



August 2012

### The Attack on the Second Amendment

Dear Friend of Radio Liberty,

**“[T]he USA and its NATO allies [and] the USSR and its Warsaw Pact allies (are in the) penultimate stage of progress toward a truly global world federal union that will eliminate the remaining potentially threatening conflict between the have and have-not nations.”**

Mortimer J. Adler: “Haves Without Have-Nots: Essay for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century on Democracy and Socialism” (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1991) P. 251. (1)

Emulating its totalitarian forebears – which slaughtered between 170,000,000 and 262,000,000 human beings during the last century (2) – the government that rules us is preparing to wage undisguised war against the American population. This is a fact that must be acknowledged without being disguised in euphemisms. Every element of the government’s vast apparatus of regimentation, control, and wealth confiscation is being militarized and placed on a war footing. Even relatively benign bureaucratic agencies are being up-armored by purchasing ammo and riot control gear.

Over a twelve-month period in 2011-2012, the federal Department of Homeland Security ordered more than *one billion* rounds of ammunition. The Washington, D.C., Capitol Police – a department not typically expected to be combat ready – ordered 600,000 rounds on its own. Federal agencies not previously considered enforcement bodies, such as the Social Security Administration and even the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration – put in orders for hundreds of thousands of rounds of ammo.

At the same time, the Obama administration has unabashedly asserted – and institutionalized – an unprecedented claim of executive power: The supposed authority of the president to order the summary execution of U.S. citizens. Professor Ryan Alford of the Ave Maria School of Law points out that this amounts to a plenary repeal not merely of the Bill of Rights, *but of the entire corpus of Anglo-Saxon common law going back to the Magna Carta.*

For the first time in American history, a president and his ruling oligarchy have both the means, and the demonstrated will, to exercise “power without limit, resting directly on force” – Vladimir Lenin’s formula for mass imprisonment and mass murder.

These aren’t merely preparations for severe and widespread social unrest; this is an overture to a bloodbath. The Regime has put itself on a war footing and put the American population in the crosshairs. This is *not* an abstract or hypothetical possibility; *it is happening right now.*

More important than the Regime’s mass expenditure on high-caliber ammunition is its frantic acquisition and deployment of exotic technologies of surveillance, crowd control, and assassination – trends that are encapsulated in the development and domestic use of remote-piloted unmanned aerial vehicles, more commonly

called “drones.” Rapidly becoming the weapon of first resort in low-grade military conflicts overseas, drones are likewise being distributed to “local” police departments as adjuncts to paramilitary SWAT units and counter-narcotics task forces.

Roughly a decade ago, Tasers were considered a useful alternative to conventional firearms for use in situations where deadly force would be justified. They were considered an implement properly employed only to deal with a criminal suspect that posed a legitimate threat to the life of an innocent citizen or to a police officer. Now Tasers are routinely employed for the purpose of “pain compliance” – summary punishment whenever a citizen is considered guilty of the informal offense called “contempt of cop.”

We can expect a similar dynamic regarding the use of unmanned drones. They are being touted as a valuable tool in search-and-rescue missions, or in dealing with standoffs involving barricaded suspects. The inaugural domestic use of drones, however, involved a rural family in North Dakota who were involved in a relatively trivial dispute over cattle that had wandered onto their land. The local sheriff’s department, which has had several long-running disputes with the family – some of them involving litigation – sought assistance from the Department of Homeland Security, and was rewarded with not one but two drone over-flights of the farm to provide intelligence and tactical information when a SWAT team was deployed to arrest two unresisting adults.

In previous installments we’ve examined how America’s once-decentralized system of “law enforcement” has been replaced by a monolithic, militarized Homeland Security State. Rather than a network of independent, locally accountable peace officer agencies – whether municipal police departments or, much better, county sheriffs – our country now has a vertically integrated system of law enforcement in which every department that receives so much as a dollar in federal funding is effectively controlled by the federal government.

The local police increasingly receive their equipment and training from the Pentagon, and are taught doctrines much more compatible with what the Pentagon calls “operations other than war,” than with the proper role of peace officers. They are taught to establish a “command presence,” to establish “objective peace” – that is, unqualified submission – and to treat “force security,” more commonly called “officer safety,” as the mission priority. This means that they are taught to perceive everyone other than those in their unit as a potential threat, part of a 360-degree “battle zone.”

