



AMERICAN RIGHTS GUARDIAN UPDATE

VOLUME 7 NUMBER 7 SUMMER 2003

The only printed voice of opposition to Federal Government Indian Policy in Wisconsin

Published by Protect Americans' Rights and Resources to maintain an informed membership

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for the redress of grievances"...Folks that is the first amendment verbatim. I believe it's impossible for a normal person to find that a 70 year old symbol, honoring veterans, is in violation of the first amendment. Perhaps they have been smoking the pot that the Mexicans, sneaking across the border, have been growing in the Sequoia National Forest, California.

Granted, this may seem like it has nothing to do with Wisconsin or Indians, but consider this: The ninth circuit court is made up of judges of the same ilk as Barbara Crabb. Judges who will legislate from the bench, all the things the liberals can't get through the congress. That's why the liberals are tying up all of President Bush's appointments; they want more Barbara Crabbs on the Federal Bench to do their bidding.

Meanwhile, a cavalier attitude is adopted by the same court pertaining to our southern borders which are being invaded by armed insurgents from Mexico, who shoot at our Park rangers and have shot tourists. Talk about screwed up priorities. The first three articles address the effects of liberal judges legislating from the bench.

In this issue

On Page 1: A large-scale Battle Over a Small Cross...How the (ACLU) is trying to force their will on the majority.

On Page 2: U.S. Invaded by Mexican Pot Farmers.

On Page 2: Federal Acquisition of Land Within States. A look at how little authority the Federal Government has to purchase private property.

On Page 4: Laws Flouted. Tribal gambling expansion advocates treat state & federal laws with contemptuous disregard.

On Page 4: Cut The Fat Cat Salaries.

On Page 5: The Mafia Connection, by long time PARR member Jack Honrath.

On Page 5: Your Tax Dollars at Work.

On Page 6: Bureaucratic Arrogance = Incompetence.

On Page 6: Clearing the Political Fog. By Elaine Willman PARR's west coast columnists.

On Page 7: Wake Up America.

On Page 7: Ancient Outdoor History.

On Page 7: Thanks for the 50" Muskie Size Limit By Greg Graunke

On Page 8: Minnesota Fish Market. Proposed sale of wall-eye gill netted in Minnesota, by Chippewa.

On Page 8: Educats Ban Founding Fathers, Mount Rushmore, Hot Dogs, Yachts, Snowmen.

On Page 9: Long time PARR Member and recently deceased Ken Keyser's autobiography for sale.

A large-scale Battle Over a Small Cross

(By Bob Manzke taken in part from an article by Daniel B. Wood | Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor)

Court case tests whether a cross in the Mojave National Preserve breaches the church-state wall.

Perched on a wind-swept rock jutting 30 feet above the Mojave National Preserve, the monument looks like a headless man in an ugly suit. It's actually a six-foot cross - covered, by court order, with brown canvas - at the root of a debate over the separation of church and state.

The Mojave Cross has sparked a First Amendment battle stretching from here to Congress over what constitutes religious symbolism and what is just plain historic. The hollow crucifix has stood in this gusty-dusty corner of California since a group of World War I veterans built it as a memorial in 1934. Situated in a wide expanse of arid desert, the cross is about 20 feet off a two-lane highway where perhaps 20 cars pass a day. "You don't even see it unless you are looking up at the right place," says, a native to the area.

The American Civil Liberties Union filed suit against the National Park Service in March 2001, saying the cross violates the First Amendment because it is a "religious fixture" on federal land.

A federal judge agreed, crushing local veterans who claim the cross is a historic monument, not an ecclesiastical object. Over the years, people have gathered at

Page 1

(Continued See Cross Page 2)

the cross for services and social gatherings. But, although it is a Christian symbol, they don't regard its purpose as primarily religious, says Ms. Sandoz.

"This is just veterans' simple way of saying we honor those who have died for this country," she says.

The newest wrinkle in the story is that local US Rep. Jerry Lewis (R) is proposing a mini land swap that would exchange five acres of private land for the half-acre surrounding the cross. The land swap would place the cross on private land, presumably ending the constitutional debate.

Last summer, Representative Lewis inserted his idea as a "rider" on an omnibus public lands bill, but it failed to pass. The Ninth Court of Appeals has ordered the cross removed, and the US Justice Department has requested a stay of that order.

The Ninth Circuit is expected to rule any day now, and the cross will remain covered in the interim. Meanwhile, Lewis is seeking another bill for his rider.

"It is not unprecedented that we could somehow maintain this cross as a historical land marker," says Jim Specht, Lewis's press secretary. One example, he says, is Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta, now owned by the US Park Service. "We believe the judge has not properly considered the memorial/historical value of this site."

§§§§§

U.S. Invaded by Armed Mexican Pot Farmers.

