


Handguns In American Society

RECOMMENDATIONS



Enforcement of Current Laws

The Commission recommends that existing Federal, State, and local laws relating to handguns be strenuously enforced. It further recommends that States undertake publicity campaigns to educate the public fully about laws regulating the private possession of handguns.

Penalties for Crimes Committed with a Handgun

The Commission urges enactment of State legislation providing for an extended prison term with a maximum term of 25 years for committing a felony while in possession of a handgun.

Stop-and-Frisk Searches

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation providing for police discretion in stop-and-frisk searches of persons and searches of automobiles for illegal handguns.

Prohibiting the Manufacture of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation prohibiting the manufacture of handguns, their parts, and ammunition within the State, except for sale to law enforcement agencies or for military use.

Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation prohibiting the sale of handguns, their parts, and ammunition to other than law enforcement agencies or Federal or State governments for military purposes.

Establishing a State Gun Control Agency

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation establishing and funding a State agency authorized to purchase all voluntarily surrendered handguns, and further authorized to register and modify handguns to be retained by private citizens as curios, museum pieces, or collector's items.

Prohibiting the Private Possession of Handguns

The Commission further urges the enactment of State legislation not later than January 1, 1983, prohibiting the private possession of handguns after that date. ✓



What you are looking at is the 340th page in the Master Set done up for Ronald Reagan when he was the governor of California. All the "insider" type of public officials know that Page 340's directives are the milestones they must achieve!

Here are some points for you to know about Page 340:

#1 At the time this was first uncovered by an alert citizen who dug into Reagan's "Master Set", it was planned that public officials would go after *hand* guns first which was pretty bold for the '70's! *Long* guns were not written into the directive. Nevertheless, ALL guns were scheduled to be outlawed.

#2 Laws had been written (but did not get passed) to permit hunting only if you checked a gun out at the Club Master's and returned it at the end of your hunt.


#3 Relate this to the little blue book from the State Department called "FREEDOM FROM WAR" (some pages back from here). The plan is total disarmament!

#4 The anti-gun legislators did not make the goal of 1983 (see opposite page) and the date obviously had to be moved up.

#5 Page 340 is still viable! You will find current bills and actions on the next few pages that prove that the direction of current day legislation is complying with the directives on Page 340.

Handguns In American Society

Except for this insert, this Page 340 is an exact copy from the State of California's *Master Set of Criminal Justice Standards, Goals and Recommendations*. The unabridged chapter unmasking the federal and state alliance is found in the 195 page Federal Commission book entitled "A National Strategy to Reduce Crime." Although the resistance of the people caused the deadline to be advanced upwards from 1983, this set of Recommendations is still the operating directive which was sneaked from the federal government to the nation's governors. This is a component part of the "Program for General and Complete Disarmament of the nation and its law-abiding citizens." (See Public Law 87-297 & Public Law 101-216)



RECOMMENDATIONS

Enforcement of Current Laws

The Commission recommends that existing Federal, State, and local laws relating to handguns be strenuously enforced. It further recommends that States undertake publicity campaigns to educate the public fully about laws regulating the private possession of handguns.

Penalties for Crimes Committed with a Handgun

The Commission urges enactment of State legislation providing for an extended prison term with a maximum term of 25 years for committing a felony while in possession of a handgun.

Stop-and-Frisk Searches

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation providing for police discretion in stop-and-frisk searches of persons and searches of automobiles for illegal handguns.

Prohibiting the Manufacture of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation prohibiting the manufacture of handguns, their parts, and ammunition within the State, except for sale to law enforcement agencies or for military use.

Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation prohibiting the sale of handguns, their parts, and ammunition to other than law enforcement agencies or Federal or State governments for military purposes.

Establishing a State Gun Control Agency

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation establishing and funding a State agency authorized to purchase all voluntarily surrendered handguns, and further authorized to register and modify handguns to be retained by private citizens as curios, museum pieces, or collector's items.

Prohibiting the Private Possession of Handguns

The Commission further urges the enactment of State legislation not later than January 1, 1983, prohibiting the private possession of handguns after that date.

This secret planning was going on in Ronald Reagan's office when he was the governor of California. Alert citizens caught him. It never hit the newspapers. It is still the source for nation-wide gun prohibition, achieved by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in Washington, D.C.



In 1999 Newspapers Document
the Actualization
of the Federal/State Alliance
Planned in 1974
to Seize All Citizen-Owned
Firearms.



Bill aims at ban on handguns

RICH HARRIS
Associated Press Writer

SACRAMENTO — Democrats in the California Assembly are out to ban the manufacturer and sale of the cheap handguns sometimes referred to as "junk guns," and say this time they think they have the votes to do it.

Also known as "Saturday Night Specials," the inexpensive weapons — often mechanically unreliable — are frequently used in crimes, sponsors of the bill said.

Previous attempts to ban such guns, many of which are manufactured in the state, have failed.

But Democrats have regained the majority in the Assembly, and sponsors of the new bill said Monday they believed they could win passage of the bill this year.

"We're going to be working very hard to convince those legislators who are in swing districts that this is a high-profile issue and one they should care about," said Assemblyman Louis Caldera, D-Los Angeles.

The bill would require all guns made and sold in California to conform to the safety standards required of weapons manufactured outside the country, which are tougher than the standards for domestically manufactured weapons.

The bill would also require that all guns sold in California after June 1, 1999, be equipped with child-proof features such as trigger locks, loaded chamber indicators or "smart gun" sensors which permit a weapon to be fired only by the person to whom it is registered.

continued

Handguns In American Society

Recommendations

Enhancement of Current Laws

The Commission recommends that existing Federal laws, and those laws relating to handguns, be substantially enhanced. It further recommends that States substantially upgrade their laws to achieve parity with those laws regarding the purchase of handguns.

Provision for Citizen's Access to a Handgun

The Commission supports the enactment of State legislation providing for purchase of handguns to individuals who are at least 21 years of age, are not prohibited persons, and are not prohibited by a court order from possession of a handgun.

Prohibited Persons

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation providing for public distribution to individuals prohibited from possession of handguns.

Prohibiting the Manufacture of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation prohibiting the manufacture of handguns that pose, and potentially could pose, unique problems for enforcement agencies in the selling of

Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation prohibiting the sale of handguns to individuals who are at least 21 years of age, are not prohibited persons, and are not prohibited by a court order from possession of a handgun.

Establishing a State Gun Control Agency

The Commission urges the enactment of State legislation establishing and funding a State agency dedicated to providing all necessary services to handgun owners, and further authorized to regulate and control handguns to enhance public safety and to enforce current laws on selling of handguns.

Prohibiting the Private Possession of Handguns

The Commission further urges the enactment of State legislation from time to time, prohibiting the private possession of handguns when feasible.

The source of the above "Page 340" is the 1985 Gun Control Act. In 1974 this secret directive was quietly created from the federal level to state levels to co-ordinate the governors and key state representatives with the plan for the gradual elimination of all handguns. Crime was deliberately increased to create public support for this retroactive idea.

It would also encourage all weapons to have such personalization features, and require warning labels on weapons which lacked them.

Coauthors include Majority Leader Antonio Villaraigosa, D-Los Angeles; Assemblywoman Elaine White Alquist, D-Santa Clara; and Assemblyman Carl Washington, D-Compton.

A spokesman for Assemblyman Larry Bowler, an Assembly gun-rights advocate and former deputy sheriff, said opposition to this bill would stem from the same reasoning as in the past: first, that defining "junk guns" in legislation is extremely difficult; second, that eliminating inexpensive weapons from the marketplace is unfair to low-income citizens who want a gun for self-defense; and third, that the "smart gun" technology would defeat the purpose of having a weapon for self-defense.

Handguns In American Society

RECOMMENDATIONS

Enhancement of Current Laws

The Commission recommends the existing Federal laws, and laws now existing in handguns, be consistently enforced. It further recommends that State legislatures, public safety campaigns to educate the public, and other steps be taken to prevent the proliferation of handguns.

Repeal the United States Constitution with a Handgun

The Commission urges enactment of laws prohibiting possession of any automatic firearm with a magazine capacity of 20 rounds for manufacturing being made by possession of a handgun.

Expanded Fugitive Searches

The Commission urges the enactment of laws requiring expanded fugitive searches for possession of handguns, and other automatic firearms and weapons of mass destruction.

Prohibiting the Manufacture of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of laws prohibiting the manufacture of handguns, their parts, and accessories within the State, except for sale to law enforcement agencies or for military use.

Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of laws prohibiting the sale of handguns, their parts, and accessories to other than law enforcement agencies or for military purposes.

Establishing a State Gun Control Agency

The Commission urges the enactment of laws authorizing, establishing and funding a State Gun Control Agency to prevent and control the manufacture, sale, possession, and use of handguns and other automatic firearms by private citizens, except for military, law enforcement agencies, or individual's home.

Prohibiting the Military Possession of Handguns

The Commission endorses the enactment of legislation on June 15, 1994, prohibiting the private possession of handguns other than for military use.

THE SURRENDER

AGENCY

A Federal/State Alliance

The 1968 Gun Control Act was accepted by the state governors. The Act brought into being the "Law Enforcement Assistance Administration". The L.E.A.A. secretly promoted the chapter on handguns in the federal book entitled: "A National Strategy to Reduce Crime".

That chapter is summarized on only one page. It is known as Page 340. Page 340 is the official guide for public officials in state legislatures to gradually get all guns away from the law-abiding citizens.

Notice that the 'surrender agency' now includes long guns. Also the deadline has been extended for prohibiting private possession.



Planned by Nixon and Reagan in the early seventies.

THE VALLEY

City Edition, Valley News, 1994, Vol. 100
www.newschoice.com WEDNESDAY, July 7, 1994

State offers money for rifles

By Tom Whelan

Owners of a particular brand of rifle may be offered \$100 by the Legislature and you are being given the opportunity to have the money in a withdrawal and to have a rifle made.

A 1997 Assembly Bill (AB) would pay for the purchase of a rifle for the Legislature and you are being given the opportunity to have the money in a withdrawal and to have a rifle made.

From now until Dec. 31, the money can be requested for withdrawal with the use through the Department of Justice's Top Back program.

The Legislature will make \$1.2 million to buy back the thousands of 300-caliber rifles that were legally imported into the state.

These rifles, by the way, are the same as the ones that were used in the 1994 shooting in the state capital building.

However, the only model eligible for the money are those made by Remington-Union City, Inc. (RUC) rifles, made of which are held up to 20 rounds. They are made with a 10-round magazine that is not detachable.

To receive a rifle, you must first have the money sent to your bank, and then the Department of Justice's Top Back program.

There are three additional ways that money can be used: to buy back the rifles, to buy back the rifles, or to buy back the rifles.

The bill will be required by the Legislature to be passed by the Legislature.

A 1997 Assembly Bill (AB) would pay for the purchase of a rifle for the Legislature and you are being given the opportunity to have the money in a withdrawal and to have a rifle made.

However, the only model eligible for the money are those made by Remington-Union City, Inc. (RUC) rifles, made of which are held up to 20 rounds. They are made with a 10-round magazine that is not detachable.

To receive a rifle, you must first have the money sent to your bank, and then the Department of Justice's Top Back program.

There are three additional ways that money can be used: to buy back the rifles, to buy back the rifles, or to buy back the rifles.

The bill will be required by the Legislature to be passed by the Legislature.

Handguns in American Society

Introduction

Establishment of Federal Law

The Constitution empowers the federal government to regulate interstate commerce. This power was used to create a national market for firearms, thereby preventing states from imposing their own laws which would have impeded the growth of the industry.

Control by Federal Government

The federal government has established a system of control over the manufacture, sale, and possession of firearms. This system is based on the principle of federal pre-emption.

State and Local Control

The federal government has established a system of control over the manufacture, sale, and possession of firearms. This system is based on the principle of federal pre-emption.

Establishing a National Standard

The federal government has established a system of control over the manufacture, sale, and possession of firearms. This system is based on the principle of federal pre-emption.

Establishing the Role of the States

The Constitution empowers the states to regulate the manufacture, sale, and possession of firearms. This power was used to create a national market for firearms, thereby preventing states from imposing their own laws which would have impeded the growth of the industry.

Establishing a Federal-State Control Agency

The federal government has established a system of control over the manufacture, sale, and possession of firearms. This system is based on the principle of federal pre-emption.

Establishing the Federal-State Control Agency

The federal government has established a system of control over the manufacture, sale, and possession of firearms. This system is based on the principle of federal pre-emption.

Public Law 96-343
96th Congress, 2d Sess.
June 19, 1979

Title I—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Enacted June 19, 1979, at the 96th Congress, 2d Sess., page 1000.

Chapter 1—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 101—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 102—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 103—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 104—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 105—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 106—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 107—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 108—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 109—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 110—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 111—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 112—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 113—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 114—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 115—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 116—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 117—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 118—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 119—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 120—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Reno seeks state tests for gun owners

By Kevin Johnson
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — Prospective gun owners should be required to pass state-mandated proficiency tests before they obtain weapons, Attorney General Janet Reno said Thursday.

Reno said applicants should have to pass both written and written level designed to measure basic knowledge of gun operation and safety. "I don't think anybody should have a weapon unless they demonstrate a proficiency to use it," Reno said.

The attorney general's proposal is not binding on the states, and the Justice Department is not advocating federal legislation that would mandate proficiency tests.

Reno said the National Rifle Association opposes the kind of thinking she thinks states should require. The NRA made it clear, however, that it would not support making such training mandatory.

"The attorney general ought to spend as much time enforcing the law as she does cooking up these



Reno says NRA could provide testing for proficiency and safety.

rules for licensing gun owners," said James Baker, the NRA's chief lobbyist. "What does she want to do next, tattoo every gun owner?"

Reno's proposal comes as the Clinton administration continues to push for stronger gun laws in the aftermath of the Columbine High School massacre.

Several Columbine students were with Reno and President Clinton

at the White House on Thursday as Clinton launched his campaign for mandatory background checks at gun shows. The administration's proposal also would require child safety locks on handguns.

"Don't allow the victims of Columbine to have died in vain," Clinton said. "We must not live the legacy of our mistakes." The president also criticized Congress for stalling gun legislation.

Reno said the NRA could serve as an ideal partner in conducting these because it sponsors firearms training programs.

Baker said the NRA trains "hundreds of thousands" of gun owners every year. But he argued that there is no reason to mandate proficiency testing.

Quoting the most recent information compiled by the National Center for Health Statistics in 1997, the NRA says accidents caused by firearms were at an all-time low.

"How is something like a proficiency test going to impact crime rates?" Baker said. "Are criminals going to shoot in fear for a test? I don't think so."

Handguns in American Society

This page documents the fact that the federal attorney-general's office controlled the missions of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The L. E. A. A. laid out the agenda for divesting the law-abiding people of their guns. They set the maneuvers for making an end run around the Second Amendment. The N.R.A. installed L.E.A.A.'s "state pre-emption". Will the N.R.A. accept Janet Reno's offer next?



Gov. Davis

NO MAN IS ABOVE THE LAW! NO, NOT EVEN THE GOVERNOR!

Gray Davis has violated his oath of office by signing counterfeit legislation which tramples upon the the Second Amendment. This is a serious offense. This collusion with the federal government constitutes an act of perjury. He must be held accountable!

A constitutional governor would have invoked the power of the Second Amendment against the nefarious activities of equally guilty errant state legislators. The governor is supposed to keep the ship of state on an even keel! Davis was not hired to participate in federal plans to disarm all the law-abiding citizens of this state! How safe will the people of California be when Davis's complicity with the federal government's secret goal of complete elimination of all citizen owned firearms is carried out?



THIS SHEET IS A HIGHLY CLASSIFIED DOCUMENT THAT WAS FURNISHED TO ONLY STATE GOVERNORS BY THE FEDERAL GOVT. CALIFORNIA IS THE LEAD STATE FOR DISARMING THE NATION. THE FINAL DEADLINE HAS BEEN UPDATED BY FEDERAL ACTION.



Handguns In American Society

Recommendations

Enforcement of Current Laws

The Committee recommends that existing Federal, State, and local laws relating to handguns be consistently enforced. It further recommends that State legislatures periodically reevaluate to identify the areas that should have the greatest priority for enforcement of handgun laws.

Penalties for Crimes Committed with a Handgun

The Committee urges enactment of laws applicable providing for an extended sentence term, with a minimum term of 25 years for committing a crime with a possession of a handgun.

Stop and Frisk Statutes

The Committee urges the enactment of laws applicable providing for police authority to stop, frisk, search, and detain individuals in areas of high handgun crime.

Restricting the Manufacture of Handguns

The Committee urges the enactment of laws applicable restricting the manufacture of handguns after years, and prohibition within the State, except for sale to law enforcement agencies or for military use.

Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns

The Committee urges the enactment of laws applicable prohibiting the sale of handguns after 2001, and prohibition to other than law enforcement or approved Federal or State government for military purposes.

Establishing a State Gun Control Agency

The Committee urges the enactment of laws applicable establishing and funding a State agency authorized to purchase, or coordinate, controlled handguns, and further authorized to register and track handguns to be retained by private citizens in public, common places, or individual's homes.

Prohibiting the Private Possession of Handguns

The Committee further urges the enactment of laws applicable not later than January 1, 2001, prohibiting the private possession of handguns other than law.

From Reagan to Davis, California has been the pilot state for enforcing the goals of Page 340. Unconstitutional bogus gun laws must be stopped in California lest other states fall like dominoes.