While this mindset has become ubiquitous, it is not a product of the post-9/11 environment; indeed, the militarization of police, in both weaponry and attitude, was well underway in the late 1990s.

During the late 1990s, by way of illustration, the Fresno, California Police Department’s Violent Crime Suppression Unit (VCSU) field-tested new weapons, tactics, and doctrines. Beginning in 1994, the VCSU – which described itself as the department’s “special forces” unit – conducted street patrols in the city’s impoverished suburbs. Operators wore military garb and toted military-grade, fully automatic weapons. Each of them carried a veritable arsenal of “blunt trauma ordinances,” as well as pepper spray, smoke bombs, flash-bang grenades, metal clubs, and Tasers. The unit was backed with two helicopters equipped with infrared sensors, and a Pentagon-provided Armored Personnel Carrier.

Rather than responding to criminal complaints, the VCSU would descend on targeted neighborhoods “like a wolf pack,” to use its own description. They would conduct what the military calls “contact patrols” – essentially swaggering through an occupied neighborhood trying to provoke trouble.

“‘Contacts’ generally involve swooping onto street corners, forcing pedestrians to the ground, searching them, running warrant checks, taking photos, and entering all the new ‘intelligence’ into a state database from computer terminals in each patrol car,” recalled crime reporter Christian Parenti in his book, *Lockdown*

*America: Police and Prisons in the Age of Crisis.* Every neighborhood was considered a “war zone”; all the inhabitants therein were treated as “enemy combatants.”

“If you’re 21, male, living in one of these neighborhoods, and you’re not in our computer, then there’s definitely something wrong,” insisted VCSU officer Paul Boyer. That is to say that your absence from the database wouldn’t reflect the fact that you’re an innocent person who had never been suspected of a crime, but rather that you’re a particularly devious “enemy combatant” who had eluded detection.

The VCSU would often take part in joint paramilitary operations with the FBI, DEA, and the San Francisco Police Department. Those raids were not conducted pursuant to warrants or probable cause regarding specific crimes, but rather to intimidate suspected gang members. Each of them was a “Shock and Awe”-style display of military superiority by the local occupation authority.

“I feel bad for the innocent women and children that were here,” stated SFPD narcotics lieutenant Kitt Crenshaw after a nighttime military raid terrorized an apartment complex and netted a minuscule amount of marijuana, “but in a way they do bear some responsibility for harboring drug dealers.”

The police agencies involved in these raids referred to their approach as “clear and hold” – a phrase that would later be employed by U.S. military personnel conducting occupation missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. All of this, recall, was taking place in the United States of America before the 9/11 attacks – which simply provided a palatable rationale to make public, and escalate, existing efforts to cultivate martial law on the installment plan. This helps explain why “local” police agencies evince a military mindset entirely incompatible with the constitutional role of peace officers.

This background is important to understand what has been going on in Anaheim, California, which is a showcase of the contemporary Homeland Security State in action.

In July, the police murdered (no other word is adequate) an unarmed young man named Manuel Diaz, who was described as a “documented gang member.” This is the domestic equivalent of being a “suspected militant” in Iraq or Afghanistan, a designation permitting to detain or execute the individual thus described.

Diaz, who wasn’t suspected of a specific crime, fled when he was approached by members of a “gang suppression unit” – that is, a police unit following the same doctrines as the one that brought “Shock and Awe” to Fresno neighborhoods more than a decade ago. (For those who understand how peace officers are supposed to operate in a free society, the use of the word “suppression” in the name of a police unit is a bright red flag.) Diaz was shot twice – once in the leg, then in the back of the head.

A platoon of police soon descended on the neighborhood. Rather than rendering aid to Diaz, or calling paramedics to do so, the officers ignored the victim as he bled to death, focusing their efforts on crowd control (in the interests of “officer safety,” of course).

When a protest coalesced at the crime scene, additional reinforcements – in the form of heavily armed riot police – were deployed. The storm troopers were captured on video firing a fusillade of “less lethal” ammunition – rubber bullets, pepper-ball and bean bag-rounds – into a crowd of unarmed and terrified citizens. (3) One officer unleashed a police dog that made a beeline for a stroller containing an infant; the baby would have been killed if a bystander – who was mauled by the attack dog – hadn’t come to the child’s defense.