(By William LaJeunesse News-Max)

SEUOIA NATIONAL FOREST, Calif. — Mexican drug growers have been seen walking through this famous national parkland, but they're not going camping. In the newest battleground in the war on drugs, some of the cartels from across the border no longer bother to smuggle marijuana into the United States. They simply grow it here, on public lands in California.

"They are going into national forests, national parks. And it's a huge problem,"
Page 2

says Dave Dresson of the California Bureau of Narcotics. In the past, most of the marijuana smoked in California was grown in Mexico. But that's no longer the case. Police now seize twice as much pot growing in public forests throughout the state as they do at the Mexican border. And the seizures at the Sequoia National Forest alone are up eight-fold. The reason: It's just a lot easier to grow it here.

First of all, the land and water are free. There are no boats or planes to buy, and no officials to bribe. And if the drug dealers are unlucky enough to get caught, the penalties are relatively light compared to those faced by cross-border smugglers.

Anyone convicted of smuggling drugs from across the border faces a minimum 10-year federal sentence. But jail time isn't even mandated by California state law. "It doesn't matter in California if you get caught growing two plants or 20,000 plants," said Eric Wyatt, deputy district attorney of Madera County. "The punishment in California isn't very severe." Officials say that people convicted of growing pot in California could be sentenced to 16 months in prison and would probably serve only eight months -- even if they're growing large quantities, according to Dresson.

It's impossible to tell how much pot is actually being grown on parklands, but the estimates are that it comes to thousands of acres. But even if California takes the issue of marijuana cultivation lightly, it's very serious business for the drug growers and dealers. Officials say pot plants can sell for as much as \$4,000 each on the street. And at those prices, the drug growers are taking precautions. They carry firearms into the parks, and have been known to plant booby traps to protect their investments.

Their activity has caused a number of problems with innocent passers-by who didn't know they were stumbling upon secret stashes. A number of hikers have been shot by the drug dealers, and the

dealers have even traded gunfire with park rangers.

No one has been killed -- yet. But the ongoing problem has left a number of officials worrying that there may be much more to fear in these woods than hungry bears.

PARR Ed Note: This doesn't seem to be a fair tradeoff. Most of our good paying jobs are sent to Mexico, and in turn Mexico sends its pot growing industry to the U.S.. Instead of issuing different color alerts why not start to defend our borders? Why worry about a couple of terrorists when a whole army of pot farmers can easily slip across the border and cultivate thousands of acres of hemp. At this rate how long will it be before Spanish is the official language of the USA?

§§§§§

Federal Acquisition of land Within States

Researched and written by Bill Howell and J. L. (Jim) Tenney, Arizona State President of Frontiers of Freedom People of the USA (FOF-PFUSA) Mr. Tenney can be reached at 4520 West Airport Rd., Willcox, Arizona 85643. Phone 520-384-2834, Fax 520-384-6396, Email it_assist@vtc.net. Bob

Does the federal government's purchase of lands within the boundary of a state require the consent of the state legislature? If we are in a sovereign state, the answer is absolutely, yes! **As a Constitutional Republic, if our elected representatives are not accountable and do not uphold our state sovereignty and individual liberties, then we are lost.**

Although the Enclave Clause of the U.S. Constitution, Article I, section 8, clause 17 authorizes Congress to purchase, own and control land within the boundary of a state, it is very specific and limiting as to what type of lands the federal government can own and control within a given state. It also leaves no doubt that the state legislature has to relinquish control of those lands. The relevant portion of the Enclave clause reads:

Congress may exercise exclusive legislative "authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings;"

Can any agency of the federal

government come into a state and purchase land without state authorization as any other buyer would? Is it a private property right for a property owner to sell to the federal government? A proper reading of the Enclave Clause shows the answer to both of these questions is, NO.

Had the founding fathers intended the federal government to have this authority they would never have included the Enclave provision in the Constitution. Had the people believed the constitution would allow the federal government to acquire any land it desired and displace the state's authority they would never have allowed their state to ratify the Constitution. Clearly, issues other than private property rights must have been at stake, and those issues must have been of sufficient gravity to compel the founders to include this clause and for the people to accept it.

The idea that states hold the power to determine the manner and context of transfers of property is the foundation of statehood. This Statement by Thomas Jefferson is another example of our founders reasoning on this matter: "Can it be thought that the Constitution be intended that for a shade or two of convenience, more or less, Congress should be authorized to break down the most ancient and fundamental laws of the several states; such as those against Mortmain, the laws of Alienage, the rules of descent, the acts of distribution, the laws of escheat and forfeiture, the laws of monopoly?" Nothing but a necessity invincible by any other means, can justify such a prostitution of laws, which constitute the pillars of our whole system of jurisprudence.