The Stanford Sentinel-Friday, August 20, 1999

Assembly OKs bill to curb handguns

JENNIFER KERR
Associated Press Staffer



Gov. Davis

The bill returns to the Senate for a final vote. The Democratic governor already has signed two gun-control bills this year.

SACRAMENTO — After prolonged lobbying by Gov. Gray Davis, the state Assembly approved a bill aimed at curbing the manufacture and sale of cheap, unsafe handguns known as "junk" guns.

This law will give California one of the strongest handgun safety standards in the country, said Luis Flores of Los Angeles-based Handgun Control, which first proposed the measure.

The bill would make it a misdemeanor to make or sell in whole or in part a handgun after Jan. 1, 2001. Handguns would have to have a safety device and pass firing and drop-safety tests in independent laboratories.

"I believe this is a reasonable measure; it holds guns to enhanced safety standards," Gov. Gray Davis told reporters a few hours before the Assembly's 43-26 vote Thursday.

Opponents contended the bill would not get handguns off California streets but would instead increase the sales of new guns and the black market for existing weapons.

Highly publicized shootings, including those Aug. 10 at a Jewish day camp, and the Sept. 10 shooting in Los Angeles that killed five students, have boosted support for gun control among the public and politicians.

Thursday's vote was delayed several hours because several Democrats, particularly those facing state elections next year, were reluctant to back the controversial bill.

Davis said he was eager to do the same in talks in early December "to ensure timely passage."

The bill's author, Sen. Richard Hanna (D-Sacramento), said the bill would make it a misdemeanor to make or sell in whole or in part a handgun after Jan. 1, 2001. Handguns would have to have a safety device and pass firing and drop-safety tests in independent laboratories.

See HANDEDNESS, Page 3

Despite taking an oath to support the Constitution, all these California governors have passed, from one to another, the 1968 Gun Control Act's directive, called Page 340, to finalize the goals of the "United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament" requiring the complete disarmament of every law-abiding individual in the nation! (Refer to Public Law 87-297).

Handguns In American Society



This is an exact copy of Page 340, a secret Washington, DC directive for federal-state collusion to socially disarm all citizens in the nation. The 1983 date has been updated.

Advocates of Control laws

The Commission recommended that every citizen of this country who is not a member of the National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the National Gun Owners Council, any other gun-owning organization, any other gun-owning organization, or any other gun-owning organization, should be required to register his or her handgun.

Provisions for Citizens Councils

The Commission urges enactment of laws which would require every citizen of this country who is not a member of the National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the National Gun Owners Council, any other gun-owning organization, any other gun-owning organization, or any other gun-owning organization, should be required to register his or her handgun.

Buy-and-sell, transfer

The Commission urges the enactment of laws which would require every citizen of this country who is not a member of the National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the National Gun Owners Council, any other gun-owning organization, any other gun-owning organization, or any other gun-owning organization, should be required to register his or her handgun.

Prohibiting the Manufacture of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of laws which would require every citizen of this country who is not a member of the National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the National Gun Owners Council, any other gun-owning organization, any other gun-owning organization, or any other gun-owning organization, should be required to register his or her handgun.

Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of laws which would require every citizen of this country who is not a member of the National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the National Gun Owners Council, any other gun-owning organization, any other gun-owning organization, or any other gun-owning organization, should be required to register his or her handgun.

Prohibiting a State Gun Control Agency

The Commission urges the enactment of laws which would require every citizen of this country who is not a member of the National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the National Gun Owners Council, any other gun-owning organization, any other gun-owning organization, or any other gun-owning organization, should be required to register his or her handgun.

Prohibiting the Private Possession of Handguns

The Commission urges the enactment of laws which would require every citizen of this country who is not a member of the National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the National Gun Owners Council, any other gun-owning organization, any other gun-owning organization, or any other gun-owning organization, should be required to register his or her handgun.

Gov. Ronald Reagan: Working with Nixon who signed GCA '68, RR passed Page 340 in Master Set of Governor's Standards/Codes.

Gov. Jerry Brown: Forced acceptance of GCA upon all counties.

Gov. Donkey Jim: Signed sweeping Jones-Roberts bad gun law.

Gov. Pat Wilson: Unsuccessfully tried to install Perata gun law.

Gov. Gov. Davis: Supported & signed bad gun bills, and endorsed Perata gun law.

It's police safety vs. privacy rights

Hostile Supreme Court hears case; Reno argues for the government

RICHARD CARELLA
Assistant Press Editor

WASHINGTON — Attorney General Janet Reno, in her debut as a Supreme Court advocate, was supplying testimony today at the argument for allowing police more power when they make routine traffic stops.

In her 15-minute appearance, Reno strongly was supported by Justice William Rehnquist, the chief justice of the Supreme Court, who said that the government was likely to win.

But even the court's most conservative members seemed troubled by the automatic rule urged in a Maryland case by Reno and the Attorney General's Joseph Cramer.

While Reno contended that she was seeking police authority for "a brief investigatory stop" of a car's occupants, Justice Anthony M. Kennedy disagreed. "This is a full-blown search," he said.

"The way an unreasonable suspicion," Justice Antonin Scalia told Reno. He then asked her whether a police officer who stops a speeding car may ask all passengers — not just the driver — if they are carrying guns.

"That might be a more difficult case," Reno said, but she indicated that officers should have the discretion.

"They are vulnerable to attack," she said.



Janet Reno

not just from the driver but from the passengers," she argued. "It's the person seated in the vehicle that creates the danger."

Cramer, who presented Reno, immediately ran into a host of questions from the bench when he suggested that police officers should be able to order all passengers out of a car and require them to remain at the curb.

"The officer has to be able to control the location of the passengers," Cramer said.

But Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, in increasingly hostile tones, inquired how long passengers can be held in the car while a driver's license and registration are checked.

O'Connor asked Cramer about the

young woman and her baby who are forced out of the car and into a dining room or a snow storm, or a driver's confused elderly parent who doesn't comprehend police orders and wanders away.

"If he doesn't understand, show him?" she asked Cramer sharply. "This could be carried to extremes, and you don't seem to recognize that there's a difference."

The court is watching personal privacy against police safety in the context of governmental demand for hundreds of more such stops across the country.

The justices must decide by July whether police who make routine traffic stops (gangs have the power to roll all passengers in and out of the car, and what authority they have to roll the passengers out in large numbers).

The court ruled in 1977 that motorists stopped for routine offenses can be ordered by police to get out of their cars. Now Maryland prosecutors and Reno are seeking to apply that decision to passengers when the car is stopped.

Under the Baltimore law, police officers can order all passengers out of their cars. The law is part of a package of legislation that also includes a law that allows police to search a car if they have a "reasonable suspicion" that the car contains a handgun. The law also allows police to search a car if they have a "reasonable suspicion" that the car contains a handgun. The law also allows police to search a car if they have a "reasonable suspicion" that the car contains a handgun.

Simon sag.

The car had three occupants, and Hughes spoke briefly to the driver while both men stood between their cars.

Hughes later recalled that Wilson, a passenger in the front seat, appeared nervous.

Wilson balked when first asked by the trooper to get out of the car. When he opened the door and stepped out, Wilson dropped a pack of crack cocaine on the ground. Hughes then arrested him.

Maryland courts refused to let prosecutors use the cocaine as evidence against Wilson, saying that Hughes violated his Fourth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures.

Officers need some "individualized and particularized suspicion" before ordering passengers out of cars in such situations, the state courts ruled.

The Clinton administration's assistance is not the only help Maryland's appeal has received. Thirty-eight states joined in a friend-of-the-court brief urging the justices to curtail police authority


Handguns in American Society



We know where they are coming from. It's under the president's Public Law 87-297 requirement.

- Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns
- Prohibiting the Primary Possession of Handguns
- Prohibiting the Manufacture of Handguns
- Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns
- Prohibiting the Primary Possession of Handguns
- Prohibiting the Manufacture of Handguns
- Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns
- Prohibiting the Primary Possession of Handguns
- Prohibiting the Manufacture of Handguns

RENO KNOWS THAT THE CAR SEARCHES ARE REQUIRED BY PAGE 340! THE WHOLE BOOK PAGE 340 CAME FROM WAS DONE UP IN HER OFFICE DURING THE DAYS OF THE ENACTMENT OF THE 1968 GUN CONTROL ACT. THE PRIMARY PURPOSE FOR SEARCHING CARS AND PEOPLE IS TO LOOK FOR GUNS.



See! I was right! Page 340
is on-going! Federal, state
and local governments are
all following its directives!

**Is it acceptable
for a nation of
free people
to allow the
communist military
from Russia,
to enter the U.S.A.
training as police officers,
searching cars and
American people?**

THE SOVIET-AMERICAN POLICE EXCHANGE PROGRAM

82 WEEK NOV. 27, 1991 A PART OF PUBLIC LAW 87-297 The Bakersfield Californian



Bill Flower, right, talks to Soviet law enforcement milliamen Sergei Soldatenkov, left, and Yuri Volobuyev

Soviet CHP cadets relish unique challenge

By ROB WALTERS
Californian staff writer

For the last three months, boys dunk to dawn, they've been learning in the classrooms before returning to the dorms to hit the books.

The two cadets admit they have to study harder than others attending the California Highway Patrol Academy in Sacramento.

That's because for the two Soviet militiamen, English is their second language.

Lt. Col. Yuri Volobuyev, 44, of Tula in the Russian Republic and Lt. Sergei Soldatenkov, 38, of St. Petersburg (formerly Leningrad), are the first two Soviet militiamen to ever attend a police academy in the United States.

"It takes us a great deal more time to learn a subject than other cadets," Volobuyev said in a rich Russian accent.

Other than that, Volobuyev says, there is little difference between him and fellow students. In fact, he says there is little difference between Soviet militiamen and American officers.

"We're doing the same job," he said. "We have the same problems."

Some problems are universal. Volobuyev said traffic jams are common in metropolitan areas, and the drunken drivers are "really a big problem in our country."

Soviet punishment for drunken drivers is stiff, Volobuyev said. First-time offenders are fined about 200 rubles — more than a half-month's salary — and they lose their licenses for a year. Second-time offenders land in prison, must pay a fine equal to 20 percent of their annual salary and lose their licenses for three years.

While the Soviet Union deals severely with drunken drivers, the United States holds the edge in resources, the militiamen said.

Computers are more widely used to aid law enforcement than in his country, Volobuyev said.

"Your highway patrol is better equipped (and) have better cars," he noted.

In addition, the Soviet "highways are in bad condition" and are "per-

ty dangerous sometimes," he said.

With the collapse of communism, more Soviets will have the chance to own cars. The two officers hope to use what they learn at the academy to turn back problems.

A year in the making, the plan to bring to Russian traffic officers to the academy belongs to Capt. Richard J. Broadfield, commander of the Bakersfield office of the CHP.

Broadfield said his primary reason for jumping through "several paper hoops" was to "enhance understanding" between officers of both countries.

"We have one common enemy," he said. "That's apprehending criminals."

The trip was arranged by Kern County Sheriff's Deputy Bill Finney, founder and director of the Soviet-American Police Exchange Program, now in its third year.

Volobuyev and Soldatenkov left the Soviet Union in the days that followed the failed coup against President Mikhail S. Gorbachev. At the academy, the militiamen have been learning about the California

courts, how to make an arrest, about search and seizure laws and enforcement techniques.

Thanksgiving marks the halfway point of their 2½-month stay. Before graduating in February, the militiamen will be given a chance to apply what they've learned in real-life situations.


As part of the curriculum, the pair are in Bakersfield for five days to observe their counterparts from the CHP, Bakersfield Police and Kern County Sheriff's Department.

While being exposed to local officers, they will "not be out making arrests," Broadfield said.

Back at the academy, the two will be out behind the wheel of U.S. made patrol cars to hone their firearms, high-speed pursuit and other tactical driving skills.

The two were selected in June from a pool of about 15 to 20 militiamen who sought the chance to come to the United States, Broadfield said. Broadfield and Finney interviewed the pair and selected them, for among other reasons, "because they are fluent in English."

GASTON GAZETTE, March 7, 1995
NORTH CAROLINA



Craig But/The Gazette

Russian Police Officer Alexey K. Gankin of Moscow directs traffic in front of Lincolnton High School.

TOUR of DUTY

Moscow police visit Gaston, Lincoln

*By Leslie Weaver
Gazette Staff Reporter*

LINCOLNTON — Greater Gaston police departments will get some extra help this week, but not from a crime bill or a federal grant.

The help will come from Russian police officers visiting Gaston, Lincoln, Mecklenburg and Catawba Counties to swap stories and ideas with their American counterparts.

The two officers visiting Gastonia — Vladimir Dedyouchin and Vladimir Morozov — have a packed schedule.

They'll attend a Gastonia City Council meeting, visit the courthouse and jail and see demonstrations by a police dog, bomb squad and SWAT team.

The Lincolnton Police Department welcomed nine Russian officers Saturday, who like their colleagues will

visit until March 12.

The Russian officers decided to come here after accepting an invitation from Lincolnton Chief Terry Burgin as part of a nationwide exchange program. Lakach had visited Moscow last May.

"There are also 300 (American) police officers working in our station in Moscow," said Ekaterina Arfeva, a Moscow patrol officer, visiting Lincolnton.



Here's a quick quiz for all the doubters who think it is O. K. for the governors to sign into law legislation that violates the Second Amendment.

Question: "Can you come up with a reason why state legislators and governors want to take away all the firearms belonging to law-abiding people?"

(Think hard now!)

Check one:

- To stop criminals from obtaining guns.**
- To reduce the power of gangs.**
- To eliminate all resistance to tyranny.**

(By now even doubters should be able to guess that Reason #3 is the correct answer.)

Why should people have guns?



Thomas Jefferson

“The strongest reason for the people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against *tyranny* in government.”

.....Thomas Jefferson





Why ask the Supreme Court to interpret the meaning of the Second Amendment? These justices were appointed to the bench by the same presidents who are in charge of the general and complete disarmament program? Besides, the purpose of the Second Amendment was interpreted over 200 years ago by the men who wrote it. Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson told the importance of all able-bodied citizens being trained in a well regulated militia as the best way to protect the people from tyranny in government. Does anyone think that they didn't understand what they were writing?

**I am
the spirit
of liberty,
of freedom,
of independence,
of self-government,
of your sovereignty,
of the pursuit of happiness,
of your right to make your own
decisions, guarded with checks and
balances. Now please, let me show you**



**the rules written to preserve in perpetuity God's endowment to you, and to your posterity, so that you can place a limit on the power others have over you, and to keep you as the ultimate power in this great republic.
Amen!**

Guns are tools - just "tools"! How can you preserve these three precious documents if the globalists take away your tools? *Hey! It simply can't be done!*




These documents contain the rules by which all public officials in the service of the United States must conform. All three documents belong exclusively to the people and none of the principles within can be altered or revoked without the consent of the governed.

BONE UP ON YOUR INHERITANCE AND
THE NATURAL LAWS THAT ARE
IMPORTANT TO YOU!



Hey, the only reason for disarming a nation is -- if they have lost a war! If you do not intend to be made defenseless, you must understand the necessary right to arms. The men who founded this nation were confirming divine laws that *already* existed. They placed them for security into a Bill of Rights. These immutable laws are beyond the power of any public officials to infringe or deny.

YOU MUST DEFEND YOUR RIGHT TO ARMS!



No interpretation by the Supreme Court members or any other public official is necessary. The Second Amendment is a confirmation of a God-given right. Those men who drafted the Second Amendment meant for it not only to protect us from invasion, but also to limit the power that man can exercise over his fellow man. The founders who wrote this Amendment, did not place anything into this shelter that did not already exist! It is a right that belongs to the people exclusively which no one can take away!



Those who drafted the Bill of Rights did not place anything for protection into this shelter that did not already exist! The right of the people to keep and bear arms existed before there ever was a Bill of Rights and a Second Amendment! The purpose of the Second Amendment was to confirm that the people already possessed the right to arms, individually and collectively, as an endowment from the Creator, and that no one would be allowed to take this right away! The Second Amendment documents a natural, inherent, and immutable right. It bars all things from taking preeminence over this endowment!



The meaning of the Second Amendment was clear from the first day in which it was demanded by the anti-federalists. There was no doubt about its meaning or its intent. Simply put, it is an individual right that can be exercised in a collective manner. At that time, it was openly stated that the strongest reason for the people to protect and retain the right to arms was to protect themselves from tyranny in government. Its authors chose language and a sentence structure to command conformity and adherence to the absolute nature of the right. They sustained it by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.

It is against the law for the Supreme Court or other public employees to "interpret" the language or the meaning of the Second Amendment, because a second Preamble, one preceding the Bill of Rights, was added which restricted any federal level interference whatsoever with its contents. It also included a declaratory element to prevail over states.

As well as being the First Ten Amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights is a separate document of its own self. This special storehouse possesses unique attributes and prerogatives of its own. By its basic nature, none of its contents can be repealed. It cannot be superseded by the treaty power, the commerce clause, executive orders or agreements, or federal or state law-making powers. Its contents are not subject to public vote nor to the outcome of any elections. No one can divest himself of these God-given rights, even if they chose to do so. The people are obligated to preserve these rights for their posterity.

THE COMMAND IN THE SECOND AMENDMENT OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

* ...the sentence means that the people are the militia... *



and it proves that the people have the right that is mentioned." ... A. C. Brocki

* * * teacher of Advanced English, a foremost expert in grammar, former Senior Editor for Houghton Mifflin.