Since 2002, notes Stephen Salisbury of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, “Anaheim and Orange County have received about \$100 million from the federal government ... to bring operations up to twenty-first century speed in the age of terror.” Those federal subsidies were intended to fortify the ability of the local police to suppress, rather

than protect, the public. This has been made clear by the Anaheim PD's behavior as public outrage mounted over the killing of Manuel Diaz (and several other young men) and the brutal crackdown on subsequent protests. (4)

Dispensing with any pretense of being a civilian "peace officer" agency, the department deployed officers wielding fully automatic weapons and clothed in the same attire worn by occupation forces abroad. Snipers nested on local rooftops; at least one undercover officer infiltrated a protest to act as an informant/provocateur. (5)

At the slightest provocation – especially one it arranges itself – the Regime ruling us will dispense with the pretense that it is a government ruled by law, cast off its velvet gloves, and wield the iron fist as it sees fit. It is true that Americans – at least for now – retain the legal right to own firearms, and in quantitative terms out-gun the government. We shouldn't ignore the fact, however, that the Regime – using wealth it has stolen from us – is pursuing a decisive *qualitative* advantage in terms of strategic reach, tactical depth, sophistication, and firepower.

In his monumental work, *Tragedy and Hope*, Dr. Carroll Quigley – the Georgetown University professor who, in addition to being the mentor of Bill Clinton, could be considered the quasi-official historian of the Power Elite – describes the importance to ruling elites in maintaining qualitative superiority of weaponry over the mass of the population.

Although "politics consists of much more than weapons, the nature, organization, and control of weapons is *the most significant* of the numerous factors that determine what happens in political life," writes Quigley (emphasis added). "All of past history shows that the shift from a mass army of citizen-soldiers to a smaller army of professional fighters leads, in the long run, to a decline of democracy [by which Quigley means a participatory political system with a diffusion of political power – WNG]. When weapons are cheap and easy to obtain and to use, almost any man may obtain them, and the organized structure of the society, such as the state, can obtain no better weapons than the ordinary, industrious, private citizen. This very rare historical condition existed about 1880, but is now only a dim memory, since the weapons obtainable by the state today are far beyond the pocketbook, understanding, or competence of the ordinary citizen."(6)

Like contemporary defenders of individual firearms ownership, Dr. Quigley – who was not a "right-wing extremist" or an anti-government agitator – pointed out that widespread ownership of weaponry is the single most significant factor in preserving a decentralized political system. Where weapons "are widely possessed by citizens, power is similarly dispersed, and no minority can compel the majority to yield to its will," he explains. But this arrangement can be nullified when the ruling minority disposes of "complex and expensive weapons that only a few persons can afford to possess or can learn to use"; when such "specialist" weapons arise and are controlled by the ruling elite, "an authoritarian political system that reflects the inequality of control of weapons will be established."(7)

While it is true that our self-appointed rulers are eager to promote civilian disarmament, their most urgent priority has been to expand the development and use of "specialist" weapons – as well as all-encompassing systems of surveillance – in order to retain their technological advantage over the rest of us.

Totalitarianism is not merely a matter of applied technology. It rests upon the State's claim to jurisdiction over the very soul of the individual, and depends upon both the active involvement of an enforcement caste and the passive compliance of the population it rules. This is why the case of Marine combat veteran Brandon Raub is so significant.

Raub was abducted from his home in Chesterfield, Virginia, by a company of federal and local law enforcement officials on August 16. (8) Raub was never charged with a crime. In fact, none of the agencies that collaborated in his abduction – the Chesterfield Police, the FBI, and the Secret Service – would admit they “arrested” him. In fact, the police didn’t even bother filing a charging petition with the judge; the form was left blank. He was quickly processed by a judge into the custody of the “mental health” system as a threat to public safety on the basis of anti-government essays he posted on his Facebook page. (9)

Raub came to the attention of his overseers after publicly expressing doubts about the official narrative of the 9/11 attacks – the contemporary “Reichstag Fire” incident that led to the USA PATRIOT Act and the Bush administration’s open-ended Authorization for the Use of Military Force. Those two measures, taken together, constitute the modern equivalent of Hitler’s “Enabling Act.” What did Raub write? He demanded the arrest and prosecution of elected and appointed officials responsible for myriad crimes against liberty and decency.