How have we gotten to the point where many will argue that to interfere with federal land acquisition is unconstitutional? Where did the idea come from that there is a right for individuals and other entities to sell to the federal government without requiring the consent of the state legislature? Part of the answer to this misconception lay in two Supreme

Court decisions. These two activist court decisions known as: Kohl, and Ft. Leavenworth did expand federal authority beyond a strict reading of the Enclave Clause. In these two cases, the justices "***discovered***" a Federal right of eminent domain that was neither specifically nor implicitly granted by the people in the Constitution. ***There is no doubt an expansion of authority was granted by the Court. This was an act of sheer judicial arrogance by men in high places.***

"It cannot be presumed that any clause in the Constitution is intended to be without effect." Thomas Jefferson spoke to the consequence of Federal usurpation of state's constitutional rights: "To take from the states all the powers of self government, without regard to the special delegations and reservations solemnly agreed to in the federal compact is not for the peace, happiness, or prosperity of those states."

This persistent and pervasive threat to state sovereignty is not a matter to be taken lightly. The Founders divided power and enumerated only certain powers to the Federal government, understanding it was the only way to maintain individual liberty. To the extent that the Federal government consumes or otherwise diminishes that independent sovereignty of a state there is an equal loss of individuals' liberty. This is reflected in another statement by Thomas Jefferson: "When all government is centered in Washington, this government will become as evil and oppressive as the government from which we have just separated."

The Founders did not intend that the Federal government would ultimately consume the states; either with respect to their governmental independence or with respect to their physical existence.

From the Records of the Federal Convention, James Madison, Sept. 5, 1787, we find another very telling explanation of the reasoning for the enclave clause to be worded the way it is: Mr. Gerry contended that (the power of the Federal government to purchase lands

within states) might be made use of to enslave any particular State by buying up its territory, and that the strongholds proposed would be a means of awing the State into an undue obedience to the Genl. Government...thus after the word "purchased" the words "by the consent of the Legislature of the State" was added to the Enclave Clause.

Reading this explanation should leave no doubt that the founders' feared uncontrolled Federal purchases of private land within states. The right to territorial self-defense was intentional and without opposition and is the reason for the "consent" provision of the Enclave Clause. The physical existence of states is not to depend upon trusting the intentions of the Federal government.

An example of the federal government's intention of ever increasing control over individual states is the current house bill, H.R. 701, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, or CARA. This bill, if passed in its present form, will produce three billion dollars per year for fifteen years and most of this money will be used for land acquisition. A major portion of this land acquisition money will be for Federal purchases and for purchases by "conservation" groups who often "flip" their purchase to the Federal government at a profit.

CARA represents a vast increase in the potential for Federal purchases of private land within states. The legislature of the State has an obligation to its citizens to proactively participate in all Federal purchases. This is not to say that sales will not be permitted, but the interest of the state and the people will be protected. It means only that the intended guardian of state sovereignty, the state legislature, will determine whether any such sale will proceed.

State consent is not an infringement on private property rights. State consent is a defense of the interests of the State and of the liberty of the people that springs from meaningful differentiation and division of power between the national and state governments. In brief,

state inaction has allowed the loss of state's jurisdiction and corresponding loss of individual liberties. The legislature needs to affirm and assert the consent role of the legislature as an essential and overdue revitalization of constitutional federalism. By inaction, a state's legislature is allowing their state authorities to be undermined by the federal government! It is time for state legislatures to stand up and exercise their fiduciary responsibility to the people they represent.

PARR Ed Note: Due to space limitations this article was edited by PARR.

§§§§§

Laws Flouted

(By Bob Manzke)

The State Constitution prohibits the expansion of gambling, and the Federal Indian Gambling act prohibits the establishment of satellite reservations for the purpose of establishing off reservation casinos, yet proposals for off-reservation casinos are plowing ahead full-steam. The irony is that our elected officials and bureaucrats at both the State and federal level are leading the parade...and the mind-boggler is the income-guarantee built into Governor Jim Doyle's give-always. If other Tribes are able to build illegal off reservation casinos, cutting into the Ho-Chunk's profit, then in essence the taxpayers of Wisconsin have to pick up the tab.

A revision to the new Ho-Chunk tribal gambling compact approved by federal officials calls for a reduction in Ho-Chunk payments to the state if another tribe gets approval for an off-reservation casino that would cut into Ho-Chunk profits.

The change was made to what some competing tribes have called a "profit-protection" plan written into an earlier version of the Ho-Chunk compact. That version said a competing tribe opening a new casino had to directly compensate the Ho-Chunk for losses resulting from the new competition.

The change was made at the request of the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
Page 4

following complaints from other tribes hoping to get approval for off-reservation casinos, state Administration Secretary Marc Marotta said.

The bureau allowed new gambling pacts for the Ho-Chunk, Oneida and Menominee and the Lac Courtes Oreilles, Sokagoan (Mole Lake) and Bad River Chippewa bands to go into effect without comment following a 45-day review period. The compacts become effective when published in the Federal Register in the next few weeks.

Marotta said the Ho-Chunk compact revision would have the effect of triggering several rounds of negotiations if the Ho-Chunk object to an off-reservation deal. The St. Croix and Bad River Chippewa hope to get approval for an off-reservation casino in Beloit.