* The Preamble to the Bill of Rights reads as follows:

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

ENGLISH USAGE EXPERT INTERPRETS SECOND AMENDMENT

By J. Neil Schulman

...the sentence means that the people are the militia.

I recently had a conversation with Mr. A.C. Brocki, editorial coordinator for the Office of Instruction of the Los Angeles Unified School District. Mr. Brocki taught Advanced Placement English at Van Nuys High School for several years, as well having been a senior editor for Houghton Mifflin. He is considered the foremost expert in grammar in the school district, the person others go to when they need a definitive answer on English grammar. I asked Mr. Brocki to parse the following sentence:

"A well-schooled electorate, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and read books, shall not be infringed."

Mr. Brocki informed me that the sentence was overpunctuated, but that the meaning could be extracted anyway.

- "A well-schooled electorate" is a nominative absolute.
- "being necessary to the security of a free state," is a participial phrase modifying "electorate."
- The subject (a compound subject) of the sentence is "the right of the people."
- "shall not be infringed" is a verb phrase,
- with "not" as an adverb modifying the verb phrase "shall be infringed."
- "to keep and read books" is an infinitive phrase modifying "right."

A. C. Brocki is a foremost expert in grammar.



I then asked him if he could re-phrase the sentence to make it clearer. He responded,

"Because a well-schooled electorate is necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and read books shall not be infringed."

I asked if the sentence could be interpreted to restrict the right to keep and read books to a well-schooled electorate, say, registered voters with a high-school diploma? He said, "No." I then identified my purpose in calling him, and read him the Second Amendment in full:

"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."

Mr. Brocki said he thought the sentence had sounded familiar, but that he hadn't recognized it.

I asked, "Is the structure and meaning of this sentence the same as the sentence I first quoted you?" He said, "yes." I asked him to re-phrase this sentence to make it clearer. He transformed it to:

"Because a well-regulated militia is necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

I asked him whether the meaning could have changed in 200 years. He said, "no." I asked him whether this sentence could be interpreted to restrict the right to keep and bear arms to "a well-regulated militia." He said, "no." According to Mr. Brocki, the sentence means that the people are the militia, and that the people have the right which is mentioned.

I asked him if another professional in English grammar or linguistics could interpret the sentence to mean otherwise. He said that he couldn't see any grounds for another interpretation. I asked him if he would be willing to stake his professional reputation on this opinion, and be quoted on this. He said, "yes." At no point in the conversation did I ask Mr. Brocki his opinion on the Second Amendment, gun control, or the right to keep and bear arms.

J. Neil Schulman is the author of *Alongside Night* (1982) and *The Rainbow Cadenza* (1983). He has recently founded the Committee to Enforce the Second Amendment. He can be reached at P.O. Box 94 Long Beach, Ca. 90801

The right to arms is not subject to repeal!



Interpreting the Meaning & Purpose of the Second Amendment

By Bernadine Smith

If you ever lose your guns, you are past history! This amendment is unrepeatable.

The framers of the Constitution were quite skillful in the use and drafting of the English Language. By putting the Militia at the forefront of the sentence which composes the Second Amendment of the Bill of Rights, they stressed the importance of the collective use of the right to arms. The collective right used in this manner, has equal status with the individual aspects of this absolute right.

When the 1787 Constitution was ready to be submitted to the governors of the states for ratification, Patrick Henry, the immortal voice for liberty, lectured daily against it in the Virginia State House for three weeks, criticizing the Constitution, warning that it has been written "or if only good men will take office!" He asked what they would do when evil men took office. "When evil men take office, the whole gang will be in collusion," he declared, "and they will keep the people in utter ignorance and steal their liberty by ambuscade!"

(Entrapment from a concealed position)

Patrick Henry asked, "What resistance could be made if the people have no guns?" ... "Your guns are gone!" ... "Your laws on treason are a sham and a mockery because of their mutual implication". Henry told the Continental Congress that a major reason for his objections to the Constitution was that "it does not leave us the means for defending our rights or waging war against tyrants!" He declared, "This Constitution will trample on your fallen liberty!" Patrick Henry warned that the new federal government was being given "too much money and too much power", and that it would end up "consolidating all power unto itself",

convert us "into one solid empire". Amongst other things, one of the areas upon which he felt the need for modification and limitation was the use of the treaty power, an area in which he predicted that "the President would lead in the treason". His fervor and graphic descriptions of "execrable tyranny" which would befall the people if they could not take arms against evil men who might take office, placed Patrick Henry in the forefront of the effort to protect the natural rights of the people. He wanted the immediate opening of another Constitutional Convention to strengthen particular parts of the Constitution. That suggestion not being workable, he proclaimed, "The least

"The strongest reason for the people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

Thomas Jefferson

you can do to guard it with a Bill of Rights!"

Young James Madison, at the time, saw no need for a Bill of Rights, since the new federal government was to exercise only those powers which were delegated to them. Patrick Henry then said, "Let Mr. Madison tell me when did liberty ever exist when the sword and the purse were given up from the people? Unless a miracle shall interpose, no nation ever did, nor ever can retain its liberty after the loss of the sword and the purse." At last,

James Madison could not ever envision the possibility of tyranny happening under this Constitution. However, Madison was later blocked from taking a seat in the first Senate. That blow to a man who had been the Secretary of the Constitutional Convention, caused Madison to re-think the probability of danger. His promise to follow through with a proposed Bill of Rights garnered support for him to take a seat in the first House of Representatives. So it was that the Bill of Rights, palladium of man's natural rights, was finalized on December 15, 1791 and it became the un-revocable and superior part of the Constitution of the United States.

Patrick Henry placed all his hopes upon the vigilance of the people of the future to protect the liberty that he helped win in the War of Independence, by their standing behind the Bill of Rights, forbidding any infringement or curtailment of not only the Second Amendment, but of the sworn oath taken "to support and defend the Constitution".

Thomas Jefferson, our Third President, supported the idea of a Bill of Rights, confirming the authority of the people by saying: "The strongest reason for the people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

May the words that Patrick Henry spoke always be heeded through all the ages to come, as he cautioned: "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!" ♦



This applies to all states

THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR ANTI-GUN LAWS TO BE VALID

The Constitution of the State of California

"The State of California is an inseparable part of the United States of America, and the United States Constitution is the supreme law of the land."

California State Constitution Article III Section 1

The California Constitution, being in full accord with the Federal Constitution, illustrates the interlocking principles by which the nation's founders permanently safeguarded their American posterity.

All California public officials are sworn to support the supreme law of the land.

The Constitution of the State of California

"I,....., do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California... that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California".

California State Constitution Article III Section 3

This Rule Book that public officials must obey is still in effect. Violation of the oath of office is an impeachable offense.

The Constitution of the United States of America

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof,.... shall be the supreme law of the land.

United States Constitution Article VI General Provisions (2)

BILL OF RIGHTS

Second Amendment

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

This is the supreme law of the land

The "Bill of Rights" is a part of the Constitution of the United States. The "Bill of Rights" cannot be repealed.

The Constitution of the United States of America

".....the members of the several state legislatures shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution..."

United States Constitution Article VI General Provisions (2)

All public officials are required to swear allegiance under oath to support and defend the principles within these Constitutions, but if they break this trust, they must be dishonorably discharged. This is the function and reason for taking an oath of office.

HOW THE SUPREME COURT HAS PARTICIPATED IN THE COLLUSION WITH THE STATES TO CONFOUND THE ISSUE

The Supreme Court is part of our trouble! If the Court wants to play the game this way, then why do they allow the federal government to create harmful gun laws???

The Supreme Court's instruction to the States:



Oh, yes! It is true that the Second Amendment applies to the federal government, but it also applies to the states as well! The Second Amendment is a part of the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights contains a Preamble which states that its contents are both declaratory and restrictive, which means that all must observe these rights as Supreme Law, and in particular, the federal government is put on notice that they are not to violate these natural laws.

How long can we put up

← with deliberate lies

that are twisting around

truthful words

so that errant public officials can operate in areas that are actually forbidden to them?

We, Americans, have never given our consent, and never will give our consent, to being divested of the keystone right that backs all of our most sacred rights!



THE SECOND AMENDMENT IS A CLEAR CUT CONFIRMATION!

There is nothing to dispute! We must stop anti-gun public officials from lying about this right!

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.

The Second Amendment is a clear cut *confirmation* of the right to keep and bear arms. The Second Amendment was built to *confirm*. No "interpretation" of this amendment by the courts was ever necessary! Today those who approve anti-gun legislation are operating against the law!

No court should be trusted to give us *their interpretation* of the meaning of the Second Amendment; nor, should we allow the untruthful claims of hired public officials to go unchallenged! *Their purpose* is to support laws calling for the complete disarmament of the nation.

The *confirmation* stated in the Second Amendment is in itself a *corroboration* of a pre-existing law that the founders wanted known and adhered to by *all*. The reason we are now being subjected to the abusive laws which are intruding upon the right of the people to keep and bear arms is that the correct thinking and the true purpose behind the writing of the Second Amendment has not been enforced.

All of the laws being written which infringe upon the right of the law-abiding people to keep and bear arms are *despicable violations of the true law*. We must make this clear to all

who serve as hired public officials. We must not honor the false proposition that "the courts have not as yet interpreted the Second Amendment". The judicial system has been compromised.

We must demand that our hired public officials obey the true sense of the Second Amendment and insist that they adhere to the correct thinking and purpose behind the drafting of it. Public officials must be required to stop *infringing and confounding* the people as to what it means.

As the time the Second Amendment was being written, it was the intention of the founders to confirm, document, and secure the right to arms that already existed. They affirmed by the language chosen that this right of the people holds individual and collective elements.

The nation's founders did not create the right -- they themselves were not giving the right to the people -- conversely, they were *confirming that the right already existed* -- a most essential and absolute right -- and that it was inextricably given to the people by the Creator. *It was only necessary for the founders to confirm the existence of*

this eternal right. This right had its existence even before any constitution was ever put to use. They purposely *forbid* any curtailment, or prohibition of the *individual* or *collective* facets by virtue of the structural language chosen for the amendment.

What we need most is for our hired public officials to stop! -- to stop muddying up the waters by putting forth ridiculous statements, claiming that the right applies to a state militia only. No! The founding fathers would not have entered a principle into law, expecting us to wait 200 years to have unfaithful global government supporters render *their interpretation* of it!

The purpose for writing the Second Amendment was to erect a barrier against future tyrants who would dare to interfere with the only tools capable of maintaining liberty. Now, what the people need is the resolve to require adherence to the amendment's true purpose, and the courage to prosecute the tyrants of today who abuse and deliberately misconstrue it.

Two avenues are open: (1) Legislative action to *repeal* anti-gun laws (there is no automatic court review in a bill of repeal) or (2) Ample support to pass the Hanford Pro-Gun Legislation.

The Bill of Rights

First Ten Amendments to the Constitution

INTRODUCTION

The Declaration of Independence is the first of those documents that established the American Republic. It is a document of great importance, and it is a document that is often cited in the history of our country.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 2 of the Constitution provides that the Congress shall not suspend the writ of habeas corpus, nor shall it pass any bill of attainder or ex post facto law.

Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides that the President shall have the right to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution provides that the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury.

Article IV, Section 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution provides that no person shall be held to answer for a crime until he has been indicted by a grand jury.

Article V, Section 4 of the Constitution provides that the President shall have the right to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

Article VI, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution provides that the Senate shall have the right to confirm and reject the appointments of the President.

Article VII, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the President shall have the right to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

Article VIII, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the President shall have the right to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

Article IX, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the President shall have the right to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

Article X, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the President shall have the right to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

Article XI, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the President shall have the right to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

THIS DOCUMENT IS MORE

PRECIOUS TO YOU THAN

THE DEED TO YOUR HOUSE.

DON'T GIVE IT UP!



The purpose of this document was to limit the power that man can exercise over his fellow man. It is the heart of your liberty! The Bill of Rights is not only a restriction on the federal government, it applies to all states as well. The Preamble to the Bill of Rights is both declaratory and restrictive. It includes all public officials because it is declaratory and censures and bans the federal government from interfering because of its restrictive element. The states are required to enforce the Bill of Rights.

The right to keep and bear arms is not "given" to us by the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights. The right to keep and bear arms is CONFIRMED by the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights. The right is an endowment from the Creator. The right to arms is a part of the common law. The United States is a common law country. The need to use arms is a part of the right of self-preservation. The right of self-preservation is the first law of nature, and an eternal right. The right of self-preservation is an absolute right. The right to arms is an absolute right. Even though governments may try to misconstrue this right, it shall go on forever since it is part of the law of nature. Alexander Hamilton had the arms rights of the people in mind when he said... "They are written, as with a sunbeam, in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of the Divinity itself; and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power." Federal Supreme court Justice Jackson said in 1943:

"The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials, and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections."

Jackson, J. West Virginia State Board of Education versus Barnette (1943 319 US 624, 638, 87 L. ed 1628, 1638. 63 S Ct 1178, 147 ALR 674)

While it is true that repeal is one of our most important judicial acts to which we have a right, the Bill of Rights itself can not be repealed. It is irrevocable. The Bill of Rights contains rights which are ordained by God. They are endowments from our Creator. They are our birthrights! No man can undo that which God has endowed!

When the Constitution was first drafted, James Madison, who was the secretary at the Constitutional Convention, was so enamored with this document that he could see no need to go on with any further additions to it. Patrick Henry warned him that they were preparing their document with the idea that only good men would take office. "What are you going to do when evil men take office?" he demanded of them. He declared that the Constitution was a "crazy machine", and that it would stomp on their fallen liberty. He insisted that a Bill of Rights was the least thing they could do to

guard against the power being given to the "monarchistic" federal government. James Madison could not see the necessity of a Bill of Rights. He felt that the federal government was being delegated only limited power which they could not exceed with all the checks and balances that were built into the system. Mr. Henry warned that "When evil men take over, the whole gang will be in collusion. They will keep the people in utter ignorance and steal their liberty by ambuscade." (Ambuscade means from a concealed position.)

To make Madison realize how serious it would be to proceed with the Constitution as it was, without a Bill of Rights, Madison was deliberately blocked from obtaining a seat in the first Senate, a position which he had longed for.

Hadn't Patrick Henry lectured for 20 days in the Virginia Statehouse over the weaknesses in the Constitution? On one occasion he struck out at Madison and said: "Let Mr. Madison tell me, when did liberty ever exist when the sword and the purse were given up from the people? Unless a miracle shall interpose, no nation ever did, nor ever can, retain its liberty after the loss of the sword and the purse."

"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!" Mr. Henry warned.

George Mason, Thomas Jefferson, Elbridge Gerry, Richard Henry Lee, among others, stood with Patrick Henry in his efforts to require a Bill of Rights. Mason declared that he would rather do without his right arm than to continue on without a Bill of Rights!

At this point the seats in the Senate were all gone. Young Madison's thinking was forced to broaden into additional expectations. He finally agreed to the need for a Bill of Rights. Trusting in his sincerity, no one blocked him from obtaining a seat in the newly forming House of Representatives. There he carried through with his promise to bring forth a Bill of Rights.


All who contributed to the drafting of the Bill of Rights did not place anything into this shelter that did not already exist! The amendments within confirm the existence of natural rights. These are the highest of laws and yet the most endangered! Without the right to keep and bear arms, individually and collectively, being included, any other rights in the Bill of Rights would not have been self-sustainable. Arms are the keystone that backstops all of the other rights. It was intended to secure and maintain the people's superiority over their hired public assistants, and to protect them against tyranny and treasonous acts within the government. Government was never intended to possess greater force than the force which the people themselves possessed.

Preservation of our Constitutional Compact, maintaining the perpetual nature of the Bill of Rights, providing security to a free state, maintaining a well regulated militia of respectful citizen soldiers, and preventing tyranny in government are obligations of the people themselves which they cannot entrust to government officials. The Second Amendment is the only Amendment that possesses the necessary force to make these objectives possible. The Second Amendment is sustained by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.

The right of the people to keep and bear arms cannot be repealed. It was meant to be beyond the reach of the treaty making power, beyond the reach of the commerce clause, beyond the reach of executive orders or presidential agreements, and beyond the reach of federal or state law-making powers. The Bill of Rights consists of immutable law that no man can put asunder.




These documents contain the rules by which all public officials in the service of the United States must conform. These two documents belong exclusively to the people. None of the principles within can be altered or revoked without the consent of the governed.



← This instrument guards you against *the loss* of your authority over your public officials, and sustains your right to limit the power that they can exercise over you.

This instrument → guards against *the loss of liberty* and forbids public officials from interfering with these, your most endangered rights and essential needs.



The people do not have to give up their armed forces and their firearms! What is happening is without their consent, and is being done behind their backs. It is not valid.




Speak Out

Against

Disarmament

This fact is as old as
the Revolutionary War:
You've got to have one in,
order to have the other two!



Public opinion has been manipulated. The only way the
people will retain their sovereignty is by having guns!
Only free people have guns! Are you listening to the
manipulators call the best defensive weapons that good
men own "assault weapons"?

Listen folks,



GET THIS STRAIGHT!

ONCE AND FOR ALL!

Good men do not have

assault weapons.



...but there are
**ASSAULT
LAWS!**

"One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown," ..GEORGE WASHINGTON IN HIS FAREWELL ADDRESS OF 1796

More than ever before in American history, law-abiding people need to be armed, but because of the awesome predominance of public officials in the United States, programmed to vote against firearms, legislatures are passing more and more restrictive firearms bills as "law". The result is that the law-abiding people are becoming less and less able to retain their basic rights, fulfill their responsibilities to secure the state, and defend society against men of evil intent.