Thanks to the timely intervention of the Rutherford Institute, Raub was released from the psychiatric gulag (what the Soviets called the *psihuksa*) within a week – but the point had been made: This is a country in which you can expect to be visited by the police, and summarily imprisoned without criminal charges, if you make yourself conspicuous through public criticism of the Regime.

David Sarti, an honorably discharged Air Force veteran and retired truck driver from Lebanon, Tennessee, learned the same lesson. In January, Mr. Sarti was declared “mentally incompetent” and had his firearms confiscated by the state government after appearing on the National Geographic Channel’s program “Doomsday Preppers.” This was done on the pretext that Sarti, who sought medical treatment following what he thought might have been a heart attack in late 2011, was supposedly a suicide risk. (10)

Sarti underwent a series of tests at a heart clinic in November 2011. It wasn’t until January 16 – after Sarti had been featured in the cable program – that he had a follow-up visit. Having ruled out a heart attack as the cause of Sarti’s chest pains and breathing difficulties, the physician, Dr. Andre C. Olivier, suggested an invasive procedure involving the insertion of a tracheal breathing tube.

“I said, ‘why not let me pass on if you’re thinking of putting tubes and holes in me?’” Sarti recalls. “I don’t want to do that.” The discussion turned to the subject of suicide. “I told him I can’t do suicide, because I’m a Christian,” Sarti explains.

What had appeared to be a flippant chat assumed a more ominous character when Dr. Olivier said Sarti would need to go to the emergency room. Explaining that he didn’t have time, and had a farm to tend to, Sarti went home. Fifteen minutes later, sheriff’s deputies materialized on Sarti’s property and forcibly took him to the emergency room.

“The logic of sending somebody with a gun after somebody who’s going to commit suicide fails me,” Sarti pointed out during an interview with broadcaster Alex Jones. After being hauled away to the hospital by sheriff’s deputies, Sarti was detained for several hours while undergoing a lengthy and redundant series of tests. Protesting again that he had a farm to tend and animals to feed, Sarti told the hospital staff that he considered himself to be a “prisoner” and demanded to speak with an attorney. At that point he was taken to a mental health facility and held for “observation.”

“At no time did I ever say I wanted to commit suicide,” Sarti insists. “I feel that they put me in there [the mental health ward] because I made them mad by saying I was a prisoner ... and I told them they were Gestapo.” He also refused to take psychotropic drugs that had been prescribed to him, “so that was another black mark.” Significantly, the drug advisory provided by the nurse listed suicidal thoughts as a side-effect of the “anti-depressant” Sarti had refused.

Sarti spent two days in confinement before being allowed to speak with an attorney – an indifferent and ill-informed public defender named David Kennedy. Two more days passed before he was able to see Judge John Gwynne. His four-day psychiatric confinement amounted to an involuntary fast, since he had been placed on a low-carbohydrate diet and the only food available – except for one hamburger patty, one serving of scrambled eggs, and a handful of cheese squares – consisted of starchy, sugar-laden foods.

Following his release, Sarti discovered that medical authorities had “terminated” his right to own firearms and seized his guns. “You have been declared mentally defective by having been committed to a mental institution,” declares the document Sarti received.

As we are reminded by the cases of Brandon Raub and Dave Sarti, registration of firearms provides our self-appointed overseers with the knowledge necessary to disarm us. But this isn’t the limit of their ambitions.

Every act of government “registration” is a prelude to confiscation. Any time a government wants to “register” something, it’s reasonable to believe that bureaucrats have eventual confiscation in mind. Think of how the tax collection bureaucracy strives to account for every penny of income people earn, spend, and invest.

Here is a sound survival axiom in dealing with government bureaucracies: If they know what you’ve got, you should expect them to take it when times get tough. This is the perspective that should inform a proposed garden registry in Utah.

The Utah Department of Agriculture and Food is sponsoring an initiative it calls the “Utah Garden Challenge,” through which the agency is trying to entice 10,000 gardeners in the state to “come forward and document their gardens.... Whether locals grow a tomato in a pot, a row in a community garden, have backyard gardens, a CSA (Community Supported Agriculture) program or work a fruit and vegetable farm, Utah is encouraging its denizens to register their gardens! There is no garden too small!”(11)

Why does the state want its “denizens” – an odd and mildly pejorative description for the state’s inhabitants, who are more commonly called “citizens” – to register their gardens with a government agency? One possible answer is found nestled among the buzzwords that litter the initiative.

