Richard Stevens, Jim March, John E. Wolfgram, Cornet Joyce, Clayton Cramer, Jon Roland, Frederick P. Blume, Jr., Angel Shamaya, Brian Puckett, the Founders and Framers, and others too numerous to mention, or to recall, shared important concepts that are incorporated into this document or helped with the editing and proof reading of same.*

INTRODUCTION

by Angel Shamaya
Founder/Executive Director
KeepAndBearArms.com

In all his verbosity, my friend Peter Mancus is not a man to mince words. You do not have to wonder where he stands or what he is attempting to convey to you as his reader. In fact, he's among the most direct, thorough and articulate modern liberty advocates manning the Radical Wing of today's Public Liberty Fortress I know.

And personally, I find his alleged "radicalness" refreshing. Even delightful.

In a world where far too few people boldly speak the unspeakable, Peter Mancus is a diamond in the rough. Even a hero.

The people who most need to read and understand Peter's careful, painstaking and even exhaustive analysis of America's Liberty Woes below would soil their pants less than halfway through it — if they had the guts to read and digest its many implications. But, alas, I must confess to more than a touch of resignation when pondering whether this message will actually convert The Enemy of The Gun. The kind of courage it would take a Sarah Brady or a Chuck Schumer to truly embrace the hard, cold, glaring facts below is something they and their sheep do not possess — if they did, I'd be doing something else right now, and so would you.

LIBERTY, in my not so humble opinion, is for people who are already reasonably with us. It's for people who own a gun or support the right to own one fully. It's for people who have actually read the Constitution, called their lying public servants to chew them out as needed, and people who feel a welling up inside their bodies that shows up like a foreboding of potentially lethal days ahead in this used-to-be-a-Republic if civil authority continues to usurp the right of the people. LIBERTY is for people who'd rather use force in defense of Liberty than live enslaved and are willing to look honestly at the fact that they may one day unfortunately be left with no alternative but to prove it.

If you believe the government's authority extends so far they can undo a basic human right, don't read any further. You'll just need an antacid if you do.

If you are a member of the Civil Authority Taliban, you are advised to study this document closely — your life may one day depend on your having done so.

Angel Shamaya
February 18, 2002

Liberty

By Peter Mancus

1. For 6,000 years of recorded history, early rulers [pharaohs and kings, etc.] were the best fighters or best politicians or both. Their successors tended to be the first born male, via alleged hereditary entitlement, or the best fighters or best politicians or both. These rulers ruled *arbitrarily*. Mankind struggled against this abuse of power. That struggle is the story of civilization.

2. *Civilization* is essentially arrangements existing between rulers and ordinary folks. Some arrangements are based on raw power. Some are, allegedly, based on the Rule of Law. For most civilizations, Rule of Law is code for what the ruler wants.

3. *Rule of Law*, devoid of norms that protect Man's rights, is not worthy of support. *Rule of Law* is too vague. Every tyrant had his Rule of Law which authorized arbitrary, cruel, tyrannical acts sanctioned by rubber stamp judges and adoring or petrified majorities. What is needed is a *Rule of Law* that promotes and protects certain norms.

4. Historically, throughout all cultures, all civilizations, all races, and all continents, the Tyrant's Pattern, uniformly, has been this: demonize arms [swords, firearms, etc.] and their owners; agitate for the regulation, banning and confiscation of same; regulate same; register same; ban same; confiscate same; once the population is disarmed, consolidate power, incarcerate or murder potential hostile leaders; and impose genocide.

5. The story of civilization is Mankind's struggle for, and embrace of, Liberty, per a written Constitution that subjects power to finite limits, protects ordinary folks from abusive rulers, and empowers ordinary folks to hold their rulers and civil authority accountable for their abuse of power entrusted to them.

6. The Ancient Greeks advanced civilization. They are credited with being the first in Western Civilization to function as a *democracy*. Their version of *democracy*, however, suffered from a serious liability. Their version was *pure democracy*, which is mob rule via a majority vote. In Ancient Greece, no one had any legally recognized rights beyond the control of civil authority or the mob. It was 100% legal for a majority to vote to execute anyone per any pretext or without pretext being required. The Ancient Greeks were also enthusiastic supporters of *pure democracy* — but only for those of property and of the right class.

7. The Ancient Greeks were 100% correct about this concept: He who refuses to participate in self-government runs the risk of being governed by a fool greater than himself.

8. The primary purposes of a written Constitution are:

- to hold civil authority within specified limits, per agreed upon rules; and
- to hold civil authority accountable when it violates agreed upon rules.

9. Arguably, the most significant political-legal document written in English, or any other language, in the entire history of Mankind is the July 4th, 1776 Declaration of Independence. The July 4th Declaration is arguably the most significant political-legal document because it declared the following concepts and linked them together for the first time in a new manner:

- Man has a Creator.
- Man has inalienable rights that exist in Nature, before the creation of civil authority.
- The Creator, not civil authority, is the source of Man's inalienable rights.
- Man's inalienable rights include, but are not limited to, the right to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness.
- These inalienable rights survive the formation of society and the creation of government.
- The only legitimate purpose of government is to secure these rights—without infringing upon them; and

- When government's prolonged oppression of the people becomes insufferable, the people have a right and a duty to overthrow government and establish a new rule of law that will restore and preserve these inalienable rights.

10. The July 4th Declaration starkly pitted the concept of Man's Inalienable Rights Derived From a Creator against the concept of the Divine Right of Kings to Rule Arbitrarily. That juxtaposition was the equivalent of a 9.0 political-legal earthquake, which continues to rumble and shake up Mankind, Civilizations and Civil Authorities around the globe.

11. The July 4th Declaration was a radical, revolutionary document signed by brave men the English Crown deemed "criminals."

12. The U.S. Constitution, as modified by the U.S. Bill of Rights, is an attempt to implement, in a pragmatic, workable fashion, the core ideas expressed in the July 4th Declaration.

13. The U.S. Constitution was ratified in 1789.

14. The U.S. Constitution was first modified in 1791 by the ratification of the U.S. Bill of Rights.

15. The U.S. Bill of Rights are the first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

16. The U.S. Bill of Rights has its own preamble. Most people, including most lawyers and judges, do not know this. An exact quote of part of this preamble is stated below:

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

The U.S. National Archives is the official custodian of records for important United States documents. This official, authoritative source confirms that this preamble, as quoted above, exists.

See: <http://www.nara.gov/exhall/charters/billrights/preamble.html>

17. Please read again, ultra carefully, this excerpt from this preamble. Then ask yourself the questions that follow.

What is the significance of that excerpt?

What were the Framers and Ratifiers of the U.S. Bill of Rights really saying, and agreeing to, for themselves?
For their posterity?

Were they saying the following:

We have a fear that the powers set forth in the Constitution might some day be misconstrued or abused or both?

We do not want our words to be perverted?

We want all future generations to take these rights seriously? We are now taking prudent safeguards to prevent that misconstruction or abuse of power?

Consequently, we are now further clarifying everything and modifying the Constitution with the following first ten amendments to it?

These first ten amendments are restrictions on civil authority's powers, INCLUDING civil authority's power to secure the peoples' inalienable Rights to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness?

The peoples' rights, as stated in this Bill, are intended to enjoy legal priority higher than all of civil authority's powers?

These first ten amendments are NOT restrictions on citizens?

On the contrary, these first ten amendments are a statement of the peoples' rights AND IMMUNITIES from civil authority's powers for exercising these rights responsibly?

We called these first ten amendments "the Bill of Rights" on purpose? We knew the difference between a right and a privilege?

We knew the difference between a right and a power? Citizens have rights? Civil authority has powers? We did not call these amendments a "Bill of Civil Authority's Additional Powers." This is because we put civil authority's powers in the Constitution? And we put the peoples' rights in this Bill?

By restrictions, we meant this: these rights belong to citizens. As such, they are legal guarantees. They are an entitlement for all U.S. citizens? They are off-limits—beyond civil authority's powers? Beyond the power of a majority vote? They are part of the "blessings of liberty"?

Civil authority, and all majorities, must take these rights seriously? These restrictions on civil authority's powers OVERRIDE civil authority's power to restrict these rights to promote the general welfare?

The general welfare cannot be promoted by restricting these rights? The general welfare is promoted by honoring these rights? That is why we included the Right to Petition for Redress of Meritorious Grievances in the First Amendment?

We were not kidding when we included the Right to Petition?

To underscore that we were not kidding about these rights, we included the Second Amendment. We chose our words that make up the Second Amendment carefully to mean exactly what we intended. Those words are: *"A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."* We included this amendment, as worded, because we wanted to make sure that ordinary folk retained the pragmatic means—arms—to enforce their rights should civil authority fail to redress appropriately meritorious petitions for redress of grievances?

If, by the Second Amendment, you [who are now seven generations removed from us] think we were granting civil authority, and only civil authority, a monopoly on arms, you are wrong! Why would we put that in a document we titled "Bill of Rights"? Especially one that has this preamble? Especially when we already granted civil authority the power to have an army and a navy in the Constitution?

Do you think we were brain dead? Do you think we goofed? Do you think we did not know what we were doing?

Do you forget that at least half of us Framers, and all of us major Framers, were among the best lawyers in the colonies? Do you think none of us proof read what we wrote? Do you think all of us intended by this preamble, this Bill, and this Second Amendment, to grant civil authority a monopoly on arms?

Do you realize that we used our privately owned, unregistered arms to win our independence from England and to make our July 4th Declaration stick?

Do you think we would stand toe to toe with redcoats, one of the world's then most professional armies, suffer horrendous losses on the battlefield, endure severe deprivation and heartaches for years, eat roots and wipe our asses with leafs, shiver at Valley Forge for months, and, after emerging victorious in a bloody seven year war, go out of our way to grant civil authority a monopoly on arms?

And codify in a document we called "Bill of Rights" civil authority's power to disarm us?

The Militia referenced in the Second is not civil authority's army? Given our experience with redcoats, we loathed, despised and feared all professional, standing armies?

The Militia was, and is, the people's army?

The Militia means ordinary citizens who are not civil authority's employees who periodically marshall, with their own privately owned, unregistered arms, for a socially beneficial public purpose?

And when the Militia disbands, all citizens who muster, go home, retaining their privately owned, unregistered arms?

Nowhere in the Second Amendment does it state that one has to be a member of the militia to have a right to keep and bear arms?

Gun Prohibitionists can look in vain, with a microscope, until eternity, at the Second Amendment. They will never find an express requirement that the right to keep and bear arms is preconditioned on membership in the Militia . . . or in any government regulated organization?

Well regulated does not mean government regulated. Well regulated means disciplined, trained, effective. A Militia can be all those things without government control?

We knew the difference between people and civil authority or state. We, knowing exactly what we were doing and why, said the right clearly belongs to the people, period?

People is not state, government, nor civil authority! In our day, a right meant a right and people meant people! Be leery of Gun Prohibitionists who persists in trying to rewrite history, who pervert our words, and who substitute one noun for another noun?

We ended the Second Amendment with this clear barrier: ". . . shall NOT be infringed." We did this on purpose, too. We knew that many would try to undermine or take away this right, under various pretexts, pleas of presumed necessity, and other bogus justifications, as a prelude to taking away other rights in this Bill of Rights?

We knew that parchment barriers are useless in the hands of power hungry public serpents?

We wanted to be pragmatic and make certain that ordinary citizens always retained the legal right to have the pragmatic means to resist tyranny and to preserve liberty? That was our policy choice. We were not control freaks.

We did not fear freedom. We trusted ordinary citizens. We understood this dynamic: To the extent that civil authority trusts citizens with arms and treats citizens equitably, civil authority has nothing to fear from well treated citizens, and civil authority can assuredly count on such citizens to use their privately owned, unregistered arms to defend civil authority from foreign aggression or domestic unrest; however, to the extent that civil authority does not trust citizens with arms or abuses them or both, citizens should not trust civil authority and should be willing, able and ready to take up arms against civil authority to preserve and to restore Liberty.

We believed in the citizen-soldier concept, and we loathed the professional soldier, standing army concept. We think we made a long term, wise policy choice. We know we did.

Do you think we were kidding about ". . . shall not be infringed."? "[I]nfringed" means prior restraint of any kind, no matter how slight, no matter what the pretext?

We ended our preamble to the Bill of Rights with this idea: "extending the ground of public confidence in the Government." We cannot stress enough that after emerging from the American Revolutionary War victorious against England, it emphatically would NOT have extended the public's confidence in the newly formed government if, by the Second Amendment, it was then understood that we intended to grant civil authority a monopoly on arms and the power to disarm ordinary citizens.

Do you think those who supported the July 4th Declaration and who survived to Frame the Constitution and the Bill of Rights were champions of police states? Were control freaks?