Good people are being treated the same as those who are admitted criminals. All are to be disarmed as the legislators engage in an engineered war against their own respectable fellow citizens. Meanwhile, men of the most evil intent, go free.

Good arms are being classified under false titles, and are being banned as "assault weapons". The real truth behind this smear campaign to vilify arms is a devious master plan to render the whole nation completely disarmed. The plan includes transferring the nation's armed forces to commanders from foreign countries. (Reference: Public Law 87-297 United States Code Books Title 22 Section 2551, etc.)

Law-abiding people do not own "assault weapons". Theirs are weapons of defense. They have the right and the duty to possess the best weapons available in order to defend against the criminal element of our society. They must at all times be able to defend against invasion by the enemies of the United States. Disarming the people will impair the energy of the entire system. It will transform the nation from a republic to a full dictatorship overnight. Crime and "public safety" have been used as excuses to cover up the real reasons for divesting the people of items essential to their well being.

Restricting law-abiding people from arms is an assault to the Constitutional system, as well as being an assault upon the sovereignty of the people. If these "assault laws" are not removed and rescinded, they will be responsible for fatally undermining the system.

Whether they will admit it or not, legislators who vote to pass anti-gun "laws" (devious acts called "laws") are guilty of altering the American system of government. The people are the ultimate power in the American system of government only if they remain as armed citizens. Arms are the only tools by which they are able to maintain their liberty. If they lose their arms, they will lose their sovereignty. Liberty will be lost and a dictatorship will take its place.


George Washington warned of the consequences in allowing public officials to make assaults upon the system of government when he stated in his Farewell Address: "One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown."

Isn't it time for law makers to start writing real laws and to stop assaulting the Constitutional system?



These two are violating more than one supreme law of the land. The laughing they do is because the people are so easy to fool.

NEW YORK POST, SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1994



No, Hillary, ah didnt think so at first, but then, ah saw how little they knew about their own government, and all their safeguards. Then, I realized we had 'em!

Looking back on it all, Bill, didja' ever think it was going to be that easy to get the guns away from the people?



Gunowners! Keep in mind that the Founding Fathers left you, your rights and liberty, well defended against tyranny from the likes of those above.

Oath of office, & the absolute right of the people to keep and bear arms, individually & collectively.



MAY I HAVE YOUR ATTENTION, PLEASE?

This is dynamite news!

Highly important!



A detective in San Diego, California has put together an article exposing how socialist/communist public officials have been forcing mind-bending techniques upon our local police, and training the rookies for a militarized communist replacement for our former law enforcement system. The article is written by Phillip Worts. His article puts the pieces together and exposes how Marxists tactics are being used to change the performance of American law enforcement officials.

Up to now even our older police officers have not been able to explain the changes and operational alterations that have been forced upon them, but with this expose by Detective Phillip Worts all the pieces fall into place for the benefit of police officers as well as those of us researchers who have been tracking the subversion emanating from the smoky corridors in Washington, D.C.

Worts shows how Communist strategies have been revived, redefined, and implemented for the purpose of controlling the American people.

You already know what they have done to the teachers in our schools, who are forced to practice techniques which mind control the thinking of the young. You have also seen how the courts and the law-making bodies push subversive legislation which our president and governors willingly sign into "law". Now you will have a bona fide expose on what is happening to those in law enforcement.

I strongly urge you to go to the following web site for Detective Phillip Worts' well written article:

<http://www.crossroad.to/articles2/Community-Policing.htm>

Make a copy of this article and take it to those you trust in law enforcement. Many police officers know something is wrong, but they don't know how to explain it. Worts' article is so clear-cut! If we can wake up this important segment of our governmental system, and get law enforcement to stand with us instead of against us, we will have reached a turning point against the new world order. If we fail to do this now, we will lose major support when it comes to enforcing New Jersey Representative Rush Holt's bad gun bill H.R. 124. There is a lot more to say on this subject, but I think you will value the information you will find on the web site.

If you desire, I can fax over to you his article with the underlining and marginal notes I did on my copy. It runs about 10 pages as I will include a copy of Maureen Heaton's article entitled "Participatory Democracy". The latter is also found on my web site (www.libertygunrights.com) under the category entitled "Federal State Collusion". My phone number is 559 584 5209. Whatever you do -spread the word heavily about Worts' article.

Some of you researchers are familiar with the technique called "Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System" (PPBS). This was the prototype that was first introduced into both the schools and general government, forced by the Office of Management and Budget, during the late 60's. It is also based upon a predetermined marxist outcome. It gets its momentum from the federal block grant programming.

Contact me if you have any questions. We could turn the tables on the global internationalists that are holding down the seats and the presidency in our government!

Remember Lincoln once said: "You can fool some of the people, *all* of the time, and *all* of the people, some of the time, but you can't fool *all* of the people *all* of the time!" Much credit goes to Phillip Worts for assembling a great article!

Sincerely hoping you will follow through, and spread the word, yours truly,

SOVIETIZATION OF OUR POLICE

Phillip Worts shows how Communist strategies have been revived, redefined and are now being used to control the American people:

“Communist Oriented Policing?”

©2000 Phillip Worts, Detective San Diego Police Department



There is a myth that communism is dead and that the cold war is over. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The problem is that few people today understand what communism really is and just where the cold war battle lines are actually drawn. Crack open a dictionary and look up the term “Dialectical Materialism.” You should find something like this:

“A philosophy founded by Karl Marx... which forms the basis of Communist doctrine: it combines the materialistic idea of matter over mind with the Hegelian dialectic in which opposing forces are constantly being reunited at a higher level.” – Lexicon Webster Dictionary

But that definition might beg the question, “What is the Hegelian dialectic?” For modern man, the answer to that question is epic. The Hegelian dialectic has profoundly impacted the world in which you live.

What is communism?

The Dialectic: Fomenting the Revolution

The concept of the dialectic has been around for a long time. It is simply that of opposite positions: Thesis (position) vs. Antithesis (opposite position). In traditional logic, if my thesis was true, then all other positions were by definition untrue. For example, if my thesis is $2 + 2 = 4$, then all other answers (antithesis) are false. Georg W.F. Hegel, the nineteenth century German philosopher, turned that concept upside down by equalizing Thesis and Antithesis. All things are now relative. There is no such thing as absolute truth to be found anywhere. Instead, “truth” is found in Synthesis, a compromise of Thesis and Antithesis. This is the heart and soul of the consensus process.

This is diametrically opposed to the Judeo-Christian world-view prevalent in the Western world for the better part of two millennia that held that God existed, that He existed outside of the material creation and that man had a moral obligation to Him and His laws. God was transcendent and thus truth was absolute and transcendent, outside of our ability to manipulate it. This all changed with Hegel and modern man was born. Man could not challenge any authority and position, even God. Since there is no such thing as absolute truth, “my truth” is just as good as “your truth”, so don’t tell me what to think or how to behave. As Nietzsche, the “God is Dead” philosopher, would later say, “There is absolutely no absolute.” Now $2 + 2$ can equal 5,

or 17, or whatever you feel is right. (Hint: This is why our schools are failing. All teachers are certified on Benjamin Bloom's work. He said "...we recognize the point of view that truth and knowledge are only relative and that there are no hard and fast truths which exist for all time and all places").

At about the same time that Hegel was passing from the scene, Karl Marx caught the revolutionary fever. He drew heavily from Hegel (the dialectic) and Feuerbach (materialism). He picked up where the other philosophers left the discussion, but with a twist. He scornfully stated, *"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways. The point, however, is to change it."* To CHANGE the WORLD was to become the warp and woof of Marxism. In the Marxian interpretation of reality, God had been abandoned. Alone in his universe, man was to fill the vacuum left by religion with materialism. Religion was the enemy of all progress. As he wrote in 1843, *"Religion is the opium of the people."* No longer bound to a relationship with his Creator, the social relationship of "man to man" became the principle of Marx's theory. It followed that these social relationships, which necessarily involve conflict, cause the changes in human progress. As the opening words of the Communist Manifesto announce: *"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles."* Note the dialectic reasoning: the clash of opposites produces synthesis and change. Man, freed from religious restraints will carry the revolution (change via conflict) forward until all are equal in a man made utopia on earth. To that end, the Manifesto concludes, *"Working men of all countries, unite!"*

To summarize Marxism:

- It is Dialectical Materialism, or, in simpler terms: a God-expunged human reasoning process.
- **REVOLUTION** is its goal, to "change the world", Marx said.
- The **CHANGE** is to be from a Theistic World View (Old World Order) to a Humanistic World View (New World Order). The term New World Order was a popular euphemism for world communism for years. Conspiracy kooks did not invent it. When it started to take on negative connotations, it was dropped for the nicer sounding label, Global Governance.
- Change is to occur through **CONFLICT**, (Crisis/Problems/Issues).

The Cold War. Where is the battlefield?

Change Happens: The Re-culturing of America

Even as the worldwide communist revolution got underway in earnest around the globe, a rift was forming within Marxist intellectual circles. Around the turn of the century there was a growing trend within this movement that a better way to change the world is not abruptly and violently at the point of a bayonet, (traditional Marxist revolution), but rather it should be done slowly and incrementally by transforming individuals and their cultural institutions. Then you

can control a country as effectively as if you conquered it militarily. In fact, this method is preferred because one does not have to rebuild bombed out cities and dig all those mass graves!

The home for this new wave of dialectical Marxist thinking became the emerging "science" of socio-psychology. It may come as a surprise to many to discover that virtually all of the pillars of modern psychology were humanistic utopians who believed that there is no God, that mankind can and should be manipulated (for its own good, of course), and that all social problems can be solved by the proper reprogramming of man's mind. This would lead to an era of peace and prosperity based on diversity, tolerance and unity. Most of their work dealt with the details of human behavior, but their over-arching view was that of transforming society (echo the revolution). Hence, they came to be known as "Transformational Marxists".

One such group was the Fabian Socialists, who took their name from the Roman general, Fabius. Fabius, it will be remembered, was confronted with Hannibal's invasion of Italy. Hannibal with his elephants held the advantage of superior forces, but was far from home and supplies. Instead of confronting his foe head on, a battle he would have certainly lost, Fabius utilized hit-and-run tactics. Harassing his enemy and wearing him down incrementally piece-by-piece over time until Hannibal capitulated, Fabius won the war. The Fabian Socialists adopted this strategy in their goal of world socialism. In a similar vein, the transformational Marxists advocated a "slow march through the institutions," as famous Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci would say. Gramsci's theories cannot be overstated in this regard, as this strategy has become synonymous with his name. The Gramsci Strategy is the "War of Position", (i.e. the battle ground is for the mind and culture) vs. the "War of Maneuver", (i.e. traditional battlefield warfare with guns and bombs). Gramsci engendered the anger of his communist counterparts in Moscow when he basically told them they were doing it all wrong. Gramsci died in prison under Mussolini's regime, but his strategy has become the strategy for changing society. [1]

Meanwhile, in Germany, a group of some 21 Marxist socio-psychologists gathered in Frankfurt and formed the Institute of Marxist Research. Perhaps that was a little too obvious for their opponents and they renamed it the Institute for Social Research. When Hitler rose to power, most of these men fled to America and continued their work here. Kurt Lewin, J.L. Moreno, Theodor Adorno, Erik Fromm, Max Horkheimer and others found positions in American universities and had their work funded by pro-Marxist foundations.

Kurt Lewin is of special interest for this discussion because it was he who went to M.I.T. and conducted the research involving group dynamics that laid the foundation for Total Quality Management. At the risk of oversimplifying how the process of group dynamics works, it could be summarized as a method of belief and behavior modification, using dialectic-reasoning skills (remember, all truth is relative), in a group setting. It utilizes the inherent fear an individual person has of being alienated from the group. By use of a change agent, or "facilitator" [2], individuals are herded toward "consensus" by compromising their position for the sake of "social harmony." According to Lewin,

"A successful change includes, therefore, three aspects: UNFREEZING the present level, MOVING to the new level, and FREEZING group life on the new level." [3]

This is precisely the technique with which the communists brainwashed American POWs, the only difference being they could accelerate the “unfreezing” phase with physical torture.[4] In group dynamics the pain is not physical, it’s emotional. Do not underestimate the force of emotional pain. POW’s frequently described their long periods in isolation as worse than some of the most brutal physical torture. Isolation from the group is a powerful behavior modification weapon. Transformational Marxists such as Kurt Lewin refined their weapon for the new battlefield: Using group dynamics to invade the culture to affect the paradigm shift.

The weapon looks like this:

- A Diverse Group (“Diversity” needed for conflict)
- Dialoging to Consensus (Dialectic process)
- Over a Social Issue (Problem/Crisis/Issues)
- In a Facilitated Meeting (Controlled environment using facilitator/change agent)
- To a Predetermined Outcome (Paradigm shift)

The Marxist Trojan Horse



TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT *

TQM is an organizational transformation strategy that uses:

- Group Dynamics
- Facilitator/Change Agents (“Strategic Planning” occurs in councils)
- “Problem Solving”
- Systems Management (ISO 9000) ← *The P.F.B.S.*

Decoding the term “Total Quality Management” is impossible without an understanding of the Marxist foundation upon which it was built. I use the word “decoding” because so many of the dialectic concepts are masked by nice sounding double-talk.

The Process

{

TOTAL = Holistic, Gestalt, Global
QUALITY[5] = People. (Also slang, short for TQM systems in general, e.g. “We have a Quality organization”).
MANAGEMENT = The facilitators, the agents of change.

With this background we arrive at our current application of the dialectic in our nation. I would like to now focus on the role that your local law enforcement agency has in the “re-

culturing of America.” Your local beat cop has a special part to play, and he doesn’t even realize it. Not only has TQM change agents restructured many of the police departments in America, they are now in a position to turn the police themselves into the facilitators of the community through a program called COPs, or Community Oriented Policing. COPs is a federally funded program administered through the U.S. Department of Justice. What is COPs? The most succinct definition I found was in a DJ brochure:

COMMUNITY POLICING WHAT IS IT?

*Shift in philosophy about police duties vs. community responsibilities to a team concept of **TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT** of the community. Reidentifying the police role as a **FACILITATOR** in the community. (Emphasis mine).*

Translation: Transformation from a constitutionally empowered local police force performing their duty to keep the peace to that of a change agent working within the community to affect a Marxist paradigm shift. Pay close attention to what the influential German Marxist Georg Lukacs had to say about who the facilitators are in the community: “The institutions in socialist society which act as the facilitators between the public and private realms are the Soviets. They [facilitators] are the congresses [diverse groups], which facilitate the debate [dialoguing to consensus] of universal problems [social issues] in the context of the everyday.”^[6]

- *Leaders of the community (law enforcement, government, business, education, health, civic, non-profit, medical, religious, etc.) collaborating to identify problems in the community, what the significant impact on people will be, and suggesting solutions to those problems. (This is POP, or Problem Oriented Policing. See footnote.)*^[7]
- *Identifying common ground, where all factions of a community can work together for the **COMMON GOOD** of the community in a broader problem-solving approach. Forming a partnership between police and the rest of the community where each is accountable to each other and the community as whole. (Emphasis mine. End of COPs definition).*

Note the reference to the “common good”, the ever-present ideal in the communist state. Individual rights become subordinated to the so-called greater good. This raises serious concern over the role of the police officer in society as a “partner” with community groups and social service programs, which due to the blurring of lines of responsibility, are unaccountable to the public [voters].

To further understand the philosophy of COPs, one does not have to look further than the late socio-psychologist Dr. Robert Trojanowicz. Formerly the director of the National Center for Community Policing at the University of Michigan, he is considered the father of Community Oriented Policing.

Consider the following selections from his writings:

*"Social control is most effective at the individual level. **THE PERSONAL CONSCIENCE IS THE KEY ELEMENT** in ensuring self-control, refraining from deviant behavior even when it can be easily perpetrated. "[8]*

"The family, the next most important unit affecting social control, is obviously instrumental in the initial formation of the conscience and in the continued reinforcement of the values that encourage law abiding behavior. "[9]

This is an astonishing admission of the fundamental dynamics of crime prevention and social disorder. The most conservative thinkers alive today couldn't have better articulated what makes for domestic tranquility in any society. Our founding fathers were keenly aware of this fact. James Madison cited the fact that our form of limited government is "wholly inadequate" without personal conscience as the internal social control. So then, in an effort to solve America's moral chaos, we are going to restore the personal conscience by encouraging accountability to a higher authority (ten commandments) and strengthening the family, right? Don't be silly, says Dr. Trojanowicz.