According to the UDAF, “The 10,000 Garden Challenge is an example of the local movement for sustainable agritourism and living.” “Sustainable” is a term of art that grows out of the UN-centered Agenda 21 initiative, which, if implemented, would require regimentation, by administrative bodies populated with wise and far-seeing bureaucrats, of all human interactions with the natural world.

This approach is referred to as “sustainable development” – that is, economic and social development supervised by people who are uniquely attuned to nature’s needs, or at least pretend to be. Another potent hint is found in the fact that the project refers to independently grown food as “an important resource to the state” – a phrase through which the state agency implicitly asserts collective ownership over private property of the most vital kind. Official language makes prominent use of the collective possessive pronoun “our” – as if every backyard garden that was cultivated and harvested through individual initiative somehow becomes the property of the collective.

For independent-minded people, guns are tools that are just as important as farm implements – and political functionaries threatened by the existence of self-reliant people are devising novel ways to confiscate both plowshares and "swords."

As political officials increasingly resort to outright theft of property, disarming property owners will become a priority. Mike Synder, a political commentator wrote: "in the state of California, armed 'nuisance abatement teams' are intimidating property owners, and in some instances they are forcing homeowners off their land entirely."

In our current environment, discretion is becoming an increasingly valuable survival skill, Synder notes:

"If you are doing something 'out of the box' on your own property right now, you might want to keep it very quiet. If the wrong person finds out, an armed 'nuisance abatement team' might just show up at your door one morning and hit you with several dozen 'code violations.' I don't know what country we are living in, but it sure isn't America." (12) That message is being sent to us every day, in an endless variety of increasingly infuriating ways.

Submitted by William Grigg

## REFERENCES

- 1) Mortimer J. Adler, *Haves Without Have-Nots: Essays for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century on Democracy and Socialism* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1991), pg. 251.
- 2) See generally *Death by Government* by Rudolph J. Rummel (New York: Transaction Books, 1994).
- 3) The video of this atrocity can be found at --  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q8Y0uWycuz8&feature=related>
- 4) "Police Shootings Echo Nationwide: Aurora Gets the Attention, But Guns Are Going Off Everywhere," Stephen Salisbury, TomDispatch.com, July 29, 2012.
- 5) See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=62pffXqRR7o&feature=related>
- 6) Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1966), pg. 1200.
- 7) Ibid.
- 8) See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sX1EvM6XksM>
- 9) "Chesterfield man held in hospital on concerns over Internet posts," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, August 19, 2012.
- 10) "Doomsday Prepper has Guns Confiscated," *Survivalist*, February 20, 2012; see <http://survivalist.com/doomsday-prepper-has-guns-confiscate.html>
- 11) See <http://www.utahgardenchallenge.com/>
- 12) Michael Snyder, "All Over America Government Agents of Tyranny Are Forcing Preppers Back On To the Grid," *Activist Post*, June 12, 2012.

We are living in difficult, dangerous, and exciting times. If you want to know what lies ahead, I suggest you attend the annual Radio Liberty Conference that will be held at the Aptos Seascapes Conference Center on October 21, 2012. The doors will open at 7:30 am, the program will start at 8:15 am, we will serve lunch, and the program will end at 6:00 pm. I believe the information that will be presented will help you prepare for the challenging events that lie ahead.

L.A. Marzulli will speak on the supernatural events that are taking place, Ambassador Henry Cooper will discuss the danger of an EMP attack, Michael Shaw will offer an overview of the coming events, Stan Monteith will discuss the Covert Plan, and there will be another exciting speaker. Accommodations are available at the Seacliff Inn. If you are coming, or if you want information on other accommodations in the region, please contact Radio Liberty at 800-544-8927.

Many radio ministries are having serious financial problems. I was forced to drop two of my three hours of shortwave broadcasts, but with your help, I have been able to maintain the remainder of my networks, and continue disseminating the truth.

Barbara and I appreciate your loyal support and your faithful prayers.

Yours in Christ,

Stanley Monteith