Do you know us? Do you know our roots? Our world view? Our attitudes? If you did, you would tell modern day Gun Prohibitionists to shut up, and you would bar them from office. And, if they did not shut up, you would do as we did: hang them and burn them in effigy; smear excrement on their homes and places of business; refuse to trade with them; bar them from their courthouses; publicly mock them; drive them out of town; burn their property; and kill them, if need be. We stood up for our rights. We claimed our rights. We did not tolerate a public serpent. [For authoritative historical documentation that this is part of how the Minutemen and political activists treated those loyal to the English Crown, read: Robert A. Gross' *The Minutemen And Their World*, ISBN 0-8090-0120-9.]

Never allow yourselves to be disarmed and defanged?

Never allow yourselves to lose an arms race with civil authority? Our muskets were technologically the equal to the redcoats'. By the Second Amendment, all ordinary citizens are legally guaranteed the right to maintain technological parity with modern military small arms, regardless of their rate of fire, lethality, power or physical appearances? Otherwise, the Second Amendment loses its effectiveness as a pragmatic check on civil authority turning tyrannical?

We are now dust in our graves. Remember us. We gave up our today's and tomorrow's so you could enjoy your today's and tomorrow's. Forget us at your peril. We did our utmost best to give you a solid framework to live freely and to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

We cannot sustain Liberty for you. Only you can do that for yourselves.

Can you do that? Will you do that? Are you worthy of Liberty?

Or will you continue to make us puke?

When will you stop being a gossipy gaggle?

When will you stop bitching about your chains?

When will you stop being psychologically intimidated by civil authority? Do you not realize that you are the world's most powerful latent guerrilla force?

When will you throw off your chains?

When will you claim your heritage? Your rights?

When will you stop crawling and stand straight, tall, proud, defiant and confident?

18. The primary purpose of the U.S. Bill of Rights was to legally place off-limits, beyond the control of civil authority and all majorities, certain rights—the rights specified in the Bill. In that sense, the primary purpose of the U.S. Bill of Rights was to take away civil authority's advantage, vis-à-vis citizens, of otherwise having absolute, boundless, unfettered, arbitrary control and unchecked power over citizens—their lives, their bodies, their property, their freedom.

19. Mankind's greatest achievement is the U.S. Bill of Rights, but only when adhered to, and not diluted by interpretations that favor civil authority to the detriment of citizens. Mankind's greatest achievement is not the pyramids, not the World Trade Center, not the Panama nor the Suez Canals, not nuclear powered submarines nor super aircraft carriers, not stealth fighters and bombers, not the wonders of modern science and modern medicine, but the U.S. Bill of Rights. That Bill is the high water mark of all civilizations.

20. The U.S. Bill of Rights is the invisible glue that holds the United States together—as an invisible, strong bond between citizen and civil authority, both co-existing peacefully and productively within a framework known as the Constitutional Rule of Law. That framework is unique. That framework freed talented human beings to become productive busy bees, to enjoy hedonistic pursuits without guilt, to worship or not worship the God of their choice [if any], to keep most of the fruits of their labor, and to not have to worry about the proverbial knock on the door . . . and what awaits them when the door is opened . . . or broken down.

20. The U.S. Bill of Rights is the invisible glue that holds the United States together—as an invisible, strong bond between citizen and civil authority, both co-existing peacefully and productively within a framework known as the *Constitutional Rule of Law*. That framework is unique. That framework freed talented human beings to become productive busy bees, to enjoy hedonistic pursuits without guilt, to worship or not worship the God of their choice [if any], to keep most of the fruits of their labor, and to not have to worry about the proverbial knock on the door . . . and what awaits them when the door is opened . . . or broken down.

21. When the U.S. Bill of Rights is interpreted away, abandoned, ignored, or not enforced, our natural resources, our continental land mass from the Atlantic to the Pacific, our infrastructure, our economy which is the envy of the world, our armed forces, our technological prowess, our intercontinental range nuclear tipped weapons, our satellites, our space shuttles, and our economic juggernaut is of scant value to the ordinary citizen. When civil authority breaks the Constitution's chains and governs in ways that are Constitutionally infirmed, those assets, when controlled by a rogue civil authority with tyrannical tendencies, become a problem. No one wants to be a lone 180-pound citizen versus a billion ton civil authority.

22. Modern technology has enabled a tyrant wannabe to inflict political-legal horrors in ways that Hitler and Stalin could only dream of.

23. It is imperative that citizens manifest the courage to keep civil authority tied down by the Constitution's chains; otherwise, civil authority will continue to morph into an unprecedented political-legal beast with awesome power—demanding more and more concessions from citizens, in the name of necessity. Modern examples of such alleged necessity are: threats to national security, the war against drugs, the war against terrorism, and the need to promote the general welfare [whatever that is!]. Beware of the war against drugs and the war against terrorism. How fortunate for civil authority that both of these wars have no clear boundaries, no clear standards, no reliable signs of progress, stalemate, victory or defeat. Beware how each of these wars, individually, and especially collectively, can be, and will be, exploited—INDEFINITELY, by civil authority—to demand more taxes from citizens and to demand that citizens surrender more Liberty to be sacrificed in the name of Security. Never let your entitlement to Liberty, as a U.S. citizen, nor the Bill of Rights, fall victim to either of these wars.

Heed H.L. Mencken's insight:

"The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed and hence clamorous to be led to safety by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary."

Heed Benjamin Franklin's warning:

"They that would give up essential liberty for a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

24. Necessity, historically, has always been the plea of tyrants.

25. Be hyper vigilant against any and all who plead necessity: surrender one more right, [allegedly] temporarily, for the common good, the common welfare. Whenever you hear that pitch, be hyper vigilant.

26. To the extent that the Bill of Rights glue dissolves, the United States, as envisioned by the Founders, Framers and those who value Liberty, will disintegrate. When that happens, what makes the United States unique and worth fighting for will no longer exist. When that happens, the United States will become a glorified, post industrial state, economically powerful, modern "banana republic" where civil authority's authority and control is boundless, arbitrary and insufferable—where "might makes right".

- 27.** Champion the Bill of Rights. Love Liberty. Never let anything come between you and the Bill of Rights. Take care of that Bill and that Bill will take care of you.
- 28.** Per the Bill of Rights, "right makes might right," and "might" is tied down by the Constitution's chains. This is true, however, only when sufficient numbers of armed citizens take all action necessary to enforce the Bill.
- 29.** Some of the hardest jobs in the world are these: being a good citizen, being a good parent, and being a good soldier on the modern battlefield. Compared to these jobs, being President of the United States or a U.S. Supreme Court Judge or a Governor or a Senator is relatively easy.
- 30.** A *good citizen*, by definition, has to do all of the following: stay informed; be hyper vigilant to protect Liberty and the Constitutional Rule of Law; show courage; take politically incorrect positions—publicly; keep civil authority from falling into error; and be willing, able and ready to take up arms, when necessary, against civil authority, to preserve or to restore Liberty and the Constitutional Rule of Law.
- 31.** A *pure democracy* means, literally, one man, one vote. Reformulated, a *pure democracy* means five wolves, two sheep and one lamb decide what to eat.
- 32.** A *pure democracy* and a dictatorship are conceptually, logically, politically and legally 100% compatible. How? Simple: The majority becomes the dictator—the infamous *tyranny of the majority*. Example: In a *pure democracy* system, a majority is within its legal rights to vote that everyone over 45 years of age, or with freckles, or with buck teeth, or with small breasts, or with blue eyes, etc., should be summarily executed.
- 33.** Realizing the grave implications of how tenuous life is in a *pure democracy*, is it prudent to live in a *pure democracy*, where a simple majority can arbitrarily determine your fate? Determine what are your rights, if any?
- 34.** Historically, many majorities have been stupid, mean spirited, unmercifully cruel, and horrendously destructive. Examples: the earth is flat; the earth is the center of the universe; everything revolves around the earth; bleeding is a legitimate medical procedure that will cure most ailments; witches are real; slavery is good; Aryans are superior, etc. Eugene V. Debs was correct when he stated,
- "When great changes occur in history, when great principles are involved, as a rule the majority are wrong. The minority are right."
- 35.** There are no assurances [never have been and never will be] that what a majority wants or votes for correlates with what is wise, prudent, humane, productive, compassionate, moral, ethical, and constitutional.
- 36.** The United States is not, and never was, a pure democracy. This is because our *Constitutional Rule of Law* system has many built-in *countermajoritarian* safeguards. Among these are: the separation of powers; staggered elections; the electoral college; bicameral legislature; advise and consent features; executive veto power; specified limits on Congress' powers; **and the Bill of Rights**.
- 37.** Anyone who states that the United States is a *democracy* [meaning a *pure democracy*] telegraphs his or her ignorance and lack of political-legal sophistication and is unfit to be a ruler, or even to vote. They are Constitutional illiterates at best or schemers at worst.
- 38.** Constitutional illiterates are uninformed or misinformed and dangerous. They are incompetent citizens who commit citizenship malpractice, and, if an office holder, statecraft malpractice. They do not even realize how incompetent and dangerous they are to themselves and to others and the problems they create for themselves, others and civil authority.
- 39.** Legally, the United States is a constitutionally limited democratic republic with certain guaranteed minimum rights for all citizens that are off limits and beyond the control of all civil authority and all majorities. These guaranteed minimum rights cannot Constitutionally be pre-conditioned, diluted, infringed, or suspended, etc., by civil authority, by a majority or by civil authority with the backing of a majority.

40. The U.S. Constitution, as modified by the U.S. Bill of Rights, is Mankind's greatest political-legal achievement. This is because it is a workable set of rules calculated to achieve a workable harmony between Majority Control and Minority Rights, with everyone enjoying certain rights within a Constitutional framework.

41. Per our constitutionally limited democratic republic with certain guaranteed minimum rights for all citizens, five wolves cannot get away with eating two sheep and one lamb. This is because the two sheep and one lamb have certain minimum rights which the majority and civil authority are supposed to (and required to) honor.

42. It is prudent for all *wolves* to respect the rights of all *sheep*. Majorities are fickle. Majorities are not permanent. Today's *wolf* is tomorrow's *sheep*; today's *sheep* is tomorrow's *wolf*. Do today's *wolves* think today's *sheep* will have pity on them when today's *sheep* become tomorrow's *wolves* and today's *wolves* become tomorrow's *sheep*?

43. There *is* security in the Bill of Rights, but only when the Bill is understood, supported and enforced. Outside the Bill, there is brute force and mob rule. Take away the Bill of Rights, or give that Bill lip service, and *sheep* become mutton to *wolves*.

44. Because *wolves* love to devour defenseless *sheep*, *sheep* must find the means, and the courage, to cope with and to defeat *wolves*.

45. Without the Bill of Rights, when the *wolves* devour the *sheep*, what will *wolves* rip into next?

46. The controlling majority that still counts is the one that came together on December 15, 1791 when the U.S. Bill of Rights was ratified.

47. Every U.S. citizen is free to celebrate Christmas, or not celebrate Christmas, on December 25 because of what happened ten days earlier, back in December, 1791.

48. Two things are strong circumstantial evidence that this nation is populated with Constitutional illiterates. First, few people know what happened on December 15, 1791, and second, December 15 is not widely celebrated nor remembered as a crucial date in our nation's history.

49. The United States, the U.S. Constitution and the U.S. Bill of Rights were born as a result of courageous men who defied a king and his redcoats, who used their wits and skills in a coordinated, sustained manner, and their unregistered, privately owned firearms to make their July 4th Declaration stick. In so doing, many of these courageous men sacrificed their lives and their fortunes, but not their sacred honor. Approximately only one half of those who signed that Declaration were alive when the U.S. Constitution was ratified. The non-survivors were killed in combat with the British, captured and executed by the British, or died of old age or disease.

50. The "supreme law of the land" is the U.S. Constitution, which includes the U.S. Bill of Rights. Article VI, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution says so.

51. All judicial officers, all elected officers, all law makers, all bureaucrats, all law enforcement officers, all members of the armed forces, and all citizens are subject to the "supreme law of the land."

52. [Note: This point is important. Please pay careful attention.] The entire U.S. Bill of Rights, effective December 15, 1791, to date, per the U.S. Constitution, is part of the Supreme Law of the Land. As such, the entire U.S. Bill of Rights, per the express terms of the U.S. Constitution, as modified by that Bill, was, from the moment it was ratified, and still is, binding on all civil authority [federal, state and local] in the United States, regardless of what anyone else, including the U.S. Supreme Court, says to the contrary. This is because:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution states:

"...amendments...shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified...."

Article VI, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution states:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding."

Article VII of the U.S. Constitution states:

"The ratification of the conventions of nine states, shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the states so ratifying the same."