"Unfortunately, because of the reduction of influence exerted neighbors, the extended family and even the family, social control is now often more dependent on external control, than on internal self-control. "[10]

Oh, darn, he says. Since that "unfortunate" breakdown of conscience and the family structure, the social order is now dependent on "external control". Read that, "The State". Unfortunately indeed! Dr. Trojanowicz ponders the dilemma of the current state of affairs in his paper *Community Policing and the Challenge of Diversity*:

"In addition to raising questions (dialectic reasoning questions all absolutes) about our national identity, increasing diversity also raises questions about how we define American 'values' and 'morality.' (Absolute values of right and wrong vs. relative values). Many strongly held traditional beliefs derive from Judeo-Christian traditions, blended with faith in the intrinsic virtues of family and the American Dream of the United States as a meritocracy where those who are willing to work hard will succeed. Can this model encompass the experience of the growing number of Muslims, Hindus and Buddhists among us? (What, Muslims Hindus and Buddhists aren't willing to work hard?) Does it reflect sufficient sensitivity to the concerns of people of color, women and gays? "[11]

Got that? Traditional Judeo-Christian beliefs (with their absolute truths and morals) are out, diversity and relative values are in. If we are not to restore the personal conscience and the family, what is his solution? He continues:

*"The community of interest generated by crime, disorder and fear of crime becomes the goal to allow community policing officer an *entree* into the geographic community. "[12]*

If you did not fall out of your chair with that line, you weren't paying attention. Social chaos is the GOAL for the transformational Marxist. The crisis of crime and disorder is the door for the police officer as facilitator/change agent to enter the community (the "client", or the latest term, "customer") [13] and to initiate the paradigm shift! Even though these social architects plainly admit what is most vital in making for a crime free community, they have absolutely no intention of restoring "individual conscience" or going back to repairing the traditional family. On the contrary, for the past sixty years these socio-psychologists have been introducing these very dialectic concepts into our school system with the intent on demolishing personal conscience. Is there any doubt they have succeeded? For them, there is no going back:

"They (Americans) may not yet recognize that there is no 'going back to basics' in education." *Training manual for Goals 2000.*

"If 'Equality of Opportunity' is to become a part of the American Dream, the traditional family must be weakened." *Socio-psychologist James Coleman.*

"In order to effect rapid change, one must mount a vigorous attack on the family lest the traditions of present generations be preserved." *Socio-psychologist Warren Bennis in his book, The Temporary Society. Bennis' book "Leaders", was recommended reading at one time when one was promoted to sergeant on the S.D.P.D., wherein he identifies the leaders in any organization as "agents of change".*

Dr. Trojanowicz admits in no uncertain terms that is what his research is all about:

"It should also be noted that the continuing interest in finding a viable definition for the term community has not merely been an intellectual exercise. The theme underlying much of the research is that once you can identify a community, you have discovered the primary unit of society ABOVE the level of the individual and the family that can be mobilized to take concerted action to bring about POSITIVE SOCIAL CHANGE." [14]

Just in case you doubt the Marxist nature of their concepts of community transformation, Trojanowicz quotes Saul Alinsky, the extreme Marxist change agent of the '60's who authored *Rules for Radicals*. Alinsky proposed "we begin viewing community through the prism of issues (Issues-problems-crisis-conflict) which, in essence, constitutes the most urgent kind of community of interest. [15]

"What community policing does is put an officer in daily face-to-face contact with the community, so that he or she can have the input of the community in setting priorities. Unlike police programs of the past where police administrators or so-called community leaders set the police agenda, the community policing movement encourages average citizens to become involved. [16]

Formerly, the police administrators were accountable to the elected officials who were accountable to the voters (representative democracy). This new paradigm that Trojanowicz describes is exactly what Marxist Georg Lukacs termed "participatory democracy" and is nothing more than the Soviet style council. The United States Constitution was the law of the land (absolute authority) restraining government intrusion into the rights of the individual. The framers designed it to insulate the private realm (the individual) from the public realm (government). Allow me to repeat Lukacs:

"The institutions in socialist society which act as the facilitators between the public and private realms are the Soviets."

By practicing the dialectic, we are removing the only barrier between a tyrannical government and the private citizen. Your neighborhood cop is now that facilitator, the Soviet. Why a police officer?

"In the role of the community ombudsman/liaison (i.e. facilitator), the community policing officer also acts as the community's link to other public agencies. The police are the only governmental agency open 24 hours a day, which makes them the ideal public agent to begin regenerating community spirit." (17)

The Soviet:

A Diverse Group

Dialoging to Consensus

Over a Social Issue

In a Facilitated Meeting

To a Predetermined Outcome

Conclusion: Useful idiots?

When Lenin was consolidating the Bolshevik revolution, he wrote how he would implement the communist bureaucracy without hardcore Marxist believers. While the elite rulers of his inner circle understood the structure he was building, Lenin said he would exploit the natural vanity and ambition of people to forward his agenda without them knowing what they were really doing. Eager to gain his favor and to enhance their political careers, they would fall all over themselves trying to promote his agenda. He called these types of people "Useful Idiots." Before you brand every police officer you see as an undercover Marxist, understand that most of them comprehend little of what they are participating in. In reality, most officers intuitively know that something is wrong in their organization, but they play the game rather than risk damaging their career. Sadly, they constitute a vast army of "useful idiots."

I'm all for "promoting mutual trust" and "cooperation between the people and the police" and "empowering neighborhoods." These "positive social changes" are the selling points for

Community Policing. But in reality, these appealing ideals camouflage the vehicle of Marxist change.

Who asked the citizenry if they wanted their communities “transformed” and their government “reinvented?” Who asked parents if they wanted their children to learn with their feelings instead of learning facts? Who asked your local police officers if they wanted their beliefs and attitudes manipulated? No one asked because if someone did, they would have been run out of town. Instead, using dialectic-reasoning skills, they have schemed to seduce, deceive and manipulate every community in the land into a utopian vision of so-called “unity in diversity.” These social engineers have no intention of taking America back to individual conscience within the family structure in order to preserve domestic peace and tranquility. That would mean a return to recognizing and submitting to the Higher Authority. This “vision” has failed whenever it has been tried. By participating in the dialectic, we have deified human reason; traded in God and truth for relative values and consensus; and abandoned individual liberty and inalienable rights for the common good and diversity. In the final analysis, we are destined for Totalitaria and worse, the loss of our souls.

The terms “communism”, “socialism”, “Marxism”, “New World Order” etc., may be worn out and abandoned. The names change, because deception is one of the rules of the game. Many erroneously believe that the cold war is over and that we actually won. But the revolution is still very much alive and America is losing. The culture war is raging in our schools, our workplaces, our media and our churches. Antonio Gramsci would be very pleased if he could see just how effective his strategy has been.

Contact Phillip Worts at Xmarksxspot@aol.com

Endnotes:

[1] A certain governor from Arkansas attended the Gramsci Institute in Italy.

[2] In early works from the '40s and '50s such as Kenneth Benne's *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*, Warren Bennis's *Planning of Change and Planned Change* by Ron Lippitt, they frequently refer to those helping bring about change as “change agents” or “agents of change”. The “change agents” eventually were referred to simply as “Facilitators”, from the word *Facile* that means to guide and make easy.

[3] Kurt Lewin, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*, p.34 (I recently attended training sponsored by the COPs program, “Facilitation Skills for Law Enforcement”, which was a crude re-hash of Kenneth Benne's book on organizational change. It prominently features Lewin's material).

[4] Socio-psychologists Edgar Schien and Warren Bennis studied how the communists brainwashed POW's so they could apply their techniques “humanely” in American classrooms.

[5] Antonio Gramsci categorizes objects, things that can be reproduced, as quantity. “Quality” he says, “should be attributed to men, not to things...” *Prison Notebooks* p.308. If that sounds like convoluted reasoning, that's because it is!

[6] Georg Lukacs, *The Process of Democratization*, p.46. Soviet can mean an individual, someone who practices the dialectic, or a political system. In Russia, the soviet system consists of a hierarchy of councils, from the local

level all the way to the top echelon, the Supreme Soviet Council. In this context, the *soviet* is the system, particularly the local council.

[7] Problem Oriented Policing (POP) was supposedly "invented" by Dr. Herman Goldstein. But the "problem solving techniques" embodied in POP were laid out by Lewin in the 1940's and is simply a rip-off of one aspect of TQM.

[8] Dr. Robert Trojanowicz, The National Center for Community Policing, University of Michigan, The Meaning of "Community" in Community Policing, p.2

[9] *Ibid*

[10] *Ibid*

[11] Dr. Trojanowicz, Community Policing and the Challenge of Diversity, p.2

[12] Trojanowicz, The meaning of "Community" in Community Policing, p.3

[13] In *Planned Change*, by Ron Lippitt, the organization or individual that is targeted for change is the "client", as if he were a "consumer" of the change agent's services. I think "victim" more accurately describes the recipient of such "service." The San Diego Police Department recently opened a new division entitled The Business Center. The concept is right out of Lippitt's work. The police dept.'s "customers" are "consumers" of police services.

[14] Trojanowicz, The meaning of "Community" in Community Policing, p.4, emphasis added

[15] *Ibid*, p.9


[16] *Ibid*, p.9

[17] *Ibid*, p.10, emphasis added

TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT

* In the United States this method has long ago been put into practice by the Office of Management and Budget (O.M.B.). The overall method being used is called by an innocent sounding name: "Planning, Programming and Budgeting System" (P.P.B.S.). O.M.B. controls the federal block grants given to communities. Grants come with federal "strings" attached.

THE MILITARIZATION OF UNITED STATES CIVILIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT UNDER INTERNATIONAL UNIFIED COMMAND



**THE BUILDING OF THE "RAPID RESPONSE MECHANISM" --
LONG DESIRED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
IN THEIR QUEST FOR "NEW WORLD ORDER" MANAGEMENT.**

The obvious encroachment of the United Nations into U.S. sovereignty makes it imperative that the U.S. should withdraw from the United Nations as soon as possible. Call your State Governor and demand action.

* Press Release #6397 issued July 14, 1997.

** The U.N. has already been given control to set standards for U.S. jails.

*** Public Administration Clearing House -- 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois under Rockefeller dominance.

**** Nat'l. Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals & Law Enforcement Assistance Administration restructured nation for militarized police.

Drawn by Bernadine Smith,

Not a government issued diagram.

WHEN LEADERS LEAD BY POLLSTERS POLLS

CLOSE-UP VIEW



VIEW FROM AFAR



The Commander-in-chief steers the U.S.S. Constitution into the New World Order



Check the date! See how far back they have been planning this!

WORLD TROOP MAP



WORLD GOVERNMENT PLAN - ALIEN TROOPS TO POLICE U.S.A.

Dead Zone maps to be retained:

Zone 12: Australia	Zone 28: Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia	Zone 78: India, Nepal, Bhutan, Tibet, E. Pakistan	Zone 88: East SSR, Tajikistan, Uzbek, Tadzhik, English SSR
Zone 22: Uruguay, Argentina	Zone 74: India, Nepal, Bhutan, Tibet, E. Pakistan	Zone 84: East SSR, Tajikistan, Uzbek, Tadzhik, English SSR	
Zone 32: Yugoslavia, Congo, Albania, Romania, Bulgaria			

This map, adopted in 1952 by the World Association of Free Nations for World Government, shows what alien troops would occupy and police the regions into which the United States and Canada would be divided.

The ruling body or World Parliament would consist only of appointed members. It would reflect population strength in Asia would dominate it.

There would be a World Division 2 into divisions and 51 regional divisions. Most of the units or regional divisions would now seem to their own interests. So an alien would command troops stationed in the U.S. and through them enforce World Government law, and prevent Americans from "plundering behind us-wardly." "United States."

We are indebted to the National Economic Council of New York City for the above map and the research involved. The reader can readily see that ten years ago the international conspirators against our national sovereignty devised a plan for policing the world under a World Government military dictatorship.

Please observe that the United States, according to their plan, will be policed by Russians, Columbians, Venezuelans, Belgians, Irish and Mexicans. No native Americans will be allowed to police American citizens.


It is difficult to believe that the U. S. Government under Mr. Kennedy and his Secretary of State Dean Rusk has presented almost an identical plan to the Geneva Conference for approval. An official document, No. 7227, issued by the State Department outlines a plan to disarm the U.S.A. completely and put us under a World Government military dictatorship run by the United Nations.

This is the same world troop map. Look it over. It has more information than the other one.



**5 Figure references are to the map accompanying with notes as to exact delineations of Zone and Region Lines.

PROPOSED POLICE DISTRICTS - ONE-WORLD GOVERNMENT



**10 Directors will receive unlimited travel facilities on all scheduled air services throughout the World.

**15 The World Organization system of security comes into force forthwith. Troop movements will be coordinated by the Commander World Security Forces."

**16 Detail of World Security Land Forces and their initial locations is given below"

Government to raise divisions	Initial Location (zones)	Initial HQ
Mongolia	61	Com FF
Eire	62	PC
Belgium	63	SW
USSR	64	Southern
Colombia, Yanes	65	Atlan
Siam, Burma		
Mal, Annamese	67	Car
		Mexico City
		Sacramento
		Madison
		Mobile
		Williamsport
		Havana

**20 The remaining armed land forces of all nations, unions and commonwealths will be disbanded and personnel absorbed into industry and agriculture."

**21 Ships, personnel and equipment whatsoever of national, union or commonwealth sea forces will be reallocated as required by the Commander Sea Security. The remainder will be disposed of under orders issuing from the World Organization."

**22 Sea bases and areas necessary for him to effect sea security and the free movement of shipping through canals and straits will be nominated by and handed over to the World Organization, if necessary on lease from the owner nation."

**23 Personnel and planes of all national, union or commonwealth air forces whatsoever will be incorporated within the World Organization scheme for air security and will move under the direction of the Commander Air."

**24 Permanent installations and airfields necessary for him to effect his plan will be handed over, on lease if required, to the World Organization."

**25 The Undersea Command will operate under the orders of their Commander as from time to time appointed. The Commander Undersea will take over underwater craft and paraphernalia whatsoever from Governments. He will use this as required in his plan and dispose of the remainder as ordered."

"27 Research and development projects for the furtherance of scientific discovery and invention will be coordinated by the Commander Research and Development Section. All scientific research establishments and equipment whatsoever will be handed over to the World Organization by whom co-ordination in effort will be made."

"28 All personnel of the World Security Forces are professional. The retiring age for officers is 57, rank service is 15-22 years."

"29 To ensure even flow of standardizing commodities the following raw materials and utility will come forthwith within the directional scope of the World Organization:

- (a) Petroleum
- (b) Metals and commodities newly described as strategic materials.
- (c) Shipping completed and in the sea."

"30 All trade agreements between Governments and their plans for future development of basic needs will be co-ordinated by the World Organization"

AB: "Task Force" January 1955 as published and distributed by "Defenders of the American Constitution, Inc.". Map showing police districts reprinted in American Legion magazine May 1955.)

"ONE-WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT" THE PLAN IN OUTLINE "(For World Government by 1955)"

"That the existing organization of the United Nations under the terms of its Charter specifically retains and safeguards the sovereignty of National States and envisages the continuance of armed forces as instruments for the enforcement of their will.

"It is necessary, therefore, to amend the Charter. Amendment is, however, impossible without the unanimous consent of the Great Powers."

Note: The Great Powers (Five) are to be Great Britain, France, U.S.S.R., China and the United States. (18th 43 - 47 - 75, 1951)

"(1) We propose, therefore, that another World Organization should be created to replace UNO with membership open to all the nations of the world who are willing to forego national sovereignty in order to achieve peace. This organization would, in effect, be the World Government."

"We propose that the United Kingdom should be divided into four separate multi-member constituencies: England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales."

"It is intended that a similar plan should be simultaneously put into action in every other country of the world"

"It is obvious that the creation of a World Government cannot be postponed until every nation in the world has ratified the Charter; such a delay will perpetrate a veto. Hence one of the clauses of the Charter of World Government will, it is anticipated, contain some such provision as the following:

"When 50 percent of the nations of the world, or the nations representing 50 per cent of the peoples of the world, have ratified this Charter, the Legislative Authority herein described shall be deemed to be set up."

"It is impossible to foresee what form the World Government will assume, But it is likely that the following powers at least will in any event still have to be contained in the authority of World Government.

"(1) A monopoly of armed forces to be used as a world police force. Participating States to be deemed to the level of their internal policing commitments.

"(2) The establishment of a World Bank for the purpose of creating a common linked currency throughout the world to hold funds for the Central Authority in order that it may initiate and finance on a large scale economic planning such as that operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority."

"This plan was endorsed by the World Government Conference held at Montreux, August 17-24, 1947. Representatives of twenty nations were present."

(Re), "THE BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE OF THE 'Crusade for World Government', Published by Cooperative Art Service Ltd., London, England.

IS THE SOUTH TO BE A COLORED REPUBLIC?

"This 'Black Belt' plan which emanated from the Sixth World Congress contemplated confiscation of all white property, seizure of all government agencies in the Southern States, and merger of the States into a Negro Soviet. See the Commentaries, February 1931, pp. 152-167; W. A. Foster, The Negro People in American History, II, Rept. 2244, pp. 265-276."

Reference Senate Bill No. 2648, Supreme Court February, March, 1958, appendix IV to part 2, page 1079, foot note 10.

"In close connection with the unskilled workers is the problem of the Negro worker. The Negro problem is a political and economic problem. The racial oppression of the Negro is simply the expression of his economic bondage and oppression, each intensifying the other. This complicates the Negro problem, but does not alter its proletarian character. The Communist Party will carry on agitation among the Negro workers to unite them with all class-conscious workers."

Folks, this is sedition! Treaties have no power to overrule the U.S. Constitution or the Bill of Rights! There is no consent of the governed for the president to disarm the nation. This is madness!

North American Aviation didn't realize back in the '70's, when it was working with the U.S. government, how long it would take to complete the partial and final disarmament treaties. Look below: Mikhail Gorbachev and *United World Federalist* Ronald Reagan are signing the *first treaty for partial disarmament (INF)* in 1987. Prepare yourself for the final treaty to be signed by George W. Bush and Russia's President Putin. Then the communists will have the only army in the world. Meanwhile, the avowed enemies of this nation, including Russia and China, are secretly building up for a first strike against the U.S.A.