The Lac du Flambeau Chippewa hope to open an off-reservation casino near Shullsburg, in southwestern Wisconsin, which also could trigger a complaint from the Ho-Chunk, Marotta said.

Ho-Chunk spokesman Mark Butterfield said Wednesday that the provision wouldn't be an issue unless a new casino were approved "within a short radius" of an existing Ho-Chunk gambling hall.

But Butterfield noted the proposed Beloit casino site was on traditional Ho-Chunk land and said that "from a historical and emotional point of view, that's still our territory."

Meanwhile The Tavern League of Wisconsin is among those pushing for a plan to allow bars to use the gambling machines, which would be linked to the state lottery. The non-partisan Legislative Fiscal Bureau estimated the machines could net the state up to \$380 million a year.

But Doyle said he believes that allowing the machines would be an unconstitutional expansion of gambling. Wisconsin voters in 1993 approved a referendum to amend the constitution to restrict the expansion of gambling.

"I would veto it because I have a constitutional responsibility to veto it," Doyle said. "We should not fictionally

balance our budget on the basis of a clearly unconstitutional scheme."

Tavern League lobbyist Scott Stenger said he hopes the committee will take up the proposal this week.

"We've spent a lot of time and effort to craft a proposal that will help meet the constitutional challenge," Stenger said. "We're not really expanding gambling. We're allowing for another delivery device." Stenger said proceeds from video gambling would help beef up the state lottery property tax credit and help a tavern industry that he said has suffered as tribal casinos have grown in popularity. **PARR Ed. Note:** Add another attribute to Gov. Doyle's repertoire of sleaze... hypocrisy! The 1993 amendment to the State Constitution to restrict the expansion of gambling wasn't even considered when he gave the state away to the tribes. Apparently there is no limit to the length he will go to accommodate his owners; The United Tribes of Wisconsin. The irony is that Doyle is rejecting \$380 million in favor of \$200 million from the tribes. Again the taxpayers lose.

§§§§§

Cut The Fat Cat Salaries

(This article e-mailed to PARR Author Unknown)

Cuts in the right places would help the state's crisis. Property taxes may go up 9% next year because the state wants to cut \$70 million in aid to local governments. Yet the state's 30,000 managerial, professional and professorial employees have received raises the past two years, raises that were higher than the increase in the Consumer Price Index and that have cost the taxpayers an extra \$107 million for the University of Wisconsin System alone.

By rolling back these salary increases, Gov. Jim Doyle wouldn't have to cut state aid to local governments. And many other programs could be saved if the state's other 13,000 managers and professionals also had salaries cut back to what they were making two years ago. If the 31,000 rank-and-file union members will not be receiving raises, the management should also

(Continued see Fat Cat Page 5)

(Fat Cat Continued From Page 4)

share the burden and not leave it up to the taxpayers.

Any business owner knows the biggest cost is employees. Taxpayers have been extremely, if unknowingly, generous with the state's salaried employees, enabling them to enjoy an affluent lifestyle while working and a comfortable, often early, retirement. Too much so. If they were good at their jobs, the state would not be in this financial mess.

§§§§§

The Mafia Connection?

(By Jack Honrath Long Time PARR Member)

I'm an old World War II Marine veteran and it upsets me when people just can't call a spade a spade. Why do people use the word "Indian Casinos? When truthfully, they are mafia casinos? Does the mafia build them, do they operate them, do they do all of the promotion work and do they get to keep 70% of the profits? Is all the Indians have to do is keep their stinky moccasin in the door for 30% of the profits. Do the Indians have millions of dollars to build multi million dollar casinos? If so; then why is our Government still giving them aid? Why can't we just call these casino's what they are? It's our politicians who termed this phrase. This was just their way to get their cut of the profits and fool the people stupid enough to vote for them.

Why can't you and I open a casino? Isn't this discrimination? I was under the impression that we had equal rights in this country. Aren't we all Americans? The current Indian blood is just as mixed as most any other ethnic group, so why does only one group or race have this special privilege?

Our Governor has given the casino's more power to have craps, roulette, etc. What is next, prostitution, illegal drugs, and abortion clinics? These are all high profit enterprises and maybe the mafia would see fit to give Mr. Doyle a cut on this too. Think about it.

Our Governor is a Democrat and his party always claims to be for the working man, yet he will do anything in his power Page 5

to stop the mine in Crandon and keep a working a man from getting a job and making an honest living. The Indians are opposed to it also because they say it "may" hurt the environment. Since when is an Indian concerned over the environment? Just take a look at their reservations and their houses. They look like an old township dump. It is a sad state of affairs when the State of Wisconsin becomes more aware of a new casino then they are of a new manufacturing plant. It appears that our politicians refuse to listen to the people unless there is violence. Must we do this to regain our equal rights? We have tried other methods to get them to listen, but they refuse any consideration to our request. They act like Saddam Insane and Hitler. We do deserve better and we must give more thought to whom we vote for and much less consideration to campaign commercials that are designed to mislead.