The Preamble to the U.S. Bill of Rights states, in part:

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

Go back and read carefully the above four bullet points. What is the true legal significance of these points? I submit that the significance is this: the U.S. Bill of Rights was binding on all levels of civil authority [federal, state and local], from the instant it was ratified on December 15, 1791 to date. A tyrant wannabee will have to win a civil war to undo what was done on December 15, 1791, if, but only if, citizens understand the above four bullet points and manifest courage [a most mysterious intangible] to restore their inalienable rights, as codified in the Bill of Rights.

What part, if any, of the following is factually not true?

- Article V of the U.S. Constitution states that all amendments to it are part of it.
- Article VI, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution states that it is the supreme law of the land.
- Article VII of the U.S. Constitution clearly put the states on written notice that their ratification of the Constitution would be sufficient "for the establishment of this Constitution between the states so ratifying the same."
- The states which ratified the Constitution, and which later joined the Union, are charged with knowing about Article VII and its legal import.
- Those parts of the Constitution created a federal system of civil authority: one central government with its powers and multiple state and local governments with their powers, all subject to the supreme law of the land, the U.S. Constitution.
- The Preamble to the U.S. Bill of Rights states that the purpose of the Bill was "to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution."
- What was "the Government" that was created when "it," the U.S. Constitution, was ratified in 1789? Answer: one central government and multiple state governments.
- The Bill of Rights are the first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The Bill of Rights were ratified on December 15, 1791. When ratified, the entire Bill of Rights modified, and became part of, the U.S. Constitution.
- The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land—Article VI, Section 2 says so. There is no exception for the states.
- The U.S. Constitution could not be the supreme law of the land if the states were exempt from that law.
- **Conclusion:** the U.S. Bill of Rights was intended to apply to the entire government, namely, all ratifiers of the U.S. Constitution [the states] and the government that the states created by ratifying the U.S. Constitution, namely, a system of federalism [one central government and multiple state governments.]

53. After the colonies won their independence from England, even before George Washington took office as the first U.S. president, two of Washington's greatest champions, Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, became the heads of competing factions, the forerunners of political parties and special interests groups. Hamilton championed the cause of Statism, Industrialization, and Nation Building. Jefferson championed the cause of Individual Liberty, Small Government, and Agrarianism. [For a scholarly discussion of this conflict, read the following: [The Presidency](#)

of George Washington by Forrest McDonald, ISBN 0-7006-0359-X and The Presidency of Thomas Jefferson by Forrest McDonald, ISBN 0-7006-0330-1.]

54. The Hamilton-Jefferson conflict continues. It is a conflict between Statism and Liberty. Statism is winning. Liberty is losing.

55. All of the major Founders and Framers expressed a personal belief in a Creator or Deity.

56. Today, many champions of Statism are atheists or agnostics who believe that civil authority is the source of all rights and that inalienable rights do not exist whereas many champions of Liberty believe a Creator [or Nature] is the source of all rights and that inalienable rights do exist.

57. The conflict between Statists [godless or god fearing, with or without a belief in inalienable rights] and Patriots [godless or god fearing, with a belief in inalienable rights derived from a Creator or Nature, and a strong commitment to maximize Individual Liberty per a Constitutional Rule of Law,] is growing. This conflict appears to be moving toward a flash point that will trigger overt insurrection and civil war. Many Patriots believe that many Statists have an agenda: to eliminate the idea of a Creator [or Nature] as the source of rights and to make a godless civil authority the sole source of rights. Statists believe X. Patriots believe Y. It remains to be seen how long X and Y can co-exist. A key challenge in our lifetime is coming to terms with this Statist-Patriot conflict. What Statists and Patriots believe appears to be 100% irreconcilable.

58. All laws contrary to the "supreme law of the land" are null and void, per the U.S. Supreme Court. Hence, no citizen is required to obey any law that is unconstitutional.

59. Legal and Constitutional are not necessarily the same. A law can be the former without being the later, even if a judge has not yet declared the law to be unconstitutional.

60. This nation was not united before September 11, 2001, and we are substantially less united now than before. This is because civil authority is using September 11 as another alleged necessity to gut individual liberty, in contravention of the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights, Liberty, Freedom, our Way of Life, our Constitutional Rule of Law, are increasingly becoming causalities of September 11. Patriots cannot, and will not, let that happen indefinitely.

61. The primary purpose of the Bill of Rights was to impose legally enforceable restraints against civil authority and to deny civil authority the exercise of arbitrary discretionary powers. Sadly, we are increasingly surrendering Liberty to civil authority and civil authority increasingly exercises unfettered, arbitrary powers. This is the opposite of what the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are about. Americans have come full circle relative to the Constitutional Rule of Law. Civil authority's train has jumped the Constitutional tracks. We are headed for a horrific, national scale, unprecedented, political-legal train wreck with a staggering body count and billions of dollars of destruction to our infrastructure and economy.

62. This train wreck can be, and should be, avoided. For this train wreck to be avoided, it is imperative that civil authority, and citizens, recognize that civil authority is out of control. We—as a nation—have broken faith with the Founders and the Framers. Most of civil authority and too many citizens fear freedom. We are living under the functional equivalent of, at best, a Judicial Aristocracy, or, at worse, Judicial Despotism. The Judiciary has seduced and co-opted the other branches of government. The Judiciary has done this by granting all branches of government immunities from civil authority's violation of Constitutional restraints, in contravention of the First Amendment's Right to Petition civil authority for redress of meritorious grievances.

63. This train wreck was set in motion by the so called "least dangerous branch of government"—the Judiciary. Any one who believes that the Judiciary is the Guardian of the Constitutional Rule of Law and the Champion of Individual Liberty should read the following:

- Max Boot's Out of Order: Arrogance, Corruption, and Incompetence on the Bench, ISBN 0-465-05432-3;
- Raoul Berger's Government By Judiciary: The Transformation of the Fourteenth Amendment, ISBN 0-86597-144-7;
- Henry Mark Holzer's and John A. Pugsley's Sweet Land of Liberty?: The Supreme Court and Individual Rights; and
- John E. Wolfgram's "How the Judiciary Stole the Right to Petition," which is available on line at: www.constitution.org/arbus/wolfgram/ptnright.htm.

64. All branches of government are dangerous.

65. Governments are especially dangerous when each branch of government enjoys immunities from its wrongdoing, each branch gangs up in unison against ordinary folk, governments collect too much money in taxes, governments convert tax money into a bigger sword which governments wield to impose further oppression, governments pervert the language and the law to interpret away *rights* and to reduce *rights* to *privileges*, governments brainwash their cops and military personnel to function as government goons who commit horrors in the name of the law, and governments manipulate citizens against themselves by spewing forth rhetoric and concepts that cannot withstand close scrutiny.

66. Make no mistake: civil authority's agents, especially judges, use language as a powerful tool to increase civil authority's powers and to insulate civil authority from its enemies, real and imagined.

67. Government is alarmingly dangerous when it repeatedly blows through Constitutional red lights; when it stiff arms citizens' petitions for redress of meritorious grievances; when it fails to obey its own laws; when it insists that citizens must turn perfectly square corners—on a dime, while it arbitrarily, at its leisurely pace, turns well rounded corners—outside the Constitution's limits; and when it coerces citizens to pay an increasingly heavy tax burden while eroding rights.

68. The U.S. Supreme Court is charged with enforcing the U.S. Constitution by maintaining a proper Constitutional balance. It is supposed to be a neutral umpire between civil authority and citizens. Starting in the 1830's, however, and continuing to date, the U.S. Supreme Court has done all of the following:

- it *invented* the Doctrine of Governmental Immunity. Per that doctrine, it granted the Judiciary, the Executive and the Legislature, and many of their subordinates, legal immunity from lawsuits. Immunity conflicts with the First Amendment's Right to Petition for Redress of Meritorious Grievances. Such immunities mock the Right to Petition. When the Right to Petition is gutted, civil authority has laid down the following challenge to citizens: wear your chains and shut up or take up arms and fight.
- it **invented** the Doctrine of Judicial Review. Per that doctrine, it boldly declared that it alone has the power to decide what the Constitution means, how the Constitution should be applied and what is and is not Constitutional.
- to consolidate its power to be sole interpreter of the Constitution, it declared that all judges must follow its decisions—its legal precedents. This set up a "follow the leader" situation. This arrangement assumes that the "leader" is correct, wise and leads prudently and Constitutionally. [This "follow the leader" concept reminds me of what happened to the U.S. Air Force's famous Thunderbird fight demonstration team a few years ago when they were flying T-38s. On a training flight over the desert, the leader, Thunderbird No. 1 (the equivalent of the U.S. Supreme Court) failed to pull up from a loop. He flew himself into the ground. Since the team was flying in their famous tight diamond formation, with pilot Nos. 2-4 looking at No. 1, those carefully selected, hand picked, gifted pilots, self-destructed. While it is true that problems can arise when everyone is free to go their own way without any authority holding it all together, what happened to those Thunderbird pilots illustrates well what can happen when the "leader" commits an error.]
- it put all judges in a logical trap: all judges take an oath to uphold, support and defend the U.S. Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Simultaneously, all judges, per the U.S. Supreme Court, are required to obey all "controlling" legal precedents. [This system assumes that all previous court decisions are Constitutional, which is an erroneous assumption. The real law is the Constitution, as worded. What a judge or a panel of judges says is the law is only the Judiciary's interpretation of the law. That interpretation is not a substitute for the real law—the Constitution. Thus, all judges face this stark conflict: When deciding a case,

does a judge honor his or her duty to obey his oath and adhere to the Constitution as the "supreme law of the land" or does the judge "follow the leader," even when the "leader" is wrong?

- it ruled that the Bill of Rights is not binding on the states. [That ruling allowed the states to become oppressors and do the feds' dirty work for them, which triggered the 1860-1865 Civil War.]
- then, after passage of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868, it *invented* the Doctrine of Selective Incorporation of the Bill of Rights Against the States via the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. This doctrine was *invented* in belated realization of the intolerable harm the states were imposing on their citizens after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Bill of Rights is not binding on the states.
- in the process of *inventing* this Doctrine of Selective Incorporation, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that only those rights which it, and it alone, deems are "fundamental" to what it describes as "ordered liberty," as determined by it, and only it, are binding against the states. [Think about what rights should be declared "fundamental".]
- to further consolidate its power to be sole arbitrator as to what is the law, after ordering judges to obey it, judges, in jury trials, now order jurors to obey them. Trial judges, therefore, serve as conduits for compelling jurors to obey the U.S. Supreme Court. Typically, all trial judges order jurors to obey what the trial judge tells them is the law. Rarely, if ever, are jurors instructed that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and that they have a duty to first enforce the Constitution. Thus, jurors are reduced to determining only what are the facts and are ordered not to judge the law. This is because the Judiciary is adamant that it has a monopoly on the right to determine what is the law and to insist that all must kowtow to its interpretation of what is the law.
- by *inventing* these doctrines that hog tie citizens, it devalued U.S. citizenship.

69. The U.S. Supreme Court created serious legal and practical problems when it invented the Doctrine of Governmental Immunity, when it invented the Doctrine of Judicial Review, and when it ruled that the Bill of Rights is not binding against the states. An abbreviated specification of some of these problems follows.

As to the Immunity Problem, all of the following is true:

- Government Immunity conflicts with the peoples' Right to Petition. Immunity places government above and against the Constitution and the people.
- Immunity allows government to hide behind its wrongdoing and to stiff arm the people with impunity.
- Immunity makes a mockery of citizens being sovereign and of the idea of the Constitutional Rule of Law.
- Immunity is a throw back to the Divine Right of Kings to rule arbitrarily with no accountability.
- When cloaked with immunity, civil authority and its agents have no incentive to do a good job because they know that immunity protects them from repercussions of doing a bad job.
- Immunity undercuts, dilutes, and perverts the essence of rights.
- Citizens have no rights and have lost control of civil authority when civil authority can violate citizens' rights and escape accountability by hiding behind immunity.
- Immunity, coupled with civil authority's prolonged abuse of its powers, motivates citizens to resort to force to hold civil authority accountable or to replace it.
- Immunity begets insurrection and civil war.

As to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision that the Bill of Rights is not binding on the states, all of the following is true:

- That ruling encouraged the states to abuse their citizens and to continue to treat slaves as property instead of as human beings.
- That ruling laid the foundation for the 1860-1865 Civil War.
- That civil war was exploited by Statists who used the alleged necessity of that war to increase civil authority's power and to reduce individual liberty.

70. Victim disarmament laws [which is a more accurate description of prior restraint gun control laws] have their origins in slavery and racism. This is because from the late 1600's to 1865, slave owners in the colonies and in the United States feared uprisings by armed slaves; therefore, they passed race-specific laws that targeted slaves to keep slaves disarmed.