Missile pact signed



General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union and President Ronald Reagan of the United States signed the intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) treaty at the White House on 8 December 1987. "Patience, dedication and goodwill have prevailed over the difficulties and obstacles that were encountered in achieving this historic agreement," the Secretary-General said, calling the treaty a "truly remarkable development."

WASHINGTON (AP) — President Reagan and Soviet Leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev today signed a historic treaty to eliminate intermediate-range nuclear missiles and together agreed to work toward a more ambitious arms control pact during their three days of summit.

"We are in good agreement on the points, which were not just about arms, but also about the future of the world," Gorbachev said at an afternoon news conference at the White House. "I am sure that our common interests will be met."

"We are pleased ourselves by getting down to business," he said.

Said Reagan: "The two sides have agreed to a historic treaty. This is a major step in the process of reducing the nuclear arms race. It is a step toward a more secure world."

The president added that "we are only beginning this historic journey. We are only beginning."

First lady Nancy Reagan and

Raisa Gorbachev looked on from the audience as the two leaders signed their historic accord today at the White House. Reagan, left, and Gorbachev, right, shook hands after signing the historic accord. The two leaders shook hands after signing the historic accord. The two leaders shook hands after signing the historic accord.

A band played "God Save the Queen" as Reagan and Gorbachev shook hands by the signing table. The two leaders shook hands after signing the historic accord.

Reagan characterized the treaty with a few words of Russian. "Thank you very much," he said in reference to the strategic provisions to grant against Soviet cheating.

Interruption Gorbachev with a smile. "The report that at every meeting."

"The English had already had a meeting," Reagan said. "I think."

Earlier, during a welcoming ceremony outside the White House, Reagan told his guest that "I hope you will find the signing of this treaty a truly remarkable development."

John Paul Jones, a member of the House of Representatives, said that the signing ceremony was a "historic event."

The signing ceremony was presided over by two signatories: Ronald Reagan, who signed for the United States, and Mikhail Gorbachev, who signed for the Soviet Union. The signing ceremony was presided over by two signatories: Ronald Reagan, who signed for the United States, and Mikhail Gorbachev, who signed for the Soviet Union.

Reagan said that "the world is watching" as they sit down to begin the signing.

Reagan said that "the world is watching" as they sit down to begin the signing.

Reagan said that "the world is watching" as they sit down to begin the signing.

while photographers crowded the scene.

While their handshake was being captured on film, Nancy Reagan turned to Gorbachev and expressed her admiration for his leadership. "I am sure that our common interests will be met."

Outside in the cold, police broke up a gathering of anti-Soviet demonstrators gathered in Lafayette Park across Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House. A few blocks away, about 25 Jewish protesters were arrested for demonstrating illegally within 100 feet of the Soviet Embassy.

The treaty banning U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles received a warmer welcome from leading Senate Democrats. Senate Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd, D-R Va.,

THE GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT TREATIES

The Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) Allows Mikhail Gorbachev To Oversee The Destruction Of American Defensive Weaponry

Spread over a series of two specific treaties

INF

- Destruction of entire class - short and medium Ground launched Ballistic Missiles & Cruise Missiles.
- Entry by Russians into key military installations, bases, defense plants, shipyards, major ports, railway centers, solar highways for 13 years as resident inspectors who sequester and destroy above equipment. **
- Greatest achievement: the Verification Process upon which Treaty No.2 depends for completion of its tasks.

THE FIRST TREATY

Signed & passed into law on December 8, 1987

*Except for the world peace-keeping force which will be under the command of the United Nations (specifically the Secretary-General of the Security Council who has always been from a socialist or a communist country.)

**Encourages invasion by terrorists inside U.S. borders and terrorists lined up at U.S. Northern and Southern borders.



THE JOINT DOCUMENT WHICH CALLS FOR TREATY ACTION IN TITLE III SECTION 3.

PUBLIC LAW 87-297

(calls for the elimination of our national armed forces; the elimination of weapons of all kinds; an effective system of international control; verification; & ultimate world disarmament.)*

MOSCOW SUMMIT

- Communist control of U.S.
- Elimination or conversion of military bases.
- Elimination of national armed forces. (Transferred to U.S.)
- World army which no nation can challenge under United Nations control.
- Elimination of long range missiles & conventional weapons.
- Continual divestiture using Verification System.
- Replacement of U.S. Bill of Rights with Human Rights.
- Elimination of citizens guns.

THE SECOND TREATY

The above can be built upon the foundation laid by the first treaty.

This purported treaty is not valid! It does not meet the requirements of the U.S. Constitution! For proof, refer to the Sentence Diagram of the Treaty Clause, which is contained in Article VI of the U.S. Constitution. Transferring of the U.S. Armed Forces to the United Nations on a permanent basis is being gradually achieved by use of Presidential Decision Directive-25 (PDD-25) and other quiet presidential agreements.



What makes anybody think they can trust their avowed enemies?

The Sentinel — WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2002

U.S., Russia finalize nuclear arms deal

By ANSILA CHARLTON
Associated Press Reporter

MOSCOW (AP) — A landmark U.S.-Russian agreement slashing each nation's nuclear arsenals by two-thirds has been finalized, the Russian Foreign Ministry said today, a day ahead of President Bush's arrival in Moscow to sign it.

"The text ... is fully ready for signing," the Foreign Ministry said in a statement, following meetings in Moscow between U.S. Undersecretary of State John Bolton and Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Georgy Martsinow. No details were announced.

Bush announced last week that the deal had been reached after months of tense negotiations, but U.S. and Russian officials have been scrambling to work out final details in recent days.

Bush arrives in Moscow on Thursday. On Friday, he and Putin are to sign the deal, which reduces cuts in each country's arsenal to 1,900 to 2,500 warheads from the current 6,000 each, is allowed.

U.S. officials have said that the deal could be the last arms reduction agreement between the two countries, which are increasingly working as partners rather than foes. But

Russian officials say the 30-year-old U.S.-Russian arms control efforts should continue.

"I'm convinced that we will continue to work with the American side, including preparation of additional agreements on increasing — transparency" of missile weapons cuts, Mikhail Lyerin, head of the Russian Foreign Ministry's security and disarmament department, said today.

A second accord to be signed by the two presidents on Friday, a declaration on shared political and security priorities, is still being negotiated, said a high-ranking Russian diplomat who spoke on condition of anonymity. That document will include a treaty section on cooperation in the missile defense field, including early missile warning systems and other measures to increase "predictability and trust," the diplomat said.

No joint work on a missile defense system is foreseen at this point, the diplomat said.

The Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions is the centerpiece of this week's summit. Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Yakovchenko said the deal covers warheads and delivery vehicles, "and everything connected to reducing strategic offensive weapons."



Bush, Putin sign nuclear arms pact

- News
- Business
- Sports
- Local
- Health
- Tech + Science
- Living + Travel
- TV News
- Opinion
- Weather
- Shop MSNBC
- MSNBC.com

Deal slashes arsenals by two-thirds; Iran concerns expressed



President Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin shake hands Friday upon signing a new nuclear arms treaty in St. Andrew's Hall at the Kremlin.

AP/Wide World Photos

Qwest One
 1-800-4-A-NEWS
 Text & Local Delivery

MSNBC, MSNBC AND NEWS SERVICES

MOSCOW, May 24 -- President Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin on Friday signed a landmark arms reduction treaty that slashes existing arsenals by two-thirds -- the largest ever cut in their nuclear capabilities. Bush said the deal "ended a long chapter of confrontation and opened up an entirely new relationship between our countries."



The following is what Dimitri Z. Manuilsky of the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow said.

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 to 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep.

So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. Then capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction.

They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

PROCESSING THE USA MERGER WITH THE USSR

Compare this article taken from the McAlvany Report printed in 1988 to the public speech by George W. Bush given in 2002.

It sounded preposterous back in 1953 when militant patriotism was still in style. Nobody believed the White House was planning any kind of gradual surrender to the Soviet Union.



Still, when the president of the Ford Foundation, spilled the beans to a Congressional committeeman, it did sound believable -- barely -- as Rowan Gaither, then 44, admitted to Norman Dodd, Chief Counsel of the Congressional Reese Commission Investigation of Subversion in Tax Free Foundations, saying:

"I have news for you. Most of us at the executive level here were, at one time or another, active in either the O.S.S., the State Department or the European Economic Administration. During those times, and without exception, we operated under

directives issued by the White House, the substance of which were to the effect that we should make every effort to so alter life in the United States as to make possible a comfortable merger with the Soviet Union. We are continuing to be guided by just such directives." —Roland Gaither

Most Americans, old enough to remember the report, have long since shrugged it off because the press has not relayed any more such news since then.

In light of today's revelations, however, Gaither's words sound prophetic. After 35 years, the muzzle is still on the press and the "comfortable merger" is at hand. A new center of power, christened "the Washcow Axis", now runs between Washington and Moscow.
—McAlvany Report 1988

Compare this Report with the public speech made on May 25, 2002 by Pres. George W. Bush in which he repeatedly referred to America as being a "democracy" (a stand-in word for communism). Bush spoke of a "shared interest" and referred to Russia as:



Vladimir Putin and George W. Bush

"a new Russia to be our full partner. Our partnership with Russia will continue to grow...We are entering upon a new chapter in our relations with Russia...We have the opportunity to build a world that is safe."

—President George W. Bush May 25, 2002

Safe for whom? While China continues to build their military machine, including a much larger arsenal of deadly nuclear bombs, George W. Bush has committed the United States to a law which he signed within the last year that requires another large round of U.S. military bases to be shut down, starting in the year 2003. Just what does it take to wake up Americans?



The men who sat in Philadelphia in 1787 held entirely different views of the presidency than what we see today. They drew their inspiration and formed policies from the revolutionary doctrines enunciated in the Declaration of Independence that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed". They held, that sovereignty resides in the people. Governmental power originates in the people, and a government, therefore, can have and exercise only such powers as the people yield. Thus, while other Constitutions had been grants from the government to the people, ours was a grant from the people, to the government. Consequently, the government established by the Constitution was one of limited Powers.

Bush, Putin sign arms deal

Leaders also pledge cooperation on missile defense

May 24, 2002 Posted: 10:42 AM EDT (1442 GMT) CNN.com/WORLD



Russian President Vladimir Putin and U.S. President George W. Bush after signing the nuclear pact on Friday in Moscow.

MOSCOW, (CNN) — U.S. President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin put pen to paper Friday, signing a landmark nuclear reduction treaty that would remove from deployment two-thirds of each nation's long-range nuclear weapons over 10 years.

"This is a historic and hopeful day for Russia and America," Bush said. "It's a historic day for the world as well. President Putin and I today ended a long chapter of confrontation and opened up an entirely new relationship between our two countries."

When the people granted limited powers to the federal government through the Constitution, did they ever intend that public officials would have the gall to misuse those powers and make the United States a *full partner* with a communist nation? When was *the consent of the governed* for this ever obtained?

When the people granted limited powers to the federal government, did they expect public officials to have the perfidy to *weaken the ability of the citizens to defend their republican system of government*, caused by treaties, such as this, that lessen the amount of defense equipment that the people of the United States may possess?

The treaty, Bush said at the signing ceremony, "liquidates the Cold War legacy of nuclear hostility."

"President Putin and I today ended a long chapter of confrontation and opened up an entirely new relationship between our two countries."

— President Bush

relations between the two countries.

The pact will remove from deployment each nation's existing store of roughly 5,000 to 6,000 warheads by about 65 percent over the next decade. The resulting number of warheads held by each country would range from 1,700 to 2,200.

Bush and Putin also discussed the U.S.-led global war on terrorism and economic

"Our nations will continue to cooperate closely in the war against global terror," Bush said. "We understand full well that the people of Russia have suffered at the hands of terrorists, and so have we."

A few years ago, it was unlawful to mix with the communists. Now the president of the United States turns the whole nation into being partners with the communists. What has happened to change the mind set of the American people?



Meanwhile, our Russian "partners" have other "partners".



Melba Jaramila/AP

Friendly Embrace: Chinese President Jiang Zemin, left, and Russia's President Vladimir Putin embrace each other in Moscow today. Putin and Zemin signed the first post-Soviet friendship treaty between the two nations today, cementing their decade-long partnership.

Hanford Sentinel July 26, 2002

When Mikhail Gorbachev on November 2, 1987 declared the following, he must have known what the partnership ball game was all about:

"In October 1917, we parted from the old world, rejecting it once and for all. We are moving toward a new world, the world of communism. We shall never turn off that road."

—Mikhail Gorbachev

Bush, Putin sign historic arms pact

The signing marks the biggest arms-reduction treaty in history

By Rex Fowkes
AP White House Correspondent

MOSCOW — Beneath the Kremlin's gleaming domes, President Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin signed the biggest nuclear arms-reduction treaty in history on Friday, writing a friendly postscript to their nations' Cold War rivalry.

But before the ink had dried on their 10-year pact, the leaders were struggling to keep Russia's nuclear ties to Iran from straining their new partnership. "Our nations must spare no effort at preventing all forms of proliferation," Bush said as his aides considered offering incentives to win Russia's cooperation.

Elbow to elbow with Putin in the gilded St. Andrew's Hall, Bush said the treaty-signing ceremony "ended a long chapter of confrontation and opened up an entirely new relationship between our countries."

The Cold War is now "in the rearview mirror of both countries," he said.

Putin called the treaty "a serious move ahead to ensure international security." It marked another tentative step away from Russia's Communist past and toward the West in ways once considered unthinkable.

Next week, Putin will join Bush in Rome to sign an accord binding Russia with NATO, though not as a member of the military alliance formed in the Cold War to contain the Soviet Union.

The arms accord would limit the United States and Russia within 10 years to between 1,700

and 2,300 deployed strategic nuclear warheads each, down from about 6,000 apiece now.



Bush

The U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma are expected to ratify the three-page treaty. The relatively small size reflects Bush's informal diplomatic style as well as his reluctance to

commit the United States in writing to anything more than he had to.



Putin

The treaty allows the United States to store warheads rather than destroy them as Putin wanted. And it leaves both nations with enough missiles to destroy each others' major

cities many times over.

"Friends really don't need weapons pointed at each other. We both understand that," Bush said. "But it's a realistic assessment of where we've been, and who knows what'll happen 10 years from now. Who knows what future presidents will say and how they'll react?"

After the ceremony, Bush met with media executives and business leaders, then toured the Kremlin's main square.

Hanford Sentinel
May 25, 2002

East, West Practice Partnership For Peace

by Gary Fields

Fort Polk, Louisiana — About 2,500 U.S. troops and 750 soldiers from nations formerly behind the Iron Curtain will conclude the first NATO Partnership for Peace exercise on U.S. soil on Saturday.

As part of the three weeks of exercises, troops from the United Kingdom, United States, Canada and 14 members of the partnership — made up of nations once belonging to or under the domination of the Soviet Union — performed various peacekeeping operations at mock villages on this post.



JOINT EXERCISES: Lt. Col. Vladimir Maringos of Moldova, right, is instructed by U.S. Army Sgt. Arthur Colver at Fort Polk, Louisiana.



Editor: The U.N. flag has been flying over Fort Polk for some time now.

One of the strongest supporters of the partnership is U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman John Shalikashvili.

Shalikashvili said a goal of the partnership is commonality: "It is not about gadgets, it's about common procedure. These exercises are checking out whether we're getting closer and closer." (Editor: Closer to what, General?)

The exercises included platoons of 40 to 51 soldiers from Albania, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Slovakia,

Latvia, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. (Editor: Platoons of 50 men are not large numbers, but later each of these young militarily and politically conditioned men becomes the commander of a platoon or larger unit.)

Warrant Officer Pete Arsenault said the most realistic part of the training is the unknown factor "the villagers" represent. At Fort Polk, local residents play the roles. It is "very realistic" Arsenault says. "In the actual situation, the armies might know what's going on, but the civilians don't . . . understand what we're trying to do."

(Editor: Just as we have long been told, the civilians are the problem, and the target as well. However, although many civilians "don't understand what we're trying to do", thousands do understand, and hundreds of thousands are being informed.)

See stories on pages 9 and 10 about mock assaults on cities and communities in the U.S. These assaults, usually using black helicopters and special military units, are being carried out as practice exercises to prepare the military and multi-jurisdictional forces to "take out" areas of resistance to the New World Order which has been planned for us "future serfs". The young people in military service, and the gung-ho members of the ATF, FBI, and other Federal agencies, just haven't got the picture yet. We pray they will in time.

I'm showing you
this for credibility



FACTORS OPERATIVE IN A POST - ARMS CONTROL SITUATION

Look at the back
page on this set
of four pages
drawn up by a
big corporation:
the North American
Aviation, Space & Systems
Division! The Corporations
knew more than you did
about what was going on when
this was drafted back in
the 1965!

So the "planners"
had to move the time table up.
I'm sure it irked them when they
could not meet all their pre-set
deadlines. 1976, then 1983, then
2000! In Bill Clinton's term of
office he signed Presidential
Decision Directive No. 25
(P.D.D. 25) which may have
wound up the final phase of
the disarmament treaties.
The latest deadline for the
take over is set for 2010.