§§§§§

Your Tax Dollars At Work

(By Bob Manzke)

With the tremendous wealth flowing on to the reservations in form of Indian gambling money, one would think that our tax dollars would no longer be necessary to support the tribes royally. Guess again! Below is a small portion of a Government seven page memorandum pertaining to cost of supporting the aristocracy of American society.

October 13, 2000 FY 2001 Bureau of Indian Affairs Funding In this memorandum we report on the final FY 2001 funding levels for the major programs in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and related agencies as contained in H.R. 4578, the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for FY 2001. H.R. 4578 was signed into law on October 11 as Public Law 106-291.

The Act provides \$2,141,130,000 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, an amount that is \$59.8 million less than the Administration requested but \$272.1 million over the FY 2000 level. Within the total are \$1.74 billion for the Operation of In-

dian Programs and \$357 million for Construction.

I also found the following paragraph to be quite interesting. Recall this dates back to 2000...The Committee is concerned that some Indian tribes may have violated the spirit of their trust relationships by locating Indian gambling facilities on property far removed from their reservation which they have acquired or hope to acquire through the land-in-trust process in areas where local communities do not support such gambling enterprises. Under the land-in-trust process Indians may acquire land and have it placed in trust by the Secretary and have it treated as "sovereign" Indian lands exempt from certain local regulations and laws. While the approval of the State governor is required before the Secretary can approve a land-in-trust proposal, no formal approval of local governments is required. The Committee is concerned by this situation and requests that the Secretary be sensitive to local concerns when considering such land-in-trust applications in the future. The views of all local government authorities directly affected by the application should be considered before an application is approved. Local authorities include the executive authority and legislative bodies of counties, towns and municipalities in which such gambling facilities are proposed to be located. The Committee notes that this concern is not about the right of Indian tribes to conduct such activities on traditional Indian reservation lands. Further, the Committee directs the Secretary of Interior to conduct a review of the after acquired, non-contiguous, land-in-trust process as it relates to gambling including all applications which have been considered or are being considered at this time, and report back with recommendations to deal with this problem.

§§§§§

New Sex Study... It has been determined; the most used sexual position for married couples is a doggie position. The husband sits up and begs. The wife rolls over and plays dead...

Bureaucratic Arrogance = Incompetence

(By Bob Manzke)

When I applied for Social Security 12 years ago, I had mega-problems. I couldn't speak Spanish and the person I was dealing with couldn't speak English. I thought the Milwaukee Social Security Office was as inferior as a government agency could get. Well looks like I was wrong again. Read on:

The U.S. inspector general's office was asked to launch an investigation into how the Social Security Administration handles disability claims in Milwaukee and into the results of a critical audit that the agency has refused to release to the public.

An internal audit of the office in February found more than 1,400 backlogged cases at the Milwaukee Office of Hearings and Appeals and two full boxes of unopened mail that was several months old. The mail included requests for congressional inquiries and medical updates, according to an internal e-mail summarizing the audit.

Attorneys who have represented people before the agency said the Milwaukee office kept some people with serious medical problems waiting more than two years for a decision. Some of those clients died before getting one. Medical records are regularly lost or misfiled, and delays were common, the attorneys said.

A man with congestive heart failure, diabetes, retinal bleeding and poor circulation has been waiting 27 months for a decision on whether he qualifies for disability payments; another who has coronary heart disease, seizures and arthritis has been waiting three years for a decision.

People denied Social Security disability benefits can appeal to the Office of Hearings and Appeals, where administrative law judges review medical records and testimony before issuing a decision. Those decisions can also be appealed.

Last year more than 5,000 people

Page 6

sought appeal hearings from the local office after being denied benefits.

§§§§§

Clearing The Political Fog...

(By PARR's West Coast Columnist Elaine Wilman)

It does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an irate, tireless minority keen to set brush fires in people's minds. - Founding Father, Samuel Adams.

Don't Get Out of Line.

Diversity and sensitivity principles have created a controlled political environment, very psychologically controlled. The strategy is to promote focus groups for purpose of consensus building so that one voice, the voice of any one particular citizen is ignored, minimized or deeply submerged. This has never been more evident than with current Federal Indian Policy and Indian lobbyist propaganda. Here's how it works:

Certain lies, myths and political agendas, repeatedly expressed in words and print, can quickly become accepted beliefs, even community and national values. Two such examples are: 1) "You stole our (Indian) land," and 2) "We (Indians) were here first." Neither statement is true, but both statements are current political mantra heard not just among Indian propagandists, but in the halls of national, state and local elected office. However, these now entrenched myths are so embedded into the American psyche that one who even questions, much less speaks an opposing perspective, is likely painted with the racist brush, viewed as a troublemaker, and is at risk for direct character assassination. Tribal entities will threaten economic boycotts too.