71. As a result of the North winning the 1860-1865 Civil War, the U.S. Constitution was modified by three great "Civil War Amendments". These were the 13th [declared slavery to be illegal], the 14th [declared all citizens to have certain rights binding on the states], and the 15th [declared that no one may be denied the right to vote based on their race or previous status as a slave.]

72. The 14th Amendment was proposed, and ratified, in 1868, primarily because the victorious North loathed how southern racists abused freedmen [emancipated slaves] and their white sympathizers. It is well documented that one primary purpose of the 14th Amendment was to grant freedmen the individual right to arms so that they may better protect themselves from the Ku Klux Klan. [Read attorney Stephen P. Halbrook's Freedmen, The Fourteenth Amendment, And The Right To Bear Arms, 1866-1876, ISBN 0-275-96331-4.] [I have a trace recollection that several years ago, when researching this topic in a scholarly book, I found a statement to this effect: the JFK and LBJ administrations, at taxpayers' expense, gave away firearms to southern blacks to help them protect themselves against lynch mob whites. I have since not yet been able to find that passage. If my recollection is correct, think about the reversal in attitudes among modern liberal democrats who fancy themselves to be champions of blacks but who currently pass more victim disarmament laws that further disarm blacks!]

73. Here is a pathetic irony. The origins of victim disarmament laws in this nation has an ugly racist root. The root is this: the early slave owners in this nation, and southern racists, feared becoming victims of armed slaves in insurrection or of emancipated blacks shooting back at them in self-defense. Slave owners, and southern racists, therefore, passed this nation's early victim disarmament laws and sustained them in various forms. Initially, such laws were race *specific*, namely, on their face, they clearly specified slaves or Negroes or both. Later, when these laws were challenged as being in violation of *equal protection*, clever racists modified these laws and made them race *neutral*, so they, on their face, applied to people of all colors, whites included. This was a scam to circumvent the denial of equal protection argument. Now that the laws are race *neutral*, civil authority has made many whites allies of many non-whites. Inexplicably, liberal democrats who champion the underdogs, especially minority underdogs, continue to champion more race *neutral* victim disarmament laws. By championing wide-sweeping, race-neutral laws, liberal democrats have succeeded in severely alienating, unnecessarily, millions of voters. In the process, liberal democrats who champion such laws pay a price for such alienation at the polls. In jurisdictions where champions of such laws have a political lock, their oppression has approached the status of being insufferable. They now risk, at a minimum, massive covert or overt civil disobedience. Increasingly, they risk insurrection and civil war.

74. Should the right to carry a firearm [or any other hand held weapon] in a public place for lawful self-defense be a *fundamental* right binding on the states? Why? If not, how can one enjoy, or benefit from, any of the other rights deemed *fundamental* if one is wounded, maimed or murdered by a criminal?

75. The right to carry a hand held weapon for lawful self-defense and for lawful defense of others in a public place, without a CCW permit [other than the Second Amendment,] and without having to first get anyone's permission to do so, is a *fundamental* right. My reasons for this statement follow.

Fundamental, per Webster, where appropriate, means this:

1. Serving as, or being an essential part of, a foundation or basis; basic; underlying;
2. of, pertaining to, or affecting the foundation or basis;
3. being an original or primary source;
4. a basic principle, rule, law, or the like that serves as the groundwork of a system; essential part.

Right, per Webster, where appropriate, means this:

1. Something that is due to anyone by just claim, legal guarantees, moral principles, etc.;
2. that which is morally, legally, Constitutionally or ethically proper;
3. a moral, ethical, or legal principle considered as an underlying cause of truth, justice, morality, or ethics;
4. that which is in accord with fact, reason, or propriety;
5. the opposite of *privilege*.

- The *fundamental* law of this nation is the July 4th Declaration, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. Legally, no one can get more fundamental than those laws.
- The July 4th Declaration declared the existence of inalienable rights which came from a Creator, not civil authority. Among these rights are the Rights to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. The logical corollary to these rights is the right to enjoy the pragmatic means to enforce these rights; otherwise, these great inalienable rights are a worthless sham.
- The right to self-defense is the right to preserve bodily integrity and to prevent trespass and harm to one's body. As a practical matter, preserving bodily integrity is *the* foundation, the platform of all *rights*.
- Dead people have no rights. It is impossible for a corpse to exercise any of the other rights already deemed to be fundamental by the U.S. Supreme Court and binding on the states.
- *Rights* are irrelevant to a corpse.
- It is axiomatic that a pre-requisite to the ability to exercise any *right* is that one must first be alive . . . and preferably not maimed nor incapacitated by a criminal. Example: It is difficult to exercise free speech or kneel in church or go to a polling place when a criminal murdered you, busted up your face, or made you an invalid.
- One of the best ways to preserve these rights is to carry a sidearm for lawful self-defense and lawful defense of others. It is difficult to enjoy life and to pursue happiness when one is reduced to the status of being unarmed, vulnerable prey by oppressive laws that attempt to strip one of human dignity.
- Per this nation's *fundamental* law, all human beings are born with inalienable rights, which are a gift from a Creator to Man. This gift pre-existed the formation of society and civil authority. This gift also survives the formation of society and civil authority. Human beings retain these rights even after society and civil authority are formed.
- The Second Amendment's Right to Arms has a First Amendment Right to Freedom of Religion component. This is because the July 4th Declaration asserts that Man's inalienable rights are derived from a Creator, and the First Amendment guarantees Freedom of Religion. For those who believe that the ultimate source of their rights is a Creator, and that their Rights to Life, Liberty and to Arms are a gift from a Creator, civil authority's laws against carrying a weapon in a public place for lawful self-defense without a CCW permit are a Constitutionally infirmed infringement against Freedom of Religion in addition to being a Constitutionally infirmed infringement against the Right to Arms.
- Freedom of Religion has already been deemed to be a *fundamental* right. Atheists and agnostics cannot legitimately force their views upon those who believe that a Creator, and not civil authority, is the ultimate source of all rights.
- Per this nation's *fundamental* law, civil authority forfeits its legitimate authority, breaks the social contract, and becomes oppressive the instant it tries to deny Man the inalienable right to carry a weapon for lawful self-defense to preserve bodily integrity.
- No citizen has a legitimate duty to suffer any trespass against his or her bodily integrity nor to die merely to promote the alleged general welfare.
- The general welfare is not promoted by stripping law-abiding, competent citizens of their inalienable and Constitutional rights and coercing them to circulate in public as unarmed, vulnerable prey.
- Civil authority's power to promote the general welfare stops cold, 100%, at the Bill of Rights, and the Second Amendment's "...the right of the people to keep and bear arms, **shall not be infringed**." Hence, the right to self-preservation does **not** require getting anyone's permission or license first. The entire CCW permit concept and system, therefore, is 100% Constitutionally infirmed and totally illegitimate. That system is an unequivocally clear prior restraint *infringement* against the right.
- Any civil authority that purports to deny an otherwise law-abiding citizen who has no criminal history, no mental illness history and no recent history of substance abuse the *fundamental* right to carry a weapon in a public place for lawful self-defense, without a CCW permit, illegitimately transgresses upon that citizen's inalienable and Constitutional rights. That transgression substantially devalues U.S. citizenship. That transgression is tantamount to civil authority's attempt to reduce citizens to the status of property, bondage, and prey. That process involves this reality: *Citizens* are reduced to *subjects* which are further reduced to property which are reduced further to *piss ants* status. That process is *insufferable*. That process is a manifestation of civil authority's contempt for *citizens*, for their *rights*, for their status as human beings, for the dignity to which they are entitled.
- Per our nation's *fundamental* law, the right to lawful self-defense with a weapon in a public place is already codified in the Second Amendment.

- This is a right that belongs to the people, which civil authority cannot infringe with any prior restraint pre-condition on the exercise of that right. The Bill of Rights, with its Preamble, makes this point unequivocally clear. That Bill's rights are restrictions on civil authority, not on citizens. Hence, this right is in effect all of the time.
- In addition to these *fundamental* laws, we also have the significance of the 1868 14th Amendment. That amendment was designed to force the states to honor the Bill of Rights, which was part of the normal "privileges and immunities" enjoyed by each U.S. citizen, as explained by the U.S. Supreme Court in its 1856 Dred Scott case. Those who spearheaded the drive for the ratification of the 14th Amendment repeatedly made it specifically clear that they were trying to secure for the freedmen [recently emancipated slaves] all the rights enjoyed by Caucasians, among which was the right of a freedman to self-defense with a firearm in a public place. The 14th Amendment made the right to carry a concealable, hand held weapon, including a sidearm, a personal civil right to lawful self-defense in a public place, for freedmen and for Caucasians. [Read Akhil Reed Amar's *The Bill of Rights*, ISBN 0-300-07379-8, and Stephen P. Halbrook's *Freedmen, The Fourteenth Amendment, And The Right To Bear Arms*, 1866-1876, ISBN 0-275- 96331-4.]
- A *right* is something one can exercise in private, without having to get anyone's permission first, and without even having to disclose to anyone that one is, or is not, exercising the right. A *right*, and what one does, or does not do with it, is one's business and no one else's business. A *right* is also 100% immune from all forms of prior restraint and infringement. Civil authority can legitimately, and Constitutionally, punish, after the fact, behavior that is an abuse of the right. Civil authority cannot, however, legitimately, and Constitutionally, impose prior restraints on the exercise of the right. Such prior restraints reduce a *fundamental right* to a *privilege*.
- To *permit* is to *control*. To *permit* is to convert a *fundamental right* to a *privilege*.
- When civil authority insists upon reducing *fundamental rights* to *privileges*, which civil authority can, and does, arbitrarily, civil authority reduces a constitutionally limited democratic republic with certain guaranteed rights for all to a police state where all rights are in peril or are non-existent. That process does not increase citizens' confidence in civil authority. Instead, that process severely alienates well-informed citizens and those who value Liberty.
- How one exercises a right becomes a legitimate concern to civil authority only when one's behavior regarding that right actually harms another. Neither civil authority, nor anyone else, has any legitimate basis to complain about the responsible, non-harmful exercise of any right. This includes otherwise law-abiding citizens who merely carry a weapon in a public place for lawful self-defense without a CCW permit. The key is: what is the citizen's behavior, not whether he or she also carries a piece of government issued paper called a permit.
- Life is full of risks. Civil authority and citizens must be willing to take risks with Freedom, Liberty, and the Constitutional Rule of Law. The alternative is Oppression, Tyranny, and Any Rule of Law. The risks associated with Oppression, Tyranny, and Any Rule of Law outweigh those associated with Freedom, Liberty, and the Constitutional Rule of Law.
- It is axiomatic that lawful defense of one's self, one's family, one's loved ones, and one's fellow citizens, in a public place, is an innate right of all mammals, which is, and has long been, recognized throughout the world.
- Most animals come equipped with natural means of self-defense, e.g., claws, teeth, powerful tail, thick skin, keen senses, extreme agility. Human beings, however, lack such natural weapons. Thus, to deny to human beings the right to carry a suitable weapon to preserve bodily integrity is to deny human beings an ability already extended to dogs and other mammals and to reduce human beings to a status *below* animals.
- Civil authority's victim disarmament laws are illogical, counterproductive, dangerous and seriously Constitutionally infirmed. Example: Civil authority professes to believe that human beings are higher than animals and are entitled to equal protection of the laws. Civil authority, however, has out done itself by making a gross mockery of these concepts. This is because civil authority has inexplicably passed victim disarmament laws which have created a multi-tiered system of Authoritarian Elites and Citizens Reduced to Piss Ant Status. Example: Authoritarian Elites [law makers and senior law enforcement personnel, etc.] decide who is, and who is not, according to them, worthy enough to be trusted with a CCW permit to protect their hide with a firearm in a public place.
- To dishonor or to frustrate the basic, powerful, involuntary, human instinct for self-preservation is to dishonor humanity itself.
- Civil authority does not own citizens. Civil authority manifests a gross form of statecraft malpractice when it passes or enforces victim disarmament laws that rail against the inborn, powerful instinct for self-preservation. This is especially true when civil authority knows that it cannot assuredly protect citizens, and, to exac-

erbate matters, it protects itself by passing laws that make it immune for failure to protect citizens while purporting to deny citizens the right to protect themselves.