CONTRACT NO. AF 49(638)-1411

NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION, INC.
SPACE AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS DIVISION
AEROSPACE SCIENCES DIVISION
OPERATIONS ANALYSIS DEPARTMENT

APRIL 1965


METHODOLOGY

MATRIX ANALYSIS - TO DETERMINE GROSS INTERACTIONS

DYNAMIC CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS - TO DETERMINE RELATIONSHIPS &
FACTORS

- SELECT U.S. OBJECTIVES - (INCLUDING MILITARY OBJECTIVES & GOALS)
- SPECIFY CURRENT SITUATION - RELEVANT TO ARMS CONTROL
- ANSWER QUESTION - "ARE OBJECTIVES BEING ACHIEVED?" IF NO;
- SELECT STRATEGIES TO CHANGE SITUATION
- PREPARE SCENARIO - LIST RELEVANT, CREDIBLE & FEASIBLE ACTIONS
- ANALYSE SCENARIO - TO DETERMINE RELATIONSHIPS

CHRONOLOGY OF SCENARIO FOR BILATERAL U.S. - USSR AGREEMENT FOR EXCHANGE OF MILITARY MISSIONS



LEGEND: ▲ ACTION OCCURRING AT SPECIFIC TIME ■ ACTIONS OR SITUATIONS CONTINUING OVER A PERIOD OF TIME

NUCLEAR FREE ZONE CHRONOLOGY

EVENTS	TIME			
	1948	1958	1968	1987
POLITICAL AND ARMS CONTROL DEVELOPMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. takes economic policy switch left and sets atomic energy program U.S. and U.S.S.R. carry reciprocal nuclear arms control talks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. establish U.S.S.R.-U.S.S.R. agreement for prohibition of nuclear arms race U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to reduce nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms
MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms U.S. and U.S.S.R. agree to limit nuclear arms

Legend: ▲ = events occurring at present time; □ = events or actions occurring only as a result of time



Treaties do NOT
supersede the Constitution!

Those, who claim they do, are daydreaming! The Constitution in Sentence 2 of Article VI referring to the making of treaties, refers to itself when it *defines* the making of treaties:

"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."

Here it declares that laws must be made in accord with itself (the Constitution). The only *authority* that public officials have to make law is "law of the United States" and that law is required to be in pursuance of the Constitution.

Treaties do not have any power to supersede the Constitution! It is the most supreme law! Treaties have to agree with the Constitution.

YOU CAN TAKE IT FROM ME, FOLKS, CAUSE I DO KNOW!

TREATIES DO NOT SUPERSEDE THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

By Bernadine Smith

Diagramming of the treaty clause proves that there is no other way to interpret the treaty clause in the United States Constitution except as presented on the reverse side. The intent of the treaty clause is obvious. All treaties must respect, be subjected to, conform to, and be in pursuance of the United States Constitution – the required criterion for judging validity. The treaty-making power is not boundless. It cannot violate the principles, nor the spirit or the energy of the Constitution. The language used in it verifies that the construction of the treaty clause was designed to prevent misconstruction of the treaty power.

Those who devoutly claim that the treaty clause says that "treaties are supreme over the Constitution" - or - that "treaties can cut clear across the Bill of Rights" intend to deceive for unlawful purposes! (Refer to John Foster Dulles as the promoter of this untruthful remark.)

Thomas Jefferson said: "Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written Constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction. I say the same as to the opinion of those who consider the grant of the treaty-making power as boundless. If it is, then we have no Constitution. If it has bounds, they can be no others than the definitions of the powers which that instrument gives."

The Constitution, laws of the United States, and treaties are, all three, on an equal footing -- only if the criteria is met.

Note that there are two dependent clauses within the compound subject

of the diagrammed sentence which centralizes treaties from becoming boundless. (See reverse side.)

First, no treaty can be valid if it is not made under the authority of the United States. Under the authority of the United States, all public officials who could participate in the treaty-making process are already bound by their oath of office taken to support and defend the spirit and principles of the Constitution.

Second, in order for a treaty to take effect within the nation, it is required that "enabling" legislation be written in order to make the subject matter of the treaty incumbent upon states, courts, individuals, etc. In order to

It is self-evident: the Constitution has pre-set the standards a treaty must meet before it can qualify as being equal to the Constitution.

draft the "enabling" legislation, law-makers are bound by that dependent clause (within the main treaty clause) to respect the rule to which they must adhere, and which, of course, is that, it must be drafted in pursuance thereof to the Constitution.

The president is not above the law nor the requirements of these clauses. The president's oath reads "to preserve, protect, and defend" the Constitution. That oath was especially written by the nation's founders for all future presidents and placed within the body of the Constitution as a part of the supreme law so that the nation's chief executive would have to keep himself within the bounds of Constitutional limitations.


Thomas Jefferson also said: "By the general power to make treaties, the Constitution must have intended to comprehend only those objects which are usually regulated by treaty and cannot be otherwise regulated...It must have meant to except out of these the rights reserved to the states, for surely the President and the Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole government is interdicted from doing in any way." *Manual of Parliamentary Practice*, Sec. 2-43 (1907)

The Constitutional duty of states to call out against the federal government whenever it has transgressed, has not been kept. For instance, the Charter of the United Nations, enacted initially as a "treaty" in 1945 was in great violation of the principles of our Constitution. The Charter has generated a concatenation of sequential unlawful "treaties", which (passed into so-called "law") have resulted in the development of an international socialistic world government (the "New World Order"). The United Nations Charter, bestows powers upon our president which are forbidden by the United States Constitution! This is why the presidents have been passing executive orders as "laws", are signing "treaties" which are altering the structure, energies, and principles of the Constitutional system, and are transferring all power under the control of the socialist world government.


The people are the guardians of the Constitution. They should hold their state public officials responsible and require them to take action against the destruction of the republic, caused by the unlawful use of the treaty power, while there is still time! They must declare unqualified laws and treaties as non-laws.

PROOF THAT TREATIES DO NOT SUPERSEDE THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

"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;" U. S. Constitution Article VI, Line 2



Diagramming of the treaty clause discloses that the subject noun "treaties" does not have exclusive use of the predicate. The structure of the sentence does not allow it. The compound subject is composed of three parts. The latter two parts, "Laws" and "Treaties", have been modified by two dependent clauses, providing evidence of the superior position that the first part holds over the latter two. What the sentence is saying is that the "Laws" and all "Treaties" are subordinate to the "Constitution", and only if and when this criteria is met, all three shall share equally as the supreme law of the land.



Key:

Indicates separation of subject from predicate



**There is something you should know about the
American power structure!**

It consists of three parts:

**These are the
lesser two.**


- 1. State power.....These two powers were delegated by the people to secure the blessings**
- 2. Federal power.....of liberty and justice.**

**This is the superior
and the
ultimate power.**

- 3. People power.....**
The absolute right to firearms is the only basis upon which the people can remain the ultimate power and retain their liberty.

**“DELEGATED AUTHORITY
IS NOT SURRENDERED AUTHORITY”**

....James Madison



“Ultimate authority resides in the people”

.... James Madison

Federalist Papers #46

The authority given to public officials is not absolute! The people have the right to retrieve the authority given to public officials if those officials are found to be overthrowing the government.

To give the armed forces to the known enemies of our Constitutional government system,* to close our military bases, and to take away firearms from the law-abiding people, all are acts authorizing the overthrow of our government!

If we have retained ultimate authority, when and how should we begin to exercise it?

Surely, we are not expected to wait until it has reached the stage of hopelessness!


*** See Public Law 87-297 U.S.Code Title 22 Sec.2551**

THE FEDERAL-STATE ALLIANCE TO RENDER THE PEOPLE HELPLESS AND WITHOUT RESISTANCE AGAINST SEDITION.

"Laws exist in vain for those who do not have the courage nor the means to defend them."

Thomas Merton

THE PIECES ALL FIT TOGETHER FOR SEDITIONOUS ACTIVITY!



Cover by Alexander Kosh

A DELIBERATE PLAN FOR THE TOTAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT OF THE UNITED STATES!

Collection: In the early 70's, the state attorneys-general and governors participated under the leadership of the federal attorney-general who had previously launched the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration into national action to design "Standards and Goals" (secretly abolishing Dreams of law-abiding citizens). Page 349 was entered into the governor's Master Set of Standards and Goals, and is still an ongoing effort by the governor and state law-makers.

**WHEN YOU PUT ALL OF THE PIECES TOGETHER,
IT DOESN'T MAKE A PRETTY PICTURE, DOES IT?**

Military Government:
Homeland Security (an agency)
Coast Guard merged with stability
law enforcement under still head.
Becomes the force to generate
internal order as required in
State Dept. Pub. 7277, Pg. 3
"Continuity of Gov't." for
operation of gov't.
from
under-
ground.

Controlled
in
O.M.B.

All power now
consolidated on
federal level.
DEPT. OF PEACE
H.R. 3881 No. 3459
(Roger Kevitch)
which is capable
of consigning
and transferring
all United States
federal power
under the
U. N.

Since 1970's the
United Nations
has been
setting the
OPERATIONAL
STANDARDS
for the UN in
United States
Possibly as far
back as 1955.

Woodside
Military Command
and Control Systems
began in 1969 at Mas-
achusetts Institute of Technology
Research Engineer Dept.

COMBAT MANUAL MANUAL
Compiled for operations
of U.S. coast
In the
United States
when
marital
law is
declared.

"Blue Print for the Peace Race"
issued 6-months
after
State
Dept.
Publ.
7277.

Public Law
87-297
U.S. Code Books
Title 22
Sec. 2051

"The
United
States Program for
General and Complete
Disarmament in a Peaceful World."

No more Army,
no more Navy, and
no more Air Force.

U.S. national
military transferred
to United Nations
on a permanent
basis.

In 3 stages
down to
"Zero"
national
military.

Plans to kill
off completely
to any buyer
If federal
government has
provided funding.

Can sell off roads, tunnels,
bridges, rail transportation,
airports, mass transit, schools,
housing, water supply, etc.
E.O. 12803 Privatization.

Intend to eliminate
state.

Groups involved in
the convention: Council
on Foreign Relations, Tri-
lateralists, Bilderberg, etc.

Diabolical
Citizen patrols
Neighborhood Watch
Total Quality Management
Community-Oriented Policing
Controlled
Evil

Must
be done simultaneously:
break down U.S.A. and
build up the N.W.O.

Bringing diverse
groups to a consensus
Facilitators. Change
Agents

DELPHI
TECHNIQUE
Must
be done simultaneously:
break down U.S.A. and
build up the N.W.O.

On Sept. 1, 1
L.E.A.A.
Project.
Gun
Control
Act of
1968
created
L.E.A.A.

which in turn utilized 499-A systems
(military standards laid upon states),
prepared for unified Military Command,
federalized police departments in all
states. Initiated maneuvers and
methods for outlawing guns
belonging to citizens.

All
Americans
citizens who
refuse to be disarmed
will be classed
as domestic
terrorists.

Bridges widened over
action to accommodate
large vehicles like tanks,
etc.

U.S. citizens
in the
United States
when
marital
law is
declared.

U.S. citizens
in the
United States
when
marital
law is
declared.

U.S. citizens
in the
United States
when
marital
law is
declared.

U.S. citizens
in the
United States
when
marital
law is
declared.

U.S. citizens
in the
United States
when
marital
law is
declared.

U.S. citizens
in the
United States
when
marital
law is
declared.

U.S. citizens
in the
United States
when
marital
law is
declared.

U.S. citizens
in the
United States
when
marital
law is
declared.

U.S. citizens
in the
United States
when
marital
law is
declared.

PLANNED
ELIMINATION
OF SHERIFFS
Elimination
of his
control
of the
courts
and
over
the
jails.

Removal
of his
control
of the
courts
and
over
the
jails.

Removal
of his
control
of the
courts
and
over
the
jails.

Removal
of his
control
of the
courts
and
over
the
jails.

Removal
of his
control
of the
courts
and
over
the
jails.

Removal
of his
control
of the
courts
and
over
the
jails.

Public
Law
101-216

1. College of
government's
ability to
provide needed
services.

2. A crisis of
major magnitude
has a physical effect on
the community.

3. A Catastrophe that
has a physical effect on
the community.

4. Camp
of local
officials.
5. Use
via E.O.
#11245
by Gen.
W. Bush

Paused
into law
via E.O.
#11245
by Gen.
W. Bush

States
and Counties
near bank-
ruptcy. NAFTA
GATT
WTO

States
and Counties
near bank-
ruptcy. NAFTA
GATT
WTO


States
and Counties
near bank-
ruptcy. NAFTA
GATT
WTO

States
and Counties
near bank-
ruptcy. NAFTA
GATT
WTO

States
and Counties
near bank-
ruptcy. NAFTA
GATT
WTO

States
and Counties
near bank-
ruptcy. NAFTA
GATT
WTO

Here's what
happens
when
the states
allow
all
power
to be
consolidated
on the
federal
level.



GEORGE WASHINGTON
LEFT THESE WORDS
OF WARNINGS IN HIS
"FAREWELL ADDRESS"
WHEN HE COMPLETED
HIS TWO TERMS AS THE
THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES IN 1796

"One method of assault may be
to effect, in the forms of the Con-
stitution, alterations which will impair
the energy of the system, and thus to
undermine what cannot be directly
overthrown..."

....George Washington



You can
open this
up and
check
inside!

**THE CONGRESS
PLANNED
A WORLD
GOVERNMENT
ON
YOUR
TAX MONEY**

HEARINGS
BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
ON
RESOLUTIONS
RELATIVE TO REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
CHARTER, ATLANTIC UNION, WORLD
FEDERATION, ETC.

FEBRUARY 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, AND 20, 1950

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1950

REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
CHARTER OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10 a. m., in the caucus room, room 318, Senate Office Building, Senator Elbert D. Thomas (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Thomas of Utah, Wiley, and Smith of New Jersey.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 66

Senator THOMAS. The committee will come to order.

The subcommittee will take up first consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 66.

I will instruct the reporter to place a copy of this resolution in the record at the proper place.

(S. Con. Res. 66 is as follows:)

[S. Con. Res. 66, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas, in order to achieve universal peace and justice, the present Charter of the United Nations should be changed to provide a true world government constitution; and

Whereas article 109 of the present Charter of the United Nations provides for a general conference to make alterations in said Charter; and

Whereas similar amendatory powers in the Articles of Confederation were used by the people of the United States in 1787 to adopt a new Constitution to insure a united, peaceful nation; and

Whereas the combined effort of many able and intelligent citizens has resulted in the preparation of a proposed world constitution based upon the principles of peace through justice with both social rights and civil rights for all peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should immediately take the initiative in requesting a general conference of the United Nations pursuant to article 109 for the purpose of establishing a true world government through adoption of such a constitution; and if such a general conference is not called within one year after the adoption of this resolution, the President of the United States should then call a world constitutional convention of delegates elected directly by the people for the purpose of adopting a world government constitution.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Senator Glen Taylor is our first witness this morning.

Will you come forward, please, Senator Taylor?

STATEMENT OF HON. GLEN TAYLOR, UNITED STATES SENATOR
FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Senator TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am appear here in behalf of Senate Concurrent Resolution 66.

Here are some copies of a proposed constitution for a world federal government. I thought possibly you gentlemen might be interested in it. The document was prepared by Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins, G. A. Borgese, Mortimer J. Adler, Stringfellow Barr, Albert Guerard, Harold A. Innis, Erich Kahler, Wilbur G. Katz, Charles H. McIlwain, Robert Redfield and Rexford G. Tugwell. It is a very interesting document. I am particularly impressed by the regional arrangements for representations which it encompasses to prevent large blocs of population on the face of the earth from getting control of any proposed world federation that might be set up.

✓ Senator WILEY. This Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, as I understand, meshes into this draft of a world constitution—in other words, this would be the preliminary step to bring about a world constitution, is that it?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes, Senator Wiley. Dr. Borgese is here to testify, and I think he does suggest an amendment or two to the resolution.

✓ Senator WILEY. Your resolution suggests, the same as the one that we had yesterday, the calling of a general conference of all the nations, instead of a conference for seven nations.

Senator TAYLOR. Yes. I cannot go along with the idea that we ought to set up any kind of an organization that is exclusive, or that does not leave the door open for all nations to come in, because I think that is further dividing the world, and I think what we need is unity, rather than further division or a drawing of lines.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Senator Taylor, the germ of your Resolution 66 goes back to previous resolutions introduced at the time of the formation of the United Nations. The idea, or the germ of this idea has now seen fruit in the Hutchins study?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. But, your resolution of several years ago called for that to happen which actually has happened, as far as the study stages is concerned, isn't that true?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes, I would say that.

PAST RESOLUTIONS FOR WORLD REPUBLIC

✓ Four and one-half years ago I introduced my first resolution in the United States Senate. Each year since, I have presented similar resolutions all calling for creation of a world republic.

I might say that each resolution was modified as further study and circumstances would seem to indicate. It has taken over 4 years and some earth-shaking events to crystallize sufficient support among the people and in the Congress to convene these hearings and afford me the privilege of testifying on behalf of this resolution. Naturally, I am happy that this has come to pass and I deeply appreciate the privilege of appearing before this distinguished committee.

On that momentous day in my life in October 1945 I said:

I believe the people of America are ready—not only ready, but anxious and definitely craving—to have something done to preserve peace in the world and to prevent the beginning of another armament race which, in view of the development of far greater instruments of destruction, can result only in leading to the absolute erasing from the face of the earth of our civilization and of a large percentage of the actual inhabitants of the earth.

During the intervening years I have reiterated time and again my belief in the crying need for world disarmament, the outlawing of all instruments of war and the importance of instituting a program for peace. Slowly, but surely, I felt that we were embarking on a world armament race that must inevitably, inexorably, lead to destruction.