The reality of these two myths is that land was lawfully acquired or purchased (Louisiana Purchase, et al.) by the United States. Kennewick Man, as well as other recent anthropological discoveries raise serious question about who was here first. No wonder the panic and urgency to bury Kennewick Man bones.

Blend in With The Sheep.

Prearranged and orchestrated public forums or planning sessions make it easier for propagandists to frame the debate

and to keep any opposition from having a balanced opportunity to state a position. A psychologically controlled environment gives a propagandist the platform from which to operate and prevents a citizen from injecting an alternate viewpoint or opportunity to take back the discussion. Consensus is generated from such forums and taken to state and federal legislators as "what the community really wants."

National and Community Neuroses.

Following lock-step with consensus groups or the current politically accepted viewpoint sets up a kind of permanent paranoia because we know it isn't true, but we don't want to make waves. We want to be a part of... We would prefer to go along with... Maybe things will get better tomorrow...

Going along with what we know is not true sets us up for internal conflict and frustration. As we build with confusion we lose our frame of reference, our own personal sense of what is true and what is right. When this process is blanketed upon an entire community, or region, or nation, we become collectively alienated. An alienated electorate, particularly if it is the backbone of society, the ones who foot most of the bills, is a tremendous boon to a propagandist. It effectively gets his primary resistance out of the picture.

The fog of Federal Indian Policy has alienated the national electorate. That is why people of good will often wait until it's too late to save themselves or, indeed, their way of life. The only antidote for coming out of this political fog is to speak your truth and act with courage. A daily supply of truth and courage is invaluable to challenge the lies, stand for what you believe, and defend your American rights of property, civility, a republican form of government, equitable and even-handed taxation, and a free and balanced marketplace.

Courage is Not an Endangered Species.

It is possible to be privately courageous

(Continued See Fog Page 7)

(Fog Continued From Page 6)

while publicly sensible. It is possible to quietly support organizations that reflect your values. As courage strengthens, it is absolutely fulfilling to experience the thrill that follows when one can say, "There, I just utilized and defended my American rights." It's actually o.k. to believe in the U. S. Constitution, - really! It's still o.k. to honor all cultures without being governed by a single one. Tribalism is fine for the willing. But only American government may govern U.S. citizens, unless citizens stay cowed and shrouded in the Federal Indian Policy fog.

I've popped my head up out of the fog, and I see more and more heads and shoulders rising above the clouds.
Elaine D. Willman, Chair

Citizens Equal Rights Alliance (CERA)

§§§§§

WAKE UP AMERICA

(By Victor Bellomy & John Fleming, PARR's West Coast Columnist)

John Fleming and I have been working tirelessly to bring this line of thought to the attention of the public at large... It is extremely gratifying to find these writings of one of the great founding fathers. It too; tells me just how much more work we have to do to set the record straight, (if ever).. In recent years Academia has fallen into the grip of the judiciary's dicta, where legislating from the bench seems to be the accepted rule of the day.; no matter how unconstitutional it may be..How can these young students ever learn when they are being taught through out their academic life? They must depend on their own individual ability to read and understand what these founders intended for this great nation that we live in.. We have the right to rise to the height of our individual ability. Nothing more or nothing less. When will we ever learn??

The following are taken from (CITIZENS RULE BOOK) starting with Jefferson's warning In 1789 Thomas Jefferson warned that the judiciary, if given to much power; might ruin our REPUBLIC, and destroy our rights... "The new
Page 7

Constitution has secured these [individual rights] in the executive and the legislative departments; but not in the judiciary. it should have established trials by the people themselves, that is to say, by jury"

"The judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working underground to undermine the foundations of our confederate fabric." (1820) "... the Federal Judiciary; an irresponsible body (for impeachment is scarcely a scare-crow) working like gravity by night and by day ; gaining a little to-day and a little to-morrow, advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the states; and the government of all be consolidated into one.. When all Government.... in little as in great thing, shall be drawn to Washington as the centre of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated. (1821)

"The opinion which gives to the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional and what not, only for themselves in their own sphere of actions , but for the legislative and executive also in their spheres, would make the judiciary a despotic branch.. ".....judges should be withdrawn from the bench whose erroneous biases are leading us to dissolution. It may indeed, injure them in fame and fortune; but it saves the Republic...

§§§§§

ANCIENT OUTDOOR HISTORY

While we do not like to interfere with fun and we know from experience that spearing fish by torchlight is an exciting sport, we feel like warning the boys to look a little out. It is against the law to spear fish, and the fine is from \$5 to \$50. (*Stevens Point Journal, April 30, 1887*). This little gem was sent to us by longtime PARR member Chris Larson, of Bancroft, Wisconsin.

Isn't amazing, how these Indians, in their search to eliminate effort while destroying portions of the environment, can resurrect practices that were considered harmful to the fisheries over 100 years ago.

§§§§§

Thanks For the 50" Muskie Size limit

(By Greg Graunke)

As of press time PARR hasn't received an answer to this letter. Apparently the answer to the question of whether the Chippewa will still spear the 50" limit lakes is to ignore it just like this letter.