- The right to preserve one's life against aggression [unjust initiated force] is the highest and foremost right of any human being. This is underscored by the extremely powerful, inborn instinct for self-preservation. To make that right a pragmatic reality, one must have the right to use an effective tool to preserve life against aggression. A person who carries a sidearm has one of the most effective tools for preserving one's life against aggression [which is precisely why cops carry sidearms.]
- To deny, to compromise, or to infringe upon a person's right to carry a sidearm is to undermine or to eliminate that person's ability to enjoy, in a meaningful way, the right to preserve his or her life and to prevent illegal transgressions against his or her bodily integrity which can have grave, long lasting consequences. No one, repeat no one, and no civil authority, has the legitimate right, nor power, to undermine nor to eliminate an otherwise law-abiding citizen's right to preserve his or her life.
- Since carrying a weapon concealed tends to improve a person's likelihood of successful preservation of one's life, concealed carry is included within the general right to be armed.
- All living organisms evolve to some degree. Evolution is an on-going modification and adaptation to changed circumstances. In that sense, evolution is a form of self-defense. The inherent need to adapt, to survive, to defend, is an indisputable fact of life. Adaptation is indispensable to the survival of any living thing and any living species. These facts are true of one-celled organisms and of multi-celled organisms. Life, via evolution, prolongs itself by defending against external threats. Biological mechanisms involuntarily pass this self-defense mechanism on to their descendants.
- Nature does not draw arbitrary lines and impose arbitrary standards. Only foolish human beings pass laws that rail against one of nature's strongest instincts: the instinct for self-preservation. Nature has allowed most species to develop, and to perfect, ingenious methods of self-defense for survival, individually and as a species. Human beings, as a higher form of life, have developed more sophisticated tools. Among these tools are laws and weapons, including sidearms. Without both [laws and weapons], human life is easily defeated.
- Humans need weapons to defend life when laws fail to deter crime that threatens human life.
- Weapons carried in public will always be needed to defend human life because criminals, who, by definition, do not obey laws, will always exist and will always commit criminal acts, especially against those they perceive as being unarmed and vulnerable to plunder.
- When human life is defeated, human life is killed, evolution stops, and extinction occurs.
- Defense of one's self, one's family, and one's possessions, with any tool available, is totally consistent with eons of life-sustaining evolution. Thus, lawful self-defense with any weapon is truly *fundamental* for survival as is a hospitable environment, nourishment, and propagation.
- A concealed defense is normal in nature as is any other life-sustaining capability. To deprive an organism of a concealed defense equates with deprivation of food or air. Rattlesnakes, honey bees, squids, mushrooms, and ordained ministers all have concealed defenses that are not readily visible to the casual observer. Concealed defenses are among one of nature's ways of deterring, and, if necessary, defeating, an assailant.

Additionally, all of the following is also true:

- There is no correlation between concealed carry and criminal intent nor criminal behavior.
- One can carry concealed without criminal intent.
- Concealed carry gives law-abiding citizens three major advantages over those who harbor criminal intent: the advantage of surprise; the ability to defeat an attack once initiated; and the advantage of deterrence because criminals do not know who is armed and prefer to plunder those who are disarmed.
- Society, law enforcement, and civil authority reap substantial benefit from law-abiding citizens who personally shoulder the responsibility of lawful self-defense with a sidearm.
- John R. Lott, Jr. is one of this nation's best criminologists, with special expertise in CCW laws and their effect. Professor Lott, who is not affiliated with the National Rifle Association, in the conclusion of his More Guns Less Crime: Understanding Crime and Gun Control Laws, ISBN 0-226-49363-6, wrote:

"...nondiscretionary concealed-handgun laws are ... the most cost-effective means of reducing crime. ... the deterrent effect of nondiscretionary handgun laws is largest for violent crimes. ... Concealed handguns also appear to be the great equalizer among the sexes. Murder rates decline when either more women or more men carry concealed handguns, but the effect is especially pronounced for women. ... Providing a woman with a concealed handgun represents a much larger change in her ability to defend herself than it does for a man. The benefits of concealed handguns are not limited to those who use them in

self-defense. Because the guns may be concealed, criminals are unable to tell whether potential victims are carrying guns until they attack, thus making it less attractive for criminals to commit crimes that involved direct contact with victims. Citizens who have no intention of ever carrying concealed handguns in a sense get a 'free ride' from the crime-fighting efforts of their fellow citizens. ... No statistically significant evidence has appeared that the Brady law has reduced crime. ... Preventing law-abiding citizens from carrying handguns does not end violence; it merely makes victims more vulnerable to attack. ... In the final analysis, one concern unites us all: Will allowing law-abiding citizens to carry concealed handguns save lives? The answer is yes, it will."

- Thus, per Professor Lott's scientific statistical survey [the largest and best to date], we enjoy a splendid **fact**: Professor Lott's scientific statistical survey **confirms, validates, and re-enforces** the Framers' profound wisdom: "...the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." Reformulated, our nation's *fundamental laws work—they are effective!*
- The bad news, however, is this: We suffer from too many Authoritarian Elites who have broken faith with the Framers' wisdom.
- These champions of victim disarmament laws have perverted the real law to our severe detriment.
- The Authoritarian Elites who function, and who think, unconstitutionally, are dangerous and lethal—to you, to me, and to our Constitutional Republic. **They are Public Enemy No. 1.**
- Citizens have a **right** and a **duty** to oppose **Public Enemy No. 1.**

76. Questions:

- Is the analysis set forth in No. 75 above persuasive?
- Do you realize that the vast majority of the Judiciary, of the Legislatures, of the Executives, of Academia, and of the Media reject this analysis?
- How do you feel about this?
- How do you feel about you, and your fellow citizens, collectively, over decades, paying trillions upon trillions of hard earned dollars in taxes to self imposed Authoritarian Elites who insist upon passing more victim disarmament laws? To people who believe their hide is worthy of protection but yours is not, that you are expendable but they are not? To people who fear Freedom? To Freedom Haters? To Liberty Thieves? To Useful Idiots for Tyrant Wanabees?
- Do you realize that the U.S. Supreme Court, after being in existence for well over two hundred years, has still not yet ruled that the right contended for in No. 75 is *fundamental* nor binding on the states? How does that make you feel? Think!
- Do you realize that all victim disarmament laws are a **perversion** of the Law of Self-Defense and of the July 4th Declaration, of the Constitution, of the Bill of Rights, and of the 14th Amendment?
- Do you now realize how Liberty's Enemies have used language as a powerful tool to try to interpret away your rights? To increase the power of Statists? To decrease the rights of Citizens?
- Do you now realize that the *supreme law of the land* is still the Constitution and not what Liberty's Enemies say the law is?
- What have you done to preserve Liberty? To restore the Constitutional Rule of Law?
- What are you willing to do?
- Do you realize that Liberty is not a perpetual motion concept? Do you realize that it is the burden of citizens to sustain Liberty?
- To keep civil authority from falling into error? To help civil authority get back on the Constitutional track? To say "No!" to civil authority when it tries to exercise illegitimate authority? And, when necessary, to take up arms against civil authority to restore Liberty and the Constitutional Rule of Law?
- If civil authority will not reform itself, what will you do: wear your chains or take up arms?
- Are you worthy of Liberty?

77. Does the July 4th Declaration's assertion of an inalienable right to Life and Liberty imply a corollary to those rights, namely, the right to carry a firearm in a public place for lawful self-defense to enforce those rights? If not, of what value or utility is a non-enforceable right? Can something even be a right if it is non-enforceable? If no one has a duty to take it seriously? If there is immunity for transgressions against the alleged right?

78. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that females have a fundamental right to an abortion — to kill their fetus.

79. Since females have a *fundamental* right to kill their fetus, should not law-abiding citizens have the *fundamental* right, and choice, to carry a firearm in a public place for lawful self-defense, to defend, to preserve, human life? Why?

80. How can killing a fetus be a *fundamental* right but using a gun in a public place for lawful self-defense not be a *fundamental* right?

81. Beginning with these dubious U.S. Supreme Court decisions, Americans, unknowingly and unwillingly, without a shot being fired, involuntarily traded, in effect, King George III's arbitrary, despotic rule for the arbitrary, despotic rule of the U.S. Supreme Court.

82. The terms *government immunity*, *sovereign immunity*, *judicial immunity*, *executive immunity*, and *legislative immunity* do **not** exist in the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. Supreme Court *invented* these terms. The terms Right to Petition, Bill of Rights, the Right of the People to Keep and Bear Arms, Shall not be Infringed, however, do appear in the Constitution.

83. The core essence of *sovereignty* is this: one is *sovereign* only when there is no higher political or legal authority.

84. The popular myth, repeat, *myth*, is this: "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

85. That government perished — as long ago as the 1830's. Since then, we have been living in a land of increasing Constitutional mirrors and disingenuous sleight of hand — intellectual dishonesty that would measure 9.0 on the Richter scale for earthquakes.

86. How can the people be *sovereign* when the Judiciary has declared immunities for civil authority and a monopoly on determining what is Constitutional? Reformulated, how can the people be sovereign when, as a result of the Doctrine of Governmental Immunities and the Doctrine of Judicial Review, the people have lost control of civil authority and are unable to hold it accountable without resorting to arms?

87. How can civil authority logically and legitimately claim "sovereign immunity" for itself when it is created by the Constitution, the Constitution says that it is the "supreme law of the land," that the people are the ultimate and final source of all legal power, and the Constitution says *nothing* about "sovereign immunity"?

88. When civil authority granted itself immunity from wrong doing, and when the U.S. Supreme Court declared that it alone has the sole right to determine what is Constitutional, it did all of the following:

- it made a mockery of the First Amendment's alleged guarantee of a Right to Petition for Redress of Meritorious Grievances;
- it broke the Constitution's chains;
- it set itself up *above* and *against* the Constitution . . . and the people;
- it set civil authority free to run amok while it weighed down citizens with its yoke;
- it forfeited its legitimate claim to authority to rule;
- it made a bold, naked grab for raw, unfettered power;
- it took a giant step toward despotic rule; and
- citizens lost the ability to control civil authority by being able to hold it accountable in a court of law.

89. It is logically impossible to reconcile Government Immunity with the Right to Petition. No genius can reconcile those concepts. Even God cannot reconcile those concepts. Immunity stiff arms citizens, breaks the Constitution's chains, undermines the Bill of Rights' glue and reduces Right to Petition to a sham.

90. Immunity cuts civil authority, and its agents, too much slack and grants them too much legal cover to hide behind when they do unconstitutional, stupid, counterproductive, wasteful, expensive, alarming things against citizens. Immunity is civil authority's way of subsidizing, protecting, promoting and encouraging statecraft malpractice. Hence, the Judiciary is not part of the solution. It is a major part of the problem.

91. What are the odds that the Judiciary will admit that it made mistakes when it invented these "jump the tracks" doctrines? My guess is no better than yours, but my guess is virtually "Nil!", until the public understands how they have been fleeced, how the value of U.S. citizenship has been reduced and make a major show of force that demands that their rights be restored, or else.

92. Power is the ability to obtain a desired result. Power, in nature, and in politics, abhors a vacuum. Power will continue to expand until stopped by an equal or stronger power that makes it contract.

93. The odds of the Judiciary, and Civil Authority, admitting that they goofed, that they have been running Constitutional red lights, and that they have been overstepping Constitutional bright lines, are, in my judgment, so small that the odds are greater that the Earth will spin off its axis first.

94. Our Constitutionally limited democratic republic is moving through the following periods in its life cycle: Formation; Golden; Complacency; Rot; Blatant Oppression; Agitation for Reform; Rebellion; Civil War; Rebirth of Freedom; New Formation; Golden—and the cycle repeats itself.

95. We are now deep into the following stages: Rot; Blatant Oppression; Agitation for Reform.

96. The Second Amendment to the U.S. Bill of Rights is currently vehemently maligned by all champions of Statism, which is consistent with the previously described Tyrant's Pattern. This is because tyrant wannabees know that before they can impose their will they must first disarm citizens who can use privately owned firearms to oppose their will.

97. The Second Amendment codified the inalienable right of U.S. citizens to retain the pragmatic means to preserve Life and Liberty—privately owned, unregistered, arms.

98. A logical corollary to the right to Life and Liberty is the right to preserve Life and Liberty with all available means possible. One of the most effective means to preserve Life and Liberty is to use a firearm.

99. Lawful self-defense with a firearm is **not** barbaric, immoral, unchristian, unethical, unconstitutional. Lawful self-defense, by whatever means necessary to preserve life, liberty and the ability to pursue happiness, is not only moral, ethical, Christian, spiritual and constitutional, it is an essential duty a good citizen owes to him- or herself and to the community.

100. Martin Luther King, Jr. was an ordained minister and a champion of non-violence who implemented non-violent tactics developed by Ghandi. Today, it is fashionable, and politically correct, for champions of victim disarmament laws to quote Martin Luther King, Jr. on the virtues of non-violence and the horrors of violence breeding more violence. MLK, Jr., however, in his autobiography, wrote that after he received death threats and after his house was firebombed, he applied for a CCW [concealed carry weapon] permit. Civil authority **denied** him the **right** to defend his life, with a gun, against criminals. Think about this carefully. By applying for a CCW permit, MLK, Jr. telegraphed that he saw no conflict among being an ordained minister, being a champion of non-violence and carrying a gun for lawful self-defense. His application for a CCW permit implies that he was willing to use deadly force to preserve his right to Life and Liberty. Think also about the despicable callousness of the police chief who denied MLK, Jr. that chief's permission to use deadly force in a public place for MLK, Jr. to preserve his own life against a criminal.