In March of 1948 I proposed an amendment to the ECA act which provided that the United States institute a program of reconstruction and economic development for all of Europe with an initial contribution of at least \$5,000,000,000 a year for 5 years. This was to be done through the UN, with smaller contributions from other nations. Universal disarmament was to be our ultimate goal also.

Last week we heard a great address by the Chairman of the Committee on Atomic Energy on the need for stopping the atomic-bomb race and finding a path to peace. This week we were privileged to listen to the statesmanlike utterances of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and who is also a member of this committee, who made an eloquent plea for world disarmament.

The events of the past 6 months have had world-shaking repercussions. Many of us who have appeared to be divergently opposed on vital subjects in the past now find ourselves echoing sentiments that are similar in word and equal in purpose. In 1945 I said to the Senate:

It has been my observation that always when great armies are built up they are not disbanded until they have been used for purposes of making war upon some other nation.

The senior Senator from Connecticut said last Friday:

Arrayed against the choice of such a policy, meaning an armament-race policy or balance-of-power policy, is 5,000 years of recorded history, which teaches again, and again, and again that armament races lead to war—under today's conditions, hydrogen war.

I wish to congratulate both of my colleagues on the eloquence and wisdom of their remarks. I hope and pray that the resolution, or at least the idea for which I speak today will have the support of these influential and honored gentlemen and all others who sincerely seek ways and means of establishing permanent peace on earth.

However, I have not come before you for the purpose of claiming credit as a pioneer in this or any other field. It is rather with a feeling of humility and Christian spirit that I speak today. The hour of self-analysis and communion with our Creator is at hand. We must face the realities of life as they exist at this moment. Yesterday it was the atom bomb. Today it is the hydrogen bomb. Tomorrow it may be a bomb that will destroy all civilization. And even then, there are the revolting and inhuman instruments of bacteriological warfare to haunt men's souls. I am told on good authority that bacteria is available that can wreak even worse havoc than atom bomb and hydrogen bombs. Whole cities and States can fall prey to germ-carrying bombs that can

bring suffering, privation, unimaginable misery, and lingering death to millions of people.

DESIRE TO STRENGTHEN UNITED NATIONS

I have always been a firm believer in using the United Nations and doing everything possible to strengthen this existing instrument into an adequate world organization. All of my votes in the Senate on foreign policy issues have been based upon the firm belief that the United Nations should be strengthened and used in every possible way. Consequently, my resolution attempts to strengthen this existing world organization and give it the power necessary to enact, interpret, and enforce world law. Historical precedent in the writing of our own Constitution can be followed in adopting an entirely new constitution for the United Nations, preferably one such as that drafted by the Committee to Draft a World Constitution. The United Nations Charter provides for calling a convention to amend or make alterations in the existing charter and this entirely new constitution can be adopted in the same manner that the Constitution Convention adopted our Constitution to replace the Articles of Confederation. If this machinery is not used and the United Nations continues to have inadequate power, I have provided an alternate method for the people of the world through their own constitutional convention to create a true world government with the firm foundation of a constitution such as that drafted by the Committee to Draft a World Constitution, thus providing the basis of world law based upon justice.

Five years ago \$25,000,000,000 for world rehabilitation, as I suggested at that time, was an astronomical figure. Universal disarmament was scarcely an acceptable subject in parlor conversations. A voice raised on behalf of world government was heard with a skeptical ear and the speaker watched with a suspicious eye. Today, thank God, we applaud utterances on behalf of disarmament and economic rehabilitation for all peoples. Tomorrow we may be willing to raise our thoughts on peaceful expenditures to \$100,000,000,000, \$200,000,000,000; certainly no monetary figure can be too high for the actual accomplishment of peace and brotherhood.

WORLD GOVERNMENT NEEDED

Let us be consistent in our outlook, in our approach, and in our thinking. We are sincere in our desire for peace even though it may have taken a hydrogen bomb to awaken us to reality. Let us follow that course to its logical conclusion—it can and must be world government. Anything else is a mere stopgap, a compromise in the face of the cold hard facts. Only a true world government can achieve everlasting peace.

The Charter of the United Nations could and should be changed to provide a true world government constitution. Such a change could be made by calling of a general conference as provided for in article 109. If that cannot be done under present conditions, then let us call a world constitutional convention of delegates for the purpose of adopting a world government constitution. True, this may involve sacrifices of sovereignty that are alien to our way of thinking. But, surely, the terrifying prospect of extermination by fire should provide

The danger in opening up a Constitutional Convention

sufficient incentive for us to embrace new concepts of thinking. It is imperative that we do so both from the point of view of self-preservation and Christian doctrine.

The time for final fateful decision is upon us. Either we will make the supreme effort for peace now, or we will be doomed to extinction. Getting tough is not the answer—armaments races can only lead to disaster. Balance of power arrangements are a discredited device recorded in past history. Even disarmament will not suffice. Half measures are not enough. The idealism of yesterday is the realism of today. Let us obey the convictions that arise from the innermost recesses of our hearts and go forward in a consistent and practical approach to achieve world peace through world government. Let us hope and pray that the sacred fervor of the flame of peace, now kindled, remain alive within us, and that some day soon, the peoples of the earth may be relieved of the unbearable burden of fear and uncertainty which hangs over mankind like the sword of Damocles. We must either press forward now and make a supreme effort to actually and literally establish the brotherhood of man or resign ourselves to a way of life more regimental and degrading than anything the world has ever known.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Senator Wiley?

✓ Senator WILEY. Well, Senator, you express, I think, in the words of one noble writer, "A consummation devoutly to be wished for."

MECHANISM OF WORLD GOVERNMENT NOT ENOUGH

The point is, and I think that is what everyone has testified to with some force, as to the various ideas, as to how to bring about this consummation, and the point is—how, through any mechanism can you find the answer to the situation in the world today, with Russia at one end, and apparently the free world at the other?

If you called this conference, is that mechanism going to just automatically, of itself, change the mental approach that one or the other of these two great ideologies reflect in the minds of men?

I would like to get your reaction to that question.

I might say, parenthetically, it was admitted the other day, in relation to the other resolution, where they had in mind the getting together of the nations of Europe, and the Atlantic Pact nations, and ourselves, they admitted that there really was a conflict in ideology that was so basic that the only thing that would be recognized by the Russians was superior force, that otherwise they would proceed in their course of world domination and that is the argument for the creating of this group of nations into a confederation with the surrender of each nation of certain of its inherent sovereignty, in order to create an arm that would be an effective rebuff against this oncoming of the Russians.

Now, I understand your proposition is either change the United Nations, or change or create, by a separate convention, a world order.

Now, I am asking, assume you get them all together, you see how they are getting together at times in the United Nations, how ineffective at times they are. The question involved is how the mere instituting of a mechanism that will bring about one or the other, how that will have a result, either as a modification of the United Nations so that one side will be the democracies and on the other side will be the

Russians and their satellites, which is pretty much of the world—how that is going to bring the answer that we all want, this consummation devoutly to be wished for, with peace in the minds of men.

That is our real problem. We are all seeking the answer, and I am sure that we want to make no mistake. I cannot understand how a mere mechanism, no matter whether it is the Ten Commandments or anything else, could do the job unless that mechanism became a thing of the spirit in the hearts and minds of men. Then what are we going to do to meet this tremendous challenge that comes to this generation, to maintain peace?

You said that armament leads to war. Armament is just a result of the internal warfare in the minds of men, the result of fear, the result of the inability to get together, the inability to apply the Golden Rule. Armament, you might say, is just the excreta that comes from men's hates, distrust, and inability to love and serve one another. That is what an armament is. The armament by itself does not lead to war, it is just a result of the war within nations, and within the minds of men; and so, we have to think deep. If there is any hope that the race can find the answer, let's find it.

Pardon me for suggesting these things, but I am a seeker after the truth that will make us free.

Senator TAYLOR. I am convinced of your sincerity, Senator Wiley; and, I must say that you have very eloquently expressed your fears and doubts and your estimate of the existing situation, and I am forced to agree that the condition in the world is most distressing and terrifying. There is no use crying over spilled milk.

PAST OPPORTUNITIES LOST

I think we were in a much better position to make an approach to a problem of this kind, and a solution of this kind 5 years ago almost, when I introduced my first resolution. Then, there was no argument. We were the strongest nation on earth. We could have led through strength. At the present time, the balance of power is shifting, and I am almost inclined to agree with my reactionary columnist friend, Constantine Brown, who said that these gestures toward this armament and plans for world peace now might be construed by people of other nations as an indication of weakness at this moment. That is deplorable, but it is a fact that we let the time go by when we were on top of the crest of the wave, so to speak, and the situation is not nearly so propitious at this time, I will agree, but it is more desperate.

The hydrogen bomb promises literally the extinction of mankind. While I am not an atomic scientist, it does seem to me that if they can set off an explosion like this hydrogen bomb, it won't be long until somebody will find a key to making one explosion out of the earth, and certainly we should seek some means to prevent that.

I imagine it would be rather painful for all of us to be blown up at once, in one big explosion, but I just cannot reconcile myself with the idea of no continuation of this world and a life on it.

SOVIET REACTION

There is no guaranty that you could even get to the Russians, or their satellites, to participate in this proposal of mine, at this time.

I am not that optimistic, but I do think that when we do set up an organization, if we do, I pray we will go ahead with the idea, that we will leave the door open and try to behave in a Christian spirit to demonstrate that we do want peace. I certainly am not an advocate of unilateral disarmament. I want to see the world disarmed, but I would never advocate or agree to our disarming alone, or ahead of others. I am afraid that we were a little autocratic at the time of our greatest strength.

I, in reading over the Baruch proposals for atomic control, felt that it was more in the nature of a take-it-or-leave-it proposition. If we had considered the pride and aspirations of other people, if we had acted upon something like the McMahon proposal shortly after the war, I think it would have had excellent chances of being accepted and succeeding; but in my estimation, instead of doing that, we proceeded unilaterally and most generally outside of the United Nations.

Of course, I say there is no use in hashing over what has gone before. The thing to do is try to make the best of circumstances as they are today.

So, I think that we should go ahead and try to set this up, certainly not with the idea of simply formalizing a military alliance which is already in existence between us and certain other nations, but invite all peoples, everywhere, to join this idea.

As I said before, I am not offering this proposed constitution as the ultimate, neither are its authors. It is simply an idea, something to think about. But there are provisions in there for groupings of nations and peoples to prevent any one very populous section of the earth from getting control of this world government. I think it is a very able world document, and I do hope that you gentlemen will see fit to report out my resolution, or the so-called World Federalist resolution. It has a great deal of merit. I do not believe it has as much as mine, naturally, or I would not have introduced mine, but I am hopeful that some action can be taken.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Just one or two questions, Senator.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN WORLD GOVERNMENT AND WORLD FEDERATION

In the first place, let me get your thought as to the distinction between the World Federalist resolution and yours. What is the distinction between the two? They referred to Dr. Hutchins' study as being too complicated at this stage of the game. You don't share that point of view?

Senator TAYLOR. I think the main difference between their resolution and mine, is the provision in my resolution that if the United Nations fails to act, then the President takes the initiative in inviting nations directly to elect representatives to a world constitutional convention.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. And you would like to see us take the position that we want a world constitution, a world state, and just put in a call to have the delegates meet! You are not in the attitude of exploring what Justice Roberts referred to yesterday, exploring the different possibilities!

Senator TAYLOR. I presume that what you gentlemen are holding these hearings for is to explore the different possibilities, and after you explore them, action is required, I believe.

Notes in this margin added by
The Second Amendment Committee,
Harford, CALIF. 93232 P.O. Box 1776

The reason the U.S.A. is being cut
up into 10 regions is for control and
management under the world authority.
These regions will become little countries.

Senator Taylor, a public
servant, paid by public
taxes, has never asked
for the consent of the
governor!

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. My question is whether you are today advocating the actual calling of a convention to set up a world state—period. Is that what you want to do?

Senator TAYLOR. First, it calls upon the President to ask for the convention, or the convening of such a convention through the mechanism of the United Nations.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I understand that.

Senator TAYLOR. And, after that, if that fails and they take no action, then to appeal directly to the people of the world.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. But you are asking us to take the all-out position that we are for a world state and act accordingly!

Senator TAYLOR. Yes.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I wanted to get that clear for the record.

Senator TAYLOR. Yes.

EFFECT OF WORLD GOVERNMENT IN FAR EAST

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I have not studied this program or the other suggestions with regard to setting up the state, but I am interested in knowing how you would deal with those areas of the world that have the enormous populations like India and China, and so forth, on the basis of a world state. How do you approach that problem today, under your plan?

Senator TAYLOR. It would be difficult to explain offhand. It is encompassed, however, in the proposed draft of a world constitution. It makes provision for representation from various regions of the earth, to do away with the balance of population in certain places, and gives each region a certain representation.

I hope you will find time, Senator Smith, to read that document.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I plan to. I am reading everything I can get because I think we are all searching for the answer, and especially this subcommittee. We are searching to see if we can get a proposal which will be a step ahead.

Senator TAYLOR. It is quite evident that there has been a tremendous amount of effort put into this proposal.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I understand there has been plenty of work, but the question is, "What can we do as a practical reality now?"

SURRENDER OF SOVEREIGNTY

Now, two more questions: Do I gather, from your proposal, that you would eliminate the separate identity of the United States, as such, in your plan? Do we just go into a new world scheme that forgets the fact that there is a United States of America that is part of the world?

Senator TAYLOR. We would doubtless be known as the United States of America, just as the section of the United States which I represent is known as Idaho. We did not lose our identity as Idaho by going into the Union; we are simply a part of the Union; we are still Idaho. However, we would have to sacrifice considerable sovereignty to the world organization to enable them to levy taxes in their own right to support themselves, so that they will not be dependent on hand-outs.



THIS IS A MATTER OF PUBLIC CONCERN... Excerpts from Dr. G. A. Bergese's Constitution

PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF A WORLD CONSTITUTION

These articles are written and published in 1974-80 except for later articles indicated by ...

Preamble	25
Declaration of Duties and Rights	27
Grant of Powers (Am. 1-10)	
The Federal Convention, The President, The Legislature (Am. 11-15)	
The Grand Tribunal and The Supreme Court (Am. 16-17)	
The Tribune of the People and The World Law (Am. 18-19)	
The Chamber of Quarantans	
The Federal Capital and Federal Language and Standards (Am. 20-21)	
The Ascending Power (Am. 22)	
[Ratification and Preliminary Period]*	31
Chart	33

*These articles and other parts of the text placed within brackets would disappear from the Constitution after the Founding Convention.

Declaration of Duties and Rights

A.

The universal government of justice as conceived and pledged in this Constitution is founded on the Rights of Man. The principles underlying the Rights of Man are and shall be permanently stated in the Duty of everyone everywhere, whether a citizen abroad in the responsibilities and privileges of World Government or a ward and pupil of the World Commonwealth.

to serve with word and deed, and with productive labor according to his ability, the spiritual and physical advancement of the living and of those to come, as the common cause of all generations of men;

B.

In the context therefore of social duty and service, and in conformity with the unwritten law which philosophers and religious alike called the Law of Nature and which the Republics of the World shall strive to see universally written and enforced by positive law:

It shall be the right of everyone everywhere to claim and maintain for himself and his fellowmen:
release from the bondage of poverty and from the servitude and exploitation of labor, with rewards and security according to merit and needs.

**SALUTE :
A CONSTITUTION
FOR THE WORLD**

"From each according to his ability and to each according to his needs."

The Founding Convention having discussed and approved by individual majority vote this Constitution, ratification by collective majorities within as many delegations of states and nations as represent two-thirds of the population of the earth shall be sufficient for the establishment of the Federal Republic of the World.]

The Committee to Frame a World Constitution

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Robert M. Hamilton
President | Reynolds W. Barr | Wilbur G. Katz |
| G. A. Burgess
Secretary | Albert Guillard | Charles H. McIlwain |
| Mortimer J. Adler | Harold A. Smith | Robert Redfield |
| | Ernst Kahler | Redford Guy Tugwell |

Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions
Santa Barbara, California 93103


BOARD OF DIRECTORS

- Paul B. Nelson and Eric Stein, Honorary Chairman; Robert W. Hutchins, Chairman; J. S. Peltier, Vice-Chairman; Ralph B. Abner, Joseph Adams; Perry B. Anderson, Patrick P. Cassidy, James H. Douglas, Jr., William S. Douglas, Joseph W. Green, Arnold H. Green, Owen Harbison, Philip L. Adams, Francis J. Kelly, Edward Lusk, John B. Lewis, Morris L. Lerner, J. Forrest Merrill, Frances Matthews, Everett Ross, Paul O'Shea, Louis Schwartz, Ronald Sims, Edwin S. Redkey, Robert Robinson, Harold Wilson

There is another one of those impractical, shortsighted world government constitutions that the globalists have waiting in the wings and in one place it starts out saying: "No person may possess a lethal weapon...." It's just another trap by the big "planners."



The People of the World
The Federal Convention



DOTTED LINE AC symbolizes intervention of Council in tenure of the President's Cabinet and Acting Presidency of the Chairman of the Council during vacancies in the Presidency.

DIAGONAL AD symbolizes Chairmanship of the President in the Chamber of Guardians.

DIAGONAL CB symbolizes Council's veto power on appointments to the Judiciary and membership of the Chairman of the Council in the Tribunal and Supreme Court.

DOTTED LINE BD symbolizes intervention of the Judiciary in elections to the Chamber of Guardians.