Dear Secretary Hassett, The Sunday paper, here in Oshkosh, had a article about you and your background and some of the sports you like to pursue. The article mentions how much you enjoy fishing Musky.

After reading that article I proceeded to read the May issue of Wisconsin Outdoors News. Among that month's many articles were two that caught my attention in light of the fact that I had just read how avid a musky fisherman you are. The first was a picture and an article of a illegally bow shot musky. The fish "was" 46 inches, by the way, a trophy in anyone's book. The arresting warden even mentioned that the fish was the biggest he has ever seen come out of the lake in his 14 years as warden and made the comment, "unfortunately this fish was killed illegally and during the closed season."

The second article was in Lee Kernen's column, former DNR fisheries manager, now retired, about various studies one of which was radio tagging 40 muskies and tracking them for the summer. I now quote from that article, "He also reported that one musky was caught three times in a two-week period. That is irrefutable evidence that catch and release works."

All of this comes after the spring meetings where one of the main topics was about a 50 inch musky size limit on certain lakes. Time and again the topic

(Continued See Thanks Page 8)

(Thanks Continued From Page 7)

that came up at the spring meetings and in discussions before the meetings was if the Chippewa would still spear, spring and unregulated winter spear, musky in those lakes. The answer to this date has been no answer, which would seem clear to everyone that this means they will still spear and thank you for the 50 inch limit! At this time PARR would ask your personal opinion on the above subjects The policy your department has now with open water and unregulated winter spearing of musky seems in direct opposition to the above mentioned articles. Equally yours, Greg Graunke Chair PARR

PARR Ed Note: Did you notice, just as soon as the liberals get into power the arrogance surfaces. However, just before press time PARR received a letter from WDNR Secretary Hassett. We will investigate his letter in the next issue.

§§§§§

Issue Item

While shopping for vacation clothes, my husband and I passed a display of bathing suits. It had been at least ten years and twenty pounds since I had even considered buying a bathing suit, so I sought my husband's advice. "What do you think?" I asked. "Should I get a bikini or an all-in-one?" "Better get a bikini," he replied. "You'd never get it all in one."

§§§§§

Minnesota Fish Market

(Bob Manzke)

Longtime PARR member and treaty rights opponent Larry Parks asked me recently if I knew anything about the Wisconsin Bands of Chippewa being able to commercially sell walleye gill netted in Minnesota. I contacted Mark Rotz of PERM of Minnesota, and this is what Mark had to say:

The Wisconsin Chippewa applied for a permit to sell-gill-netted-fish; however Mark said that as far as he knew no permits were issued. I guess that immediately after the permit was applied for an outcry exploded about this being in Page 8

violation of the Minnesota law prohibiting the sale of game. Mark seems to think that they never had any intention to pursue the permits; it appears to be a form of extortion for something. Mark and PERM just haven't figured out what. The Chippewa lie and extort; declaring twice the fish they can physically spear every year is a way of life in Wisconsin.

Finally, Mark tells me that the Wisconsin Chippewa gill-netted 60,000 lbs. of fish out of Lake Mille Lacs. Unless my math is all out of whack, using a conservative figure of \$5 lb., that amounts to about \$300, 000; you sure can buy a lot of politicians for that. Oh, I forgot, they need these fish to feed their families.

§§§§§

Educrats Ban Founding Fathers, Mount Rushmore, Hot Dogs, Yachts, Snowmen

(With Carl Limbacher and NewsMax.com Staff)

If you wonder why children in America's failed government school monopolies aren't learning, perhaps it's because P.C.-crazed educrats are too busy acting as left-wing thought police.

Out in La-La Land, educrats are re-writing history to appease those who make a career of taking offense at reality. California's textbooks are being changed as follows, according to Fox News Channel:

Even though all the signers of Constitution were specimens of those dreaded white males, "Founding Fathers" is a no-no, to be replaced by "The Framers."

Pictures of naughty foods such as hot dogs, soft drinks, butter (even though that's better for you than margarine) and cake are banned.

The euphemism "senior citizen," once politically correct, is now politically incorrect. The new P.C. term: "older person." Older than whom? Who knows?

Mount Rushmore can't be mentioned because "it appears to offend" some American Indians. ("American Indians," of course, was long ago replaced by the silly term "native Americans," even though anyone born in the U.S. is a Native American.)

American Indians can't be depicted with long braids, in rural settings or on reservations, even though many American Indians have long braids and live in rural settings or on reservations.

Snowmen aren't allowed. Snowpersons are. Hey, that could be part of sex ed. Yachts can't be mentioned. Too elitist.

"Jungle" is banned; "rain forest" is the P.C. euphemism. (Are all references to "swamp" changed to "wetlands"?)