101. Per the Bible, the historical Jesus Christ railed against bloodlust but never championed *sword control*. The Bible is replete with references that the Apostles carried swords, in plain view, in Jesus' presence and with the consent of the Roman authorities.

102. Jesus Christ did not rail against homicide. He railed against *murder*.

103. Even the Romans allowed their subjects, at the lowest rungs on the social-economic-political ladder, to be armed in public, as long as they pledged allegiance to Rome and refrained from overt acts against Roman control.

104. That Roman policy helped to bond newly conquered peoples to Roman control. Think about that. The Romans risked allowing newly conquered subjects to retain personal arms as long as they pledged allegiance to Rome and

acted accordingly. By doing so, the Romans judged people by what they did, not by what they could do nor might do nor by what others did. By doing so, they sowed trust and always had at their disposal an enormous supply of manpower for their legions, made up of ordinary citizens familiar with arms. Reformulated, the Romans judged people by their **behavior**, not by what they believed, and not by a piece of paper issued by them. The Romans realized something that modern day Statist control freaks refuse to acknowledge: **There is no correlation between paper [permits/licenses] and behavior, and, what is important, is a person's behavior, not whether they applied for and were issued a permit or a license to do something.**

105. Statist control freaks are permit and license happy. The presence or absence of a government issued permit or license is not a reliable guarantee of behavior. A marriage license does not guarantee that the bearer of same will be a good spouse or a good parent or both. A driver's license does not guarantee that the bearer of same will drive safely. A building permit does not guarantee that the bearer of same will build a structure that is sound and complies with the building code. A hunting or fishing license does not guarantee that the bearer of same will comply with the game laws. A CCW permit does not guarantee that the bearer of same will not misuse a firearm. One can be an excellent spouse, parent, driver, and builder, etc., without having a piece of government issued paper. **The key is behavior, not paper, stupid!**

106. Government-required permits and licenses reduce *rights to privileges*. To permit is to control. To permit is to regulate. To regulate is to infringe. Permits and licenses are the anathema of Liberty.

107. Government uses money raised by government-issued paper to defray the cost of government, to increase the size of government, and to fund government employees' retirement plans. Liberty, however, should never be abused by control freaks who raise money in a manner that is Constitutionally infirmed.

108. The Second Amendment exists as a life preserver to preserve all rights when civil authority attempts to turn tyrannical. The Second Amendment has nothing to do with hunting Bambi. It has everything to do with preserving Life, Liberty and the *Constitutional Rule of Law*.

109. In some ways, the Roman Empire system, which did not have an equivalent of the Second Amendment, was closer to what the Framers envisioned than what exists in the United States today, especially in such constitutionally-infirmed states as Kalifornia which inexplicably champions more victim disarmament laws.

110. Kalifornia has a draconian CCW [concealed carry weapon] permit law. This law is unconstitutional because it conflicts with the Second Amendment, which is part of the supreme law of the land. Per Kalifornia's CCW law, police chiefs and sheriffs are supposed to issue CCW permits to those citizens who can prove that "good cause" exist for those permits. But many police chiefs and sheriffs arbitrarily believe that "good cause" never exists to warrant them issuing a CCW permit.

111. Want "good cause" to justify issuing CCW permits? Consider the following:

- Do criminals obey the law?
- Can civil authority control criminals?
- How good is civil authority's track record in controlling criminals?
- Do cops have a legal duty to protect you?
- Can cops protect you?
- Since cops cannot protect you, is it prudent to do nothing to protect yourself?
- If cops and you will not protect you, are you just *prey*?
- Is anyone counting on your paycheck? What about them?
- Are you comforted by the fact that a cop will draw a chalk line around your body?
- Do cops circulate in public *without* firearms? Even when off duty, in civilian dress?
- Is a quarter in a pay phone for a 911 call a smart investment? A realistic first line of defense of your person and property?
- What if there is no pay phone available? Will the assailant cooperate and let you get to the phone? Deposit a quarter? Talk to a dispatcher? And wait for the cops to arrive?
- Since when did men become angels?

- Since when did civil authority assume liability for failing to protect you? For reimbursing your medical bills? Your lost income? Paying your mortgage? Putting food on your table?
- Since when can civil authority repair your body? Make your pain go away? Remove a scar? Return you to a "pre-criminal assault" state with no residual injury?
- Since when is the right to life not *fundamental* or *inalienable*?
- Since when has civil authority really given a damn about you ... except when it comes time to pay taxes? Or you violate one of its rules?

112. Kalifornia's CCW laws are seriously Constitutionally infirmed. [I have written a 50 page article on this topic which is heavily laced with legalese.] Briefly, a few of the Constitutional or pragmatic infirmities associated with Kalifornia's CCW laws, and how they are implemented, follow.

- To *permit* is to *control*.
- A *right* cannot be regulated without being *infringed*.
- Such *control* is a prior restraint *infringement* contrary to the Second Amendment's unequivocally clear Constitutional bright line—"...the *right* of the people to keep and bear arms, **shall not be infringed**."
- Such control reduces a Constitutional *right* to a statutory *privilege*, which a police chief or sheriff can arbitrarily withhold.
- "[R]ight of the people" is not "*privilege* of the people" nor "*right* of civil authority".
- We are talking about a Bill of *Rights*, not a Bill of *Privileges*.
- "Shall" is a clear, mandatory command with no exceptions as to time nor place;
- "Not" is a clear, absolute negative.
- "Infringed" means no preconditioning, no dilution, no pretext nor justification of any sort is Constitutionally permissible to infringe against the right guaranteed by the Second Amendment.
- All CCW permit systems of law are a form of registration of firearms and firearms owners, which is approximately one half of the way down the Tyrant's Pattern, which is not good for any registered individual nor for society.
- No criminal, nor anyone who aspires to be a criminal, has ever applied for a CCW permit, so what is the point of CCW permits? To control criminals? Or to control law-abiding citizens who do not need to be controlled? To register who has guns so they are identified and can later easily be rounded up and eliminated?
- Police chiefs and sheriffs are not well equipped, by training, experience or anything else to determine who can be trusted with the right to circulate in public armed.
- This law reverses the proper burden of proof. The burden should be on civil authority to prove that a citizen should be denied his right to be armed in public, not on the citizen to establish "good cause" to have a CCW permit.
- "Good cause" is too vague and too illusive, which is convenient for public serpents who want to make citizens more dependent on them to justify bigger budgets to build bigger law enforcement empires.
- The Second Amendment is your permit because it is your birthright, and your birthright as a U.S. citizen is the only true entitlement.
- No American needs a permit to preserve his or her life with a gun.
- Per Kalifornia's CCW laws, police chiefs and sheriffs have immunity if they issue CCW permits or if they do **NOT** issue CCW permits. They have **NO** legal duty to respond to a Dial 911 call for help. They are legally **IMMUNE** for failing to respond to a Dial 911 call. They have **NO** legal duty to protect anyone. Instead, they are deemed to be a general deterrent. Knowing all this, many police chiefs and sheriffs despicably and callously **REFUSE** to issue CCW permits to allow you to defend yourself. These public serpents have become a defacto ally of criminals. You, and I, pay for this insufferable perversion of the inalienable right to life and liberty and the Constitutional right to arms. [Specific legal documentation of these shocking facts is succinctly and clearly stated in attorney Richard W. Stevens' Dial 911 and Die: The Shocking Truth about the Police Protection Myth, ISBN 0- 9642304-4-5, published by Mazel Freedom Press, Inc.]
- All human beings have only one life. Each life is not like baby teeth nor a lizard's tail. No dead human can replicate his or her life. Each human being, therefore, has a vital interest—repeat, vital interest—in preserving his or her one and only earthly existence. Consequently, any civil authority, and any public serpent, who opines or declares that your right to defend yourself with a firearm in a public place is non-existent, that you must beg them for their permission, that they have a legitimate right to deny you such permission and to arrest you and to criminally prosecute you for defying their absurd perversion of the law, and, to exacerbate

matters, they are legally immune for failing to protect you when they refuse to let you protect yourself, is your mortal enemy ... unless, of course, you can rise from the dead.

- After being a goody-goody citizen, and after paying trillions of dollars in taxes to this beast we call civil authority, after this 6,000 year struggle to achieve civilization, is this what we end up with: having to beg our blue belly tin stars, our judicial despots, our law makers, our callous Constitutional illiterates, for their permission to defend our lives with a gun in a public place? And, when they refuse to honor that right, to be reduced to the status of prey?

113. I am disgusted with civil authority's callous double standard. By double standard, I mean this: When it is to civil authority's advantage, it harps that the Constitution is "the supreme law of the land."

Examples: when it comes time to pay income taxes, submit to the draft and let federal snipers come in and shoot a mother in the head while holding her infant while standing in the door jamb of her home, minding her own business, with no outstanding criminal warrants against her, then, and only then, is the Constitution the "supreme law of the land."

But, when it comes to ordinary citizens enjoying one of the blessings of liberty, such as the individual right to bear arms guaranteed by the Second Amendment, the Constitution is no longer [somehow] the "supreme law of the land."

Example: When a law-abiding citizen wants to carry a firearm in public for lawful self-defense so he or she can shove a gun barrel in a criminal's face to preserve his or her bodily integrity, civil authority says, in effect, "Not so fast here. This is one of those 'Yes, but' rights. To promote the general welfare, in our infinite wisdom, despite what the Constitution says, which is not really the 'supreme law of the land,' we have reduced that right to a privilege. We do not trust you with a gun. You might do something bad with it. Shut up. Stay in line. Do not complain. We cannot control criminals. But we can control you, and we can blame and punish you for what criminals do with guns. Circulate in public as prey. When attacked, it is your civic duty to die, peacefully. Do not make a fuss. You must be willing to assume the risks we deem reasonable, and to sacrifice yourself to promote the general welfare. Pay your taxes on time. Your vote is appreciated. We work hard for you."

114. A *Constitutional bright line* is a demarcation, a solid wall, made with words that spotlight a concept and set that concept apart, calling attention to the concept.

115. It is difficult, if not impossible, to conceive of a more clear *Constitutional bright line* than this one:

"...the **right** of the **people** to keep and bear arms, **shall not be infringed.**"

116. The price of having a Constitutional government is having government take rights seriously, to trust Freedom, to trust the Framers' vision and judgment, to honor Constitutional bright lines, whether government likes them or not. The stark, sad fact is this: many judges, many elected officials, and many bureaucrats *dishonor* Constitutional bright lines.

117. To the extent that civil authority fails to honor Constitutional bright lines, it forfeits its legitimacy, citizens have no duty to obey nor comply with arbitrary rules, the Bill of Rights *glue* lets go and we flirt—seriously—with civil war.

118. What part of "the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed," if any, do you not understand?

119. How could the Framers have made that Constitutional bright line any brighter?

120. Collectively, the Judiciary has done to the Second Amendment what a grossly incompetent plastic surgeon would do during a face lift: put the belly button on the chin, the left ear where the nose should be and cut nerves so the facial muscles are inoperative, the skin drops, the face loses its symmetry and the patient emerges looking like a grotesque freak. This is **not** hyperbole. As support for this statement, read Clayton E. Cramer's For The Defense of Themselves and the State: The Original Intent and Judicial Interpretation of the Right to Keep and Bear Arms, ISBN 0-275-94913-3. This is an excellent survey of leading judicial interpretations of the Second Amendment contrasted with the historical record left behind by the Founders, Framers and Ratifiers of the organic law of the United

States—The July 4th Declaration, the U.S. Constitution and the U.S. Bill of Rights. While reading this book, most of the judges quoted in this book made me feel embarrassed for, and ashamed of, the legal profession. These "guardians of the Constitution and Liberty" are, at best, inept. Only a pitiful handful of judges quoted by Mr. Cramer "got it right."

121. Question: Why should citizens obey judges who are all over the ball park...and even outside it? When they do not agree among themselves? Example: the Federal 9th Circuit of Appeals ruled that the Second Amendment does not guarantee an individual right to arms and since there is no such right, no gun owner has "standing" [a fancy legal term meaning a legally recognized basis] to bring a lawsuit to redeem a right. The Federal 5th Circuit of Appeals, however, ruled 180 degrees *contrary!* Rights should never be a function of geography and chance based on the circuit in which one lives. If the Bill of Rights *glue* was strong, the 9th and the 5th circuits would agree, but they disagree.