"I think our textbooks should to our greatest capacity be free of any type of stereotyping," Sue Stickel, who is "deputy superintendent for curriculum and instruction" for the so-called California Department of Education, told Fox News. "We need to make sure that all ethnicities are represented. We need to make sure that both males and females are represented. We need to make sure that our materials cover the full gamut."

Others, however, know what is going on. "It's outright censorship," said author Diane Ravitch, who has written extensively on this school issue. "It dumbs down our textbooks, makes them bland, far less interesting than anything children might see in the movies - even in G-rated movies or TV.

"The problems that have happened in education is that the textbook publishers and the test developers have become so sensitive to any controversy that whenever they receive a complaint it is very likely that they will remove the source of the complaint," explained Ravitch.

§§§§§

Issue Item

Zebediah and his egg business!!! Zebediah was in the fertilized egg business. He had several hundred young layers, called pullets, and eight or ten roosters, whose job was to fertilize the eggs.

Zeb kept records, and any rooster that didn't perform well went into the soup pot and was replaced. That took an awful lot of Zeb's time; so, Zeb got a

(Continued See Zeb Page 9)

(Zeb Continued From Page 8)

set of tiny bells and attached them to his roosters.

Each bell had a different tone so that Zeb could tell, from a distance, which rooster was performing.

Now he could sit on the porch and fill out an efficiency report simply by listening to the bells.

Zeb's favorite rooster was old Brewster. A very fine specimen he was, too. But on this particular morning, Zeb noticed that Brewster's bell had not rung at all!! Zeb went to investigate. The other roosters were chasing pullets, bells a-ringing! The pullets, hearing the roosters coming, would run for cover. BUT, to Zeb's amazement, Brewster had his bell in his beak, so it couldn't ring. He'd sneak up on a pullet, do his job and walk on to the next one.

Zeb was so proud of Brewster that he entered him in the county fair. Brewster was an overnight sensation. The judges not only awarded him the No Bell Piece Prize but also the Pullet surprise.

§§§§§



For the last few years PARR carried the Butternut Lake Resort's brochure on our web site. During this approximately two year period the resort's ad had over 3,000 hits. This resulted in many inquiries and bookings. In return the resort provided me (Bob Manzke) and my brother with lodging for a few days in September, so I could officiate at PARR's annual membership meeting at Arbor Vitae. Butternut Lake Resort is now under new management, which is politically correct, consequently the add was removed. Because we don't deal with businesses who consider us contemptuous, we are looking for new lodging. So, if someone in the Lakeland area is interested in the same deal we had with The Butternut Lake Resort please contact me at (414)- 543-4181 Or At P.O. Box 270007 Milwaukee, WI. 53227, or at PARR1@tds.net .

| | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------|----|
| PARR MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION | | | 01 |
| (PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY) | | | |
| NAME(S) | | | |
| ADDRESS | | | |
| CITY | STATE | ZIP | |
| PHONE() | DATE | | |
| SINGLE MEMBERSHIP \$15() | FAMILY \$20() | | |
| NEW MEMBER() | RENEWAL() | DONATIONS\$ | |
| FILL OUT AND MAIL ALONG WITH YOUR CHECK TO: | | | |
| P.A.R.R.; P.O. BOX 270007; MILWAUKEE, WI. 53227-0007 | | | |

Several Memberships that expired in March of this year have not been renewed as yet. If the mailing label on this newsletter reads Membership Empires: 03/15/03 feel free to use the application to the left and renew at this time.

If you grew up in the depression, or were raised in an orphanage, you will really relate with long time PARR member Ken Keyser's book "*The Kids of the Guardian Angel Boarding School.*" This book is an autobiography of Ken's childhood growing up in The Guardian Angel Boarding School. As I read this book I was transported back in time 60 plus years to my childhood years growing up during the depression. Now that I look back at those years, in my case, being a kid during the depression wasn't so tough. Sure candy was a rarity, and toys were scarcer yet, but I lived in a home with a loving Mother, Father and Brothers. And like Ken and his fellow residents of The Guardian Angel Boarding School we made our own fun.

This is a really enjoyable book about a rebellious and sometimes rowdy teen age boy's life in a boarding school, his friends and enemies at the school, and the Nuns and Priest that ran the school.

ARGU ran an article by Ken in the Christmas 2002 issue. Unfortunately Ken is no longer with us he died on April 5th 2003. His wife Betty Hiller Keyser wrote PARR later in April and informed PARR that she would remain active in PARR as a member. In her letter she also talked of Ken's book. Because Ken was a very loyal PARR member we decided to try to help Mrs. Keyser sell Ken's book...So please fill out the enclosed form, clip it, and send it along with your check to:

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| NAME | |
| Delivery Address | |
| City, State, Zip | |
| Number of Books | |
| How Much | Books are \$18.00 each this includes \$2.00 Shipping & Handling. Make check payable to Betty Hiller Keyser. |

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| Betty Hiller Keyser |
| N11069 Boat Landing 10 Rd. |
| Athelstane, WI. 54104 |