122. The much maligned *militia* has a Constitutionally legitimate, vital purpose and function: when all else fails, to preserve Liberty and the Constitutional Rule of Law.

123. Out of approximately 75 million firearms owners in the U.S., 99.999999999999% of them, yesterday, the day before, the day before that, tomorrow, the next day, and the day after that, ad nauseam, did **not** misuse a firearm in any way.

124. Since when is the misuse of a right by a small percentage Constitutionally good cause to permit *prior restraint* against the exercise of that right by the many, out of fear that some one some place some time might abuse the right? Answer: **Never!**

125. Post-misuse of a firearm punishment is Constitutionally permissible. But, *all* prior restraint regulation of firearms regarding the mere manufacture, sale, purchase, possession, control, ownership, non-negligent use, and carrying a firearm in a public place for lawful self-defense, is Constitutionally infirmed. Otherwise, the Constitutional bright line of "the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." is meaningless.

126. How can a right be regulated without being infringed?

127. How is the general welfare promoted when all rights are subject to prior restraint, diluted, preconditioned, reduced to privileges, suspended?

128. How does civil authority promote the general welfare when it guts the Second Amendment and orders citizens to circulate in public as unarmed, defenseless, vulnerable prey, with the knowledge that law enforcement cannot protect the public?

129. How does civil authority promote the general welfare when it persistently rails against inanimate objects, exploits tragedies involving firearms, blames and oppresses those who never misused a gun, increasingly reduces citizens to a state of defenseless dependency on cops who cannot defend them, refuses to accept liability for failing to defend citizens who it will not let defend themselves, and increasingly moves the nation toward a police state?

130. Is the Constitution a contract between civil authority and U.S. citizens? If the answer is "No.," why do citizens have to obey civil authority? Why is civil authority's rule legitimate? If the answer is "Yes," must civil authority obey the Constitution? Or may civil authority grant itself immunity and set itself up **above and against** the Constitution and the citizenry? If civil authority's rule is illegitimate, how long should citizens tolerate such rule? Why?

131. Would you enter into a contract when the other party to the contract told you in advance, and in writing, that per the terms of the contract, they had an unappealable, absolute right to interpret and apply the contract any way they wanted to and you had to go along with their unilateral, unappealable interpretation and implementation of the contract?

132. Do you realize that when the U.S. Supreme Court declared that it has the sole power to determine what is and is not Constitutional, and that it, and all government, is cloaked with immunity, that the Judiciary perverted Man-

kind's greatest achievement—the Bill of Rights—and made you an unwilling party to a one sided contract, a contract of adhesion.

133. George Washington, "Father of the Country," called guns "Liberty's teeth." Diane Feinstein, Bill Clinton, Ted Kennedy, Sarah Brady, Gray Davis, Don Perata, and many public serpents masquerading as tin stars have malignged "Liberty's teeth" by pejoratively labeling them *assault weapons*. Who do you trust: George Washington or these public serpents?

134. If you are inclined to support more victim disarmament laws, why? Why are you more comfortable with only criminals and cops having guns instead of law-abiding citizens also having guns? Why do you want to move the United States toward a police state? Do you realize that when citizens are disarmed and the streets are safe only for police and criminals, that is the classic definition of a *police state*? Where is the virtue in this: the police arrive at a crime scene and find a strangled, raped female and a long-gone rapist? Is this not more virtuous: the police arrive at a crime scene and find a criminal assailant prone, bleeding, with two bullet holes in his chest and a live, unharmed female?

135. Which is more accurate: the police exist to protect and to defend or to draw chalk lines and to investigate?

136. After September 11, are not all citizens now on the front lines? If so, why does civil authority inexplicably treat us as *cattle* or the *enemy* or *suspects* instead of as *citizens*?

137. Dial 911 is not a failsafe crime prevention program. Dial 911 is law enforcement's biggest sham against taxpay-ers. It is a bone tossed to placate those who are gullible, who blindly trust the police, the misinformed and the unin-formed. For Dial 911 to be effective, approximately 30 or more links in the "Dial 911 chain" have to all fall in place and be secure. Each of those links, however, is incredibly weak. Dial 911 is really civil authority's version of Dial-A-Prayer. A cheap, functioning .38 caliber revolver, that is readily accessible, is superior crime protection to an expen-sive cell phone and a dispatcher on the other end of the line.

138. Guns have enemies: Rust, Freedom Haters, Liberty Thieves, Whoring Politicians, Tyrant Wannabees, Tyrants and their Useful Idiots, Public Serpents, Uninformed or Misinformed Citizens, and Sheeple.

139. Know guns, know peace and safety. No guns, no peace nor safety.

140. One does not shoot to kill; one shoots to stay alive. Guns are designed to kill. So what? What is wrong with killing enemies who initiate unlawful force? Criminals? Muggers? Rapists? Murderers? Tyrants? Guns are also de-signed to deter crime, to preserve liberty, and to save lives.

141. Firearms are inanimate objects made of metal, wood and plastic. They are incapable of human thought or emotion. They cannot form the intent to commit an "assault". The only thing a loaded firearm can do without human intervention is What? Answer: *Self-destruct* via a mechanism called rust. *Self-destruction* is the opposite of *commit an assault*. Where is the hard, verifiable, objective proof that any firearm in the history of firearms has done any of the following: Formed the intent to commit an assault? Loaded itself? Selected a target? Aimed itself? Pulled its own trigger?

142. What are the real *assault weapons*? Answers: Politicians who champion victim disarmament laws in a mad march toward Tyranny in the name of *gun control*.

143. If you think champions of victim disarmament laws are trustworthy, since they disregard your rights when an armed citizenry exists, do you think they will honor your rights when citizens are disarmed?

144. Is a gun on a shelf in a gun store morally neutral? If it is bought by a cop does it become a good gun? If it is bought by an ordinary citizen does it become a bad gun? If the cop misplaces his gun and it is found by a criminal does it morph into being a bad gun? Does it morph into being a good gun again when found by an ordinary citizen? When returned to the cop? Is a gun used to stop a crime a bad gun? Is a gun used to preserve or to restore Liberty bad?

145. Ever notice how many statues of Liberty's heroes include a gun?

146. Since champions of victim disarmament laws fancy themselves to be so smart and so superior, why do they refer to inanimate objects as being capable of forming the intent to commit an *assault*? Are these people smart, stupid or demagogues? Do they have a sinister agenda? Are they doing their utmost best to manipulate you against yourself and against Liberty—to scare you into surrendering your rights?

147. Burn this into your psyche: An armed man is a **citizen**. An unarmed man is a **subject**—and worse: a *piss ant*. Civil authority has to take a *citizen* seriously. Civil authority can ignore, flatten, incarcerate, and execute a *piss ant*. Which would you rather be: a *citizen* or a *piss ant*?

148. Burn this also into your psyche: *A gun in the hand is better than a dispatcher on the phone or a cop in route*.

149. *Gun control* is all of the following: putting ten bullets in the same hole; people control in the guise of crime control; people control; control—period, repeat, just plain tyrannical control dressed up as crime control; the biggest and most dangerous farce since the end of WWII; a smokescreen to warrant surrendering real security—Freedom supported by armed citizens. *Gun control* is not *criminal control* nor *crime control*. *Gun control* as an effective criminal control measure is a *trade-off*, not a *solution* to eradicating or reducing crime. This *trade-off* [swapping Liberty for alleged Security to end up with Tyranny] is a blatantly bad trade for citizens. It is sloppy "thinking" to assign cause of crime to guns, to assume or even suggest that all gun owners are or even might be criminals.

150. If the linkage of guns to crime or anyone with a gun to be a criminal is valid, are cops criminals? What about sheriffs? Highway patrol? FBI agents? The Armed Forces?

151. If guns cause crime, pencils cause misspelled words, forks cause obesity, cars cause drunk driving, banks cause themselves to be robbed and houses cause burglaries.

152. Free men do not ask permission to bear arms. They use their arms as Liberty's teeth to preserve Liberty, to hold the Prince to his promise, to stay alive and to preserve their autonomy. If you don't know your rights you don't have any. If you know your rights but will not fight for them, your rights are worthless because you would not stand up for them, claim them, enforce them, breathe life into them, make them vital and relevant, force others to acquiesce to your claim. You only have the rights you are willing to fight for...and to kill for, literally.

153. Those who trade Liberty for Security have neither. They end up with Tyranny.

154. Freedom is not free.

155. The best security is *Freedom!* — unfettered freedom and maintaining faith with the Founders and Framers.

156. Criminals love victim disarmament laws—it makes their jobs safer.

157. A government that oppresses its citizens tends to be afraid of them and tries to control them and over regulate them.

158. When you remove the people's right to bear arms, you create slaves.

159. The American Revolution would never have happened with gun control. In fact, the King's and the redcoats' efforts to disarm the colonials triggered "the shot heard around the world" and Patrick Henry's electrifying "Give me liberty or give me death" speech.

160. To King George III and his redcoats, the Minutemen's single-shot, muzzle-loading muskets were *assault weapons*.

161. This nation was born of the courage of religious, God fearing "criminals" — "gun nuts" who treasured Liberty and who understood the true linkage between an armed citizenry and Liberty.

162. Those who beat their swords into plowshares, will plow for those who still have swords.

163. If you champion non-violence, Taliban airplane hijackers would love to hijack an airliner filled with people who share your views. No airliner filled with people who share my view would ever be successfully hijacked. People who share my views would quickly muster as a make shift militia [the peoples' army] and defeat the hijackers--without the damn government's help.

164. The core essence of *Talibanism* is this: manipulating and perverting language and established doctrine to mean something else for self-serving purposes; unfettered, arbitrary control over others; the willingness to commit despicable acts against innocent others without just cause; and actually doing so.

165. The United States is plagued with American style Talibans. These societal scourges are frequently referred to as liberal Democrats and champions of victim disarmament laws—anyone who tells you that we must surrender one more liberty or right to promote the general welfare. A classic example of an American style Taliban is Gordon Pitter, Police Chief, Sebastopol, California. This public serpent functioned as an American style Taliban when he did all of the following:

- First, he refused to stock his police headquarters with CCW permit applications because instead of making an individual determination for each applicant, he made up his mind that he would never issue a CCW permit to anyone; hence, there was [allegedly] no purpose in keeping a supply of such applications on hand.
- Second, he made up his own illegal "legislation by cop" standard for issuing CCW permits, namely, one had to be "the best" to get a permit and, since he is incapable of determining who is "the best," he decided he would never issue a CCW permit to anyone.
- Third, he did this *after* the Federal 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that police chiefs must make an individual determination for each application for a CCW permit, and California law states that for "good cause" the police chief may issue such permits, which implies that some permits, at a minimum, should be issued. But this American style Taliban unilaterally pushed his discretion to an extreme and, by refusing to even give out, or to consider, CCW applications, refused to exercise his discretion, which is a clear abuse of his discretion.
- Finally, to exacerbate matters, the Sebastopol City Council, the Sebastopol City Manager, and the Sebastopol City Attorney, to date, after being put on repeated clear notice of this rogue public serpent, have still failed to take any meaningful public action to get this serpent under control or to fire him.

166. Anyone who tells you you must surrender liberty, you have no right to use a gun in a public place for lawful self-defense, and you must beg them for their permission to do so is your enemy. Repeat: your *enemy*. That fact is true despite the fact that that enemy may be perceived by others as a police chief or a sheriff or a law maker or a judge, too many of which have morphed into being public serpents.

167. Gun Prohibitionists who champion victim disarmament laws support unconstitutional policies. They are hypocrites, elitists, authoritarians who support discriminatory laws of racist origins that are Nazi inspired.

168. Citizens who really believe in the inalienable right to life and liberty, and that the Second Amendment guarantees an individual right to arms that shall not be infringed, act like it. They pack a sidearm without a CCW permit. They go public with that fact. They defy civil authority to arrest them. If arrested, they defend in court. If the jury does not cut them loose, and if they lose on appeal, the militia, if active, musters, and does whatever needs to be done to correct a miscarriage of justice. Otherwise, Liberty is toothless.

169. The highest person on the proper Constitutional chain of command is: *citizen*. Never forget that fact. Burn that fact into your brain. Every citizen should exercise oversight control over all public serpents and tell these serpents that *citizens* are their *boss* and master, not the other way around.

170. Unfortunately, too many domestic enemies of the U.S. Constitution know they are such and do not give a damn, are proud of it and are pretty good at concealing that fact while others are Constitutional illiterates who are so incompetent they do not realize that they are one of those "domestic" enemies that they took a sworn oath to defend against.

171. Do not take refuge in denial. Given current trends, the odds are high that government goons will be sent to confiscate your guns.

172. When firearm confiscation begins, as a good citizen, it is incumbent upon you to surrender your guns—bullets first.

173. All gun confiscation orders would be unconstitutional. All who issue such orders would be traitors. All who would try to execute those orders would be traitors. Such orders would be in contravention of the organic law of this nation and the Nuremberg Principle [civil authority cannot wage war against its own civilians and "I was just following orders." is not a legally valid defense to obeying an illegal order.] Any cop and any soldier who violates those legal principles is, despite his or her uniform, a government goon. When a government goon leaves you no alternative, per the organic law of this nation, it is every citizen's right and duty to kill the goon and all who issued such orders.

174. I want to be perfectly clear on the following points.

- A *peace officer*, like all good citizens, is worth many times his or her weight in gold. Each are true national assets. Each should be treasured.
- Peace officers and citizens function best when they reinforce and support one another. Each group should do their utmost best to never let anyone drive a wedge between them nor to separate them from the U.S. Bill of Rights.
- It is vital, however, to understand the difference between a *peace officer*, a *law enforcement officer*, an *enforcer*, and a *government goon*. The first respects the Constitution. The later will enforce anything.
- The stark reality is simply this: a citizen loyal to the Constitutional Rule of Law must be willing, able and ready to reduce a gun grabbing government goon to maggot meat; otherwise, Liberty has no teeth.
- Judges cannot be counted upon to preserve nor to restore Liberty.
- Some judges are political hacks. Some cave to perceived political correctness. A tyrant wannabee has the power to turn an excellent judge's brain into a pink mist.
- None of the above is intended to reflect adversely on good cops, good soldiers and good judges, of which there are many.
- But no one who seriously violates the Constitution should be granted sanctuary merely because of their uniform or title.
- It is vital that civil authority not miscalculate; therefore, I am doing my utmost best to send a clear message to civil authority, its agents, and all citizens. In my judgement, it is better for gun grabbing government goons to be greeted by Geronimos, not Ghandis.
- **THE BEST WAY TO PROMOTE A PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE PER A CONSTITUTIONAL RULE OF LAW AND TO PROVE THAT YOU ABHOR VIOLENCE IS TO TAKE THE BILL OF RIGHTS SERIOUSLY - THE ENTIRE BILL, AS WRITTEN. THIS IS BECAUSE TO THE EXTENT THAT CIVIL AUTHORITY AND CITIZENS REVERE THE BILL OF RIGHTS, EVERYONE'S RIGHTS, FREEDOM, AND LIBERTY ARE HONORED, CIVIL AUTHORITY DOES NOT ALIENATE ITSELF FROM CITIZENS, CIVIL AUTHORITY'S LEGITIMACY REMAINS BEYOND DISPUTE, AND PEOPLE LACK MERITORIOUS GRIEVANCES. AS A CONSEQUENCE, THERE EXISTS NO ISSUE WORTHY OF VIOLENCE, ESPECIALLY LETHAL FORCE.**

175. If the referenced *train wreck* is to be avoided, it is imperative that all good cops, all good soldiers, all good judges, and all ordinary good citizens unite around the Bill of Rights, support one another—publicly and strenuously, in a manner that maintains faith with the Founders and Framers—to promote a maximum measure of individual liberty. Otherwise, the Bill of Right's *glue* will let go and the *train wreck* will happen.

176. If you are unwilling to deliver your guns bullets first, look in the mirror and ask yourself, honestly, this question: "Am I worthy of Liberty?"

177. When the glue lets go, and gun grabbing government goons come, Liberty has a knife held to her jugular. Ordinary citizens must marshall quickly and effectively as a militia to preserve Liberty. They must do what no reasonably constituted person wants to do: kill other human beings over an idea and a dispute about the meaning of words. But much more than words, definitions and concepts are involved. Liberty, the Constitutional Rule of Law, Civilization and a Way of Life are involved .. and at risk.

178. If you will not stand up for Liberty now, before the government goons come, who will?

179. If you will not stand up for Liberty now, before the government goons come, what makes you think you will stand up then? Are you kidding yourself? Be honest!

180. If you will not stand up, how will Liberty survive?

181. If you will not stand up for Liberty now, think about the following wisdom. You need to come to terms with these quotations.

"Will the abandonment of your most sacred rights tend to the security of your liberty? Liberty, the greatest of all earthly blessings—give us that precious jewel, and you may take everything else! ... Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel. Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force and whenever you give up that force, you are inevitably ruined." —Patrick Henry, "Liberty or Death" Speech

"Disobedience to tyrants is obedience to God." —Benjamin Franklin*

♦[Comment: A friend of mine said, "The fat man got it right!"]

"Those who profess to favor freedom, and yet deprecate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing up the ground. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its waters. This struggle may be a moral one; or it may be a physical one; or it may be both moral and physical; but it must be a struggle! Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did, and it never will. Find out just what any people will quietly submit to and you have found out the exact measure of injustice and wrong which will be imposed upon them, and these will be imposed upon them, and these will continue until they are resisted with either words or blows, or with both." — Frederick Douglas, "West Indian Emancipation" August 4, 1857

"For this reason, whoever desires liberty, should understand these vital facts, viz: 1. That every man who puts money into the hands of a "government" (so called), puts into its hands a sword which will be used against himself, to extort more money from him, and also to keep him in subjection to its arbitrary will. 2. That those who will take his money, without his consent, in the first place will use it for his further robbery and enslavement, if he presumes to resist their demands in the future." —Lysander Spooner, No Treason No. VI, 1870

182. We are all guilty of civic malpractice. We have the kind of civil authority we deserve. Citizens are guilty of citizen malpractice for letting civil authority slip its Constitutional collar. Officials are guilty of statecraft malpractice for inventing bogus doctrines, for hiding behind immunities, for gutting the Right to Petition and for gutting the Second Amendment.

183. Mark my words: Our system is at these stages—Complacency. Rot. Blatant Oppression. Agitation for Reform. We are close to civil war. The sky is falling.

184. Anyone who claims citizens do not have a right to defend themselves in a public place with a firearm is invited to self-fornicate.

185. Power still comes out of the barrel of a gun.

186. Gun Prohibitionists are thin skinned serpents, easily reduced to maggot meat by lead poisoning.

187. We are in a race to see which happens first: Civil authority takes the First Amendment's Right to Petition and the Second Amendment's individual right to bear arms free of prior restraint seriously or civil war erupts.

188. A civic lesson in Triggernometry 101 will cancel all ballots and nullify all unconstitutional laws, laying the ground work for a rebirth of freedom, at a horrific price. That price will probably have to be paid because power abhors a vacuum. That is an eternal truth per the Laws of Nature and the Laws of Politics.

189. Power, unless checked, will expand indefinitely, consuming all in its path.

190. Unfortunately, civic authority is not sufficiently afraid of an armed citizenry. Too many citizens are apathetic, clueless, scared and have been too tolerant of, and too polite toward, public serpents. On the other hand, there is a hard corps of armed citizens who retain the will, the courage, the skill, and the pragmatic means to enforce their rights and to deliver an overdue, well deserved, comeuppance to public serpents. Civil authority, collectively, however, is too arrogant and too stupid to appreciate how vulnerable it is and how much it has virulently pissed off a hard corps of armed citizens.

191. Do you now understand the link between privately owned, unregistered firearms and Liberty? Do you now understand that civil authority in the United States operates like a criminal enterprise under the sham of the people being sovereign and in control of civil authority?

192. So, what needs to be done? Ponder these reforms and ideas:

- Immediately declare that the Second Amendment **does** guarantee an individual right to arms independently of membership in any government organization, that all prior restraints against that right are unconstitutional, and take that right seriously.
- Immediately repeal all prior restraint "CCW permit" weapons laws and get law enforcement entirely out of the business of issuing CCW permits.
- Immediately repeal all laws that grant civil authority *immunity* for its wrong doing.
- Civil authority should immediately start taking ultra seriously two rights: the First Amendment's Right to Petition for Redress of Grievances and the Second Amendment's Right to Bear Arms—including in a public place.
- The U.S. Supreme Court should reverse itself and declare that it does not have sole authority to determine what is and is not Constitutional.
- The U.S. Supreme Court should promptly declare that jurors are permitted to be a judge of the facts *and* the law.
- Celebrate every December 15th as Bill of Rights Day in ways that are truly meaningful. [I can think of at least a dozen major different ways to do so. Can you?]
- Become Constitutionally literate.
- Know what your rights are.
- Know the limits of civil authority's powers.
- Demand that all officials stay in line and wear the Constitution's chains.
- Get involved politically.
- Publicly tell civil authority when it is committing error or makes and enforces unwise policy.
- Do not give up on the political-legal system.
- Throw off your chains! Stop being psychologically intimidated by civil authority.
- Prepare for civil war—in earnest. Train yourself to be the functional equivalent of an effective, modern Minuteman.
- Steel yourself to the idea of killing public serpents, if it becomes truly necessary, as a last ditch effort to keep Liberty's flame burning.

193. Do you reject this analysis? These sentiments? If so, here is a challenge:

- Are any specified facts wrong?
- If Gun Grabbing Government Goons started their raids tomorrow, are you prepared to stop them?
- Are you enjoying some measure of Liberty now because Tyrant Wannabees fear me and people like me?
- What have you done to preserve Liberty?
- Do you take Liberty for granted?
- As a citizen, are you coasting?
- Do you assume that tyranny can never take root in the United States? How far down the Tyrant's Pattern are we?
- Do you realize that most victims of tyranny did not see the darkness fall until they were trapped?
- Can you see yourself being reduced to a lampshade? To a medical experiment? To smoke? To a bullet stop? To land fill?

194. In summation, think about the following. There is a grand building located at 914 Capitol Mall in Sacramento, California. The California Supreme Court frequently sits in this building. Sadly, that court has been acting in a fractured manner. It has a track record of honoring most Constitutional *bright lines* but not this one:

"...the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Instead, this court has been upholding laws that further infringe against the Second Amendment. Ironically, the east wall of the lobby of this building contains this inscription:

"This abode of peace shall stand as long as there are those willing to die in its defense."

Think about this court's record on Second Amendment cases and this inscription. Ask yourself these questions:

- Is that building still an "abode of peace" or has it degenerated it into an "abode of Judicial Despotism" blind to the Second Amendment's Constitutional bright line?
- Who is willing to die in defense of that "abode," and its current occupants, when those occupants are unwilling to honor the Second Amendment's Constitutional bright line? [Not !!]
- Who is willing to die in defense of that "abode," and its current occupants, when those occupants construe the Second Amendment in a manner that denies citizens an individual right to arms? When those occupants uphold as Constitutional laws that devalue U.S. citizenship and tell citizens they must beg Chief Serpents like Sebastopol's Gordon Pitter for their permission to pack a gun in a public place for lawful self-defense? When those occupants, while guarded with armed guards paid for by taxpayers, uphold unconstitutional laws that coerce citizens to circulate in public as unarmed, vulnerable prey, without legal or financial recourse against civil authority, when civil authority fails to protect them while not letting them protect themselves? [Not !!]
- When, if ever, will virulently pissed off citizens storm that "abode" and confront its occupants face-to-face about Liberty?

195. A true, deep love of Liberty, coupled with a faithful adherence to the Bill of Rights, would eliminate many of Mankind's major political-legal problems. Such an attitude would create a firm foundation for safety in society and an excellent basis for a long term, mutually rewarding, Citizen-Civil Authority relationship. Sadly, however, too many in and out of civil authority lack such an attitude. Too many think the Founders, the Framers, and the Ratifiers are old prune faces reduced to dust who are irrelevant by over two hundred years. To exacerbate matters, too many erroneously believe that they are smarter than the Framers, or they are not duty bound to adhere to the Framers' framework. There is, however, a direct relationship between how far civil authority undermines the Bill of Rights and our current major political-legal problems. To the extent that civil authority and Authoritarian Elitists persist with perverting language to undermine the Bill of Rights, it is inevitable that those who value Liberty will be forced to confront reality starkly. When that happens, many will roll up their sleeves and begin to slit throats. Liberty will be born anew from such courage and conviction, and it will be nurtured with the blood of Patriots and Non-Patriots.

June 7th 2010

Editor's note:

Recompiled from the original at <http://billstclair.com/liberty.html> with formatting adhering to same. It should be noted that some links contained within appear to have expired. All attempts have been made to produce a faithful facsimile of the content.

Visit <http://www.rkba-2a.com/basefile/liberty-mancus.html> for a web version and discover a source of many Second Amendment links, articles and videos. Be sure to obtain <http://www.rkba-2a.com/pdf/gun-facts-5.1.pdf> - "Gun Facts" is a definitive work on Guns, and 'Gun Control' (900Kb)

"Dial 911 and Die" - information can be found here - <http://www.ipfo.org/filegen-a-m/dial911anddie.htm>
